

## Chapter 4: Constructivist and Inclusive Education: Exclusion and the Present Crisis of Democracy

Jim Garrison<sup>1</sup> & Stefan Neubert<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, USA

<sup>2</sup> University of Cologne, Faculty of Human Sciences, Cologne, Germany

Correspondence: Stefan Neubert, University of Cologne, Faculty of Human Sciences, Gronewaldstraße 2, 50931 Cologne, Germany. E-mail: s.neubert@uni-koeln.de

Received: May 25, 2017

Accepted: September 1, 2017

Online Published: March 7, 2018

doi:10.5430/irhe.v3n1p56

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/irhe.v3n1p56>

### Abstract

This chapter combines perspectives of Deweyan philosophy and education with Zygmunt Bauman's sociological approach. It addresses the present deep crisis of democracy represented by reascent nationalism and right-wing populism in many places around the globe. Among other things, we explore Bauman's account of liquid modernity with a special eye on his critical views on the ambivalence of communities in contemporary life. First, we argue that inclusive education in a Deweyan sense must be based on civil and hospitable communities. Second, we use Bauman to explain some important characteristics of exclusive as opposed to democratic communities. Third, we discuss some of the main strategies of exclusion that lead, according to Bauman, to a loss of civil spaces in liquid modernity. We interpret them as challenges and risks that Deweyan democracy has to face in the world of today. Fourth, we adopt Bauman's idea of explosive communities and use it to analyse some of the more dramatic and violent dangers to democracy that are involved by contemporary extreme nationalist and right-wing populist policies. Fifth, we draw implications for democracy and education by identifying some strategies to counter these dangers and to enable and facilitate new ways of liquid learning in liquid times. We discuss six necessary aspects and qualities of learning communities that seem appropriate to this end. Throughout the essay, we show, from a Deweyan perspective, that the development from solid to liquid modernity, as depicted by Bauman, has taken a new and unexpected turn, again, in the course of the very last years.

**Keywords:** John Dewey, Zygmunt Bauman, nationalism, right-wing populism, exclusive communities, crisis of democracy

### 1. Introduction

As the preceding three essays have all suggested, education is everywhere and always about personal and cultural identity. Of course, both kinds of identity are interdependent. These chapters have shown how difficult it is to acquire and retain a stable sense of self in a rapidly changing world. Globalized liquid modernity has challenged individual and collective identity in novel ways. 2016 and 2017 may be the years people began to break under the strain with the election of far right anti-liberal ultra-nationalistic movements and candidates such as Rodrigo Duterte in the Philippines, Brexit in the United Kingdom, and Donald Trump in the United States with the promise of more to come. Right-wing islamophobic extremist Geert Wilders triggered much public debate and concern during the early 2017 national elections in the Netherlands, and the ultra-nationalist Marine Le Pen succeeded to proceed into the second and decisive phase of the presidential elections in France the same year. New right-wing populist anti-liberal and anti-democratic movements and parties have appeared in many other parts of the world, including Germany, Poland, Hungary and other European countries. In Germany, the recent federal election in September 2017 has brought a relatively new extreme right-wing party, the so-called Alternative for Germany (AfD), into the federal parliament as the third largest faction. These changes in the political climate almost around the globe seem unbelievably swift to many, but as the preceding chapters indicate, the relation between solid and liquid modernity is only a matter of pace and degree, and the thermodynamic phase change of any liquid is sudden and swift.

In the foreword to the second edition of *Liquid Modernity*, Bauman (†2017) states, "I did not think earlier and do not think now of the solidity versus liquidity conundrum as a dichotomy" (Bauman 2012, ix). The cover of this more recent edition appears to portray a melting block of ice. The phase change from solid ice to water occurs at 0 °C

degrees centigrade. A fraction of a degree either way makes a dramatic difference. Further, the phase change from liquid to gas, that is, the boiling point, for water is also just a fraction of a degree at 100 °C. Later modernity may well turn out to be a rhythm of rapid phase changes, and things can always boil over. We must not forget that we live in a world which is deeply divided and characterized by extreme amounts of social inequality. In the introduction to his book *The Great Divide*, Nobel prize laureate economist Joseph E. Stiglitz (2015, xii) reports breathtaking figures – originally launched by OXFAM in 2014 – according to which the 85 richest persons in the world own as much wealth as the poorer half of mankind i.e., roughly 3.5 billion people. According to latest OXFAM information published early 2017, the number had shrunk in 2016 from 85 to 8. (Note 1) Of course such numbers are difficult to calculate and there may be haziness in details. But no matter whether it's 8 or 80 or even 800, there can be no doubt that the gap has become immense and that issues of social inequality belong to the paramount political problems and challenges all around the globe in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Bauman (2000) observes that precariousness and deep seated fears of social decline are among the most fundamental concerns in the lives of many in liquefied modernity and under conditions of liquefied capitalism: "Precariousness is the mark of the preliminary condition of all the rest: the livelihood, and particularly the most common sort of livelihood, that which is claimed on the ground of work and employment" (160). Deprived of sufficiently stable orientation as well as sufficiently predictable life and working conditions while being exposed to new risks and uncertainties under rapidly changing social and economic terms, the lives of many are burdened by relatively novel forms of anxieties: "The most acute and stubborn worries that haunt such a life are the fears of being caught napping, of failing to catch up with fast-moving events, of being left behind, of overlooking 'use-by' dates, of being saddled with possessions that are no longer desirable, of missing the moment that calls for a change of track before crossing the point of no return" (Bauman 2005: 2). It is obvious how obtrusively and successfully Trump's right wing populist campaign has played on the keyboard of fears of social decline in the recent U.S. presidential election.

This chapter makes some conjectures about the relation between liquid and solid modernity. It is unlikely that any political economy, even the most virulent forms of "economic nationalism" (to use Stephen Bannon's phrase for the jingoist economic agenda of the Trump administration), can do more than render liquid modernity more or less viscous. The economic and political advantages of liquidity in global capital and labor are simply too great. Woe to those left behind. Nonetheless, the effects of even short-lived xenophobia are hard to overestimate, and one cannot assume that ultra-nationalism with its striving for ethnic purity, protectionism, perfection, and scapegoating may not boil over into enduring change.

It is necessary to examine the recent right-wing anti-liberal and anti-democratic attempts at political re-solidification of modernity and what they might mean for inclusive education. We will do so by reversing some of Bauman's analyses in terms of his own visual image of the block of melting ice, which now (2016/17) seems to be freezing again.

## 2. Inclusive Education as Civil and Hospitable Community

Previous chapters have established that heavily regulated educators – constantly held "accountable" to external agencies, and under continuous surveillance – find themselves placed in a paradoxical, intermediate, transitional, and indeterminate state between solid and liquid modernity. The same holds for educational institutions like schools, universities, and programs of teacher education, including the Cologne International Teacher Education Laboratory (ITEL). This section identifies three virtues of democracy and inclusive education, namely civility, hospitality, and listening. We do so in hope of opening up an extended conversation about what other virtues, beliefs, and values might characterize such spaces.

In the following quote, Bauman (2012) considers the prime virtue of *civility* as a precondition for democratic public spaces. His criterion readily extends to educational communities such as the ITEL (see chapter 2) or the IUS (see chapter 1):

The main point about civility is ... the ability to interact with strangers without holding their strangeness against them and without pressing them to surrender it or to renounce some or all the traits that have made them strangers in the first place. (104)

He goes on to observe, "Civility, like language, cannot be 'private.' Before it becomes the individually learned and privately practiced art, civility must be a feature of the social setting" (95). He describes some of the characteristics required for a site "hospitable" to the practice of civility. Among other things, there is the "provision of spaces which people may share as *public personae* – without being nudged, pressed or cajoled to take off their masks and ... confess their inner feelings and put on display their intimate thoughts, dreams and worries" (96) while sharing a common good. Civility is a virtue of inclusive social settings. Inhospitable communities "encourage action, not

*inter-action*” (97). Interaction among differences – or better transaction – involves mutual transformation, co-creation, and the reciprocal actualization of human potential. It is crucial for educational growth.

Inclusive education requires the construction of *hospitable spaces*. In describing such spaces, it is hard to do better than the following insights of Henri Nouwren (1975): “Hospitality ... means primarily the creation of a free space where the stranger can enter and become a friend instead of an enemy. Hospitality is not to change people, but to offer them space where change can take place” (71). So conceived, hospitable educational spaces are sites of possibility, but not coercive necessity. Substitute “teacher” for “host” and “student” for “guest” and nothing else would need to change for one to realize that teachers have much to learn from students and much to offer: “A good host is the one who believes that his guest is carrying a promise he wants to reveal to anyone who shows a genuine interest” (87). If every individual has unique potential and unique experience, as we have repeatedly claimed with Dewey in the previous chapters, then each must have unique stories to tell. For “every individual is in his own way unique. Each one experiences life from a different angle than anybody else, and consequently has something distinctive to give others if he can turn his experiences into ideas and pass them on to others. Each individual that comes into the world is a new beginning; the universe itself is, as it were, taking a fresh start in him and trying to do something, even if on a small scale, that it has never done before.” (LW 5: 127) If he or she can tell their stories and turn their experiences into ideas shared with others, they are already on the way to becoming an individual mind and not just an individual with a mind. In a good Deweyan spirit, Nouwren (1975) suggests that a hospitable space is a site of pluralistic communicative democracy:

Teaching, therefore, asks first of all the creation of a space where students and teachers can enter into a fearless communication with each other and allow their respective life experiences to be their primary and most valuable source of growth. (85)

Hospitable teaching places a premium on *listening*. Many democratic constitutions, including the “Universal Declaration of Human Rights,” secure freedom of speech and expression (see Preamble and Article 19). However, there are no constitutions mentioning listening. Surely listening is as important to inclusive, pluralistic, and communicative democracies as speech. It is well to add listening, especially in dialogues across difference, to civility and hospitality as among the virtues of an inclusive educational space.

Dewey was well aware of the substantial role of listening in democracy and education. Only a responsive culture of listening can do justice to his democratic principles of generous participation, exchange, and cooperation across differences. He notes, for example: “Even in the classroom we are beginning to learn ... that every individual becomes educated only as he has an opportunity to contribute something from his own experience, no matter how meagre or slender that background of experience may be at a given time; and ... that enlightenment comes from the give and take, from the exchange of experiences and ideas.” (LW 13: 296) For him, the democratic way of life includes the clear and unambiguous awareness that the expression and appreciative perception of differences is a rightful claim of others as well as a means of enriching one’s one life-experience (see LW 14: 228).

Civility, hospitality, and listening are three core virtues of democracy and inclusive education; there are many more. It seems deeply concerning to see in what fundamental ways the recently rising far right populist and ultra-nationalist movements, parties, and proponents are denying and aggressively undermining such basic democratic values.

### 3. Exclusive vs. Democratic Communities

Bauman provides a critical picture of the role of communities in contemporary society: “In the liquid stage of modernity ... [c]ommunities come in many colours and sizes, but if plotted on the Weberian axis stretching from ‘light cloak’ to ‘iron cage’, they all come remarkably close to the first pole.” (Bauman 2012: 169) He turns to communitarianism to reflect on community in liquid modernity. Such communities are “not the pre-established and securely grounded *Gemeinschaft* known from social theory ... but a cryptonym for the zealously sought yet elusive ‘identity’” (171). In classical sociology, the community of *Gemeinschaft* as an ideal-type is one of shared attitudes, beliefs, close personal relationships, and commitment to traditional customary concerns yielding a strong sense of shared identity. It contrasts with *Gesellschaft*, which involves loose, indirect, impersonal associations with formal and often legalistic beliefs and values. Liquid modernity is a planetary extension of *Gesellschaft*. It leaves very few *Gemeinschaften* in the sense of traditional or “given” communities in place (the Amish in the United States, some indigenous communities around the world, and such).

Communitarians and others, including ultra-nationalists, seek to establish exceedingly solid forms of association to cope with the fragility of identity in the contemporary world. Bauman observes that all communities that must appeal to their members to secure their survival “by individual choices and take for that survival individual responsibility”

are “*postulated*; projects rather than realities, something that comes *after* not before the individual choice” (169). Such communities are constructed rather than given, as their members would like to believe. They are experienced first of all in imagination. Like a working hypothesis, a postulate is something suggested or assumed to exist or be true for the purposes of ratiocination, discussion, or belief. Bauman points to the asymmetrical relations of power involved in many such cases of community formation that tend to exclude in order to establish an apparently stable “we.” He always considers the attendant ambivalences. Such communities often tend to be closed and homogenous. They appeal to supposedly stable forms of identity in the face of “the new fragility of human bonds” (Bauman 2000: 170) in liquid times. They pretend to offer security through essentialized visions of community, identity, and belonging: “The community of the communitarian gospel is a home writ large (the *family* home, not a *found* home or a *made* home, but a home *into which one is born*, so that one could not trace one’s origin, one’s ‘reason to exist’, in any other place)” (Bauman 2000, 171). They clearly distinguish between those who are members to be included and those who are strangers to be excluded. Among the examples that Bauman mentions are nationalism and patriotism (see: Bauman 2000: 172-176), but he also points to the gated communities of the rich and ethnic ghettos of the poor to indicate contemporary trends of separation, purification, and exclusion (see: Bauman 2000: 180).

Liberal and inclusive spaces for democracy and education, such as the ITEL (see chapter 2) and the IUS (see chapter 1), are also postulated communities. The difference is that such communities, rather than being designed to defend some fixed and stable identity, provide opportunities for individual and social growth through participation, communication, exchange, and cooperation across differences. They seek civility, hospitality, and emphasize listening in welcoming diversity as a way to help each individual grow and become a critical and creative individual mind, self, and identity. They are enigmatic sites that attempt to solidify communicative, pluralistic, and transformative democracy. In Bauman’s terminology, they rely on “the *republican* model of unity” understood as “an emergent unity which is a joint achievement of the agents engaged in self-identification pursuits, a unity which is an outcome, not an *a priori* given condition, of shared life, a unity put together through negotiation and reconciliation, not the denial, stifling or smothering out of differences.” (Bauman 2000: 178) Bauman insists that this is the only way of countering the exclusive tendencies shown by many communities in liquid modernity. As already observed, democratic communities for inclusive education lie, today, in a liminal space between solid and liquid modernity; occupying this space is difficult. Paradoxical, postulated, threshold-like, pluralistic, and inclusive spaces caught between the phases of liquid and solid modernity will always remain imperiled outposts of dangerous democracy, particularly when things boil over.

It seems helpful, in this connection, to include some further considerations on the question of cultural identity into our discussion by referring to one of the most influential proponents of British *cultural and postcolonial studies*, the late Stuart Hall (†2014). Hall (1992a) uses the distinction between “tradition” and “translation” to characterize two opposite poles of a spectrum that covers much of contemporary social and cultural life around the globe. They represent, among other things, possible responses to the forces and assimilation pressures of social, economic, cultural, and political globalization. In a somewhat simplified way we may say that on the first pole, we find cultural identities that are primarily backward looking. They tend to evoke “tradition” as something allegedly fixed and stable – carrying essential or even holy meaning inherited from the past – that offers secure and unambiguous orientation. The basic attitude is one of return to a supposedly better past in order to evade the predicaments of an apparently precarious present. The imagination of belonging to an inherited and shared tradition allows for a clear separation line between “us” and “them”. Trump’s slogan: “Make America Great Again!” may well serve as a contemporary example. More generally speaking, movements of nationalism and religious fundamentalism are the two most dominant forms of manifestation in our contemporary world. On the second pole, we find cultural identities that are primarily forward looking. They do not necessarily deny the value of traditions, but use them as cultural resources for the continual reconstruction and transformation of experience. They dare the precarious and often perilous venture of border crossings in which traditional meanings and values are themselves being opened up to processes of reconstruction and recontextualization. The term “translation” refers to the idea that such reconstruction frequently takes place in-between different cultural or linguistic contexts. It creates “third spaces” (Bhabha 1994: 36-39) in which new visions and identities can emerge. Diaspora or hybridity are names for such cultural identities formed through processes of translation. The precarious spaces of “culture’s in-between” (Bhabha 1996) that these identities occupy often allow for new critical and constructive perspectives on cultural traditions, customs, habits, and institutions. What had been taken-for-granted is seen from a new angle. Belonging becomes an ambivalent matter, and categories like “us” and “them” appear as deeply ambiguous and deceptive constructions. We will repeatedly get back to Hall’s distinction in the course of this essay.

#### 4. Strategies of Exclusion and the Loss of Civil Spaces

Here we examine exclusive communities in the contemporary global political scene. In the following comment, Bauman (2012) proves prescient regarding the motives behind the currently rising global tide of nationalism:

Efforts to keep the 'other', the different, the strange and the foreign at a distance, the decision to preclude the need for communication, negotiation and mutual commitment, is not the only conceivable, but the expectable response to the existential uncertainty rooted in the new fragility or fluidity of social bonds. (108)

The very conditions of liquid modernity, including the fragility and fluidity of identity required to live within it, call forth efforts to re-solidify society and, thereby, the self.

Bauman exposit four strategies used “to cope with the otherness of the other” for those driven by concerns with security, xenophobia, or the pursuit of purity. The “emic” strategy involves “spitting out the others seen as incurably strange and alien” (101). Mild forms include spatial separation and selective access, urban ghettos and gated communities. Bauman identifies the “place called La Défense” in Paris as a typically emic place: “What strikes the visitor to La Défense is first and foremost the inhospitality of the place: everything within sight inspires awe yet discourages staying.” (96) Extreme forms of the emic strategy involve “incarceration, deportation and murder,” which are the sorts of measures typical of strident nationalists, racists, homophobes, sexists, and such. It seeks the “exile or annihilation of *the others*” (101).

The second, “phagic,” strategy consists of “disalienation;” that is, the “ingesting” or “devouring” of “foreign bodies and spirits” (101). This strategy aims at “the suspension or annihilation of their *otherness*” (101). Bauman identifies the “consumer spaces” (101) and shopping malls (see 80-90) as typically “phagic” places in contemporary urban living – the consumers’ temples for casting out the liquid modern fears of losing identity, purity, orientation, and control in the permanent flux and flow of difference and otherness. “Whatever else compulsive/addictive shopping may be,” Bauman insists, “it is also a daytime ritual to exorcize the gruesome apparitions of uncertainty and insecurity which keep haunting the nights.” (81) “Divided we shop,” (89) and the shopping gives us a sense of ingesting the otherwise overburdening diversity into our own fragile identities. Another version of the “phagic” strategy is the idea of a national melting pot. In his essay, “The Principle of Nationality,” Dewey expresses what is wrong with this idea for the pluralistic, communicative democrat:

The theory of the Melting Pot always gave me rather a pang. To maintain that all the constituent elements, geographical, racial and cultural, in the United States should be put in the same pot and turned into a uniform and unchanging product is distasteful. The same feeling that leads us to recognize each other's individuality, to respect individuality between person and person, also leads us to respect those elements of diversification in cultural traits which differentiate our national life. (MW 10: 289)

By devouring difference, individuals and nations deprive themselves of the diversity needed to actualize collective and individual unique potential.

The next two strategies for dealing with strangeness and diversity are subtler and less explicitly exclusive. There are “non-places” (or “nowherevilles”) that are “devoid of the symbolic expressions of identity, relations, and history” (102). Non-places include “airports, motorways, hotel rooms, public transport,” and such (102). In liquid modernity, such transient spaces are becoming more prevalent. They do not “require a mastery of the sophisticated and hard-to-study art of civility,” since contact is so causal and quick (102).

Finally, there are the “empty spaces” (103). They are the “places one does not enter and where one would feel lost and vulnerable, surprised, taken aback and a little frightened by the sight of humans” (104). Such spaces include the parts of the city people like “us” would never go and hardly acknowledge they existed. Examples include railroad and power line right of ways, underpasses, deserted buildings, ghettos, and the like. However, rather than physical emptiness, it is the void of mental space that matters most. Such empty spaces are “first and foremost empty of *meaning*” (103). They are simply not on our conceptual map; they are places that for us have no function or purpose in our lives. Whether physical or mental, these spaces are often occupied by the invisible “Other” whose plight those like “us” may never know in large part because “we” do not wish to know.

It is the task of every genuinely democratic and civic community to identify, discuss, and respond to all four kinds of exclusive strategies. This involves “difficult knowledge” and often involves willful ignorance; these resistances are among the most difficult any educator can face. Pitt and Britzman (2006) depict such knowledge thus: “Both philosophical and pedagogical view of ‘difficult knowledge’ question the relationship between education and social justice because they assume, albeit differently, a kernel of trauma in the very capacity to know” (379). The trauma arises from the cognitive and emotional disturbance of coming to understand that our personal identity may not be as

morally upright as we believed. Resistance to such knowledge arises from a desire to preserve our identity as morally upright and blameless for the actions of others. Zembylas (2014) understands “difficult knowledge as an intersection of language, desire, power, bodies, social structure, materiality, and trauma” (390). (Note 2) In teaching difficult knowledge, teachers are asking their students, and themselves, to engage in the kind of risky and vulnerable communication required of the pluralistic communicative democrat. With Hall we might say they encourage their students, and themselves, to engage in ventures of translation and self-critical reconstruction of cultural identity. Avoiding such potentially identity shattering and dangerous confrontation and conversation is what the exclusive social strategies represented by emic places, phagic places, non-places, and empty spaces are all about. In this regard, Bauman also speaks of “public, but not civil” spaces and places (Bauman 2000: 101, 105). Opposing these strategies is an important part of what inclusive spaces such as ITEL or IUS intend. It is essentially a matter of creating spaces in which a genuine democratic as well as educational culture of civility can flourish and grow.

A chief goal of inclusive education (e.g., ITEL and IUS) is to overcome compartmentalization, which prevents pluralistic, communicative, and creative democracy. Writing over eighty years ago, Dewey observed:

Life is compartmentalized and the institutionalized compartments are classified as high and as low; their values as profane and spiritual, as material and ideal. Interests are related to one another externally and mechanically, through a system of checks and balances. (LW 10: 26)

Religion, morals, politics, business, occupations, social classes, races, and ethnicities are all compartmentalized and it is assumed “these divisions inhere in the very constitution of human nature” (LW 10: 27). They do not, but it is understandable that for “much of our experience as it is actually lived under present economic and legal institutional conditions, it is only too true that these separations hold” (LW 10: 27). As a result, people touch, feel, smell, hear, see, talk, and communicate, but not in depth. As a result, only occasionally do people experience “the sentiment that comes from the deep realization of intrinsic meaning” (LW 10: 27). Such realization is, to say the least, a worthy curricular outcome.

The goal of liberal institutions and educators is to reawaken the sense to experience, and experience in depth, the other, the different, and the strange. It is part of a Deweyan democratic faith:

A genuinely democratic faith in peace is faith in the possibility of conducting disputes, controversies and conflicts as cooperative undertakings in which both parties learn by giving the other a chance to express itself, instead of having one party conquer by forceful suppression of the other—a suppression which is none the less one of violence when it takes place by psychological means of ridicule, abuse, intimidation, instead of by overt imprisonment or in concentration camps. (LW 14: 228)

The proponents of separatist, nationalist, and xenophobic strategies see nothing in such pluralistic democratic activity beyond self-sacrifice, loss, and defeat. The democratic pluralists see something else. With Dewey, they are convinced that to “cooperate by giving differences a chance to show themselves because of the belief that the expression of difference is not only a right of the other persons but is a means of enriching one's own life-experience, is inherent in the democratic personal way of life.” (LW 14: 228) We do not know ourselves until we know others different from ourselves. Further, we can only actualize our potential and grow by building relationships with those different from ourselves.

## 5. Explosive Communities and the Crisis of Democracy

The current crisis of democracy arises from the solidifying effects of right wing populism, anti-liberal ethnocentric forms of protectionist, perfectionist nationalism featuring demagoguery and authoritarian promises of a return to a lost golden age all of which easily shade off into proto-fascism and the demise of democracy. The word “crisis” derives from the classical Greek *krisis* meaning literally, judgment, choice, decision, result of a trial, selection. Liberal democracy is now on trial to a degree it has not seen since the end of World War II. This section examines this crisis in terms of explosive and often violent communities.

Writing from the perspective of liquid modernity, Bauman (2012) partly tends to speak of nationalism in the past tense. With nationalism solidifying itself again, it is best to speak of it in the present and future tense. Bauman himself uses the phrase “nationalism, mark 2” (172) to denote phenomena of resurgent and re-solidifying nationalism in times of liquid modernity. Among other things, his extensive discussion of the 1990<sup>s</sup> Yugoslav wars shows that he regards renascent forms of nationalism as a potentially dark and dangerous side of liquid modernity and one can safely assume that he anticipates the same for the future. Reflecting on nationalism, Bauman (2012) notes that unlike other forms of unity, the claim to ethnocentric unity has, from that point of view, the “advantage of ‘naturalizing history’, of presenting the ‘cultural as a fact of nature’, freedom as ‘understood (and accepted) necessity’” (172-173).

He then observes “the nation-state promoting the principle of ethnic unity overriding all other loyalties was the only ‘success story’ of community in modern times” (173). The renascent nationalism of our day alarms us that what “was” now “is” again. After a discussion of the difference between crude nationalism and refined patriotism, Bauman echoing Bernard Yack, concludes there is little difference in the end:

[W]henever lofty patriotic feelings have ‘risen to the level of shared passion’ ... ‘it has been a fierce rather than gentle passion that patriots have displayed’, and that patriots could display over the centuries ‘many memorable and useful virtues, but gentleness and sympathy towards outsiders are not prominent among them’ (175).

The new nationalists again emphasize the eradication of diversity, heterogeneity, ambiguity, ambivalence, impurity, and complexity in defining national identity.

Bauman distinguishes between two kinds of unity – one through similarity and the other through differences. Unity through difference is taken up later in our paper. Of similarity Bauman (2012) writes, “We of the patriotic/nationalist creed means people *like us*; ‘they’ – means people who are different from us ... It is a typical either/or” (176). “Like so many other modern undertakings of public powers,” Bauman (2012) declares, “the dream of purity has been in the era of liquid modernity deregulated and privatized; acting on that dream has been left to private – local, group – initiative” (180). As liquid modernity partly changes back to solidity by resurgent nationalism and state protectionism, much of the chauvinistic struggle for purity and security is becoming re-regulated by the state.

In a section titled “Filling the Void,” Bauman (2012) explores what might happen if “the blow delivered to state sovereignty proves fatal and terminal, if the state loses its monopoly of coercion” (193). He observes, “it does not necessarily follow that the sum total of violence, including violence with potentially genocidal consequences, will diminish; violence may be only ‘deregulated’, descending from the state to the ‘community’ (neo-tribal) level” (193). One may quickly add that the violence with potentially genocidal consequences may become accentuated with the restoration of right wing ultra-nationalism within nation-states. In fact, it is quite possible there will be both regulated and deregulated organized violence.

Bauman (2012) finds that in the absence of state regulation, “sociality may well return to its ‘explosive’ manifestations, spreading rhizomically and sprouting formations of varying degree of durability, but invariably unstable, hotly contested and devoid of foundation to rely on – except the passionate, frenetic action of their adherents” (193). Consider the following frightening claim:

Explosive communities need violence to be born and need violence to go on living. They need enemies who threaten their extinction and enemies to be collectively persecuted, tortured and mutilated, in order to make every member of the community into an accessory to what, in case the battle were lost, would most certainly be declared a crime against humanity, prosecuted and punished. (Bauman 2012, 193-194)

Thinking in terms of liquid modernity, Bauman conceives explosive communities as functioning below the level of nation-states. However, it is typical of resurgent nation-states to engage in rituals of national rebirth, revival, and re-creation – such as Donald Trump’s “Make American Great Again” – that feature symbolic and literal violence toward outsiders (e.g., Muslims and Mexicans).

There is no reason to think that in re-establishing themselves, ultra-nationalist governments will not resort to violent acts of re-parturition for much the same reason as smaller communities that are “frayed frontiers of communities” and “whose identities are uncertain and contested” may need and use violence “as the boundary-drawing device when the boundaries are absent, porous or blurred” (195). In the U.S, this may mean the forced deportation of up to four million illegal immigrants many of whom will have children born in the U.S. that are, therefore, citizens. The potential scale of violence in redefining the nation is hard to comprehend. (Note 3) For example, imagine the citizen child watching the police or specially appointed deportation squads forcibly entering their home and carrying their parent away without any provision for their care. Now imagine schools and their personnel dealing with such tragedies or even just the threat of deportation, and this is only a start. (Note 4) Or think of president Rodrigo Duterte’s officially announced and state regulated initiative of getting rid of drug dealers throughout the cities of the Philippines by literally killing them or having them killed by officially prodded vigilante groups, and you have a perfect example of how a governmentally operated “explosive community” may serve as an instrument for an extremely right wing and extremely violent agenda of bringing about the rebirth of a nation.

Racism in its many and varied historical forms is, of course, one of the most notorious manifestations of “explosive communities.” Moreover, it is often regarded as proto-typical and exemplary also for other forms of excluding, discriminating, persecuting, devaluing, and annihilating others. In his elaborated and subtle studies of racism and

racialized practices of representation, Stuart Hall points, among other things, to the complexity of racism as a deeply ambivalent and contradictory cultural practice that painstakingly employs violence to sustain a masquerade which veils the emptiness and vanity of the claimed superiority:

Contrary to the superficial evidence, there is nothing simple about the structure and dynamics of racism. ... It is racism's very rigidity that is due to its complexity. Its capacity to punctuate the universe into two great opposites masks something else; it masks the complexes of feelings and attitudes, beliefs and conceptions, that are always refusing to be so neatly stabilized and fixed. ... All that symbolic and narrative energy and work is directed to secure us 'over here' and them 'over there,' to fix each in its appointed species place. It is a way of masking how deeply our histories actually intertwine and interpenetrate; how necessary 'the Other' is to our sense of identity; how even the dominant, colonizing, imperializing power only knows who and what it is and can only experience the pleasure of its own power of domination in and through the construction of the Other. (Hall in: Grossberg 1994: 14-15).

At the present juncture, by the turn of the year 2016 to 2017, it seems hard to read these lines without thinking of many current events world-wide, including the aggressive, imperialist, and racist agenda of the Trump administration against Mexico. The wall that "we Americans" build and have "them Mexicans" pay for seems like a perfect symbol for the violent process of masquerade enacted in order to conceal from ourselves the basic fact of our deep and mutual interdependence – i.e., the historically embedded symbolic, cultural, social, economic, and political interrelations between the U.S. and Mexico.

Bauman draws on the work of René Girard to further explicate several features of explosive communities; the first one is enough to make the point:

First: if regular sacrifice of 'surrogate victims' is a ceremony of renewal of the unwritten 'social contract', it can play this role thanks to its other aspect – that of the collective remembrance of an historical or mythical 'event of creation', of the original compact entered on the battlefield soaked with enemy blood. (Bauman 2012: 195)

In the United States, nationalist citizens could, perhaps, recall the era when the nation entered its age of empire by first forcibly annexing what is now the state of Texas in 1845 and later, as a result of the U.S.-Mexican war, acquiring other territories including modern day California, New Mexico, Nevada, and Utah in the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. With the rebirth of nationalism, nations throughout the world will have no trouble recalling such "victories" – or perhaps evoking "defeats" that nationalism must eventually strive to turn into "victories" by violent means if necessary. Again, this is only a start on imagining an almost endless array of violent acts of nationalistic re-parturition that will affect educational institutions.

However, in the phase change between liquid and solid modernity when only a fraction of a degree can make all the difference, it is reasonable to suspect that regulated and deregulated community violence might exist simultaneously. Bauman (2012) seems to acknowledge this in his discussion of "cloakroom communities" as a particularly fluid form of communities in liquid modernity:

Most contemporary explosive communities are made to the measure of liquid modern times even if their spread can be territorially plotted; they are, if anything, exterritorial ... just like the identities they conjure up and keep precariously alive in the brief interval between explosion and extinction. (199)

In contemporary modernity, the thermodynamic phase changes are such that fluid exterritorial gains can readily be solidified territorially.

Fluid "cloak room" community is a metaphor for the kinds of communities that form by attending an event in an auditorium where one may check their coats and hats at the cloakroom:

Cloakroom communities need a spectacle which appeals to similar interests dormant in otherwise disparate individuals and so bring them all together for a stretch of time when other interests – those which divide them instead of uniting – are temporarily laid aside, put on a slow burner or silenced altogether. Spectacles as the occasion for the brief existence of a cloakroom community do not fuse and blend individual concerns into 'group interest'; by being added up, the concerns in question do not acquire a new quality, and the illusion of sharing which the spectacle may generate would not last much longer than the excitement of the performance. (Bauman 2012: 200)

He has in mind the daily press, TV and radio headlines, the movies and also "carnival communities" (200-201) and other such examples that offer "a virtual 'common purpose' around which virtual communities may entwine" (201).



Bauman thinks that such communities “effectively ward off the condensation of ‘genuine’ (that is, comprehensive and lasting) communities which they mime and (misleadingly) promise to replicate or generate from scratch.” (201). There are exceptions to this claim. For instance, there is considerable evidence that such media outlets as Fox News and the American supermarket tabloid the *National Inquirer* provided heavily biased and strong support for Donald Trump. However, one might ask: What about the Internet?

One may check in and check out of Internet communities easily and with little chance of detection. Internet communities also generate spectacles that create shared interest. Media in general and internet media especially are liquefied and exterritorial, yet participation in such cloakroom communities may readily phase change into support of solid territoriality, walls, and deportation squads. On August 17, 2016, Steven K. Bannon was appointed Chief Executive of Donald Trump’s campaign at which time he left Breitbart News. Bannon was a founding member of the board of Breitbart opinion and commentary website known as the main media vehicle of the “alternative right” in the United States and often identified with white supremacy, nationalism, antifeminism, homophobia, anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, and strident nativism. On November 13, 2016, Bannon was appointed chief strategist and senior counselor to the President-elect Donald Trump. (Note 5) There is a rapid series of phase changes from liquid to solid modernity in Bannon’s story, which also involves symbolic and rhetoric violence exceeding the boiling point. For example, on 28 November 2016, Breitbart news posted a subtly dismissive article carefully crafted for its readership regarding Dictionary.Com’s word of the year, “xenophobia.” While it has now been scrubbed off the website, when navigated to it in the process of writing this paper, the first reader comment was the following:

Simply a word used to silence our discussion of reality. Globalists have been purposefully diluting the few white countries that remain (we are a global minority). Why? White countries are independent and generally safe/successful. This is not a true “racial” attack, it’s a power attack. They’re the ones that use “racism” to promote hatred/division and as a way to cause the dilution. How can a globalist agenda be fulfilled if there are several independent, successful, safe, free, and most importantly, POWERFUL countries? It can’t.” (Note 6)

One may simply show up at the website of a violent community, participate passively by reading or actively by posting, and exit. It is a liquid cloakroom community in which content can simply evaporate (e.g., via web scrub); yet, it may also readily condense into a solid and literally violent political agenda of ultra-nationalism. It seems that there is one important factor that serves as a facilitator of such phase change from liquid to solid. With the growing influence of internet platforms and websites in public communication and the formation of political opinions, there is evidently the increasing risk that people get caught in a qualitatively new kind of “communication loop” made possible by the new media. On the look for information, consumers are led from one website to another and yet another and yet another, all of the same kind or similar political position. Expectably, this situation increases the chances that what starts as a relatively fluid and fleeting attendance in a cloakroom community gradually and maybe even without notice changes into solid adherence and constituency in favor of a political agenda. In this respect, one urgent political question today seems to be whose cloakroom communities succeed in becoming solid, stable, and permanent hegemonic forces.

## 6. Democracy, Education, and Liquid Learning

As we have seen above, Bauman advocates a position which he calls the “*republican* model of unity” and diametrically opposes to nationalism (and patriotism). Against the idea of reaching unity through similarity, he proposes “a kind of unity which assumes that civilized society is inherently pluralistic, that living together in such a society means negotiation and conciliation of ‘naturally different’ interests” (177). His pluralism is strikingly similar to that of Dewey. Both envision unity as an emergent result of processes of cooperation across differences, of negotiation and reconciliation, i.e., as a joint achievement of shared life and not as something given *a priori*. Bauman (2012) writes:

This, I wish to propose, is the sole variant of unity ... which the conditions of liquid modernity render compatible, plausible and realistic ... The volatility of identities, so to speak, stares the residents of liquid modernity in the face. And so does the choice that logically follows it: to learn the difficult art of living with difference or to bring about, by hook or by crook, such conditions as would make that learning no longer necessary. (178)

Of course, if liquid modernity solidifies in terms of violent nationalistic and cloakroom communities determined to secure the rebirth of rigid, monistic, xenophobic national identities then it will be unnecessary “to learn the difficult art of living with difference” (*op. cit.*). (Note 7) As recent events have reminded us once more, there is nothing necessary about democracy and the democratic state, but then again any other kind of state is equally contingent.

Perhaps the most prominent debate of the twentieth-century regarding journalism, media and democracy involved John Dewey and Walter Lippmann. The latter provided the modern psychological sense of the word “stereotype” and

pioneered the study of how media can shape public opinion, something he had practical experience with during WW I when he was perhaps the most instrumental figure in establishing propaganda as it is now known. Lippmann thought the modern world was too complex for the average citizen to comprehend and that it would be necessary to have a democratic elite of educated bureaucrats, and the technocrats that would emerge later in the century, as well as capable journalists and other media mavens. Dewey countered Lippmann in his highly influential political book, *The Public and Its Problems*. There he argued that the public was indeed capable of sufficiently understanding the complex issues of a techno-scientific global world where remote events could influence local affairs in significant ways.

Dewey believed that the public was capable of understanding the issues that affected them provided educational systems devoted to critical and creative literacy existed and would be sufficiently endowed as well as continually reconstructed in order to make education a pillar of democracy: “Since education is the keystone of democracy, education should be truly democratic.” (LW 9: 393) On this basis, spurring sufficiently intelligent debate in suitable public forums where many kinds of expertise could confront each other in open dialogue could lead to the enactment of public policy. He also argued that an emergent elite would become its own social class with its own interests not shared with the larger public. He was committed to the idea that collective wisdom always exceeds individual knowledge and expertise.

In recent decades national education systems, their institutions, and personnel (especially teachers) have been managed by bureaucratic and technocratic experts to serve the needs of the global economy with almost no mention of their role as stalwart institutions necessary for the survival of vital pluralistic communicative democracy wherein citizens could learn “the difficult art of living with difference” (*op. cit.*). Even in democratic nations, these educational systems have educated citizens as if they had all the democracy they needed, but not enough capitalism. Human capital theory assumes we may refine and render human beings (i.e., human capital) fit to circulate in the global economy. Education has become a public or private investment in refining raw human resources into standardized interchangeable parts for circulation along with other non-human commodities within the global economy. Such standardized international tests as PISA and TIMSS, and PIRLS are designed to provide ready comparison among the products of the various national education systems. (Note 8)

Educators and educational institutions devoted to the goals of democracy and inclusive education – such as the ITEL and the IUS – must be well prepared and well positioned to respond to the global crisis of democracy, including the increasing capitalization of education around the world (see Garrison / Neubert / Reich 2016). They will find many important insights and clues about what such positioning exacts from them in Dewey’s rich and resourceful reflections on the fundamental interconnections between democracy and education. For instance, some of the educational implications of his opposition to Lippmann are found in Dewey’s essay, “Education as Politics” where he begins by observing, “the chief advantage of education is the assurance it gives of not being duped” (MW 13: 329). Stated more positively, “the profit of education is the ability it gives to discriminate, to make distinctions that penetrate below the surface” (MW 1: 329). Education offers the most effective antidote to demagoguery, but only a certain kind of critical, creative education (see also Dewey’s essay “Construction and Criticism,” LW 5: 125-143). Dewey wonders, “What will happen if teachers become sufficiently courageous and emancipated to insist that education means the creation of a discriminating mind, a mind that prefers not to dupe itself or to be the dupe of others?” (MW 13: 333-334) Courage and conviction may not be enough if the forces of reaction are sufficiently strong. However, let us hope it will suffice and that there are enough willing to make the sacrifice. Such educators “will have to cultivate the habit of suspended judgment, of skepticism, of desire for evidence, of appeal to observation rather than sentiment, discussion rather than bias, inquiry rather than conventional idealizations” (MW 13: 334). He then draws the following conclusion:

When this happens schools will be the dangerous outposts of a humane civilization. But they will also begin to be supremely interesting places. For it will then have come about that education and politics are one and the same thing because politics will have to be in fact what it now pretends to be, the intelligent management of social affairs. (MW 13: 333-334)

The ITEL (see chapter 2) and the IUS (see chapter 1) are just such dangerous outposts and extremely interesting places, for as long as they are allowed to last. They are intended to be models of liquid learning that do justice to Bauman’s idea of the “*republican* model of unity” and Dewey’s understanding of democratic communities based on principles of participation and diversity.

In his path-breaking reconstruction of educational philosophy, theory, and practice, Dewey anticipated in many ways what we today might call “liquid learning.” For example, consider his criticism of all sorts of “compartmentalization” in society and education, including the separation of work from leisure, of doing from knowing, labor from

management, luxury from poverty, political elites from the masses, etc. (see LW 2: 235-372; LW 10), or in education, the typically modern separation of school from ordinary life, the division of disciplines in the curriculum, the monotonous rhythms of time management, the tendency to regard the teacher as his or her own master inside the tightly closed classroom, the aloofness of bookish learning, the strictly individualized and hierarchical forms of evaluation and grading etc. (see MW 9; LW 6: 99-111). According to Dewey, such solid forms of compartmentalization, separation, and division need to be dissolved in order to make the streams of learning flow more even, unhampered, and better balanced for all learners.

His concept of “occupations” as the primary method of learning in his Chicago Laboratory School is a constructive response to this necessity. “Occupations” is Dewey’s term for what we today call “learning projects” (see chapter 1) – i.e., the overcoming of strictly separated disciplines and contents of learning through inter- and transdisciplinary projects that cover a flexible and often considerable time span and intend to connect the learners’ experiences, interests, and activities with a great variety of relevant skills, competencies, and ways of knowing (comp. the examples given by Reich in chapter 1). Remember also that Dewey’s democratic vision understands education as a communicative process, a flow of give and take between unique individuals in groups and communities that are based on principles of participation and diversity. Considered today from a perspective that connects with the Deweyan tradition of democracy and education, we may say that liquid learning rests upon a vision of community that at least includes the following six interrelated aspects:

(1) First, there is the classical idea of a *laboratory community* that provides learning environments or landscapes – including learning materials and tools for communication as well as the persons that interact in their learning – which offer all participants diverse opportunities for learning through their own activities, doings, trials, discussions, reflections, and communications. In this connection, Dewey’s distinction between surroundings and environment in education and learning is significant. “The words ‘environment,’ ‘medium’ denote something more than surroundings which encompass an individual. They denote this specific *continuity* of the surroundings with his own tendencies ... In brief, the environment consists of those conditions that promote or hinder, stimulate or inhibit, the *characteristic* activities of a living being.” (MW 9: 15) The distinction is important because it highlights the interaction between learners and their environments. Activities and environments correspond to each other. Constructive learning depends on the active participation of learners in the co-construction, the continual developing and shaping of their learning environments. Dewey uses the model of the laboratory to indicate a kind of learning by doing that includes many constructive elements: “The method of the laboratory is an experimental one. It is a method of discovery through search, through inquiry, through testing, through observation and reflection – all processes requiring *activity* of mind rather than merely powers of absorption and reproduction.” (LW 6: 109)

(2) This leads us to the second idea which consists of an *experimental community* that provides occasions for learning by experience, construction, and criticism including, among other things, the five steps of experimental learning stated by Dewey (see MW 9: chapter 11 and 12; Garrison/Neubert/Reich 2016: chapter 8). For example, the concept of the ITEL (see chapter 2) presupposes that all learners – in this case, teacher students – have already experienced practice periods before they attend the laboratory. They bring their own experiences, interests, perspectives, problems, and perplexities to the laboratory and participate by building up their own relevant learning environments. Likewise, experimental learning is not confined to the ITEL. The intention is to encourage students to develop an experimental attitude towards their teaching profession altogether. This experimental attitude can be nurtured through interaction with (international) peers with diverse school backgrounds, different learning environments, insights and experiences from internships in different contexts of practice, multi-professional experts, supervision, team teaching, dialogue and communication across these different perspectives. The challenge is to broaden and reconstruct the conventional image of teachers, including their potentials of becoming investigators of the educational processes themselves. In his essay on “The Sources of a Science of Education,” Dewey observes: “It seems to me that the contributions that might come from *class-room* teachers are a comparatively neglected field; or, to change the metaphor, an almost unworked mine ... For these teachers are the ones in direct contact with pupils and hence the ones through whom the results of scientific findings finally reach students. They are the channels through which the consequences of educational theory come into the lives of those in school. I suspect that if these teachers are mainly channels of reception and transmission, the conclusions of sciences will be badly deflected and distorted before they get into the minds of pupils ... [besides,] it is impossible to see how there can be an adequate flow of subject matter to set and control the problems investigators deal with, unless there is active participation on the part of those directly engaged in teaching.” (LW 5: 23-24) As the example of the IUS (see chapter 1) has shown, liquefied learning presupposes that the school – or any other educational institution – must itself be seen as an experimental or “learning” organization that can only be successful and sustainable to the degree that it provides comprehensive opportunities of participation for all.

(3) Thirdly, we suggest the idea of a *performative community* in the sense that the community itself is being constructed, deconstructed, and reconstructed in and through the diverse activities, projects, and interactions of all members. It implies the clear sense and awareness that the community serves purposes that are meaningful to all its members. They bring in their different experiences and cultural, social, emotional, academic, linguistic etc. backgrounds as observers, participants, and agents (see: chapter 2). In such performative communities, issues of identity, belonging, and relationship can never be seen as something simply “given.” They must rather be understood as complex and often ambivalent processes of construction that involve continuous reconstructions and deconstructions of experiences, habits, outlooks, ways of thinking, values. The community itself is necessarily open-ended and subject to continual transformations in accord with the changing experiences and transactions of its members. For example, in the case of ITEL there is a focus on the diverse visions of being a teacher that students bring to the process as part of their own constructions of personal and professional identities. Through processes of examination, discussion, reflection, comparison, and critique in the community of peers, supported by cooperation with local and international experts, these visions can be scrutinized and further developed in mutual exchanges. As an educational community, the ITEL changes with the individual developments of all of its members based on its ability to include new experiences and visions into its common horizons.

(4) This brings us to our fourth component which consists in the idea of a *community of translation and reconstruction* in the sense that the community welcomes differences – even profound differences – of individual experiences, outlooks, and visions as well as social, cultural, and linguistic contexts. It regards these differences as challenges for translation (in the sense explained above) from person to person, group to group, context to context and as means for the transformation and continual reconstruction of experiences and identities. Of course, there are limiting conditions: A democratic community is not an arbitrary “anything-goes” community. Its aim is to facilitate individual and social growth for all. Therefore, differences need to be negotiated on the basis that democratic values and virtues like civility, hospitality, and mutual listening are safeguarded for and by all lest the community itself loses its democratic quality. Such negotiations may sometimes be difficult, troublesome, and precarious processes of democratic learning. They imply that minorities have sufficient opportunities to express their differences and be listened to closely and attentively instead of being marginalized by sheer majority vote or dominance. Dewey observes that it is “because I believe in democracy that I believe in this principle of just representation, especially when it is backed up by proportional representation that gives the minority its full voice.” (LW 9: 318) And elsewhere he claims: “Majority rule, just as majority rule, is as foolish as its critics charge it with being.” (LW 2: 365) More important are the means and processes by which a majority is attained – “antecedent debates, modification of views to meet the opinions of minorities, the relative satisfaction given the latter by the fact that it has had a chance and that next time it may be successful in becoming a majority ... It is true that all valuable as well as new ideas begin with minorities, perhaps a minority of one. The important consideration is that opportunity be given that idea to spread and to become the possession of the multitude.” (LW 2: 365) So understood, *communities of translation and reconstruction* respond to the need of “learning the difficult art of living with differences” (*op. cit.*) on the basis of civility, hospitality, listening and other democratic values and virtues. Our previous chapters have given many concrete examples of how such educational practices may look like. Maybe most impressive are the many detailed descriptions given by Kersten Reich in chapter 1 of how the Inclusive University School (IUS) in Cologne provides opportunities for all learners to develop and further this difficult art.

(5) This easily connects with the fifth element in our list which consists of a *community of reflection* in the sense that the community provides and shares methods for elaborating and documenting processes of reflection in and on learning in many forms (see chapter 2). For example, in the case of ITEL, portfolio work appears as an indispensable tool for sustainable reflection, exchange, and development over a long period of time. In the case of IUS, we have seen that the multi-professional teams, among other things, play a decisive role in providing continual, resourceful, diversified, and qualified spaces of care and reflection in the frame of the respective learning landscape. They support each individual student – in combination with phases of peer reflection and self-reflection according to the respective learning formats explained by Reich – in developing from the very start a reflective attitude toward his or her own learning combined with high degrees of “learning to learn” and competencies of self-determined learning and growth. Moreover, liquefied learning in an increasingly globalized world presupposed that the horizons and perspectives of reflection be enlarged regarding the diversity of experiences and relevant local and global contexts. The many ways in which the IUS has invented and established itself as a “school-into-the-urban-context” and a “school-into-the-world” – based on its original slogan “school-is-open” – are responses to this continual need.

(6) Finally, the five other aspects all cumulate in the idea of an *open community of growth for all*. Growth in the Deweyan sense includes a lifelong process of learning and reconstructing experience. It is based on cooperative processes of meaning making and enriching the lives of all through shared experiences. One constructive educational

response to the ambivalences and dangers of communities discussed above is to further and strengthen the social intelligence of all members as observers, participants, and agents in a democratic community of growth. If such an educational community is successful, it can provide the nurturing ground for individuals – students and teacher alike – to develop their powers of social self-creation as described and claimed by Garrison (see chapter 3). Insofar, it provides a response to the unavoidable paradoxes of teaching and learning in-between solid and liquid modernity. A generous attitude of inclusion belongs to the core values of such educational practices.

We cannot forecast with certainty how the present great crisis of democracy that we have addressed in the main parts of this chapter will further develop, whether it will deepen and solidify or whether the forces for democracy will be strong enough to overcome it. But if Dewey's conviction is right that "education is the keystone of democracy" (*op. cit.*), as we believe it is, then we can at least predict that the crisis will not be sufficiently met and sustainably overcome unless deliberate and collaborative efforts are undertaken to make education, on a local as well as global scale, more fully and "truly democratic" (*op. cit.*) than it is at the present juncture.

## References

Citations of the works of John Dewey are to the critical edition, *The Collected Works of John Dewey, 1882-1953*, published by Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale and Edwardsville.

Volume and page numbers follow the initials of the series. For instance, MW 9: 1. Abbreviations for the volumes used are:

EW 1-5 = *The Early Works* (1882–1898), Vol. 1-5

MW 1-15 = *The Middle Works* (1899-1924), Vol. 1-15

LW 1-17 = *The Later Works* (1925-1953), Vol. 1-17

Supplementary Volume 1: 1884-1951

## Other References

Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press.

Bauman, Z. (2005). *Liquid Life*. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press.

Bauman, Z. (2012). *Liquid Modernity* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London, New York (Routledge).

Bhabha, H.K. (1996). Culture's In-Between. In Hall, S., & Du Gay, P. (Eds.), *Questions of Cultural Identity* (pp. 53-60). London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.

Garrison, J. (1996). A Deweyan Theory of Democratic Listening. *Educational Theory*, 46(4), 429-451.

Grossberg, L. (1994). Introduction: Bringin' It All Back Home – Pedagogy and Cultural Studies. In Giroux, H.A., & McLaren, P. (Eds.), *Between Borders – Pedagogy and the Practice of Cultural Studies* (pp.1-25). New York, London: Routledge.

Hall, S. (1992a): The Question of Cultural Identity. In Hall, St., Held, D., & McGrew, T. (Eds.), *Modernity and Its Futures* (pp.273-325). Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press.

Lehrer, E., Milton, C., & Patterson, M. (2011): *Curating Difficult Knowledge: Violent Pasts in Public Places*. New York, N. Y. Palgrave.

Nouwen, H. (1975): *Reaching Out: The three movements of the spiritual life*. Garden City: Doubleday.

Pitt, A. J., & Britzman, D. P. (2006). Speculation on Qualities of Difficult Knowledge in Teaching and Learning. In Kenneth Tobin and Joe Kincheloe (Eds.), *Doing Educational Research* (pp.379-396). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2015). *The Great Divide*. London, U.K.: Penguin Random House.

Willoughby, J. R., Sundaram, M., Wijayawardena, B. K., Kimble, S. J. A., Ji, Y., Fernandez, N. B., ... DeWoody, J. A. (2015). The reduction of genetic diversity in threatened vertebrates and new recommendations regarding IUCN conservation rankings. *Biological Conservation*, 191, 495-503.

Wolin, R. (1992). The Conservative Revolutionary Habitus and the Aesthetics of Horror. *Political Theory*, 20(3), 424-447.

Zembylas, M. (2014). Theorizing 'Difficult Knowledge' in the Aftermath of the 'Affective Turn': Implications for Curriculum and Pedagogy in Handling Traumatic presentations. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 44(3), 390-412.

**Notes**

Note 1. See <https://www.oxfam.org/en/pressroom/pressreleases/2017-01-16/just-8-men-own-same-wealth-half-world>. Approached March 1, 2017.

Note 2. Museums, such as the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum and other museum and heritage sites address issues of justice, memory, and post-conflict reconciliation confront similar issues. People want to forget traumatic experiences. (See Lehrer, Milton, and Patterson, 2011).

Note 3. See *The Economist* (10 Dec. 2016). Donald Trump's administration could deport millions of undocumented immigrants, using a system perfected under Barack Obama. <http://www.economist.com/news/united-states/21711336-if-he-wins-second-term-president-elect-could-realistically-expel-around-4m-people>. Retrieved 11 Dec. 2016, 7:34 a.m. U.S. Eastern standard time.

Note 4. A colleague of one of the co-authors of this paper that works with undocumented immigrants on a weekly basis reports that community is in a desperate panic. Many of these people have lived in the U.S. for decades and some who came across the border when very young have known no other life. For many, if deported there is nothing to which they may return.

Note 5. As it turned out, he already had to leave the White House several months later.

Note 6. <http://www.breitbart.com/tech/2016/11/28/dictionary-coms-word-year-xenophobia/>. Retrieved 6:24 p.m., 30 November 2016 central European time. We recommend the reader visit this website, which is rapidly becoming mainstream news, to acquire a feel for the quality of reporting.

Note 7. Hillary Clinton would have won the election if she had taken 7/10 of one percent more of the votes in the state of Pennsylvania, less than 1/2 of one percent more in the state of Wisconsin, and 3/10 of one percent more in the state of Michigan. She won the popular vote 48.07% to 45.99%, which would have given her the election easily in any country in Europe. The slightest swing in the next election would lead to a dramatic phase shift.

Note 8. PISA is administered by the Organization for Economic Co-operation (OECD), which is a member of the United Nations Global Compact. TIMSS and PIRLS are also international.