WIELOGŁOS W MYŚLI O WYCHOWANIU

100 lat polskiej pedagogiki filozoficznej

Redakcja naukowa
Sławomir Sztobryn • Katarzyna Dworakowska

Towarzystwo Pedagogiki Filozoficznej im. B. F. Trentowskiego

Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego WUW

Ministerstwo Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego

Maria Kultaieva

H.S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University
ORCID 0000-0002-0603-0986

Intercultural discourse in the philosophy of education: Theoretical reflection between generality and singularities

Introduction

The long tradition of the philosophy of education in West Europe gives its neighboring countries with a communistic past a cause for rethinking their cultural and educational history in terms of its intercultural and transcultural connections. One of the ways to do this is to ask about possibilities created by the communicative turn of contemporary philosophical and pedagogical thinking in their common intercultural discourse. The self-reflection of representative pluralities upon the subject field of philosophy of education can be combined through their reciprocal reflections aiming to contribute to the solution of the well-known meta-theoretical problem of educational philosophy: education beyond the struggles for recognition or fighting for the leading position of their authorities in the world of the educational and scientific community. Such widening of the concept of "intercultural discourse" to include the world dimension allows us to bring into the light of philosophical reflection some blind spots of cultural and subcultural phenomena in education. Moreover, crossing from industrialism to post-industrialism and vice versa makes it possible to construct hybrid contexts for educational practices. The selection of empirical material illustrating the self-understanding of educational philosophy in industrial and post-industrial conditions was done in accordance with this methodological assumption. In some respects it was necessary to regard in more detail the self-interpretation of American educational philosophy in the half-forgotten 1970s and 1980s, during which some models were elaborated by combining different epistemic cultures both without and within the interdisciplinary approach. The post-industrial

changes in educational practices can be better explained by going back to those constructions of American educational philosophy.

Also, it must be mentioned that the philosophical reflections on education considered within the conditions of globalization propose a variety of their conceptualizations in the form of intercultural syntheses and hybrids, combining different cultures and ideologies. This makes it difficult to offer general guidelines for educational practice for all cases and in all cultural contexts. However, the processes of European and world-wide educational integration activities require both – an ideal of education corresponding to the contra-factuality of the knowledge society, and a model, or at least a mechanism, turning the desirable purpose into reality under national conditions. The intercultural discourse in the philosophy of education generally moves in different directions, with the following main special aspects: ontological, epistemological, practical and axiological ones. Furthermore, the intercultural discourse as communication has its own logic and structure, which might be regarded also as a decisive factor for evaluating normative and descriptive educational theories with a local and global reach. The references to universalism also need more convincing arguments, as was the case in past centuries. The turn toward post-secularity observable today is an indicator of this requirement.

The intercultural discourse in philosophy of education cannot be identified with intercultural education and its theoretical and practical problems, although all these problems have many common points with the ones we are reflecting on. The main issue of this discourse can be defined as a problem with commensurability within the plurality of epistemic cultures of educational philosophy and its self-representations. For East European countries this problem has a high degree of actuality because their educational integration in the global space and their disintegration from the post-Soviet space have shaped a problem circle related not only to the new standards in education based on the US model, but also the cultural dimension of the curriculum and the validity of the national tradition under conditions of globalization. Furthermore, on the agenda there is also the task of the re-education of teachers with a radical communist worldview. German and Austrian educational philosophers are also disconcerted by the "transatlantic export" and its educational forms replacing European ones (Konrad Paul Liessmann, Julian Nida-Rümelin, Mark Roche, etc.).[1]

The analysis presented below is founded on the assumption that all these aspects are not strictly separated from each other and can be regarded as complex communication. This can be explained by using the methodological construct of the "ideal communicative community" which would make the intercultural

---

[1] M. Kultaieva, *The Education and its Deformations in the Contemporary Culture: A Contribution to the Actuality Th.W. Adorno's Theory of Half-Education*, "Philosophy of Education" 2017, no. 1(20), pp. 153–195.

discourse on education free of authorities' domination and political interests.[2] The problem which is regarded in this paper is connected with a split into two logics in the orientation in the philosophy of education dealing with a multicultural reality: one of generality and one of singularities.

Some tendencies in the intercultural philosophy of education: Discovery of singularities and temptation of generality

The problem, which can be articulated in Kantian spirit as "How might the intercultural philosophy of education be possible?," requires regarding both the possibilities of philosophy to reflect intercultural educational phenomena and its ability to select intercultural phenomena for their theoretical reflection on the field of education. The intercultural educational discourse offers different ways of realizing this requirement, which also might be reflected on.[3] However, the same philosophical reflection of intercultural objects, when it is widened to include education, is less complicated because of the interpenetrating of philosophical and pedagogical reasons. The concept of "singularity" in plural is used here to mean a divergence of the development possibilities with relations complementary to each other. The validity of educational philosophy in the contexts of the later modernity cannot be defined in the form of ultimate universal normativity because post-industrial societies have a tendency to produce singularities, especially in cultural and educational fields. The logic of the singularities replaces the logic of generality in the philosophical conceptualizations of education and actualizes the intercultural discourse within philosophy of education and on its borders. Andreas Reckwitz describes the tendency of "doing generality" as a "static and dynamic regularity with the codes better/worse," which was typical of classical modernity but has only limited validity in late modernity.[4] This distinction has methodological relevance for the analysis of new realities in education because the cultural conditions of educational

---

[2] This methodological position of Jürgen Habermas is explained precisely by Axel Honneth: "In his case the form of critical theory follows the idea of an interaction free of domination in that its principles of constructions coincide with a mode of self-reflection that is immanently situated and committed solely to the non-violent force of arguments." A. Honneth, *The Fragmental World of the Social: Essays in Social and Political Philosophy*, ed. C.W. Wright, State University of New York Press, New York 1995, p. 106.

[3] W. Sweet, *The Project of Intercultural Philosophy*, [in:] *What is Intercultural Philosophy?*, ed. W. Sweet, Cardinal Station, Washington 2014, pp. 1–19.

[4] A. Reckwitz, *Die Gesellschaft der Singularitäten. Zum Strukturwandel der Moderne*, Suhrkamp, Berlin 2017, p. 39. All translations are my own.

practices and institutional landscapes of early modernity are not acceptable in post-industrial societies with their extensive network of formal, non-formal and informal education with different learning cultures. This circumstance of the co-existence of different cultural matrixes in philosophy and in the reality of education must also be taken into consideration. The national versions of the philosophy of education reveal different relations between generality and singularity. This is no less important for constructive intercultural discourse because of its subliminal influence on national culture.

The ideology of industrialism continues to play its role as a principle of organization of mass education to a lesser degree in post-industrial societies, but parallel to that a new type of school emerges in the educational space of late modernity. Reckwitz describes it as "the ambitious school":

> The ambitious schools [*die ambitionierten Schulen*] present themselves as "cultures of potential development" of single pupils and their gifts: the singularizing of school organization might be in the ideal case in accordance with the singularizing of the educational process approximately as project learning or mentoring […] The ambitious schools at least ought to bring together two goals: the pedagogical goal of the potential development of single pupils and the realization of the institutional determination of the school as a distributive station of life and career chances.[5]

This splitting of school organization and different school cultures requires the raising of new issues in contemporary intercultural discourse on the philosophy of education. However, a similar trend in this discourse has already been observed in the 1960s. The debates upon mass culture and its educational consequences, which were initiated by representatives of the Frankfurt School, can be regarded as a contribution to intercultural discourse upon the philosophy of education. Theodor W. Adorno's theory of half-education is an attempt to bring back the old concept of a cultivated person, whose education was founded on Humboldt's ideal of the human being.[6] A similar tendency in new, post-industrial conditions has been discussed in a publication devoted to the relationship between different educational cultures. This can be illustrated both by educational reality and by its philosophical reflections. Representatives of the different kinds of epistemic and epistemological cultures are working within the same problem circle, not only with the purpose of being the best in this field – they are also looking for the truth in its different appearances.

---

5 Ibid., pp. 334–335.
6 See M. Kultaieva, *The Education*…, op. cit., pp. 156–168.

Transfer of pedagogical ideas from pre-modernity into late modernity

Pre-modernity means in this context pre-bourgeois forms of power and culture. Late modernity includes some patterns of pre-modernity and gives them legitimacy even in the form of re-feudalization.[7] The transfer of pedagogical ideas from pre-modernity into late modernity and their adaptation to the post-industrial realities can be regarded as a relatively new direction in the stream of the intercultural discourse upon contemporary education and its systems, although the transcultural moments were always preserved in the conceptual constructions of the pluralized philosophy of education. The actualization of its historical dimension brings as a consequence the opening of some new horizons for pedagogical research, but that is also connected with risks of establishing the former orders and practices, which are inadequate for contemporary cultural designs. As an example here can serve the tendency of transforming national systems of higher education, taking into account the global migration of students with their learning cultures and pedagogical traditions, including life plans, with the general logic of rational choice and with individual ambitions of self-realization. Rudolf Stichweh sees in this tendency a new form of the medieval university coming back with its educational practices, which seem to be more adequate for contemporary globalized societies. But this revival entails the risk of destroying national systems of education. Stichweh defines this tendency as "paradoxically" caused by the hybridizing of the "cosmopolitan and nation-state university":

> The consequence of this cosmopolitan orientation of the university is a steady conflict with national laws, distribution of opportunities, imperatives of national security considering national interests. Therefore I insist on the concept of "paradox" because the paradoxical condition might be used in currently available interpretations as a definition of a perpetual oscillating movement between reciprocally exclusive poles.[8]

On the level of schools this transfer is not as evident as it is in the case of universities, but communication between different school cultures is also complicated through the existence of zones closed to understanding. The everyday organization cultures of mass schools and of the "ambitious" ones belong to parallel worlds. Also, the learning cultures here are not less different and need translation not only in linguistic, but also in philosophical and practical senses. Inclusive education propagated globally seldom takes place within the options of the singularized

---

[7] See ibid., pp. 163–165.

[8] R. Stichweh, *Die Weltgesellschaft. Soziologische Analysen*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main 2000, p. 151.

school because the familial origin plays a decisive role in the selection of their scholars. The pre-modern tendency of latent converging of educational and life-world spaces is also noticeable. The project of the "new school," which was started in Ukraine and some other European countries and was inspired by the Finnish model, can be regarded as an illustration of this paradox. An attempt to provide new standards for mass education is often connected with identifying "quality education" with studies abroad, which carries risks of experiencing a cultural shock at different stages, which reduces chances of successful learning and a career in the world of work. The modernization strategies of mass school education around the world are formally grounded on transcultural meanings of education with their anthropological assumptions. Reckwitz remarks that the transcultural part of the educational discourse dissolves on the level of educational reality in the arguments of economic rationality:

> The social logic of generality, which is manifested in demands of education standards, is addressed to families of people with low qualifications. It is important to maintain the minimal standard in this respect. At the same time also the school logic of distinctiveness [*schulische Logik des Besonderes*] is widening noticeably with its appeals to families of a new middle class. Because not only job conditions are polarized in the society of singularities, but also life forms and residential districts.[9]

The heritage of the Enlightenment is carefully preserved in the European philosophical tradition with all its diversity and paradoxes. The philosophy of education in its normative representation nearly always includes something of this treasure as a pattern of theoretical constructions or a basis for comparison of national traditions of education. From this point of view the intercultural discourse within the philosophy of education is connected with a revision of its possibilities to make the communicative links for cultural distinction with mutual respect. The disciplinary identification of the philosophy of education is also connected with its ability of self-description. William Sweet provides an explication for the paradox of the intercultural philosophy of education:

> Yet even if the notion of "intercultural" is clarified, there remains the question of how intercultural philosophy is philosophy. Is it to be a field or subject area of philosophy or is it more of an attitude, method or approach – or plurality of approaches – to doing philosophy? Does it provide a positive direction or agenda, or does it focus more on avoiding certain problems in (traditional) philosophy? In other words, do we know what intercultural philosophy even looks like? For many, then, whatever intercultural philosophy is, they presuppose that it must be distinct from philosophy in general.[10]

---

9 A. Reckwitz, *Die Gesellschaft der Singularitäten*…, op. cit., p. 333.
10 W. Sweet, *The Project*…, op. cit., p. 2.

This discourse can also be regarded as a contribution to the discussion about the perspectives of the philosophy of education involved in the processes of globalization and modernization. All this makes it difficult to give a definite answer on the central inquiry of the educational intercultural discourse: what perspectives can be opened for the philosophy of education in the hypothetical world society (in reference to the German concept of "Weltgesellschaft," which can also be used in the plural form) and in the contexts of different national cultures? Migrants' crises in Europe and the problem of integration of the refugees move this discussion usually into the field of political and social philosophy, where the autonomy of education was often excluded from theoretical reflection. The growing intensity of contacts with foreigners and others compels the intercultural discourse to revise the starting position and research perspectives. Some of this has been implied by Sweet:

> Though there has been contact or, at least, a mutual awareness among cultures – particularly those of Europe, Asia, and Africa – for millennia, this contact has increased significantly since the early modern period. With this contact have come encounters with a wide range of practices, cultures, religions, and, particularly, of wisdom or philosophical traditions. The extent of differences among them is often, but not always, obvious, and there have been varying responses to these encounters: sometimes incomprehension, sometimes rejection and denigration, but sometimes active engagement.[11]

Before turning to the intercultural philosophy of education it is worth analyzing the main methodological problems of contemporary philosophy with its attempts to reflect the reality of the multicultural world and to give an orientation to pedagogical practice.

Epistemic cultures and their reflections in the philosophy of education

The epistemic aspect and its epistemological reflection are not so often raised by educational philosophers and pedagogues. In spite of that, all the problems with integrations of contemporary education systems depend on the cultural contexts of changes in the curriculum and its philosophy, including also styles of philosophical thinking about education. The distinction in producing educational knowledge, its selection and transmission can be decisive for further transformations of educational systems. Before turning to reflection on epistemic cultures in philosophy of education, some methodological remarks connected

---

[11] Ibid., p. 1.

with its epistemic subject as a formal paradigmatic consensus made by Hans Jörg Sandkühler should be mentioned because they can be useful for the further explication of intercultural reflections upon these categories in different representations of the philosophy of education:

> Cultures of knowledge present themself as relations between cultural and scientific traditions. The plurality of epistemic cultures is intercultural and it is intra-cultural more complexly as it is fixed in the "western" concept of epistemic pluralism. Epistemic subjects are acting in conditions of difference so between cultures as well as within cultures in open networks and crossing spaces too.[12]

The problem of communication in the different scientific communities is how to reach an understanding through the transmission of knowledge, experience and skill, which is especially important for pedagogy scholars. In any case, the understanding of a foreigner provides also the competence to speak critically about one's own culture. From the methodological point of view what is particularly useful is the assumption of Wolfgang Welsch about transversal reason, which might be a transcultural foundation of intercultural philosophy and pedagogy in spite of different ways and styles of philosophizing on educational problems.[13] European philosophy was developed as a plurality of theories and methodological approaches which have a great influence on the European way of life and corresponding educational practices. The Platonic tradition in philosophy of education can be regarded as a transcultural foundation and a mutual communicative space for the Western and Eastern European discourses[14] because the Aristotelian one is not embedded into national cultures in countries in which Orthodoxy was integrated into their cultural basis. This circumstance has to be taken into account in the strategies of intercultural education.

This diversity clarifies and explains national distinctions in pedagogical theories and practices and shows the condition for the possibilities opening for intercultural dialogues with the agents and addressees of educational services. Therefore, for the pedagogical elaborating of new post-industrial claims it is no

---

[12] H.J. Sandkühler, *Kritik der Repräsentation. Einführung in die Theorie der Überzeugungen, der Wissenskulturen und des Wissens*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main 2009, p. 69.

[13] For more on this issue see W. Welsch, *Vernunft. Die zeitgenössische Vernunftkritik und das Konzept der transversalen Vernunft*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main 1996.

[14] With reference to Peter Sloterdijk, pedagogy in this tradition must be defined as "the integral revolutionary science" and "pure conversion art" or "revolutionary orthopedic." See P. Sloterdijk, *Du mußt dein Leben ändern. Über Anthropotechnik*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main 2009, p. 124. European history of education is described by him as "anthropological techniques" transforming the whole world into "the training planet" (see ibid., pp. 563, 37). From this point of view intercultural communication on education must be founded on the principles of the so-called alternative language, which is stated in the laconic formula of dialogue: "repetition plus translation plus generalization" (see ibid., p. 33).

less important to pay more attention to the different epistemic cultures both in philosophy and in pedagogy. Sometimes the theoretical dialogue between national cultural and educational traditions can be interrupted through arrogance of its participants because everybody accepts advantages only on his own side, with a blind spot for heuristic ideas on the opposite one. The endeavor to make the American tradition the dominating one and accordingly to stop the intercultural discourses inside philosophy of education has both subjective and objective reasons. Especially after the Second World War and the more or less successful anti-totalitarian re-educational practices in West Germany, the American philosophy of education began to position itself as the most efficient one for solving educational and political problems on the basis of John Dewey's pragmatism. It can be illustrated by the following statement of Edward J. Power from the early 1980s:

> No general philosophy speaks more directly to education than pragmatism and in some respects pragmatism is primarily a philosophy of education or, at least, philosophy's best testing ground.[15]

In spite of this attitude, the American philosophy of education shows growing interest in British analytical philosophy and the continental European philosophy of education, especially in its anthropological and existential directions as necessary alternatives in education. However, the American philosophy of education was historically developed always in the intercultural direction, which might be regarded as a consequence of pluralism as a principle of American ideology, national way of life and common living standards in this country. In accordance with this social reality, the educational space cannot be structured only based on the model of the melting pot, but also on the exact opposite, namely on the recognition of cultural plurality. Gerald L. Gutek sums up: the logic of singularity as a consequence of autonomous plurality makes schools and other educational institutions the "place of value tensions."[16] Thus, the general philosophy of education for this type of society is rather a transcultural construct integrated into the matter of American ideology. It must also be added that it has always been important for the American styling of the philosophy of education to show some alternative options both for pedagogues and students. It is significant that already in the early 1970s Gutek predicts the later development of the philosophy of education as a hybrid of different epistemic cultures, including their historical dimension, the validity of which is not lost even in the post-industrial singularities:

---

[15] E.J. Power, *Philosophy of Education: Studies in Philosophies, Schooling, and Educational Policies*, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey 1982, p. 136.

[16] G.L. Gutek, *Philosophical Alternatives in Education*, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, Columbus 1974, p. 3.

> Idealism, Realism and Thomism are three of the philosophies of education that have had a long history in the Western civilization. They are still vital philosophies that guide educational process and give substance to various forms of curricular design. Closely related to these rather traditional philosophies are the educational theories of Perennialism, which emphasizes man's rational character and Essentialism, which stresses basic education. In contrast to the more traditional philosophies, John Dewey's Pragmatic Experimentalism emphasizes the process of education as a transaction between man and his environment. […] Contemporary education has witnessed the rise of two new approaches: Existentialism and Philosophical Analysis.[17]

Therefore, the fusion of different epistemic cultures in American philosophy of education was not only possible, but also desirable on the level of educational practice. In contrast to the European tradition, all these recommendations were delegated from the theoretical to the practical pedagogues with the competence of combining different epistemic cultures and pedagogical ideas verified also within other cultures:

> Philosophical enquiring may aid the educator in examining his immediate decisions and problems. In turn, the philosophy of education may draw heavily from the experiences, practices and observations of the educator. For example, educational goals, practices and ends can be extrapolated from such systems of philosophy as Idealism, Realism and Thomism. The converge is also true. Philosophical enquiring may aid the educator in examining his immediate decisions and problems. In turn, the philosophy of education may draw heavily from the experiences, practices and observations of the educator.[18]

This consideration is cited not with the aim of offering an apology for the obsolete types of ontology, but with the aim of showing that within new epistemic cultures their hidden heuristic potential can be used according to emerging contexts of post-secularity. It can be illustrated using the principle of subsidiarity, one of the cornerstones of the European Union, which was borrowed from the social philosophy of Thomism. In the countries where the tradition of Thomism was absent, this concept is practically absent in curricular options of political education, which makes European integration there more complicated.

Continuing to regard the epistemic cultures of American tradition with its intercultural relationship, it is important to show the role of American pragmatism as a synthesizer of different pedagogical knowledge representations. The link between democracy and education, which is emphasized by Dewey, makes the philosophy of education open to intercultural dialogue in spite of the real or imagined incompatibility of epistemic cultures or local styles of philosophizing on the field of policy. Power notes that:

---

[17] Ibid., pp. 8–9.
[18] Ibid., p. 9.

> Any fully developed philosophy of education should be capable of moving, although not always effortlessly, from principle to policy, to practice […].[19]

Therefore, such self-understanding of pragmatism as a "fully developed philosophy of education" makes impossible its falsification – in Karl Popper's sense – which is connected with the danger of its conversion into an ideology which tries to play the leading role in intercultural communications, presenting itself as a methodological authority. However, it would be wrong to state that the epistemic culture of pragmatism has no transversal abilities. In the theoretical constructions of critical pedagogy or critical thinking it is easy to see similarities with emancipatory ideas of the Marxist epistemic culture, a renaissance of which has been observed in recent years. The Marxist pedagogical utopia, which is often taken as an argumentative basis in the intercultural discourses upon education, has the feature of inconsequence, which is often used following the logic of singularities but with a claim of general recognition. Honneth draws attention to some of those incoherencies in the Marxist matrix of the learning possibilities of working:

> However, in place of an argumentative model that seeks to explain the possibility of social emancipation directly on the basis of educational potential of work, there has emerged the less ambitious model of the working class becoming technically qualified and disciplined through industrial factory work. In the economic theory of his late writing, Marx obviously no longer wants to entrust to social labor the practical-moral learning potential that he must presumed it to have if he wants to explain the emancipator ambitions of the proletariat on the basis of the action-experience of work. Instead he now wants to attribute to the social labor only the learning potential entailed in a process of technical education […].[20]

This comment is very important for understanding the building of hybrids with Marxist transformations and British analytical philosophy of education, especially in the discourse of multicultural education. The connection between intercultural education – excluding the empathy theories and struggles of cultural recognition minimized through pedagogical technologies of integrative intercultural learning – and ideologies was often described in Marxist terminology, especially in the cases of the struggle for recognition. Thus, Robert Jeffcoat, a liberal educational thinker, would call himself "with pleasure a radical Marxist" because he had a "particular view" on injustice.[21] This attitude is coming back into the consideration schemata of the educational aspect of the newly started refugee

---

[19] E.J. Power, *Philosophy of Education…*, op. cit., p. 20.
[20] A. Honneth, *The Fragmental World…*, op. cit., p. 25.
[21] R. Jeffcoat, *Ideologies and Multicultural Education*, [in:] *Education and Cultural Pluralism*, ed. M. Craft, The Falmer Press, London 1984, p. 161.

crisis in Europe. The philosophical reflection on it survives the ideas and educational constructions well-known from Canadian debates upon multiculturalism (Charles Taylor, Anthony Smith, etc.). However, this tendency occurs not only in the problem fields of political and social philosophy but also involves the educational aspect of multiculturalism. All these tendencies, which unveil the variety of existing modes of educational philosophy, make evident its subjective and cultural versatility. This polyphonic way of theorizing about education and its culturally determined practices brings some difficulties in the transmission of the explorations made in this problem field to intercultural discourse, which is embedded into national cultures, which can provoke their irritations. Otfried Höffe proposes a methodological strategy for reducing these difficulties:

> For the intercultural legitimization it is important to answer if the intercultural interests would exist in general. If those fundamental interests, which all the people in all cultures and all epochs share, would be discovered somewhere, they may be defined only as relative transcendental interests. They can be realized only reciprocally through relative transcendental change.[22]

Both the consensus and arguing in intercultural communication can provide an unexpected impulse for continuing this communication with the aim of combining the transcultural and intercultural content of the philosophy of education. This theoretical assumption allows us to construct a transcultural philosophy of education grounded on the recognition of children and human rights, which provide all the pragmatic, existential and social orientations for educational practices. The intercultural philosophy of education can be also regarded as a depository of the philosophical conceptualizations of educational problems, which can be actualized by searching for the transcultural ground needed for the philosophy of education in the globalized world.

Imagined pedagogical realities in the intercultural discourse of educational philosophy

Implications of educational philosophy within intercultural discourse have been making it more sensible for psychological problems which are later translated into pedagogical decisions with the aim of blocking mobbing in all its forms, such as disrespect and denigration. The strategies of self-realization of foreigners within the horizons of the native and some other culture are divergent and

---

[22] O. Höffe, *Koexistenz im Zeitalter der Globalisierung*, "Information Philosophie" 2009, no. 5, pp. 12 ff.

grounded on different experiences and moral values.[23] The patch-work biographies of most people in the post-industrial societies are not coherent with their plans in options of the "normal biography." These problems and a lot of others derive from a change of the cultural constellations, which often provokes a conflict of interpretations of pedagogical programs and projects. This is also one of the causes of differences in the understanding of the goals of self-realization and its places. It can be illustrated using the model of long-life learning or learning for adults. This group is not homogenous, also in the cultural aspect, and needs individual pedagogical support and singularized courses. The dreams of a better life abroad, and accordingly better education possibilities, are often connected with the production of imagined pedagogical realities,[24] the borders of which are marked with symbolic reifications of education in the form of diplomas, certificates, etc. The imagined pedagogical reality can be extended to mega-space. Sloterdijk connects this tendency with a new ontological position of teachers in the global world:

> Everybody who is ready to teach becomes a member of the powerful organization of the contemporary world: teachers without boards. Its action can in the future make possible the convergence of the world-time and the school-time.[25]

The myth of the locally established system of education, which is recognizable globally, is connected with the logic of generality. This paradox often occurs in the intercultural discourse in the philosophy of education. As a stereotype of pedagogical thinking it can provoke some problems with patriotic education, especially in the case of a pedagogical definition of the concept of the motherland as an imagined pedagogical reality. However, it also makes it possible to propose some new operating codes of the concept of the motherland in contemporary philosophy and sociology of education. The proposition, addressed to teachers and pupils, to use this concept in plurality can be understood not only as a model of the soul relationship, but also as a rational, acceptable possibility to create a wishful motherland and to take responsibility for one's own creation. It opens some new perspectives for the national and patriotic education in the globalized world, which is also thinking in plurality as "world societies." Advocating for "pedagogy in the horizon of a world-society," Alfred K. Treml proposes to define its imagined space as a "place of careful relations with traditions":

---

[23] See F. Dietrich, *Ethik der Migranten. Zur Einführung*, [in:] *Ethik der Migranten*, ed. F. Dietrich, Suhrkamp, Berlin 2017, pp. 10–20.

[24] For more about pedagogical realities see A. Schäfer, *Einführung in die Erziehungsphilosophie*, Belz Verlag, Mannheim–Basel 2005, pp. 128–149.

[25] P. Sloterdijk, *Du mußt dein Leben ändern…*, op. cit., p. 551.

The careful relation with traditions – traditions here means the places of coming back – assumes that it has a disburdening function, because a person can compensate the load of his local experience abroad through the effects of a return. In family education and at school may be made such careful places with educational aims. […] Such pedagogical staged places of "motherland" are constructions; therefore the concept of the motherland can be used for observers also in plurality.[26]

No doubt this proposal belongs to the cosmopolitan-oriented pedagogics and is very risky because of possible damage to one's own cultural and national identity, which is especially dangerous for children. As a positive element of this concept for intercultural education it can be asserted that it makes possible soft integrations of migrants into a new social and cultural environment at all stages of the cultural shock. This model shows that a small motherland could be constructed in school spaces as a plurality of special relaxation zones for children with different social origin and elaborated sub-cultural linguistic codes. No less important is the problem of the different school cultures, which intensifies the social stratification among students.

Conclusion

The discussions about the complex project of intercultural philosophy of education are only starting. The transcultural aspect of it may be regarded as a necessary condition for minimizing the risks and pathologies of hybrids between national and epistemic cultures within education in the contexts of the knowledge society. Moving in this direction makes the problem field of educational philosophy more open, not only horizontally but also in the historical dimension, which contributes to producing singularities within educational systems and makes possible their selection through generalities formed as contra-factuality.

The status of the philosophy of education is changing for the better in post-industrial societies in comparison to other philosophical problem fields. Pedagogy and its philosophical reflection have to gain more acceptance in the contexts of post-industrialism, as was the case in industrial societies, because their social functions also include providing orientation in the plurality of world-view options, national and epistemic cultures. Communication among the representatives of the different styles of philosophical and pedagogical thinking is not only possible but also can be very useful for opening new perspectives for research in the field of education. The ideal type of this kind of philosophical dialogue anticipates the acceptance of the cultural variety of both the contextual

---

[26] A.K. Treml, *Allgemeine Pädagogik. Grundlagen, Handlungsfelder und Perspektiven der Erziehung*, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart 2000, p. 263.

conditions and the educational practices in different societies. But only one condition is obligatory in evaluating the educational experience and current intercultural educational practices, namely protecting children's rights, on which exists a consensus, although there is still discussion about the narrow definitions of them because the logic of singularities often reveals its incompatibility with the general principles. This can be traced back to the different views of the human being and the child, of the relationship between different generations and dominating images of goals and methods of education in the intercultural perspective.

Bibliography

Dietrich F., *Ethik der Migranten. Zur Einführung*, [in:] *Ethik der Migranten*, ed. F. Dietrich, Suhrkamp, Berlin 2017, pp. 9–29.

Gutek G.L., *Philosophical Alternatives in Education*, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, Columbus 1974.

Hampe M., *Welche Werte sind zentral für die europäische Lebensform,* "Philosophie Magazin" 2016, no. 2, p. 58.

Höffe O., *Koexistenz im Zeitalter der Globalisierung*, "Information Philosophie" 2009, no. 5, pp. 7–22.

Honneth A., *The Fragmental World of the Social: Essays in Social and Political Philosophy*, ed. C.W. Wright, State University of New York Press, New York 1995.

Jeffcoat R., *Ideologies and Multicultural Education*, [in:] *Education and Cultural Pluralism*, ed. M. Craft, The Falmer Press, London 1984, pp. 161–189.

Kultaieva M., *The Education and its Deformations in the Contemporary Culture: A Contribution to the Actuality Th. W. Adorno's Theory of Half-Education*, "Philosophy of Education" 2017, no. 1(20), pp. 153–195.

Power E.J., *Philosophy of Education: Studies in Philosophies, Schooling and Educational Policies*, Prentice-Hall, New Jersey 1982.

Reckwitz A., *Die Gesellschaft der Singularitäten. Zum Strukturwandel der Moderne*, Suhrkamp, Berlin 2017.

Sandkühler H.J., *Kritik der Repräsentation. Einführung in die Theorie der Überzeugungen, der Wissenskulturen und des Wissens*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main 2009.

Schäfer A., *Einführung in die Erziehungsphilosophie*, Belz Verlag, Mannheim–Basel 2005.

Sloterdijk P., *Du mußt dein Leben ändern. Über Anthropotechniken*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main 2009.

Stichweh R., *Die Weltgesellschaft. Soziologische Analyse*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main 2000.

Sweet W., *The Project of Intercultural Philosophy*, [in:] *What is Intercultural Philosophy?*, ed. W. Sweet, Cardinal Station, Washington 2014, pp. 1–19.

Treml A.K., *Allgemeine Pädagogik. Grundlagen, Handlungsfelder und Perspektiven der Erziehung*, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart 2000.

Welsch W., *Vernunft. Die zeitgenössische Vernunftkritik und das Konzept der transversalen Vernunft*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main 1996.

Abstract

Intercultural discourse in the philosophy of education: Theoretical reflection between generality and singularities

Intercultural discourse within the philosophy of education is regarded as its self-reflection in industrial and post-industrial cultural contexts, including their national specificity. The distinctions between theoretical priorities of the philosophy of education in industrial and post-industrial societies are analyzed as founded either on the logic of generality or on the logic of singularities. The logic of singularities tends to dominate in post-industrial cultural conditions as the culture of the knowledge society and as an important element in its system of education. The theory of the society of singularities (A. Reckwitz) is verified through the analysis of the changes in the self-understanding of the philosophy of education, which is trying to adapt itself to new cultural and social challenges. The heritage of the Enlightenment is carefully preserved both in the continental European and in the American philosophical tradition with all their diversity and paradoxes of different epistemic cultures.

Abstrakt

Międzykulturowy dyskurs w filozofii edukacji: teoretyczna refleksja między ogólnością a singularyzacją

Międzykulturowy dyskurs w filozofii edukacji postrzegany jest jako jej samo-refleksja w industrialnych i postindustrialnych kulturowych kontekstach, wliczając w to ich narodową charakterystykę. Różnice między teoretycznymi priorytetami filozofii edukacji w industrialnych i postindustrialnych społeczeństwach analizowane są jako ufundowane albo na logice ogólności albo singularyzacji. Ta druga wykazuje tendencję do dominacji w postindustrialnych kulturowych warunkach jako kultura społeczeństwa wiedzy oraz jako istotny element w systemie edukacji. Teoria singularyzacji społeczeństwa (A. Reckwitz) może zostać użyta jako metodologia zweryfikowana do analizy przemian samorozumienia filozofii edukacji, która stara się zaadaptować do nowych kulturowych i społecznych wyzwań. Dziedzictwo oświecenia jest starannie przechowane zarówno w kontynentalnej, europejskiej, jak i amerykańskiej filozoficznej tradycji, w ich zróżnicowaniu i paradoksach odmiennych kultur epistemicznych.

Keywords: philosophy of education, intercultural discourse, theory, generality, singularities, epistemic cultures, communication, knowledge, post-industrialism, school

Słowa kluczowe: filozofia edukacji, dyskurs międzykulturowy, teoria, ogólność, singularyzacja, epistemiczne kultury, komunikacja, wiedza, postindustrializm, szkoła