

**IMAGINING CRITICAL COSMIC PEDAGOGY
NESTED WITHIN CRITICAL PEDAGOGY**

TRACEY I. ISAACS – Senior Researcher,
Stellenbosch University,
(Stellenbosch, South Africa)
E-mail:tray_236@hotmail.com

The infinite problems attendant with mass public schooling requires evermore resilient and innovative theories to buttress an account of education that is socially defensible. While educational inequality could previously be attributed to developing nations due to their economic underdevelopment, developed nations too, with growing rapidity have to confront their internal burgeoning crises in education. It is against this backdrop that I focus on the possibility of expanding a notion of critical pedagogy by nesting the concept of cosmic pedagogy therein. As such, I draw on the Montessorian theory of cosmic education; Bazalukan theory of the formation of a planetary and cosmic personality; and Freireian critical pedagogy to discover the resonance and disharmony between these conceptual positions. Of the three theoretical frames, each can in their own right be considered a methodological approach to address particular problems in education and society at large. So it is with these theories and methods in mind that I suggest and reflect upon the ways that education might nudge us along in our attempt to be fully human and to occupy the space of intelligent matter in an ever expanding universe.

Keywords: cosmic pedagogy, critical pedagogy, cosmic personality, consciousness, intelligent matter, epistemological curiosity, interdependence, humanization, pedagogic intervention.

**КОСМИЧЕСКАЯ ПЕДАГОГИКА
КАК ЧАСТЬ КРИТИЧЕСКОЙ ПЕДАГОГИКИ**

ТРЕЙСИ АЙЗЕКС – старший научный сотрудник,
Стелленбосский университет
(г. Стелленбос, Южно-Африканская Республика)

Данная статья посвящена компаративному анализу теорий космического образования М. Монтессори, формирования планетарно-космической личности О. Базалюка и критической педагогики П. Фрейре, с целью выявления резонанса и дисгармонии в их концептуальных положениях. Сделан вывод о том, что все три теории предлагают педагогический механизм, направленный на преодоление стандартизации и унификации образования, индивидуализацию обучения и создание условий для полноценной самореализации личности. Тем не менее, благородное видение альтернативного образования О. Базалюком и М. Монтессори кажется несовместимым с концепцией общедоступного образования, так как содержит «тонкие нити» классовых различий, исключения и элитарности, которые П. Фрейре мог бы посчитать негуманными, и, несомненно, являющиеся препятствием для становления личности, в частности, представителей подчинённых классов.

Ключевые слова: космическая педагогика, критическая педагогика, космическая личность, сознание, разумная материя, эпистемологическое любопытство, взаимозависимости, гуманизация, педагогическая интервенция.

Introduction

Holloway (2003) defends a view that the capitalist mode of production structures a particular set of behaviors, where objects are imagined to dictate the social activities that produce them namely, fetishism (Holloway, 2003:25). The threat here, as he sees it, is that human identity becomes the most concentrated expression of this fetishism and even more menacing is the fact that contradiction is completely flattened (Holloway, 2003:25). Consequently, the rule of identity becomes the rule of amnesia as radically alternative possibilities for the future are delegitimized and obliterated from recent memory (Holloway, 2003:25). We can thus interpret Holloway's conception of identity distortion through capitalist social organization in the same way Freire highlights the need for 'conscientization' or critical awareness away from the ravages of capitalist hegemony. Through a process of deconstructing capitalist hegemony by examining the causes and effects of their lives, practitioners of critical pedagogy may engage with the possibilities for change (Freire, 2005). As such, Freireian critical pedagogy is conceived as a process through education, to address social problems and as a means through which society could be transformed along inclusive or participatory, democratic lines, markedly dissimilar from the alienation of capital social relations. Since capitalism seeks to flatten out and reduce complexity by homogenizing reality, students can be seen to be passively accepting of the identities and thoughts capitalism channels through its socio-cultural organs (school, family, church, media etc.). To this end, Freire admonishes us as educators to 'reclaim critical democracy, individual freedom, social justice, social transformation and a revitalization of the public sphere' (Freire, 1994) on behalf of students by using the power of thought to negate the accepted limits of their conscious (and unconscious) mind; and to open the way to new a future (Freire, 2005:32). It then appears that it is foremost in the arena of thought that we can truly appreciate our ontological vocation, which is to be a subject who acts upon and transforms the world (Freire, 2005:32). Moreover, in this way, Freire's critical pedagogy ignites the imaginative capacities in students as they come to see the world as a problem to be worked on and solved, rather than as closed or a given (Freire, 2005:32). Thus, under these conditions students are characterized as subjects: those who know and act, rather than objects that are programmed to conform (Freire, 2005:36). In the above section I have attempted to draw attention to the identity formation of students under capitalist social behavior and highlighted the need for ethical pedagogic interventions to derail and subvert efforts to dehumanize students. What follows in the next section is a view of how cosmic education as proposed by Montessori either advances or refutes the notion of the humanizing project as developing an autonomous student free from oppression.

Montessorian cosmic education

Montessori imagined education as the means through which the human mind, body and spirit work together for true liberation, oneness and wisdom (Montessori, 1989). Her pedagogic approach is premised on the process of education and not the results thereof. Thus in a learner-centered environment, teachers are delegated the task of scientifically observing and reflecting upon the pedagogic encounter (Montessori, 1989). Consequently, students are given the opportunity for self-determination and self-realization through independent activity as part of what Montessori termed the 'Cosmic Plan', which is to nurture the spirit of the child to explore and respect the

world and to account for a more balanced impression of the world (Montessori, 1989). It is abundantly clear that Montessori's philosophy on education has identifiable tensions with the traditional, capitalist structured education that too easily identifies and promotes student unconsciousness, deficits and ignorance. In its stead, Montessori advocates on behalf of a universal syllabus that unites the mind and consciousness in harmony; and through education, develops the latent energies which help students acquire: clearer intelligence, stronger character, and a new and freer consciousness capable of understanding the totality of human needs (Montessori, 1989:111). As disruption to the individualistic identities cultivated under capitalist social relations, Montessori proposed a system of educational interdependence where students come to imagine themselves as contributing to the existence of all, and take as their duty the task of lifting all of mankind from a state of inferiority. However, she also recognized that education has fallen behind contemporary requirements and that students be obliged a pedagogy of guided intelligence to change things constructively. To this challenge she proposed that children be given a vision of the whole universe that would empower them, through their own insight to discover their place and purpose in the world (Lillard, 1972). Furthermore, the proposed cosmic education she introduces here suggests that students not only explore human history but additionally the history of the Earth, biosphere and universe to establish a unified account of how one history illuminates the other. More prescient though, Montessori was able to discern that what we see manifest as challenges in education are in fact not educational in nature, but really social problems such as the instance of oppression, and particularly the oppression of the child by the adult (Standing, 1957:231). In such instances the child who is naturally curious is appropriately cast as an 'interrupted scientist' who forcibly has to adapt and become self-protective to the degree that she hides her true self and forgets and buries it (Standing, 1957:238). This repression results in psychological scars that bear testimony to the unsatisfied (intellectual, psychic, emotional) needs of the child, and ultimately reduce the child to an unharmonious, diminished being (Standing, 1957:242). In contrast, cosmic education seeks to help children answer philosophical questions such as 'Who am I?', and 'Why am I here?' with an informed understanding of themselves as stewards of the Earth, and as active agents who are capable of modifying and perfecting it (Montessori & George, 1964). Furthermore, an intelligent and well-informed acceptance of an unfolding cosmos opens terrain for new possibilities and reveals answers about physical and spiritual evolution that invites clearer insights into human purpose and belonging that extends far greater than the individual self. In sum, education reform could be considered a mere palliative if we continue to define education in terms of students passively accepting pre-existing knowledge, when we might instead entertain the task of cosmic education as proposed by Montessori which is to move beyond imagining our purpose as simply surviving, consuming and procreating. So far I have labored to provide an account of an active, engaged, child-centered cosmic pedagogy that is based on student liberation to negate the authoritarian, interfering and oppressive intellectual culture apparent in schools under capitalist hegemony. In the upcoming section, I shall consider a scientific-philosophical account that conceptualizes how identity formation might be thought of under planetary and cosmic relations.

The formation of a planetary and cosmic personality

Bazaluk and Blazhevich (2013) draw on the philosophy of Russian cosmism propagated by Wentzel (1993) to develop a notion of how intelligent matter can progress to create a planetary and cosmic personality. According to the authors, it is in the third state of matter that we may envision the unity of the personality and the infinite cosmos (Bazaluk and Blazhevich, 2013:1). Wentzel introduces a particular philosophical and cultural orientation as he conceptualized that unity, interrelation, integrity, co-evaluation of humankind and the cosmos were some of the hallmarks of cosmism (Bazaluk and Blazhevich, 2013:3). Additionally, education under cosmism is understood to be free, and independent to the aid and development of an original personality with good morals (Bazaluk and Blazhevich, 2013:3). And finally, this education alluded to above is employed to expand the creative capacities of the child.

As contrast, Bazaluk and Blazhevich (2013) provide their interpretation of Andreyev's ideals for communistic education which is the: subordination of personal considerations to common or societal purposes; promotion of a spirit of internationalism; and striving for the future. With what I consider Wentzel's cultural (progressive) and Andreyev's (nationalist) political perspectives on cosmic and planetary pedagogy contrasted, Bazaluk (2009) presents a scientific lens through which we may grasp the mattered states that occupy their own unique determinative space: inert matter (which occupies the space of cosmic vacuum); living matter (which occupies molecular-genetic space); and intelligent matter (which occupies mentality space) (Bazaluk, 2009). Of principal import to the concept of personality formation is of course the relationship of neuron unification and complexes as seen in the state of consciousness and sub-consciousness (Bazaluk, 2009). Bazaluk describes the interaction between the three states of matter as sequence nesting where metaphorically this can be interpreted to mean an object-within-similar- objects, or more vividly as the layering of an onion (Bazaluk, 2009). It is thus supposed that the cosmic vacuum is the outer sequence, followed by molecular-genetic space and finally, intelligent matter is nested in the final and most secure sequence. What is more, inert matter is conceived of as part of an expanding universe which is the model supported by astrophysical observation (Bazaluk, 2009). In this theoretical framework, intelligent matter as conceived from a philosophical-scientific point of view represents humanity and the human society that occupies what Bazaluk calls the 'psychospace'. Psychospace could be interpreted as humans occupying a totality of mental activity in this space while it is indeterminate whether intelligent matter (consciousness and sub-consciousness in humans) is possible or visible in the other mattered states (Bazaluk, 2009). Thus bio-intelligent matter is proposed as the complex process of formation and directed development of an individual mind or different groups of minds occupying psychospace (Bazaluk and Blazhevich, 2013:5). As such, cosmic education is seen to be invested in the permanent improvement of intelligent matter to form a planetary and cosmic personality that has synchronization of mind, soul and body (Bazaluk and Blazhevich, 2013:5). More specifically, cosmic pedagogy is directed in the efforts to: actualize internal creative potential; promote thinking focused not on the quantity of information but its quality; advance analysis of the past, present, and to forecast the future as a sign of evolved intelligence; broaden visions of life; and to inculcate the purposeful nature of activity (Bazaluk and Blazhevich, 2013:7). And finally Bazaluk and Blazhevich relate the objectives of cosmic pedagogy as the: identification of a planetary and cosmic personality; expansion of the creative potentials of each mind;

presenting the ideal image of the future human being; desire to raise, train and educate students, encouragement of competition between evolutionary minds; support of the best and able minds, provision of equal opportunity, and the enrichment of knowledge of planetary-cosmic evolution. To summarize, in this section, I have interpreted an outlook of intelligent matter as a material substance, described as highly developed mentality which Bazaluk expresses is holistic, self-developing and self-reproducing; and he appreciably imagines such attributes to be the defining features of a planetary-cosmic personality. What follows immediately below is my understanding of Freire's account of personality formation, specifically understood in the context of pedagogy as the act of leading children towards something and bringing about transformation in the mind (consciousness) and society as an assertion of humanity.

Freireian critical pedagogy as affirmation of intelligent matter

To begin with, I have to digress into foregrounding intelligence and consciousness-raising by attending to the concept of ideology. Ideologies have a threefold purpose which seeks to shape and determine behavior and beliefs in individuals and their communities by: telling them what exists, what is good and what is possible (Therborn 1980: 18; Gramsci, 1971). The ruling elite, because of their positions of power, are the originators of ideologies, (which are silent, unspoken and unconscious structural manifestations of unequal material relations of production) while the subjugated classes have the ideologies imposed upon them and surreptitiously assimilate them into thought and deed. As stated by Giroux (1983), ideology can be seen as the 'power of a specific class to impose and distribute in society specific meanings, message systems, and social practices in order to lay the psychological and moral foundations for the economic and political system they control.' (Giroux, 1983). One way that these dominant ideologies become normative is through the socialization function of schooling and education. The school is instrumental in transmitting the values required by the existing society or ruling elite. The ruling class remains uncompromising in perpetuating their beliefs (to maintain power, domination and hegemony), and does not delegate this responsibility frivolously to social formations such as the family, or other civic organizations such as the church (and media) to reinforce these beliefs, but maintains (subtle) sophisticated hegemonic control usually through state power. Hegemony therefore proves to be so pervasive that its manifestations become to be seen as organic and common sense by even those who are subjugated by it. Yet an often neglected understanding is that marginal students bring valuable lived experiences that enrich the learning environment as they provide insights into different perspectives of what exists, what is good and what is possible. But hegemony works to eviscerate certain student perspectives as it serves as an inhibitor to explore these valuable perspectives and leads to a "waste (of) their social wealth" (Santos, 2004:2), robbing us of the chance to entertain subjugated views of what exists, what is good and what is possible. In opposition to hegemony, a counter-hegemonic position would be essential to ensure a functioning, emancipatory democracy, by interrupting the dominant ideologies of the bourgeoisie. Thus Freire proposes that we inculcate in students the desire to live in a constant state of intellectual doubt to avoid being ensnared in ideologies that are not their own (Freire, 2005:36). Furthermore, he stands in agreement with Montessori in the belief that oppression of one group over another leads to dehumanization (both for the oppressor and the oppressed) (Freire,

2005:43). While it could be implied that adults oppress children by constraining their natural intelligence (Montessori), the ruling elite oppress dominated groups by imposing ideological hegemony and by reducing human doing (action) into alienating labor. As such, the capitalist class, considered the oppressors in Freireian terms, turns everything into an object of domination: the earth, time, property, production, people, themselves and the creations of people (Friere, 2005:58). In this materialistic conception of existence, money is the measure of all things and profit, the primary goal (Friere, 2005:58). Consequently, those who do not have money are considered incompetent and lazy (Friere, 2005:59). And even more sinister, if Freire is to be believed, the oppressed have an irresistible attraction toward their oppressors in as much as the latter's way of life becomes an overpowering aspiration to the former (Friere, 2005:62). In this way, the oppressed strive to resemble, emulate and imitate their oppressors and come to be classified according to Freire as 'beings for others' (the oppressors) and not being for themselves (Friere, 2005:74). So one might wonder where the polemical violence creeps if the dominated classes yearn for middle or upper class status? Is this not concomitant with the progress our technological society promises? It could then be assumed that ideological hegemony liquidates complexity and reduces the dominated classes to instruments of technical and social control, thereby inscribing in them self-depreciating ideas, beliefs and feelings such as: 'good for nothing, know nothing, incapable of learning, sick, lazy, unproductive' (Freire, 2005:63). Notwithstanding ideological hegemony, one might consider the proposition that as agents of choice, dominated classes might refuse oppression, but as Freire cautions, the mental fatalism and docility that is attendant with cultural and historical reproduction via ideology, handicaps the chances for a disruption of ideological domination (Freire, 2005:78). In sum this ideological confusion brought about by false consciousness (the ideas, beliefs, and reality of the elite class) contradicts Bazaluk and Blazhevich's expanded notion of a planetary and cosmic personality, as an impoverished self-concept and a neglect to rely on own reason implies an impediment to the ontological purpose of becoming fully human and a being for 'self' rather than mimicking being the 'other'. Additionally, a neglect to address the prevalence of false consciousness forecloses on the possibility of developing superior consciousness, creative potentials and evolutionary minds in intelligent matter. To this Freire suggests a process of redirecting false consciousness by praxis: the process whereby students use problem-posing, problem –solving techniques (or questioning) to reflect upon their particular reality, as a way to act upon and transform their reality, and ultimately to reclaim their humanity that the oppressor strives to withhold (Friere, 2005:88). To conclude, in the above section I have introduced controversy to the idea that a cosmic pedagogy and the development of a planetary and cosmic personality may be effortlessly attained without problematizing the existence of a particular consciousness programmed on capitalist ideology. In the upcoming section, I redirect my focus on the methodological considerations that might best lead me to how the studied theories intersect and diverge to help develop an expanded account of pedagogy and human intellectual potentials for Earth and beyond.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) or Critical Discourse Studies (CDS)

Van Dijk (2004) correctly calls for a rethinking of the term 'analysis' in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) since he sees discourses as part of an interdisciplinary overlay of many disciplines and our study of them (Van Dijk, 2004). For example in

this article I will study texts primarily written in the social sciences with bearing on philosophy and education but that also consider politics and the other natural sciences in order to make an interpretation of the knowledge and social impact each contribution seeks to make. If the function of discourse is understood to make and change knowledge, social relations and social identity, CDA methodology aims to elucidate how this happens by exposing the 'unspoken' elements of discourse (Fairclough, 1992). As such, CDA is invested in contributing to social emancipation and justice by revealing ideologies in texts and discourse as well as to develop consciousness of an issue (Fairclough and Wodak 1997: 271-280). In this particular article I shall engage with specific educational positions and undress the ideologies beneath them to test their responsiveness in dealing with social problems (educational improvement, humanizing pedagogy, expanded curriculum etc.). Secondly, I have sought to engage with the three specific theories of education (because they imagine alternatives to current education dilemmas) that are marginal and not widely recognized within the broader discourse of education reform. In this way, alternative interpretations of effective schooling may still be entertained as these specific theories continue to fight for legitimacy and do not yet occupy a single or accepted position in the discourse.

Following Huckin who cautions that CDA should not be seen as a step-by-step method but rather an approach and as an interpretive investigation of content in order to inform social action (Huckin, 1997:1), I shall study the ideologies of each theory, how it conceives of student identity formation, and how responsive it might be as a radically alternative possibility in educational futures. It could be presumed that ideology critique has matrimony with CDA in the way that it aims to make transparent the ways in which meaning is constructed in society as it questions how ideology establishes and sustains relations of domination in society (Thompson, 1990). In an understanding of ideology as the way thought shapes social reality (Eagleton, 1994), the Frankfurt School elaborates the distinctions between scientific theory and critical theory to illuminate the agentic potentialities within the critical paradigm to question, refuse and unsettle the notion of absolute reality. Thus Wodak interprets the distinct aims and goals of scientific theories as divergent to those of critical theories (Wodak, 2002: 5-6). She argues that scientific theories are defined by instrumental use, where the concentration is set on manipulating the natural world by understanding matter (Wodak, 2002: 5). In contrast, critical theories aim to make human agents aware of hidden coercion in order to free them so they can determine their own, true interests (Wodak, 2002: 5). Secondly, the cognitive structure that informs scientific theories is found in objectifying the subject. In this way there is a distinguishing between theory and the objects that the theory refers to, so that the theory becomes divorced from the object-domain it describes (Wodak, 2002: 6). Dissimilarly, the cognitive structure that enlightens critical theory is reflective; as the researcher is always part of the world she is studying (Wodak, 2002: 6). And finally, scientific theories and critical theories diverge in the confirmation of the evidence used to determine whether or not the results of inquiry are acceptable or not (Wodak, 2002: 6). In the case of scientific theories confirmation is provided in quantitative, absolute terms, whereas for critical theories human behavior and action is presented in qualitative approximations.

Wodak (2002) proposes that CDA demystifies discourses by deciphering ideologies as it works to expose language, and if not for the power it gains by the use of powerful people, how that language on its own is immobilized (Wodak, 2002: 10).

Thus CDA chooses the perspectives of those who suffer (the marginal, non-elite, subordinate classes) as it analyzes language use of those in power who are in fact responsible for inequalities. And in its analysis CDA allows us to come to understand the transmitting of knowledge, the organizing of social institutions and the exercising of power (Wodak, 2002: 10). Consequently, texts are sites of struggle where two viewpoints are presented and CDA provides the theorizing and description of social structures and processes within individuals to create meaning with texts (Fairclough & Kress, 1993:133-168). CDA differs in relation to pragmatics and sociolinguistics on the basis that with the latter, context variables are naively correlated with an autonomous system of language (Kress & Hodge, 1979). In its way CDA thus avoids the deterministic relation between texts and the social by reminding us that every discourse is historically produced and interpreted in time and space. And although dominant structures are legitimated by the ideologies of powerful groups, possibilities of resistance to unequal power relations that appear as social conventions must be fought for. CDA thus seeks to expose these societal conventions that are portrayed as stable, neutral and “given” conventions in the construction of meaning, and to incite resistance which is seen as the breaking of conventions (stable discursive practices) in acts of creativity (Fairclough & Kress, 1993:133-168). Wodak further notes that in sociolinguistics, context is trivialized as being “not linguistic” and therefore accommodates notions of static sociological variables when in fact context is transient and unique and should account for the textured responses from counter-hegemonic “others” who strive to recover their creativity and fight for more balanced and equitable relations of power (Wodak 2002: 12). In summary, CDA’s responsiveness to ideology critique gives promise of its ability to help understand and develop freer student consciousness in pedagogic encounters and beyond. What follows immediately below is my interpretation of Montessori’s educational philosophy which is contrasted against Freire’s critical pedagogy to see how both inform a changed view of knowledge in education, how this might impact social relations and the possible social identity it promotes.

Montessorian versus Freirean pedagogy

Firstly, the epistemological position that Montessori occupies is one where a cosmic, balanced impression needs to be made known to the child. It is imagined that this approach in education leads to a political ideology where liberation, oneness and wisdom is achieved. Furthermore, this ideology also seems to permeate Montessori’s vision of relative equality between teacher and child as her emphasis is on a child-centered approach to learning and where education is perceived as a process not a product. This autonomy allowed on the child’s behalf inspires a situation where children can experience self-determination and self-realization and where human needs and purposes are defined by using personal insight. Additionally, Montessori’s emphasis on holistic development (mind, body, spirit) connects the mind and consciousness in harmony in the promotion of a freer consciousness, understood in the context of a universal curriculum that illuminates the interrelatedness of humanity, the Earth and the universe. And finally, Montessori indicates that social problems are manifest in education such as the oppression of children by adults, which results in children being forced to submerge their true identity which has its consequence in maladjusted social identities and relations. Now that I have studied Montessori’s contribution to the discourse on identity formation, social relations and pedagogic con-

tent, I will continue to give an account of Freire's critical pedagogy to track elements of coherence and dissonance between his and Montessori's pedagogic approaches.

To begin with, Freire posits that identity distortion in students occurs via false consciousness as social relations are structured around economic ideology. He proposes that through a problem-posing, problem-solving pedagogy, teachers raise student 'conscientization' in an effort so they may advocate for a democratic political ideology over having their legal rights violated. As such, critical pedagogy can be viewed as an educational intervention concerned with the possibility for change and its method of using educational practice to help bring about individual and social change. As opposed to passively assimilating capitalist social identities which are dehumanizing and entrench inferiority, Freire introduces models of awareness where students are able to refuse deficit roles, and where students instead exercise autonomy and self-determination. In this way they do not succumb to a materialist culture but rather assume roles as active agents of choice through the conscious process of praxis which is based on action and reflection with a view to transform an unfavorable reality. Now that I have presented Freire's conception of capitalist identity formation and the class hierarchies it promotes, as well as his insertion of 'conscientization' to buffer capitalist ideology, I shall progress to compare the two theorists.

Firstly, both Freire and Montessori advocate for a child-centered pedagogy based on respect for children's and student's autonomy and self-determination. This ethical approach invites principles of democracy and equality into education that enhance positive identity formation. Secondly, epistemologically both Freire and Montessori capitalize on raising freer student consciousness but where Montessori's approach is more expansive (to include mind, body and spirit) Freire's is more detailed by getting students to problem-solve, reflect and act in the interest of transformation. Thirdly, both theorists clearly problematize unequal social relations and promote a progressive approach to student identity formation. Fourthly, although considered within the framework of relatively marginal educational discourses, (with critical pedagogy being even more recent and marginal) both approaches present us with views of exciting educational futures. I have thus far tried to relate Montessorian cosmic pedagogy to Freirean critical pedagogy and will now transition into associating the formation of a planetary and cosmic personality as conceptualized by Bazaluk and Blazhevich, to the two previous theorists.

Evolutionary minds in intelligent matter

Bazaluk and Blazhevich guide us into a view of the unity between student personality and an infinite cosmos. This position mirrors that of Montessori's cosmic pedagogy in that both consider a more balanced impression of human development that extends beyond the boundaries of our planet. While the authors build on Wentzel's theory of a beneficial and cooperative relationship between humankind and the cosmos, Bazaluk and Blazhevich extend the theory by conceptualizing 'psychospace' as exclusive to humans by virtue of their consciousness. This may not at all be in conflict with both Montessori's or Freire's desire for consciousness-raising with a view to enhanced creative intellectual capacity for the actualization of full human potentiality. Furthermore, the authors also examine Andreyev's political conception of a cosmic pedagogy, that in my interpretation holds the ideology of Cold War USSR's political and economic ambitions for world domination. In this instance, while the authors do not take a position on the merits (or demerits) of the ideology, the case

strengthens Freire's refusal of ideological hegemony on the consciousness and subsequent negative, imposed identity formation of students. Additionally, social relations and pedagogic content under such an ideology cannot be considered to work in the interest of promoting autonomous, self-determining students. What I consider a limitation of the 'psychospace' model is that it could lapse into the very pedagogic ideology Montessori and Freire seem to want to avoid, viz. the hierarchy and deficit models attached to student learning. While Bazaluk and Blazhevich propose a view of the ideal image of the future human being with evolved intelligence, 'encouragement of competition' and 'support of the best and able minds' create exclusion and elitism when it was initially imagined that 'psychospace' pedagogy was devoted to the expansion of the 'creative potentials of each mind'. I have so far attempted to align as well as to create distance between the diverse conceptual positions offered by the authors above, what follows is a consolidated perspective of what each theory offers as an account of possible futures for education as it relates to student identity formation, transformed social relations and enriched pedagogic content.

Discussion

What each theory respectively alludes to in addressing future possibilities for education is that education is currently in crisis, so theorizing as above is offered in part as a response to the repression students face through schooling and the subsequent eclipse of true student identity. Having said that, Freire provides a more Earth-focused approach and possibly the most lucid account of how ideological hegemony seeks to threaten true student identity. Additionally, the focus falls on how this threat minimizes the pedagogic ambition of allowing students their ontological vocation (as Freire terms it) in becoming fully intelligent human beings. However, what may be considered a realistic (read grounded) theory in Freire, could also be seen as a limitation in that the theory is not expanded to include the cosmos and the body/spirit connection which completes human experience.

Secondly, Montessori capitalizes on the innate curiosity of children to help characterize the pedagogic engagement necessary to develop clearer intelligence, stronger character and freer consciousness. When we succeed at this task, she envisions an understanding to descend on children (and on us educators) that unearths their true identity and personality as well as informs their understanding of all human needs. However, this account may appear too idealistic as the Montessori Method is exclusive to special (private) schools where it could be supposed students are sheltered somewhat from the brutalities of capitalist social relations. Furthermore, under capital, human needs and purposes are determined by market dictates, so it might follow that identity formation, social relations and pedagogic content are influenced by capital.

Thirdly, in each account, to arrest an understanding of what it might mean to be fully human and to imagine the personality and identity of future human beings, we cannot lose sight of the fact that it is unrealistic to exist free from ideology. As such, when we refer to freedom and autonomy, it should be understood in relative terms since each theory (above) possesses a particular ideology to inform an account of what exists, what is good and what is possible. Nevertheless, this statement does not un hinge the problematic nature and abuses of prevalent capitalist ideological hegemony.

Fourthly, the powerful sway of Western epistemological and ontological reference points make it hotly disputed whether we can overcome unequal power relations (or other social problems such as race, class, gender bias etc.) through education. Under the assumption that schools carry out the socialization function of the elite under the direction of the Ideological State Apparatus (curriculum)(Gramsci, 1971), we can expect that any calls for active agency should be correctly understood as constrained agency. Thus the doubt and wonder so valorized in students may well lead us to alternative ways of knowing and being in the future, but under capital and class domination (as assumed by Freire) we see greater conformity and less intelligent development.

Conclusion

While there seems to be consensus among the aforementioned theorists on the necessary focus on human consciousness as a sign of evolved intelligence, Freire and Montessori properly problematize the quality of this consciousness. If student consciousness centers on adult directed prompts and ambitions, then ethical pedagogic engagements could be considered authoritarian and exploitative. Additionally, Bazaluk, Freire and Montessori also seem to suggest a pedagogic arrangement that creates distance between standardization and rather embraces individualization through highly evolved intellect, lived experience and self-actualization. As such, these debates help organize a conception of a more educationally and socially defensible account of desirable student identity. However, the noble Bazalukan and Montessorrian visions of alternative education appear inconsistent with an expanded notion of education as they hint of the subtle class distinctions, exclusion and elitism that Freire might consider dehumanizing, and of course that are a hindrance to identity formation, particularly that of subordinate classes. Although not part of this debate, Holloway articulates a strident call not to overlook how capital has wrought a materialistic conception of reality in so far as it prescribes human needs, purposes and identities. Under such conditions it could be imagined that students need first to overcome capitalist ideology (nestled in consciousness and sub-consciousness) as a sign of intelligence and to restore more equal power relations. And it can be inferred that by overcoming deterministic agency; and supplanting it with critical student agency, that we might adequately confound and scale back the attempts of identity suppression and intelligence curtailment. Student agency as it is used here above may be specified as the type of agency that is: self-regulating, self-directed, self-organizing, proactive agency. Thus in its practical expression, critical student agency might reveal the incidents of unequal power relations in society in order to transform undemocratic practices to practices of individual freedom and justice. In this way, critical student agency could be identified in instances where students are able to see the contradictions in the capitalist order and name them in order to transform them. Secondly, critical student agency could be seen to empower students to create their own realities by understanding that social reality is born out of individual lived experience and not codified in abstract school content. Thirdly, critical student agency would be visible if it enabled students to raise critical and difficult questions in order to challenge and transform inequality and injustice. And finally, critical student agency would be on display if it allowed students to see schools as sites of contestation where they may be expected to conform; but where critical agency may become most trenchant, and where students determine their own identities, needs, and purposes. In conclusion,

while the need to progress toward developing a more robust and expanded notion of a planetary-cosmic personality is evident, it would appear that the most practical departure point is to pay attention to the planetary challenges that are as yet insurmountable and resolve those first. If not, it could be imagined that our ventures into the cosmos might carry with it the unreconstructed material of a splintered capitalist identity, and where the scourge of capital may continue to thrive in false consciousness.



References

- Bazaluk, O. &. (2013). *Cosmic Education: Formation of a Planetary and Cosmic Personality*. Kiev: ISPC.
- Bazaluk, O. (2009). World existence and “evolved matter” as its modern model. <http://philpapers.org/rec/BAZWEA>. Retrieved on 26 August, 2014.
- Bazaluk, O. (2010). *Philosophy of Education- Formation of a Planetary-Cosmic Personality*. In I. T. (ed)., *Science in Different Dimensions: the collection of scientific works of the II International theoretical and practical conference devoted to memory of the Doctor of Philosophy, professor G.F.Mironov* (pp. 354-360). Ulyanovsk: UNTU.
- Eagleton, T. (1994). *Ideology*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. New York: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. L. & Wodak, R. (1997). *Critical discourse analysis*. In I. T. Dijk(Ed.), *Discourse Studies. A multidisciplinary introduction*. Vol. 2. *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258-284). London: Sage.
- Fairclough, N. &. Kress, G. (1993). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.
- Freire, P. &. (1994). *Pedagogy of hope : reliving Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New rev. 30th-Anniversary ed. . New York: Continuum: Continuum.
- Giroux, H. (1983). *Theory and Resistance in Education: A Pedagogy for the Opposition*. Connecticut: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. International Publishers.
- Holloway, J. (2003). *Change the World Without Taking Power: The Meaning of Revolution Today*. London: Pluto Press.
- Huckin, T. N. (1997). *Critical discourse analysis*. In I. T. (Ed.), *Functional approaches to written text* (pp. 78-92). Washington, DC: US Department of State.
- Kress, G. H. (1979). *Language as Ideology*. London: Routledge.
- Lillard, P. (1972). *Montessori: A Modern Approach*. New York: Schocken Books .
- Montessori, M. &. George, A.E. (1964). *The Montessori method*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Montessori, M. (1989). *Child, Society and the World (The Clío Montessori Series)* . Goleta: ABC-CLIO Ltd.
- Santos, B. (2004). *A Critique of Lazy Reason: Against the Waste of Experience*. In I. Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System in the Longue Durée* (pp. 157-197). London: Paradigm Publishers.
- Standing, E. (1957). *Maria Montessori: Her Life and Work*. London: Hollis & Garter Limited.
- Therborn, G. (1980). *The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology* . New York: Verso Publishing.
- Thompson, J. (1990). *Ideology and modern culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- van Dijk, A. (2004). *Discourse, knowledge and ideology*. In J. N. In Martin Pütz, *Communicating Ideologies* (pp. 5-38). Berne: Lang.
- Wentzel, K. (1993). *Svobodnoye vospitaniye: sbornik izbrannykh trudov . .* In C. b. Filonenko, *The Free Education: A Collection of Selected Publications* (p. 364). Moscow.
- Wodak, R. (2002). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. In D. (. Schiffrin, *Handbook in Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwells.

