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Citizenship is a contested terrain, very much linked to issues of power. The more progressive literature associates it with contributions made by individuals and groups/movements to the democratic public sphere. This entails an engagement in the ongoing struggle to safeguard public spaces from the onslaught of privatisation and commodification (Giroux, 2001). It also involves transforming hitherto undemocratic and exclusive structures into more democratic and inclusive ones. An education for citizenship, in this context, is a democratic education, one in which students learn about democracy not simply by talking about it but by engaging in a democratic learning experience governed by non hierarchical social relations of education. This is in keeping with John Dewey’s over-arching concept of education for democracy.

The struggle for the democratization of educational opportunities is also connected to the issue of citizenship: the ability of more people to benefit from an education that provides not only the skills and competences to earn a decent living but also the disposition and critical literacy necessary to enable persons to contribute to the workings of an ever evolving democracy. In this regard we have been exposed to the idea of citizenship that is tied to not only notions of ‘thin democracy’ but, in a number of contexts, a much more robust sense of democracy, referred to as ‘thick democracy’. The Porto Alegre experience of a participatory democracy centring round a participatory budget, and that entails a ‘deliberative democracy’ (Gutman & Thompson, 2004), is in keeping with the idea of a thick democracy (Gandin & Apple, 2002).

Historically speaking, we have witnessed struggles for industrial democracy, the attainment of basic civil rights, greater access to power structures for traditionally disenfranchised groups and the reconfiguration of institutions to accommodate different needs, forms of knowing and action. All these were linked to struggles over the meaning of citizenship.

As far as education is concerned, schools, universities and the more progressive forms of adult education were conceived of as vehicles for greater participation in the polis. The ideas of Raymond Williams and R.H Tawney in Britain, Don Lorenzo Milani, Aldo Capitini (with his concept of ’omnicrazia’-grassroots democracy- and his centres for social orientation) and Danilo Dolci in Italy and Paulo Freire, Frei Betto and Bettinho (Herbert Jose de Soúza) in Brazil, to name just a few, served this purpose admirably.
Furthermore, even the UNESCO ‘master concept’ of Lifelong Education (and not the more narrowed concept of lifelong learning that dominates international policy discourse these days) emphasized this aspect of education, despite the predominantly liberal thrust found in the work of many exponents of this concept (Gelpi and Suchodolski would be notable exceptions). And yet the transition from lifelong education to lifelong learning, as a result of which less emphasis is placed on the State’s responsibility for ‘education for all’ and more emphasis is placed on the individual taking charge of his or her own learning, with all the financial implications this might have for members of different social classes, marks a defining moment in the discursive shift that occurred with respect to education for citizenship. It certainly reflects a shift in the dominant discourse which sits comfortably with the ideology of Neo-liberalism, with its emphasis on individual, as opposed to social, responsibility. The OECD promotes this particular version of lifelong learning. For all its emphases on ‘social cohesion’ and ‘active citizenship’, the EU’s lifelong learning policy discourse gestures in the same direction. This particular conceptualisation of lifelong learning is all in keeping with a very narrow notion of citizenship, endorsing that reductionist view of citizenship already decried by Herbert Marcuse in *One Dimensional Man*. Citizenship is reduced to a matter of producing and consuming, something about which Ian Martin, one of the contributors to this volume, and others have been writing about for years (Martin, 2001).

There is no collective dimension in this notion of citizenship and the process of learning which it entails, that process which Lorenzo Milani and Paulo Freire emphasised in their political pedagogical work. On the contrary, ‘liberation’ consists of a matter of indulging in consumer pursuits where, to give one example I recently came across, the commercially overworked and much appropriated (in bad taste) image of Ernesto ‘Che’ Guevara accompanies the words “revolutionary energy” cynically claimed to be derived from buying a particular consumer product, a canned energy drink! As Roger I. Simon once remarked, today’s revolutionary figure becomes tomorrow’s commercial icon (Simon, 1992).

Higher education for adults features among these ‘liberating’ consumer delights as the State, in its Neoliberal and ‘competition’ garbs (see Ball, 2007, on the ‘competition state’), helps create and sustain a privatized Higher Education market while often reducing funding allocated to the public HE sector (see Giroux & Searls Giroux, 2004; Gentili, 2001, 2005). Adult education, in the form of evening diploma and degree courses, often offered through institutions serving as franchise agencies for British and other universities, plays an important role here. We are now witnessing the emergence of the ‘entrepreneurial’ university or else the corporatized university (Giroux, 2006) with “structured partnerships” between business and higher education being advocated in such documents as those produced in recent years by the EU (CEC, 2006, p. 6).

There is hardly any notion of persons being social actors (Martin, 2001) in this conception of citizenship. The multiple subjectivities of persons as well as their potentially emancipatory relational aspects (relations with other human beings and
human-earth relations) are denied. This theme is taken up by Darlene Clover in this volume and elsewhere.

More than anything else, it is the vocational aspect of citizenship that is stressed in the dominant discourse, where lifelong learning is all about ‘learning’ and supposedly ‘relearning the skills’ for employability – the ever so employable citizen, if you will. And yet Ettore Gelpi (2002) is on target when he reminds us that ‘employability’ does not necessarily mean employment, which can be linked to Judith Marshall’s argument that a ‘job’s crisis’ is constantly being presented as a ‘skills’ crisis’ (Marshall, 1997).

As Cynthia Lee Andruske argues in one of the papers in this volume, we have a dominant discourse concerning citizenship that is linked with waged labour, a notion which reduces anyone who indulges in non waged, life-centred work or retirement pursuits, and relies on state assistance, as a parasite. This discourse affects not only those requiring welfare assistance (see Brine, 1999; Crowther & Martin in this volume), in what is now also being billed, as a result of ‘Third Way’ politics, a ‘workfare society’ (Ball, 2007), but also older adults. These older adults would have contributed to the contemporary wealth through their efforts in the past. Many of them, however, might not be able to benefit nowadays from a well earned pension unless they had the wherewithal to invest in a privatized pension scheme throughout their working life. State provided pensions are no longer deemed sustainable and so people are encouraged to work beyond the traditional retirement age. Adult education for older adults, so broad in scope in the past, even if one makes allowance for the bourgeois nature of some of the much publicised types of provision, such as the Elderhostel and University of the Third Age, is now fast becoming an exclusively vocationalised form of learning. The concern is with providing opportunities for skills upgrade or vocational re-orientation.

The issue of old people’s homes ought to be given some consideration in a discussion on adult education and citizenship. My personal experience in visiting my mother at an old people’s home in what turned out to be the last two years of her life led me to believe that elderly persons who are confined to such homes are, in certain contexts, stripped of opportunities for really active citizenship. They are simply reduced to being helpless persons passively awaiting death while occasionally being called on to deliver their vote in a municipal and general election – perhaps the crudest form of ‘thin democracy’. I wonder whether this Maltese experience resonates with that encountered in other countries. In addition to being equipped with medical and paramedical staff, these homes would benefit from the presence of adult educators and cultural animators who can help create learning settings that render life in old age meaningful. They can ensure, through a series of active and possibly collective learning projects, that one can continue to engage in participatory citizenship in the latter stages of one’s life.

The over-emphasis on vocationalism in lifelong learning in general leads to a policy discourse that conceives of citizenship in such a way that the skills and competences required for employability in the market and the so-called ‘knowledge
economy’ are the same ones required for participation in the social sector, often referred to as ‘active citizenship’ (Borg & Mayo, 2006, p. 23). The EU Commissioner on Education, Training, Culture and Multilingualism, Jan Figel unabashedly states that the competences required by the jobs of the future are very much the same as those required by the citizens of the future (Figel, 2006, p. 3).

And the notion of competences being referred to in the dominant, including EU, discourse, is a very reductionist one that includes a plethora of new basic skills and literacies but which alas does not include any modicum of critical literacy in Freire’s sense of ‘reading the word and the world’ (Gadotti, 2008; Mayo, 2008).

Happily there exists a discourse that serves as an alternative to all this. It is part of the progressive and social justice oriented tradition in adult education which, though not dominant, makes its presence felt in books, workshops in various parts of the world, and in variety of sites of educational and other social practices. It is the discourse to which I referred in the first part of this introductory piece. Here citizenship is conceived of as a matter of individual and collective participation in a wider social sphere which includes the environment in its broader context and which incorporates numerous areas governed primarily by life-centred as opposed to exclusively and narrowly market driven values, to adopt the distinction provided by Angela Miles (Miles, 1998). In addition, adult educators and other cultural workers would, according to this discourse, see history as a process of ‘becoming’, and therefore ‘possibility’, and partake of it fully as agents of change. They do not regard the present as setting the limits on what can and should be.

The papers in this volume admirably capture the spirit of this alternative discourse as they cover such areas as the participatory budget in Seville (see the contribution by Lucio-Villegas et al, in this volume and the work of Schugurensky, 2000a and b; Gandin & Apple, 2002), with its Porto Alegre overtones (the Participatory Budget and the World Social Forum), environmental adult education (the ultimate concern with life centred values), care work, participatory action research and the transformative potential of social movements. Theirs is a discourse that connects with a broader notion of citizenship combining social difference, including ethnic difference in this age of strong migratory waves across the globe, with biodiversity (see Clover in this volume). Human beings are conceived, through this discourse, as social actors constantly developing and refining their own view of the world and challenging, as well as renegotiating (see once again Andruske in this volume), the current hegemonic arrangements. Together they provide a volume that indicates that, despite the myopic nature of current global policy discourse with regard to adult education, citizenship and lifelong learning, one can still collectively act and learn for the creation of another world that is possible, in the spirit of the World Social Forum, a world in which life centred values take precedence over exclusively market driven ones.
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INTRODUCTION

In her farewell to the International Brigades in Barcelona on the 30th of October 1938, Dolores Ibarruri, La Pasionaria, said:

You can go with pride. You are history. You are legend. You are the heroic example of the solidarity and the universality of democracy. We will not forget you; and, when the olive tree of peace puts forth its leaves entwined with the laurels of the Spanish Republic’s victory, come back! Come back to us and here you will find a homeland (in Gray, 2008, p. 199).

Now, while I am writing this introduction the expression ‘you are legend’ is being used by a TV channel to refer to the Spanish national team footballers playing in the FIFA Confederations Cup in South Africa. As Peter Mayo says in the foreword of this book, the market is using all the symbols to buy things. It is a double game: they can buy things – the national team matches on TV. But, on the other hand, I add, these kinds of things obscured the true and transformative significance of such events as people coming to Spain to fight for democracy. Maybe the TV channel advertisement agents are not aware that International Brigades have been, are, and always will be a symbol, in the eyes of several people, of the continuous popular struggle for democracy and citizenship.

This book - Citizenship as politics. International perspectives from adult education – centers on and promotes two main concepts: citizenship and adult education. It seems that both are now ‘endangered species’.

Following the last election for the European Parliament two issues arise. Firstly, we have been witnessing the re-appearance of political parties based on racist, xenophobic and even fascist ideologies which, among other things, refute the idea of diversity: of people, thought, beliefs, etc.

Secondly, only an average of 40% bothered to vote. More than a crisis of legitimacy, it signifies a crisis of credibility – politicians’ lack of credibility. I do not know whether this crisis results from the role politicians have been playing in public life and the public image they have been projecting. In Spain, Portugal, Italy, the United Kingdom and other countries, politicians are viewed with suspicion regarding the way they handle public money or the way they avail themselves of their position of power within state institutions. The most amazing thing is that, at least in my country, most politicians have reflected on the high levels of abstention from voting.

Nevertheless, when people are encouraged to take part in an authentic process of decision making, people do participate in public affairs. People, for instance, accepted the challenge of partaking of the Participatory Budget in Seville from 2003 to 2007; alas, this process has now been stripped of its power to transform the city. I think that it is in contexts such as these that one encounters the true meaning of citizenship, a notion of citizenship characterized by the old idea of participation, of getting involved in public issues and of transforming our own community together.
The second main idea is that of countering the hegemonic concept of Lifelong Learning with that of Adult Education. Those who advocate Lifelong Learning as a concept and a field of practice seem to have forgotten that adult education is more than the preparation for a job. Adult education is learning for democracy; researching communities with a view to creating a school for all; transforming communities; the struggle for our own rights and civil liberties; becoming aware of environmental hazards; edifying the city through artistic expression – theatre, art displays etc. These are the things that a true and educational process of popular participation should valorize. Lifelong Learning’s concepts and practices seem to obscure the fact that life is more than the labor market. Life includes: relationships among relatives, partners and friends; parents and children; holidays and work; desires and illusions; happiness and sadness; good or bad decisions; emotions and feelings; a sunset in Almograve (Portugal) or dawn viewed from a plane returning home; the dirty and delicate work of living. Lifelong Learning’s concepts and practices seem to have made many forget that the entire life of women and men constitutes adult education’s substance.

This book is divided into three sections. Part I is titled *Approaches to adult education for citizenship and democracy*. Crowther and Martin provide ten positions and proposals to reflect on the meaning of an authentic process of adult learning for democracy. Aparicio explores connections between community and education in search of a Citizenship School, while Kirkwood explains how we can reinvent Freire’s ideas and practices to organize a community and encourage people to become citizens.

In Part II, *Expanding citizenship*, Andruske advocates the extension of citizenship’s rights to people devoted to care work, presenting this engagement as a socially empowering task. Gomes and Lucio-Villegas connect the old idea of Permanent Education with the processes of recognition of prior learning as a new pathway for people to become and act as citizens.

Part III is devoted to some examples of practice and bears the title of *Fields to struggle and learn*. The recovery of the public space – the public arena – is a recurring idea. This process of recuperation is connected by Clover with environmental issues, by Lucio-Villegas and others with the practices of participative democracy through the Participatory Budget and by von Kotze with public art as a way to express different peoples’ realities.

We have tried to present a diverse scope of ideas and experiences from different countries and perspectives. The common element is the relationship between citizenship and adult education.

A previous version of *Zebra Crossing*..., by Astrid von Kotze, was published in *Rhizome Freirean international on line review*, 3. The interview with Colin Kirkwood was originally published in Spanish in *Diálogos*, 53–54. The *Paulo Freire Institute of Spain* published, in Spanish, in its collection *Sendas y Travesías del Pensamiento [Paths and Thought Crossings]*, and in Valenciano, in *Omega práctica i teoria d’educació continua [Omega practice and theory of continuing education]*, the following papers: *Foreword* by Peter Mayo; *Women on Welfare*..., by Cynthia L. Andruske; *Adult Education, Citizenship and Territory*..., by Pep Aparicio; and a
more complete version of *Educating Citizenship...*, by Lucio-Villegas and others. I thank the three publishers for giving me permission to publish these papers for the first time in an English version.
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PART I

APPROACHES TO ADULT EDUCATION FOR CITIZENSHIP AND DEMOCRACY
INTRODUCTION

It is worth remembering in these days of managed consensus that the awkward citizen has always been as important to democracy as the conformist citizen. To begin with, then, a few words about what we mean by the notion of ‘learning for democracy’. What this does not mean is that democracy can somehow be learnt like a subject or managed like a mere procedure, let alone ‘delivered’ like a pizza. On the contrary, what it suggests is that learning is for democracy, i.e.; a truly democratic society can only be achieved and sustained through the common commitment of citizens to learn and argue and debate and, if necessary, to differ and disagree – and to live together with the consequences of this. Learning for democracy is about building a deliberative democratic culture.

In 1944 – significantly, just before the end of the Second World War, and looking forward to a different kind of future – the Workers’ Educational Association (WEA) in the UK published a book by Harold Shearman called Adult Education for Democracy. Here is Shearman’s statement about what adult education for democracy means and entails:

Democracy implies the formation of social judgement on the basis of informed discussion. It requires that men and women shall decide on particular issues, not as a result of passing moods or casual opinions, but in the light of a philosophy of life. Such a philosophy, if it is to be anything more than the repetition of slogans, must be formed as the result of much reflection on the problems of social organisation in general and on the aims and purposes of society. Knowledge is essential; but it must be mixed with experience; and the pooling and comparison of experience in the light of new knowledge, in a group of people with common interests but bringing varied contributions to be drawn from daily life, is the essence of democratic Adult Education (Shearman, 1944, p. 77).

This, then, is a rigorous, deliberative and distinctively adult educational process. The Scottish Education Department’s 1975 Alexander Report Adult Education: The Challenge of Change adds to this the suggestion that it is also an intrinsically risky business in which unintended outcomes may be as significant as intended ones: Society is now less certain about the values it should uphold and tolerates a
wide range. Individual freedom to question the value of established practices and institutions and to propose new forms is part of our democratic heritage. To maintain this freedom, resources should not be put at the disposal only of those who conform but ought reasonably to be made available to all for explicit educational purposes. The motives of those who provide education need not necessarily be identified with the motives of those for whom it is provided. (Scottish Education Department, 1975, p. 25).

OPEN LETTER

In this chapter we consider recent experience in Scotland where community-based adult education has increasingly been incorporated within the state’s managerialist agenda for ‘delivering community to policy’, which we are now seeking actively to resist. In particular, we are interested in the relationship between diversity and democracy, and are concerned to re-establish the connection between our educational work and the problems and possibilities of democratic life. Such a project has special resonance in Scotland today, where significant powers have been devolved by the London-based British state to new Scottish Parliament in Edinburgh. It is in this context that we have recently circulated an open letter entitled *Whatever happened to learning for democracy?* This reads as follows:

We see our work in community-based education as part of a broader democratic process. This is about enabling people to demand social justice and equality for themselves and others. There is now an historic opportunity to renew democracy in Scotland, and yet we are beginning to feel a profound sense of disappointment about the way in which both our own work and the lives of people in communities are being managed, regulated and controlled.

Community learning is being tied into state policy rather than policy being informed by democratic learning. Despite much good practice on the ground, there is a systematic and debilitating reductionism at work in the policy agenda: lifelong learning is largely reduced to instrumental and economistic terms, to learning for a living rather than learning for life; community development is largely reduced to delivering the community to policy through pseudo-democratic forms of participation and partnership; working with young people is largely reduced to surveillance and preparation for employment. There can be no vision of a different kind Scotland in this systematic reduction of democratic purpose to managerial procedure.

This is not the way to activate citizens for democratic renewal or enthuse them about the possibilities of democratic life. Moreover, there is a real danger of a new kind of democratic deficit developing. The real threat to Scotland’s new democracy comes not from apathy but from cynicism.

What is required, in the first instance, is a much more open, democratic and imaginative dialogue and debate about what kind of society we want to live in, and how we can begin to build it in Scotland today. Education and learning in communities can contribute to making this vision a reality, and they are a rich resource for tackling significant problems in society. Ordinary
people need the opportunity to have their say, to be listened to and to talk back to the state. This is essentially a democratic process. It cannot simply be managed and measured; it has to be nurtured and cultivated in communities. It requires faith and trust in the people, and a valuing of genuinely democratic dialogue and debate.

This paper gives an account of some of the thinking behind this initiative and what we hope may come out of it. Given the ubiquity of the managerialist state in the era of neoliberal globalisation, we hope that colleagues from other countries and contexts may be able to make their own connections with our argument.

‘IN AND AGAINST THE STATE’: THE ORIGINAL ARGUMENT

In 1979, just as the first Thatcher government in the UK came to power around an emerging neo-liberal ideological agenda, a group of socialist welfare state professionals, who identified themselves collectively as the London Edinburgh Weekend Return Group, published a pamphlet called *In and Against the State*. A fuller version of the pamphlet was subsequently published as a book (LEWRG, 1979).

The original purpose of *In and Against the State* was to examine the contradictory positioning of professional workers within the education, health and welfare apparatus of the state in late British capitalism – and to explore the problems and the possibilities of working both in and against the state. The challenge they addressed was to fight back ‘oppositionally rather than simply defend the indefensible’ of the capitalist state. Workers were in the state as beneficiaries or employees but against the capitalist social relations it represented and reinforced. By this they meant the way social class was denied, social problems were individualised or rooted in ‘disadvantaged communities’, relations of authority were fostered rather than democratised and structural issues of poverty and inequality obscured. In short, these relations divided people rather than unified them.

Advocates of the ‘in and against’ argument made the distinction between the welfare function of the state and its social control function or, as Bourdieu (1998) puts it, the progressive ‘left hand’ of the state and the coercive ‘right hand’ of the state. However, working ‘in and against’ was not simply a strategy for promoting the state’s left hand over the right. It was also imperative to develop new social relations based on values of democracy, equality and social justice. The state was not monolithic and being in the state meant there were also spaces to create progressive experiences based on the social relations of socialism. The key to this was in distinguishing the institutions of the state (education, health, policing etc) from the social relations it creates as a capitalist state (dependency, individualism etc). To open up the distinction was to identify a new focus for oppositional struggle where progressive practice could insert itself. The ‘relative autonomy’ of the worker could be used to resist and challenge the social relations of the state by introducing alternative – prefigurative – relations based on equality and deeper forms of democratic life.
The original argument was not highly theorised but it did strike a chord with some radical workers employed by the state. It reflected a new form of struggle influenced by a Gramscian perspective on the necessity of hegemonic struggle rather than Leninist vision of capturing the state. It was still, however, a difficult position to take. The state sponsored community development projects (CDPs) of the 1970s were closed down when they became overtly critical of the government rationale that informed them. Working ‘in and against’ was not a ‘call to the barricades’, which seemed to characterise some of the CDP tactics, but neither was it a stealth strategy. Counter-hegemonic work involved contributing to a climate for change rather than being the direct instrument of change. But is this still possible today?

THE CHANGING CONTEXT FOR BEING ‘IN AND AGAINST THE STATE’

Since the original argument was made almost thirty years have passed and there have been important changes in the form and functions of the state. The question needs to be asked if we are more caught up in sustaining people rather than challenging relations of exploitation. Have changes since the original argument was formulated made the task of exploiting the contradictions of the worker’s position even more difficult? Certainly the need to resist exploitative social relations – based on structural inequalities - and build socially just, egalitarian and democratic ones is still the same.

In the following section we briefly highlight changes in the economy, state and civil society to open up some of the issues which inform the relevance of the ‘in and against’ argument today.

Two related developments that have a considerable impact on the nature of capitalism today have been the trend towards flexibility and the spread of globalisation. In Sennett’s (1998) analysis of the corrosion of character he documents the key characteristic of the experience of living with capitalism today as being the short-term nature of work, the constant requirement to update skills and the impermanence of relationships. Flexibility involves the reorganisation of work to adapt it to short-term trends in the market so that firms can respond rapidly to its fluctuations. According to Sennett, this process has wider ramifications, in that it is changing our expectations so that fewer people see themselves as undertaking the same type of job for life. In addition, we no longer seem to be able to count on acquiring skills for employment that are long lasting. ‘Flexploitation’, as Bourdieu characterises it, is a new mode of domination based on the creation of a generalised and permanent state of insecurity aimed at forcing workers into submission, into the acceptance of exploitation (1998, p. 85).

The overall result is that human character (by which Sennett primarily means the ethical nature of our aspirations and dealings with others) is undermined and aspirations for a more humane and socially just society sidelined. Uncertainty and insecurity of employment also affect welfare provision, which is increasingly regarded
as a time-limited intervention in people’s lives with the emphasis on people acquiring work rather than being supported by welfare. Short-term projects are injected into communities and quickly evaporate before they take root. Workers no sooner begin developing programmes of work before they have to start searching for new funding to continue. This state of ‘permanent change’ limits the scope for action for employees of the state.

The state’s scope for action too has been curtailed through the growth of economic globalisation, involving powerful and unaccountable transnational companies and the importance of equally unaccountable international institutions in regulating and influencing policy trends and world markets. The International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development are important bearers of neo-liberal ideology and practices, which directly shape or influence the policy of nation states in relation to education, health, welfare and the economy. The policy discourse is not set by these agencies but they, and associated ‘think tanks’, shape it, which limit the courses of action national states can take. These developments are not entirely new but they are more prominent in terms of the politics and policies states adopt. The result has been the dominance of a neo-liberal political and economic agenda on a world scale. Moreover, as the UK state seeks to reduce and privatise welfare provision, and ‘socialise’ people for the market, it is deepening the processes that divide people. The growth of individualisation and the remoralisation of the working class are not new practices but they are more central to neo-liberal state policy. People who make the right market choices are able to look after themselves.

The limitations on the scope of state activity do not mean that its role is unimportant or that politics does not matter. Nation states still command considerable resources and can act to facilitate or resist, to varying degrees, the impact of global forces. Scandinavian social democratic states have typically relied on generous welfare provision to cushion citizens from the downside of flexible capitalism and economic globalisation. Another example is the resistance now posed by different governments in Latin America to the ideological hegemony of neo-liberalism. Also nation states have been able to dilute their sovereignty and restructure through various forms of alliances or re-organisation into new and more powerful state forms. The European Union is one example of this. Typically the process of restructuring into larger and more powerful political alliances has created issues of political legitimacy – at least in more social democratic states - as the decisions made seem to be further removed from people’s lives. To retain legitimacy the form and function of the state has involved a simultaneous process of concentrating strategic political, economic and military decisions upwards and channelling downwards through devolution other areas of decision-making. The various demands for devolution in different European states and the renewal of the Scottish Parliament in 2000 in the UK are examples of this.

We are also witnessing a shift from government to governance whereby the state is dispersing some of its functions to social partnerships, which are then tightly regulated. Linked to this is the growth of managerialism, which aims to control policy outcomes through performance targets and control mechanisms, which enable the
state to 'steer' rather than 'row'. The impact on public sector workers may be uneven but teachers, health workers, social workers and workers in communities have seen reductions in their ‘relative autonomy’ and therefore closure of the spaces to be oppositional. All of these changes have made being ‘in and against’ the state today a different and increasingly difficult project than when it was initially formulated. However, recognising this problem is not the same as ‘giving up’!

IN AND AGAINST THE STATE TODAY

Despite the important developments outlined above the basics of the struggle have not really changed: the need to resist individualisation, exploit ambiguities in policy, oppose deficit constructions of communities, build alliances between different groups, and create hope for a better world. We still need to be ‘in and against’ – how could it be otherwise? – and we need to identify where these possibilities lie today. But perhaps we also need to be working more effectively with forces ‘outside’ the state to challenge the ‘social relations’ of exploitation.

Social movements have always constituted a site of resistance to exploitation and oppression and have been a motivating force for a socially purposeful education allied to social change. In addition to the social learning opportunities they generate, movements have created the context for more direct popular education activity. The emergence of new social movements in the 1960s has widened the focus of movement struggles from the politics of redistribution to cultural struggles for recognition. Moreover, internationally, the growth of the European Social Forum and the World Social Forum, and other alter-globalisation movements, generate opportunities for critical consciousness raising work.

The forces of economic globalisation are also leading to contradictions which can be exploited for educational engagement with communities. On the one hand, it has led to resistance in terms of reasserting local cultural practices which Robertson (1994) terms globalization. On the other, linking the local and the global makes more sense today because the connections between the two are clearer and easier to justify. The impact of globalisation means that ‘time-space’ constraints are qualitatively different – the rapid movement of people is one indicator of this. Moreover, information and communication technologies have been resources for global movement organisation as well as for global capital. The insularity of socialism – implicit in the original formulation of in and against the state – was one of its limitations whereas now there are greater possibilities of broadening the linkages between groups in struggle and extending them outwards and internationally.

As Stuart Hall states:

far from there being no resistance to the system, there has been proliferation of new points of antagonism, new social movements of resistance organised around them – and consequently a generalisation of ‘politics’ to spheres which hitherto the left assumed to be apolitical: a politics of the family, of health, of food, of sexuality, of the body… (Hall, 1996, p. 234).
As the state’s regulatory role has extended the boundaries between the public and private have also changed creating new hegemonic struggles.

We now turn to examine how some of the forces we have described have been developing in the Scottish context. After this we focus on the emergence of the ‘learning for democracy’ which has begun to mobilise opposition amongst adult and community educators to the current trend.

SCOTLAND: CHANGE AND CHALLENGE

The dominance of new Labour in Scottish politics has reinforced the growth of the partnership approach in the delivery of welfare services with predictable consequences for those professional agencies and groups charged with ‘delivering community to policy’ in this way. The restructuring of community education into community learning and development reflects a new politics of welfare. This simultaneously presents the development of partnerships as the means for communities to be involved in addressing goals linked to social inclusion and active citizenship whilst disguising the reality of increasingly top-down, target-driven and controlled terms of engagement: ‘stitched-up thinking’ (Shaw, 2005). One casualty of these changes is the Community Education Service, which developed following the publication of the Alexander Report *Adult Education: The Challenge of Change* (Scottish Education Department, 1975). Perhaps a more significant casualty is the commitment to build democratic learning processes from the bottom up. The Alexander Report was underpinned by a social democratic philosophy which believed that community-based education was a means of understanding a changing society and that an educated public was an important resource for democratic change.

By 2003 the Scottish Executive had officially replaced ‘community education’ as a *service* with ‘community learning and development’ as a *process*. This has had an important impact on the community educator’s role and the scope for ‘bottom-up’ educational engagement. The planning process creates ever greater demands for management information systems whilst, at the same time, the surveillance net is cast wider and drawn tighter to ensure community partnerships meet targets which express the priorities of the state. Learning for democracy, however, should mean interrogating policy rather than simply doing it. In this respect, it is worth noting that there is a very particular kind of terminology coming to be associated with Community Learning and Development. This matters because the words we use tell us how to think and what to do. For example, a quick glance at the recent Scottish Executive document *Working and Learning Together to Build Stronger Communities* reveals the following ways of saying what the work is about: delivering outcomes, closing the opportunity gap, growing the economy, managing consensus and building social capital. There is nothing at all about political education or learning for democracy. It is worth emphasising what is happening here: community education has been de-marginalised at the expense of becoming simply a partner in delivering state policy – as distinct from an agent of democratic politics.
It is useful to make the distinction between policy and politics (Shaw & Martin, 2000). By policy is meant the top-down imperatives of the state, and the invited spaces they offer for various kinds of managed consultation and partnership. By politics, in contrast, is meant the bottom-up aspirations of people in communities, and the demand for democratic spaces in which to articulate and pursue them. We need think no further than the ‘community planning’ process in Scotland today, facilitated by strategic partnerships of one kind or another, to realise the extent to which the managerial state now charges community-based educators with responsibility for ‘delivering the community to policy’. On the other hand, it is as agents of democratic politics as distinct from instruments of state policy – working in and against the state – that towards the end of last year we composed and circulated the Open letter: Whatever happened to learning for democracy? which is reproduced at the beginning of this chapter. We now end it with a brief account of subsequent developments.

An electronic version of the open letter was widely circulated in Scotland, mainly but not exclusively to colleagues in community-based education, in September and October 2006. This quickly elicited about 180 expressions of interest and support. It was clear that it struck a chord. With the help of one particular Member of the Scottish Parliament who was sympathetic to our cause, we then arranged for a meeting to take place in the largest room available in the Parliament building. This was attended by 80 people and led to the formation of a small working group which was charged with responsibility to consider the options and take matters forward. This group met twice for intensive working sessions which, in turn, resulted in the formation of 5 special interest groups. These are as follows:

1. Critique, dialogue and agency – an alternative report of learning for democracy;
2. Creating space for critical reflection and action;
3. Publication: special issue of the journal Concept on Learning for Democracy (which has recently been published);
4. Research possibilities – small-scale audit of practice;
5. Strategic dissemination.

CONCLUSION: NEW BEGINNINGS?

In relation to the above we want to say a bit more about the first of these activities (referred to above) in which we were involved along with other academics, practitioners and student activists who met over a period of a year to look at ways of presenting our ideas to a wider audience. The end result of extensive discussion and debate was an eye-catching laminated wall chart rather than a lengthy alternative report which had been originally conceived. The wall chart presents ten propositions and ten proposals about learning for democracy which express commitment without being prescriptive; it is accessible and provokes discussion; it articulates an alternative rather than simply responding in terms which are already too loaded; it stresses the political nature of a very depoliticised professional discourse. In summary, it goes completely against the grain of the current hegemony, which we propose is its unique value. The purpose of the chart is not only to articulate an alternative vision, but to change the discourse, to reclaim the kind of language which has been suppressed in current developments. The wall chart reads as follows:
A) Ten propositions - Democracy is about:

– Freedom: Human flourishing is achieved through freedom to act individually and collectively, only constrained by due consideration for others.
– Equality: All people are of the same moral worth and are obliged to mind the equality of others.
– Justice: Justice and democracy are interdependent. An unjust society is an undemocratic society and an undemocratic society breeds injustice.
– Solidarity: Shared aims and values arise from the pursuit of common purposes and mutually supportive ways of living.
– Diversity: Dialogue between different cultures and identities can enrich society and help to build a common culture.
– Accountability: The state is accountable to its citizens for providing the policy framework within which judgements about common good are made and contested. Those who hold power are answerable to the people.
– Dialogue: Democracy requires dialogue and the possibility of dissent. This means learning to argue, articulate beliefs, deliberate and come to collective decisions concerning what constitutes the good society.
– Responsibility: Consistency and coherence between private and public behaviour are essential to the quality of democratic life.
– Participation: Democracy is something to be negotiated from below rather than handed down from above. Citizens require the opportunity to talk back to the state.
– Sustainability: A commitment to the environment and to future generations requires determined opposition to those forces which are wasteful and destructive.

B) Ten proposals - Learning for democracy means:

– Taking sides: Educational workers are not merely enablers or facilitators. The claim to neutrality can reinforce and legitimise existing power relations. Practitioners need to be clear about what they stand for—and against.
– Acting in solidarity: Practitioners should proactively seek opportunities to engage in a critical and committed way with communities and social movements for progressive social change.
– Taking risks: Critical and creative learning is necessarily unpredictable and open-ended. Exploring official problem definitions and challenging taken-for-granted ways of thinking can be a liberating process.
– Developing political literacy: Politics needs to be made more educational and education made more political. Learning to analyse, argue, co-operate, and take action on issues that matter requires a systematic educational process.
– Working at the grassroots: Democracy lives through ordinary people’s actions; it does not depend on state sanction. Practitioners should be in everyday contact with people on their own ground and on their own terms.
– Listening to dissenting voices: Activating democracy is a process of creating spaces in which different interests are expressed and voices heard. Dissent should be valued rather than suppressed.
– Cultivating awkwardness: Democracy is not necessarily best served by the conformist citizen. This means that the educational task is to create situations in which people can confront their circumstances, reflect critically on their experience and take action.

– Educating for social change: Collective action can bring about progressive change. Learning for democracy can contribute to this process by linking personal experience with wider political explanations and processes.

– Exploring alternatives: Learning for democracy can provide people with the opportunity to see that the status quo is not inevitable – that ‘another world is possible’.

– Exposing the power of language: The words used to describe the world influence how people think and act. Learning for democracy involves exploring how language frames attitudes, beliefs and values.

This wall chart has been widely distributed, in and beyond the UK, and has proved very popular as a statement of intent and as a tool to critically engage with issues which seem to be missing in so much education. We have not yet attempted to systematically evaluate how it is being used, and what response it has generated, but we are aware of a variety of different groups that have used it in different educational settings and in different countries.

Pedagogically, the succinct nature of the propositions and proposals make it ideally suited for work with community groups as a stimulus for changing the discourse about how we think about public services. We are aware of community groups who use it because the language is ‘user friendly’ and this helps educators to stimulate discussion as well as to legitimate collective dissent. In a very different institutional setting, staff at Northern College in the UK have, in the context of their partnership work at the University of Vīlabh Vidyānagah, India, used it as part of their educational work on climate change because it quickly generates discussion and is a simple way of highlighting the political nature of education. Students of Human Ecology at the University of Strathclyde have also debated the wall chart as an example of popular education in Scotland.

Of course different contexts crucially shape the experience of democracy and the issues that need to be discussed and acted on. The wall chart’s propositions and proposals may not be the best or most appropriate ones in some contexts. Students at the Ontario Institute for the Study of Education, in Canada, have critiqued the wall chart for its ‘developed world’ centredness and that the thorny issue of the relationship between democracy and capitalism is not explicitly discussed, amongst other things. We welcome such critique as examples of what democracy and democratic learning should entail. Our intention is not to create a rigid formula for thinking about learning for democracy but to deploy the propositions and proposals as a starting point for analysis and discussion – not its end point. In our University we run a series of ‘learning lunches for democracy’ where students are invited to come along, eat their lunch and discuss ideas such as freedom, equality, social justice and so on and to identify the many explicit and nuanced ways we experience these in our everyday lives. There are no lectures or inputs to these sessions but questions posed as a starting point for discussion. E.g.; Why are we interested
inequality? What do we mean by it? Where do we experience equality in our lives? Where do we experience inequality? What do we understand are the causes of these experiences? Is inequality ever justifiable? Apart from generating some critical discussions and insight the learning lunches have created, unintentionally, an opportunity for undergraduate students from different year groups, and postgraduates, to debate these issues together – an interesting democratic experience itself.

In addition to the above, the wall chart has been cited at academic conferences, professional policy contexts and practice settings. It has been explicitly used to address issues of professional identity through The Edinburgh Papers (2008), which is a compilation of articles written by university staff involved in the provision of community education training programmes and it has been widely circulated as a resource for reinvigorating discussion of professional culture and values. In Aberdeen, in the north of Scotland, the wall chart has been used as part of in-service training on community development work. The importance of building a curriculum of engagement from the ‘bottom up’, rather than the ‘top down’, is reinforced through discussion of the proposition and proposals. As part of this process Strathclyde University is organising a symposium in 2009 on Devolution: Ten Years On, which aims to reassess the relationship between the state, communities and community education. But not all uses of it need to be grand. As one community educator told us, he has the wall chart hanging beside his computer as a reminder of what he should be doing!

The wall chart is now in its second print run and has had a high demand. We believe that the value of this kind of initiative is that it is a very modest but public act of resistance, which provides a distinctive resource for the difficult business of learning for democracy.

In this way, we are seeking to reconnect our work with a tradition of adult education and adult learning for democracy which exists, in one form or another, in many contexts and cultures. We wonder what scope there is for comparative and collaborative work with colleagues in other European countries who share our interests and concerns.
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HERE, ADULT EDUCATION, CITIZENSHIP AND TERRITORY. THE VALUE OF LEARNING

Sometimes I think that one speaks about citizenship as if it were a very abstract concept (...) as if, as the word citizenship were pronounced, everybody acquired it automatically. Or as if it were a gift that politicians and educators gave to the town. It is not that. It is necessary to clarify that citizenship is a production, a political creation (Paulo Freire)

The democratic order will only be achieved with the participation of everybody as human people, not as qualities or characters; equality is not uniformity. It is, on the contrary, the supposition that allows acceptance of differences, the rich human complexity not only in the present, but in the future. The faith in the unforeseeable. (Maria Zambrano)

The democracy is the expression of desires, live work, the production, the capacity to unite differences; democracy is the formidable capacity to unite through the work of continuous dialectics of differences, the capacity to arrive to an agreement, to build in common. (Antonio Negri)

INTRODUCTION

A certain conservative wave is shaking the world and society: education, citizenship, politics, and ethics. This has gradually been moving to neighbourhoods, districts, towns, cities, and regions by shaping them as neutral space-times and by neutralising them where the mere moral and representative process has been soaking. This is done first by shaping education in general, and that of the adult in particular, to only have an individual, adapting and banking perspective, although there are still tendencies that always maintain a tenacious resistance and a capacity for denunciation and purpose. Paraphrasing the title of a fundamental book, there is good news from school. Second, this is done by conforming and by profiling a light or weak citizenship without a brain or heart – a zombie who limits or disables the educating dimension of context and configures territories as simple containers of men and women as far as it establishes the inability to remember. Therefore memory, an incarnated memory, maybe always places us on a hope horizon, between repetition and innovation.

© 2009 Sense Publishers. All rights reserved.
This wave, which first had a Malay topology and, in these moments, is configuring itself as a tsunami impregnating all human action and, mainly, is producing a process that detaches and/or anesthetises affective, singular and social bonds. In definitive communitarian bonds, it even forces the disappearance of relationships and mediations among human beings as the ones between education and citizenship, education and territory, or citizenship and territory, to name those that we reflect upon here. Of course, it is quite difficult to create, to impel and/or to promote from these contextual dispositions the educational citizenship that remains very often in a moral impulse that lacks not only social components but also educational, ethical, and political components.

This new conservative spirit, which many times has taken root in a strident religious perspective, goes throughout the world and in a certain way tries to anchor us (people and communities, entities and institutions), in a permanent situation of risk and vulnerability, which is required and requested on the part of the new capitalist spirit. Flexible men and women, with an enterprising, cooperative and creative spirit, open to causality, who must respond to different educational programs that will have, among other functions, functions for settling down and/or consolidating the educational-cultural, social fragmentation and politics by virtue of the contents and methodological purposes that will swing between the educability and the employability. They transfer the responsibility of having or not having education or employment to women and men — and make it appear in educational institutions. Because of the vertiginous changes of our environments and contexts, we are living sensation of insecurity and defencelessness. Newcomers, especially from Africa and from the centre of Europe, bring new languages and cultures, when we have still not solved from an ecological perspective the biodiversity, biopedagogy; the cultural-linguistic plural fabric here; the increase in the diffuse violence of patriarchal and racist character; the more or less clear dismantle of the establishments, the state of scarce well-being. In addition, both bear social and political controls of a new kind on human lives, controls that are liquid and liquefying and, of course, soluble in any material means, human or not, that does not facilitate advancement toward some societies and territories on a deliberate educational footing.

REMAKING SOME POLICIES OF THE EXPERIENCE

Since long ago (e.g.; through different educational initiatives and adult education), the real and current potential to found institutions that might enable relationships among education, citizenship and territory, have been pursued in diverse ways. Likewise, this enabling means the realisation of projects, programs, and processes that culminate with the constitution and visibility of singular and social imaginary alternatives that have taken root in the past but flow to the future and the establishment of new ways of life. They were, at times past and present, in those in whom the concept-practice of lifelong education and cultural democracy was materialised and verified in practice. Italian experiences were picked up in them, and Latin American experiences too, as well as the enormous inheritance of those that, in our countries, had been developed from environments and diverse institutions. These ranged from
social initiatives (liberal athenaeums, town houses) impelled by the State (Institución Libre de Enseñanza, Pedagogic Missions while II Republic) or by municipalities (athenaeums, adult schools, labour institutes) or with theoretical and practical educational initiatives of deep root, like Ferrer i Guardia, Giner de los Ríos, along the short twentieth century, and those that were forgotten in many senses.

Maybe it would be necessary to think about why we haven’t arrived at educational levels or enabling educational processes of the II Republic in these moments, after so many years of democracy, and after so many means and resources (Subirats, 2005). Maybe it would be necessary to ask ourselves which have been and which are the priorities of local, national and state governments, by obviating singularities that are at truth. Maybe it would be necessary to think about why the introduction of a new subject, education for citizenship, lifts that immense dust cloud of integrist and conservative affections thought by some entities and institutions to appeal to the conscientious objection that ‘I don’t know if it is really programmed to the education for citizenship or, perhaps, to whole modernising cultured process’. Of course, this time is without a military option in favour of a coup, but clearly has all the components of a crusade and an exclusive and excluding profile. In addition, here we start once again since 70’s, first by means of social initiatives, then through institutional initiatives, abandoning the social ones. And maybe a part of the answer to the previous question lies there, which fundamentally would turn on the declaration of human rights and on the possibility, among others, of universal ethics, singular and social. The answer might also turn on the beginning of processes of singular and social autonomy that outlines, among other purposes, the question of schooling that subsumes educational courses that establish several dependences on the spirits and bodies of girls and boys, of youth, of adult people that also produces positively modulated exclusions and integrations.

Meanwhile, from municipal political initiatives, for example, it has been suggested questions like the concept of the educational city - first in the 1990’s - that define in a certain sense the municipal active political actions in a simple fan of actions and interventions. This is a substitute of other institutions that the city holds and puts to the service of education, but as experiences, generally through an educational project of a city. However, the educational city, without the citizenship school anchored in the breast of a community, is impossible. Maybe it would be necessary to think if the city educates or what it really needed in terms of education-instruction to be able to be a city and to move away the community towards a hopeful and emancipating horizon, in an isolation and individualisation process that requires the commodification and/or privatisation of schools.

There isn’t project or process of educating city if there is not institution of active, radical and full citizenship; if there are not permanent participation channels and substantive democracy; if communities don’t organise themselves and assume city administration and control or if it doesn’t break with political, union, cultural, or local elites and the controls they exercise with their style of governing. Patronage and bureaucratisation and new public civic spheres are built and, for example, recall Freire:
The Citizenship School is assumed to be a centre of rights and duties. What characterises it is the formation for citizenship. The Citizenship School, then, is the school that makes viable citizenship of those who are there and that of those who go there. It cannot be a citizenship school in itself and for itself. It is citizenship as far as it is used in the construction of citizenship of those who use their space. The Citizenship School is a school coherent with freedom. It is coherent with their educating and liberating speech. It is a school that, by fighting to be itself, fights for pupils-educators to also be themselves. As nobody can be alone, the Citizenship School is a community and a companion-ship school. It is a school of common production of knowledge and freedom.

It is a school that lives the tense experience of democracy (Freire, 1997).

We could rescue, and to rethink, redo, the practice-concept started by the movements of pedagogic renovation. For example, *Escola pública, valenciana i popular* made operative the learning devices and denied the exclusion and exclusive practices of education and schools, which are today fully assumed under denominations of desertion, repetition, and objection. Forgetting some contributions of Freire, for example:

> These children are expelled from school ... therefore; there are reasons, which are internal and external to the school, to explain the expulsion and reprehension of working class’ children (Freire, 2006, p. 180).

Maybe today we would have to profile that exclusion is a highly gratifying process and a practice—politically and socially—and that, evidently, it is being done. It sometimes marks subjects, and other times it hides them, an anonymous particle that always supposes names and last names that, also, presupposes some positions and situations from the part of the speakers, who are falsely neutral and use languages between old and new. An undertaking that men and women take in a dynamic and flexible way, one that we materialise and we verify from a position where we argue equality as a purpose, not as a principle inherent to any human being. Maybe this is one of the basic changes in conception-practice that information society is settling on in a superficial and deep way in the social and singular imaginary. Maybe it does not have anything to do with the success and the failure of young people, girls and boys, adults, and older men and women in educational and social processes. Maybe it is a change that has a general and integrated device that looks for, produces and consolidates, positively, some logics of exclusion that in the first place need and are nurtured by new words, practices, new emotions and passions....

Finally, considering that there is a strong tendency to stress psychology, education and professionalism as elements that characterise information and/or knowledge society, elements that require new languages and, simultaneously, produce a phenomenon of the production of new words and new senses of old words. A definitive gibberish becomes practice and vice versa, practice derives from language. Both processes introduce lethal doses of lost of autonomy, fragility and vulnerability, processes that we are apprehending and learning, each in a different way and according to the place in which we place ourselves in educational,
citizenship and territorial processes. Do these doses vaccinate us periodically and make us conceive and assume the previously mentioned logics and our own exclusion as a process and a practice? Moreover, from this horizon, what education, for what society? We asked ourselves: what antagonistic recreation of territories are we able to create and implement as tools in the institutions where we are working? Which dialogues or conversations do we put in the centre of educational processes, constituting other ones as a subject of education and recognising their knowledge made of experience? What dynamic of conviviality are we able to gestate and implant in the territories already liberated?

DRAWING BOUNDARIES TO THE TERRITORY

Before flourishing, the green chalice of the poppy is hard as the shell of an almond
(John Berger)

The concept of territory seemingly must be only linked to two dimensions: space, a portion more or less configured by other sub-dimensions like altitude, width, surface; and time, which, up to now, we had always granted a unique development line. Clearly, progress: past, present and future made us walk tiptoeing across a line of accumulative power and knowledge.

This perspective knocks us out. It de-socialises and/or rarefies by means of a unilateral process of concealment of limits, marks, and frontiers through which concept-actions arose: inside and outside, excluding and marginalising, in school, in prison, etc. In addition, it made it clear that subjects who produced the practical-theoretical displacement of territorialisation and subject-objects who suffered inappropriate re-territorialisation were not defined as territories. By ignoring the double connection of all educational and formative politics of bodies and territories, re-territorialisation, by generating countless of corporations and incorporations, by means of a panoply of full details that dictate where we be placed, you and I, in front of territories, cities, towns, neighbourhoods, schools, classrooms, teachers, and pupils, as subject-objects, developed without the common and social knowledge that enables us to live and to interpret.

One day this shell opens up
three green pieces fall to the floor
(John Berger)

The real and/or virtual distance along time and space that we have been interposing in professional relationships and in space-time as teachers or social workers has ended up implementing the forgetting of formulas, marks, associations, and relationships in an exponential way. However the fact of knowing and thinking – that is to say, women and men are intellectual with a capacity to create and know – promotes the emergence of the kingdom of opinion that gives uniformity to life. This kingdom is defined by Macedo as a Pedagogy of the Big Lie that determines
the real processes of human beings’ stupidification (Macedo, 1993), as well as the isolation of adults in increasingly closed and differentiated/differentiating universes, disabling interpretations, and recognition of the life for ignorance and underviability. For example, in adult education schools, by impeding the blooming of distinction and decision skills, this relates to the real possibility to conform to the program and educational processes.

It is not an axe that opens,
just a gnarled ball of petals
which are fine as membranes and wrinkled cloths
(John Berger)

Therefore one of the tasks to create new relationships among territory, citizenship and education would have to be the recovery of distinguishing, deciding and inhabiting capacities of territories, while recovering the community processes of re-creation that simultaneously recreate ourselves. Living is recreating, and that re-creation, that reinvention is always existence put at stake and place. This reinvention makes us understand that it is not possible to think that citizenship, territory and education exist outside power relationships. These, like the three vectors, upon which we are commenting, are political, full and real. As Freire points out:

It is necessary that educators be advised of it ... because as far as the educator understands that education is a political act, he discovers himself as a politician.
(Freire, 2006, p. 42).

Of course, since that moment we can distinguish, decide, and choose, and the option we take is directly political and pedagogic, in unison, because they cannot exist separately. This process must place in the centre of action, reflection action, which are the practical categories of self-organisation and self-creation. So much of people are in territories. Self-valorisation and self-organisation of different people constitute groups, associations and territories. That is to say, the process of care-knowledge oneself and territory-environment is resistance. It is creating, singularly and socially, conditions of possible processes of denunciation and pronouncement, of taking the word3, so that many times we have learned how to read and write in practice and, mainly, to make visible the singular and social rebuilding of the alternative subjectivities per se and in their territorial contexts of life.

As they are unwrinking, clothes change colour
from the neonatal pink to the screechiest scarlet
that can be found in field
(John Berger)

From a glocal position we could affirm that all territory is constituted and redimensioned, externally, as a cause and effect, from its constructive material practices, its discursive games and its codes. Internally, we could affirm that all territory is a cause-effect of diagrammatic, cognitive and emotional lines. Moreover, we could affirm that all territory is constituted by individual and social practices, by their relationships with human abilities (memory, desire, imagination, and reason)
and by the power of different strategies. The adult territorial experience is configured by means of the complex and often contradictory crossing of real territory. It is a kind of an external bend that conditions individual and it is pre-existent to him. (Therefore, external tensions and pulsions are not only a virtual and/or real projection of adult actions-reflections). It is an external bend pre-existent to the individual experience and the imaginary notion of territory itself as an internal bend. That is to say, it is a notion of multiple experiences and polymorphic historical, emotional, and identity registrations of adults and youth, a kind of product and/or an ideological mark that points it out to us as space, by differentiating them between flat and grooved ones.

If we defined, starting from now, the territorial perspective as agency, we would be taking a step ahead, beyond the concept-practice of structure, system, form and process. At the same time we would guarantee that heterogeneous, biological, social, epistemological, and imaginary components that now condition us, from pre-existence, from the baggage and history, they would help us condense and displace some forms of conforming territories as common places of/for singularities, where it was possible for thought-feeling, creativity and resistance. These would be the vectors that could reconstitute a transversality in turns that cross internal, deep, external and superficial territories that are live basins to overcome and/or break the school/schooling ‘complex’ (the complex that is pedagogic, psychological, antipolitical, and anti-social). This complex masks the crisis, conflict, and chaos, and it is based on the teacher/father’s great metaphor: where the teacher—or any other professional—is the patriarchal subject who needs to be identified as a subject by other teachers and professors and, mainly, by those who have not still ended up being subjects. Or, in other words, the teacher needs be identified as a subject by ‘students’ boys and girls.

It is as if the force that opens the chalice were the necessity of this red to become visible and to be seen

(John Berger)

It is as if forces that open territories were necessities and desires of women and men to become visible, generating processes of social creation. I think that it is necessary to get down to work, to put the community in education and liberation, and give them hope to love, by trying to constitute territorial, ethnic flows of gender and sex and to form an education and adult education that defines the act/value of learning as:

a conversation among all the possible subject-observers, where each speaker transcends their identity and is transformed in a process. When conversing they change, as the system that converses changes (Murillo, 1997, p. 221)

Enlarged in an oblique way by the practice/concept/tool of deep participation, knowledge and actions are constituted and/or reconstituted especially by adult participants who look for the resolution of the conflict, by disagreement. These interactions are open and expansible processes that gain information, senses and experience, where the recognition of other women and other men generates and
expands the transverse exchange between multiplicity of centres internal to the
group or to the territory. They are connected by nothing in the middle, without
hierarchies or classifications (Aparicio, 1999).

Being so, these are real possibilities to articulate territories, by means of
education and citizenship, from a community ethics and eco-responsibility, from
autonomy and local-global knowledge and, mainly, from the recovery of the sense
of place and community that bends and opens out. All around and from singularities,
autonomies and freedoms, adult participants, teachers, and other professionals
placed in context. This implicates the creation of a physical and academic reference
where the whole formative demand is agglutinated (e.g.; Local Plan of Permanent
Education) in a manner that can be steered (Local Council of Permanent Education)
in a flexible way. All information and procedures, as well as the design, the
participation, situational planning of educational and cultural actions, and those
of formation-employment, developed from local corporations to place value on
learning and popular knowledge, valorise citizenship as a political creation of
women and men. As Freire reminds us:

sometimes I think that one speaks of citizenship as if it were a very abstract
concept . . . as if, when the word citizenship was pronounced, everybody
acquired it automatically. Or as if it were a gift that politicians and educators
gave to the town. It is not. It is necessary to clarify that citizenship is a
production, a political creation (Freire, 2006, p. 137).

And as a political creation, it is necessarily first a social and singular creation for
which we make women and men in our educational, ethical, and cultural work.

BE YOURSELF THE CHANGE THAT YOU WANT TO CREATE IN THE WORLD:
PROMISE AND COMPROMISE

Between promise and compromise, popular education is placed. We are with them,
here, to count and to be counted, to say and to do, to innovate words, actions and
life, to have some voice that can take root and, at the same time, to be in movement.

The inaugural experience of each human life is learning how to speak:
speaking is the most public and political thing that there is in the feminine
and masculine experience (Garretas, 2002, pp. 12–13).

Coming from our mother, it verifies that acting is before politics (López Petit,
2003, pp. 204–205). Exceeding the old - and current - relationship friend/enemy,
Lazzarato indicates:

The unfolding of the asymmetric action of minorities explodes the relationship
of friend/enemy - that which despaired Schmitt. And the differential unfolding
of cooperation is always the one that breaks bad dialectics with the capital -
that which despairs the Marxists (Lazzarato, 2006, pp. 220–226).
This is displayed in a minority future that always implies that possible worlds can proliferate as creative horizons that defy dualism in general and, especially, worlds that oscillate around the relationships of capital/work, man/woman, and adult/youth. As a guarantor of a knowledge-sex, knowledge-cooperation, or a knowledge-work, the creator of worlds (impelling actions of sabotage, alternative and domestic, in territorial production and making) put at stake and in place political life in daily life in some relationships, as a realisation of emancipation that moves and/or is sub-product of liberation. The two exceed the simple moral and technical administration of territories of human beings and citizenship, of things, and of institutions and movements, without strong or weak separation.

A process of social creation that implements a sense of life, relationships or freedom as an assumption of liberation, for example, in school and in classrooms, or in associations and in entities, makes it appear that an active, democratic, and political life exists. That is, life is materialised in real education, associations, schools and democratic institutions and, now, in organising and mobilising education processes. This changes ourselves, education and training, and being ourselves changes what we want to create in the territory, in education, and citizenship.

A promise and a compromise that enable the capacity to be and to speak, experience and language, action and reflection, regardless of their explicit formation, produce actions with democratic and unequal senses and organisations in which

the conscience of the practice (that) implies the science of the practice which is implicit or announced in it changes sense. This way, making science is discovering, revealing truths of the world, live beings and things that wait to be robbed. It is giving an objective sense to something that new emergent necessities of the social practice outline to women and men (Freire, 1996, p. 113).

Now that we feel and we know that education, territorial contexts and community are important for giving a sense and quality to citizenship and life, we could point out a work outline that we started in the processes of popular education (see figure 1). As shown by the queries - for who is it made and for what reason it is made - and by problematisations and reproblematisations, through those smaller questions that affect us, we advance through different phases, by picking some of the best contributions in Latin American popular education that are exemplified in four mathematical operations: subtraction, addition, multiplication and division-distribution. We take them as operative functions to empower or disempowering people and pupils and their tasks and actions to be developed. These transactions will be able to be, in their operation, continuous or not, and they mean to go towards the process of development of necessary actions to transfer and transverse the learning processes that promotes popular education, by crossing the different contexts - mental, internal and external - of singular young people and adults in learning groups and territories.
Figure 1. Dynamic diagram of learning process and its relationships with citizenship
They can and we can act, really and virtually, by enabling promise and compromise - singular and social. That is to say, we can enable the viable concretion of the unpublished thing and the possible creative thing, as a production of the new thing, by giving women and men full capacity to make effectiveness of this new creation. This gives them, the constructive and operative exercise of the expressed, distributed, open and unforeseeable potentialities that bear the verification of the conversational relationship that transcends as much of the exchange as recognition. It is the verification of an event-in-process that enters in the innermost initiatives and actions of popular education. A relationship in which, as Lazzarato puts it:

The conversation is one of the most important things in the transmission and the discussion of speech and other people’s words. It is a constitution tool and of capture of brains and other people’s words... The conversation occupies a strategic list in the cooperation of brains and all mechanisms of constitution of public opinion should pass through it (Lazzarato, 2006, p. 150).

Through this relationship, it emerges self-mediation and mediation. Without them, women and men would not be the practices of life that materialise as singular and social. In that process, popular education has an ontologic dimension that rotates, among political and ethical measures, in a use of knowledge and new power: be, yourself, the change that you want to create in the world.

THE VALUE OF LEARNING

Today, we could state that education and citizenship are in a borderline situation. At the same time, they are perceived by a part of society as keys and axes around which we could consolidate singular and social resistance. And also as creation that overcomes educational, social, and political exclusions. One facilitates the legitimate aspiration that women and men have to aspire to a singular and social autonomy. The educational, ethical and political tasks must recapture the emancipating tradition-innovation of building a democratic and self-regulated society. This society reaffirms individual and collective autonomy and sustains them both. Autonomy is necessary and indispensable for society and the real and current movement of women and men. It is an emancipating and democratic movement that must cross schools and homes, universities and associations.

If their situation is borderline, they conform themselves and they are conformed from the outside from here, and then the school is no longer only par excellence the space in which the educational process is carried out. Other environments emerge correlative, some of which have been always tending to be educational as a function of collective desires and necessities. Maybe it would be worth remembering again that the basic role of communities have invariably been learning places, far from mystifications and kitsch recoveries that maybe officiate a simple mockery between ritual and controller, in which learning balances operatively, valorising all and each action that the human being carries out.
In addition, education emerges as innovating, since its value is not in itself but in the traffic of learning that women and men make and produce in the innermost of living processes, by our ancestors and by ourselves. This is not a moral demand but, mainly, a political and human demand, which would be the key to the value of learning that, in a certain way and measure, prevails over the value of educating, even though we could defend their complementary character. So, as Freire wrote and lived:

The equality of the educator-pupil is demagogic. They are different, but that difference, in the revolutionary perspective, cannot be antagonistic. The difference becomes antagonistic when the educator’s authority, different from the freedom of the pupil, becomes authoritarianism (Freire, 1986, p. 54).

Our own style is shaped by experiences and the practices that we want change and want to be the generating force of a movement of sense transformation, a promise that we complete daily. This promise appears among concepts – it is really so – and it also appears among and with affections — the future, when crossed by love or knowledge, of which we become part, and precepts, or those “packages of sensations and relationships that survive who experience them” (Deleuze, 1996, p. 218). It is in education where these cheerful powers—affections, precepts and concepts—can bend, spread, and withdraw into themselves. In the learning, we conceive, believe and carry out, overflowing ourselves.

In this, we reveal I want to be free. I want to participate in the decisions that affect me. These feelings overcome the segregating individualism and infantilism that sends us, unceasingly, inside to places characterised by the privatisation of lives, equipment, and institutions. This privatisation has an ethnic and conservative community and family as a transverse axis that unites and supplements, in an alienating way, in the private-public sphere. It operates foundationally as a de-politicising and privatising, responsibility-removing and passive element. This value of learning places us in a social and real imagination of democratic collective creation, emancipating desire, and intellectual cooperation, with an aspiration to carry out the critical question of reality and society that appear in them. These collectives are just the creation of workers, men and women, young and adult men and women, boys and girls, etc. through conflict and creation, through resistance and appropriation. In this instituting movement, education has a fundamental role because it makes and produces singular and social identities and coherences. As Castoriadis points out:

the individual will become what the society makes of him essentially, and this 'production' goes first and foremost through education . . . it is because the citizen of the future is produced there, over whom the democracy will be able to be developed. Or, it will know, to the contrary, a new bureaucractic degeneration . . . education, whatever the system that guarantees it, including the United States, cannot be another thing different from a public matter in a wide sense (Castoriadis, 2006, p. 120).
Maybe we would have to remember that before citizens, we are human beings and members of a local public community. At that crossroads, we build human beings and citizenship, among practices and concepts. We locate the tools, establishments and the production of new subjectivities and equipments. This makes real and current, intellectual cooperation and construction of the common thing, beyond the dichotomy of private and public. With the materialisation of equality as a starting point, the articulation of differences — sexual, ethnic, etc. — as powers carried out by the movement of women and men in the revelation-rebellion exercise that supposes learning. A real movement is only democratic when it presupposes that education and citizenship are an act. In addition, they belong to the public sphere, but the practices that we develop will only be domesticating and banking, a widespread astonishment that implies the confirmation of the inability of women and men. Our citizenship, will be an antidialogical, apolitical, subjective, and prisoner to the representation of community, citizenship and education. That is the denomination of democracy.

After the systematic extermination of republican teachers; after Auschwitz, as Pedro Casaldáliga points out in his beautiful poem inside Auschwitz7; after El Ejido; the barriers of Sabta and Malila give some nearby example in time that can affect us more directly. We know that one can only give and receive words, enjoyment, learning, and education in a real horizon where freedom is already material foundation. So as we make it in each struggle, in each movement toward the common thing in the present and in the future as a free event, learning is simultaneously production and creation. It is always open and reveals or rebels against new possibilities in dialogical contexts. In the line of contributions made by teachers -to whom I recognize myself as permanently indebted8- and by the Institución Libre de Enseñanza, during many years, with the contributions of Freire in his different pedagogies: of the oppressed, of the hope, of the autonomy, and of the indignation. In this last one he writes:

Children need to grow in the exercise of this capacity of thinking, wondering and asking, doubting, experiencing action and hypothesis, programming and almost not following programs, which, rather than proposed, are imposed. Children need to have insured the learning right of how to decide that is only made by deciding (Freire, 2001, p. 70).

Also, Bajtin’s contributions give dialogue an ontologic and political role that removes a being’s new sphere . . . In this sphere, the relationships are sense relationships that are expressed through language and signs, but they are not reducible to these last ones. . . . The dialogism reveals the being as a question or as a problem (Lazzarato, 2006, pp. 174–176)

By means of the procedures that women and men put on through dance, through the word flowing and fluent that we make diverge in the events that are mainly the possibility of emergency of multiplicity and distribution, some words make a place for the maximum interaction of another’s word with context, beyond their reciprocal telling influence, beyond the free and creative
The evolution of the word ‘foreigner’, beyond the graduation of transitions, beyond the game of the frontiers (Bajtin, 1991, p. 165).

A learning and some words that always walk in hand, and are deeply responsible and committed antiauthoritarian. These characteristics shape the ontological character of intellectual cooperation among human beings, which, in turn, implies the learning process. On the other hand, the construction of the common thing that, as a corollary, adds that learning shouldn’t or couldn’t be polluted or governed by overschooling that makes adults childish. Overschooling, at the same time, makes young people infant adults and, transfers to experts and technicians the power to make assessments and validation processes. These techniques replace interrogations and experiences without any power, or are subsumed as repetitions and copies, so that they make way to democratic fiction in education and in schools, in another environments, in a democratic fiction or fascination. Learning must be a free process, and must be constituted as power. Therefore, citizenship—and democracy—must be a creation and product of learning the learning, of liberating the liberty and learning the liberty.

Being so we could begin and/or consolidate processes to edify education and citizenship—far, very far, from education for citizenship—in a new promise that is already necessary to put into circulation in schools, ministries, churches, political parties, unions, families, and in movements of pedagogic renovation. Maybe learning and creation in a smaller sense, materialisation of the ways of existence, singular and social creations, and re-creation of possibilities of an active and political life. Paraphrasing Castoriadis, the barriers of Sabta and Malila, El Ejido, Auschwitz, and the reprisal and murder of Republican teachers in Spain, and so many other ones, are not refuted, but fought. This movement is necessary to trigger the march of the unemployed ones, the victims of injustice, those who protest against impunity, those who cry out against violence, against the lie and the scorn of the public thing. The march of the homeless, those without school, those without hospitals, renegades. The hopeful march of those who know that it is possible to change (Freire, 2001, pp. 72–73)

Those are the movements—of workers, women, young people, the paperless, environmentalists—that grow and engage us slowly, that steer and show us that thinking is creating, that creating is speaking and making, and that speaking and making is resisting.

The resistance is a radical alternative to the capitalist colonisation of life, but it can only be that as far as it is an appropriation of the common thing (that is to say the conditions in which we live), or capacity to break, radically but in an original, frank, spontaneous, autonomous and self-founding form, with the given order (Negri, 2006, pp. 188–189).

A sheaf of relationships and trust, situations and love, takes us to make and to think that education is not possible without the other. The same thing happens with the world and with collectives. With it we could begin and/or consolidate reading and writing of the world, and of course, reappropriation of the common thing, public equipment, and relationships, without the institutional mediations that deprive us of...
life. As well as they shape them, we could say conservatively, to women and men, this is as much as a desire to take the power of women and men to transform their existence and to assume their responsibility.

Education cannot be conceived and donated if teachers and pupils don’t want it or are not interested in learning. Between the two impulses, the love of learning arises sometimes as a thread, and other times as a slice. That isn’t learning how to love human people.

These double impulses of love on the one hand connect ourselves—singularity and creation—and, on the other, connects the rest of women and men – the humanity—who are the multitude of singularities and social creation. We could also define it as viable unpublished actions, innovations that force the emergence of qualities of live work in a process anchored in the old and new, processes firstly affected by creativity and then by trans-form-action. That is to say, a becoming that crosses people, and equipment in the realisation of

[the critical reading of the world] is an indivisible pedagogic-political task of the political-pedagogic task. That is to say, part of political action that involves groups organisation and popular classes to intervene in the reinvention of society (Freire, 2001, pp. 52–53).

We have felt passed over by tongues of fire. Here—in a border passing—in a poetical learning, they have given us the word—a word that is always between other people, among the multiple and plural—and we have received it and have given it back, as we are doing now, in an exercise of knowledge re-creation and subjectivity production. Both constitute us as citizens, global and local citizens with full multiplicity, as at their moment the working class was and continues to be another way - as women in the process of becoming who they are, as immigrant people who are part of a global and local citizenship. As demand and proposals cross education and politics and establish continuous and discontinuous processes of the society, self-institution and citizenship go through self-organisation and self-government in diverse communities, for example, in classes, schools, or neighbourhoods.

These double impulses and love, perhaps, are the light that is sloping – it announces and liberates a new life —birth and innovation— that is inspired and correlative, active and enabling. Unlearnings and disobediences are double impulses. Love in education mends society with global citizenship, and vice versa, to make an ontologic creation that operates as a guide for the questioning of laws and institutions. It must always suppose a conservation disabling that is the preservation and/or closing of the school system, and other systems, and the annulment of autonomy that produces a domestication and banking education. It must also suppose simple innovation that is the educational system preservation, and with it, other systems of value, obedience. They manufacture and/or shape women and men through taming and/or new education, or by means of the domestication and banking education of a new kind: internet, integrated computer packages, etc.
However, it must suppose, simultaneously and necessarily, an emancipating education enabling it to be located in tradition without focusing, recreating, and reinventing it, in a process of unforeseeable learning in which teachers and pupils take up what’s said, the text, and they say it again, they read it, or they interpret it, they translate it, they deny to have said what they said, they say it again in another way... (Melich, 2001, p. 409).

By creating the democratic order, as Zambrano tells us:

The democratic order will only be achieved with the participation of everybody as human beings in what corresponds to human reality. The equality of all men, ‘dogma’ fundamental of the democratic faith, is equality as humans, not as qualities or characters. Equality is not uniformity. It is, on the contrary, the supposition that allows acceptance of differences, and rich human complexity, not only in the present, but in the future. It is the faith in the unforeseeable thing (Zambrano, 1996, pp. 163–165).

From these perspectives, following a typology, elaborated and presented by Joan Subirats and reprocessed from our experiences, and starting from an investigation carried out in public schools of adult education, we could also transfer to the experiences of teachers and to other spheres of those ‘public services’ that spins around two axes: school projects and relationships with the community.

Figure 2. Types of schools derived from relationships and mediations between educational projects and communities
Only those in the left superior quadrant respond to the pre-requirements of a citizenship school (Clovis, 2005, 2007): integrative-inclusive, complex and unforeseeable, and producer and creator of citizenship. It would be established that

As a process of knowledge, political formation, ethical manifestation, search of beauty, and scientific and technical training, education is an indispensable and specific practice of human beings in the history as a movement, as a struggle (Freire, 1996, pp. 16–17).

This practice-concept of civic schooling introduces another notion of community:

Today we know that the community idea cannot be thought of as an oppressive and authoritarian space, but as a free election based on conscience that only in the reciprocity of the relationship, the true recognition of difference and particularity takes place. The community can be the place where individual particularities are defended and valued, where the conversion of all of us in social illiterates is avoided (Barcellona, 1992, p. 125).

This is not nostalgia or tradition but the possible creation, not to carry out, but to consummate, and to make these micropolitical and macropolitical worlds become the community through which the non state public cooperation and community emerges as a sphere of production and circulation of common goods. Knowledge and uses, knowledge and languages, affections and desires, art and information, and services cannot be appropriated and are gratuitous, and they do not depend directly on the State and do not respond to the relationships capital/work.

These alternative experiences that are given in the citizenship school have always a juridical character. This would be a clear sign of their identification that they can multiply freedom, by liberating the emancipation, by emancipating liberty, and allowing the building of methods, guides, materials, tools, and devices, as well as potentiating alliances to build and to constitute —de-territorialised and re-territorialised again the transformation of the existent power’s relationships— strategic relationships, government’s techniques and dominance states. In this movement of resistance and creation we have begun to create and/or to produce interferences and bifurcations in the learning processes that we are generating and materialising. As Castoriadis affirmed, “it is necessary wisdom and it is necessary will” (Castoriadis, 2006, p. 234) to be able to make educational and civic innovations. Of course, it is in this process in which, as the poet Yolanda Castaño says:

Traballo todo o dia./Algúns vermes venhabitar os meus tendóns./Cunha man/recoñezo amultiplicidade da contenda./coa outra/peiteo o universo9

In that multiplicity recognition there is a final consideration: the experiences in which we are immersed must be and must constitute a transformative and creative movement, as much for teachers as for pupils. They must imply a moment and a process of association, cooperation and coordination of workers who are in these spheres. In addition, they must produce synergies, interrelations and exchanges. We must be able to transfer to community, society, institutions, political groups and unions these proposals and demands. They must imply a moment and a process
of association, cooperation and coordination of women, men, young men and
women, kids, old men and old women, who live in territories. In addition, they must
produce synergies, interrelations and exchanges among them. The projects-programs-
processes that are developed must have credibility, consistency, and coherence, as
well as an ethical and political load that enables us to comb the universe, perhaps
to crosscurrent, for being teachers:

The teacher is who maintains, who looks for in his direction, that direction in
which each one is alone in his research and in which he doesn’t stop looking

Being so, to liberate life, education, school, institutions, and territories, to liberate us
and ourselves from conformism, by crossing frontiers, the value of learning is here.

As people practice in freedom schools, freedom cities, their neighbourhoods and
streets, and in associations, unforeseeably and unpredictably, the effectiveness of
new action models getting away from the dual relationship of capital and work, and
by creating common goods, by re-problematising experiences, by practicing freedom
and specific emancipations, autonomy and self-valorisation. In some territories and
in some communities, liberated and transformed, Marina Garcés (2007, pp. 13–19)
indicates:

Being liberated is transforming our existence conditions collectively. The
emancipation does not go through the conquest of individual sovereignty, but
through the capacity of being engaged into a common world.

In public-public, common spheres, where forms of life are made and produced,
where acting, thinking and co-creating the will and the wisdom to rethink, the role
of a nomadic and radical, republican and common citizenship goes through
positions and situations, by creating and by cultivating another way of life. By
crossing frontiers, and by constituting the value of learning, making that education,
citizenship, and democracy could be

… the expression of desires, live work, production, and capacity to unite
differences... the formidable capacity to unite through the work, the continuous
dialectic of differences, the capacity to agree, to build in common (Negri,

Sometimes, it is necessary to count an entire life
in order to refute a single sentence
(John Berger)

To conclude, but without concluding, I would like to pose ourselves some questions.
Will we, as teachers, dare to learn in that open process of being teachers? Will we
value learning and, with this learning, place ourselves in a position to guide women
and men who participate in the learning process to place themselves in a position to
shape educational initiatives, to transform territories into practices and experiences?
Will we begin actions (be yourself the change that you want to create in the world)
that imply
ADULT EDUCATION, CITIZENSHIP AND TERRITORY

[the construction of democratic powers [as] real alternatives from personal points of view and from the community [that is really at the moment] a democratic power in the city, in the school, and in the factory [that] means to build new social relationships and different balances of power (Barcellona, 1992, p. 109).

Here and now, now and here.

NOTES

1 Translation from Spanish by Xavier Montero.

2 This is part of a preliminary work about the perspective and territorial dimension in Permanent Education.

3 That is to say, the real and current appearance in the educational, cultural, political and ethical scenario in which some of us are involved our entire life. That is to say, the realization of a qualitative-quantitative jump of women and men as intellectuals in their lives and contexts, that connects Marx’s contributions - general intellect - to those of Castoriadis (the practice-concept of autonomy), with the ‘Greek’ world. For example the contributions of Foucault about the parrhesia concept state that ‘a certain ethics of the word’ is the opening of the heart, the opening of the thought, the necessity that both speakers don’t hide anything of what they think and speak frankly, the responsibility and the commitment of speaking, of taking the word. The positionings of Freire, contextualised at the present time, makes transfer of the teaching relationship a descent to a reflexive and complex position. Morin - complementarily displaces the action-reflection of giving, when taking, in an enactive way. Varela - living is a challenge to materialisation and the verification of the active life. Arendt - political and democratic, but mainly, dialogical: being is a question or a problem. Human beings, women and men, [the demos], by establishing in an act in a public and common space, establish that a territory doesn’t need the teacher’s direction, but needs teachers as guides. That is a very subtle difference. For example, perhaps in a curved space-time, other people’s words and the foreigner’s words, the difference arises between the maternal word and the nascent own word.

4 The different contexts are neither distinct nor indistinct, but the relationships of distinction/non distinction do or do not facilitate the bifurcations for irruption of energy fluctuations or matter or by means of interaction with the environment. It is at this point when the variable decision arises, as the distinction establishes a relationships: decision/no-decision.


6 A more developed paragraph was presented in Jornadas Pedagógicas Internacionales de Primavera organized by the Pedagogical Renovation Movement Alarje and The Faculty of Education of the University of Cordova in May, 2007.

7 How/to speak about God/after Auschwitz?/you wonder,there, on the another side of the sea, in abundance./How/to speak about God/inside Auschwitz?/the companions wonder here,/loaded with reason, with weeping and with blood,/put into the daily/death/of millions...

8 Only a long but necessary sign: “I speak here about Pereira because he was my teacher. I had this fortune. Soon after the Civil War, a group of parents contracted him to educate their children. I was one of these children. In the most dismal and asphyxiating phase of the Spanish national catholicism, I was educated in liberty, instructed socratically in the sensibility and the reason of a Galician teacher victimized by fascism. I am a live witness of the meaning of the pacific, civic, cultural, ethical and pedagogical revolution tackled by the self-sacrificing republican teachers. I am a posthumous disciple of victimized teachers, who were murdered and tortured by fascist barbarism. I am indebted to them for all my life. All of us are indebted to them”. Beirás in Iglesias (2006).

9 I work the whole day/Worms come sometimes to inhabit my tendons./With a hand/I recognize the multiplicity of the contest,/with the other one/I brush the universe.
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