LIBERATION AS DEPENDENCE: RECONCEPTUALIZING EMANCIPATORY EDUCATION IN THE NEW CLIMATIC REGIME

TRISTAN GLEASON
gleasont@moravian.edu | Moravian College, United States of America

ABSTRACT

Bruno Latour argues that we are currently living in a New Climatic Regime, where binary oppositions like Nature/Culture and Subject/Object prevent the development of modes of politics capable of collective action. The New Climatic Regime requires the reconstruction of human relations with the more-than-human world, including the contemporary politics of education, which mostly developed in response to problems lumped under the category of 'the social.' Here, scholars have asked how education might play a role in emancipating individuals and groups from oppressive social forces. However, climate change is a different type of political problem, and one where the logic of emancipation appears to break down. This paper puts Latour's thinking in conversation with Freire's praxes of liberatory education to inquire into the role emancipatory education might play in engendering collective action towards climate change and other problems of the present.

KEY WORDS

Latour; emancipation; Freire; climate change; politics.

SISYPHUS
JOURNAL OF EDUCATION
VOLUME 8, ISSUE 03,
2020, PP 9-22

DOI: https://doi.org/10.25749/sis.20107

A Libertação Dependente: Voltar a Conceptualizar a Educação Emancipatória no Novo Regime Climático

Tristan Gleason
gleasont@moravian.edu | Moravian College, Estados Unidos da América

RESUMO

Bruno Latour argumenta que estamos a viver um Novo Regime Climático, no qual existem oposições binárias tais como Natureza / Cultura e Sujeito / Objeto que impedem o desenvolvimento de modos de fazer política que resultem da/em ação coletiva. O Novo Regime Climático exige recompor as relações humanas neste *mundo que é mais do que humano*, nas quais se incluem as políticas educativas contemporâneas cada vez mais chamadas a resolver problemas classificados sob o signo de 'sociais'. Assim, os académicos têm-se questionado sobre o papel da educação na emancipação de indivíduos e grupos relativamente a forças sociais opressivas. No entanto, as alterações climáticas são um problema político diferente, no qual as lógicas de emancipação parecem quebrar-se. Este artigo coloca as conceções de Latour em diálogo com a prática da educação libertadora de Paulo Freire, de forma a equacionar como uma educação emancipatória pode gerar ações coletivas que afrontem o problema das alterações climáticas, entre outros, no presente.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE

Latour; emancipação; Freire; alterações climáticas; política.

SISYPHUS
JOURNAL OF EDUCATION
VOLUME 8, ISSUE 03,
2020, PP 9-22

DOI: https://doi.org/10.25749/sis.20107

LIBERACIÓN COMO DEPENDENCIA: RECONCEPTUALIZACIÓN DE LA EDUCACIÓN EMANCIPADORA EN EL NUEVO RÉGIMEN CLIMÁTICO

TRISTAN GLEASON
gleasont@moravian.edu | Moravian College, Estados Unidos de América

RESUMEN

Bruno Latour sostiene que actualmente vivimos en un Nuevo Régimen Climático, donde oposiciones binarias como Naturaleza / Cultura y Sujeto / Objeto impiden el desarrollo de modos de política capaces de acción colectiva. El Nuevo Régimen Climático requiere la reconstrucción de las relaciones humanas con el mundo más que humano, incluida la política contemporánea de la educación, que se desarrolló principalmente en respuesta a problemas agrupados en la categoría de 'lo social'. Aquí, los académicos se han preguntado cómo la educación podría jugar un papel en la emancipación de individuos y grupos de las fuerzas sociales opresivas. Sin embargo, el cambio climático es un tipo diferente de problema político, en el que la lógica de la emancipación parece romperse. Este artículo pone el pensamiento de Latour en conversación con las prácticas de educación liberadora de Paulo Freire para indagar sobre el papel que la educación emancipadora podría desempeñar en la generación de acciones colectivas hacia el cambio climático y otros problemas del presente.

PALABRAS CLAVE

Latour; emancipación; Freire; cambio climático; política.

SISYPHUS
JOURNAL OF EDUCATION
VOLUME 8, ISSUE 03,
2020, PP 9-22

DOI: https://doi.org/10.25749/sis.20107

Liberation as Dependence: Reconceptualizing Emancipatory Education in the New Climatic Regime

Tristan Gleason

> What is certain is that, while humans of the modern species could be defined as those who always emancipated themselves from the constraints of the past (…) the Earthbound have to explore the question of their limits.
> Latour, 2017, pp. 290-291

> Dependency comes in first of all to limit, then to complicate, then to reconsider the project of emancipation, in order finally to amplify it.
> Latour, 2018, p. 83

INTRODUCTION

Bruno Latour (2018) discusses the election of Donald Trump in the U.S., the Brexit movement in the U.K., and other rises in nationalism to forward an observation about three interrelated phenomena: (1) the forces of globalization and deregulation; (2) the explosion of inequalities; and (3) systematic efforts to deny the reality of climate change. Latour's "hypothesis is that we can understand nothing about the politics of the last 50 years if we do not put the question of climate change and its denial front and center" (p. 2). This is a provocative hypothesis, and offers a challenge to the politics of education, which have mostly developed in response to problems that we tend to lump under the category of 'the social.' In this framework, scholars have asked how education might play a role in emancipating individuals and groups from oppressive social forces. However, climate change is a different type of political problem, and one where the logic of emancipation appears to break down. In other words, it is hard to imagine what it means to work towards emancipation from climate change.

Indeed, the desire to escape from the constraints of the present is part of our ability to ignore the challenges of climate change, and Latour understands the denial of climate change as oriented by a political attractor he calls the 'Out-of-This-World.' As elites around the world recognize that the promise of globalization and progress, of expanding the extractavism needed to maintain our modern way of life, is not possible for all humans given the material conditions of Earth, they cease working towards anything resembling a collective good. Instead, they prepare for isolation and escape from the commons. If we recognize that the logic of emancipation is unable to grapple with the political challenges presented by climate change – and may tacitly support this out of the world response – how else might we conceptualize the politics of education? That is, this paper asks how we might reconstruct the politics of education in what Latour calls the New Climatic Regime. As the guide quotes above indicate, this requires we understand

emancipation differently. No longer is it a project whereby humans realize their radical independence, but rather a process of recognizing our limits, and our dependence on human and non-human others.

EDUCATION AND THE MODERN LOGIC OF EMANCIPATION

> A decisive step in the history of emancipation was taken in the eighteenth century when emancipation became intertwined with the Enlightenment and enlightenment became understood as a process of emancipation.
> Biesta, 2008, pp. 169-70

Philosopher of education Gert Biesta traces the modern emancipatory ideal of education to Kantian humanism, where the realization of human potential requires the development of independent, reasoned thought. Schools and teachers become responsible for developing the child's natural potential for reason, often against the always intruding dangers of culture and ideology. This emancipatory project is present in many contemporary articulations of education, from the critical (eg. Freire, 2012) to the ostensibly apolitical (eg. Siegel, 1985). Moreover, this logic of emancipation remains an important feature of educational praxes concerned with the role that schooling plays in reproducing inequalities, and for educators working to transform and ameliorate oppressive structures.

On the one hand, this linking of emancipation and education offers schooling a role beyond the maintenance of the status quo, the transmission of dogma, and the training of individuals to perform prescribed social roles. At the same time, Biesta (2008) identifies three contradictions that work against this transformative potential. First, emancipation is linked to freedom and autonomy, and these require "an intervention based upon a knowledge that is fundamentally inaccessible to the one to be emancipated" (p. 172). In other words, the student's independence depends on knowledge that by definition they lack. Second, because the student's education depends on the teacher's knowledge, the resulting student-teacher relationship is inherently unequal. Third, the logic of emancipation necessitates that teachers maintain a basic mistrust towards the experience of the student. This is particularly true with educational philosophies that adhere to Marxism and critical theory, where particular forms of knowledge are needed to demystify and dispel the quotidian experiences that produce 'false consciousness.'

Importantly, Biesta (2008, 2010) work is not intent on dismissing the project of emancipatory education entirely, but rather to ask how the philosophies of Michel Foucault and Jacques Rancière enable educators and philosophers to do and think emancipation differently. In this paper I follow a similar line of inquiry, turning to the work of Bruno Latour to problematize and reconstruct the relationship between education and emancipation. Latour's philosophy is grounded in his anthropological study of the sciences in action (1987), and the discrepancy between these practices and traditional epistemic descriptions of Science as a homogenous and universal mode of knowledge production. Latour identifies the logic of emancipation as an anchoring

concept of our problematic modern politics, and one that is particularly ill-suited for grappling with socio-scientific problems, including the denial of climate change.

I argue that Latour provides important resources for reconstructing the politics of education beyond the Enlightenment concept of emancipation. Because Latour's writing is rarely concerned with the relationship between politics and education, I find it useful to put his theorizations into conversation with Freire's (2012) efforts at describing a liberatory praxis of education for several reasons. First, although liberation and emancipation have tended to share the logic and contradictions described above, they are not the same: liberation is a collective political praxis, while emancipation as an Enlightenment ideal is individualistic. Maintaining Freire's emphasis on collective politics is an important aspect of this effort to reconstruct the politics of education. Second, thinking with Latour and Freire together helps flesh out some of the contradictions in the traditional logic of emancipatory education that Biesta points to above, while also directing Latour's thinking towards important questions about the relationship between politics and education that Freire explicitly surfaces. Finally, Freire's political project serves as a reminder that the project of modernity that Latour seeks to problematize and reconstruct is inseparable from that of colonialism. Or, in the words of Catherine Walsh and Walter Mignolo: "Coloniality is constitutive, not derivative, of modernity. That is to say, there is no modernity without coloniality" (2018, p. 4). This serves as a reminder that modernity is not simply an arbitrary Eurocentric worldview, but rather a contingent political project whose shape and contours were designed to justify genocide and the exploitation and extraction of non-human others.

This comparative project is not meant to validate Latour's thinking at the expense of Freire, nor to use Freire as a foil. Indeed, many of the limitations in Freire's thinking I surface here have been explored with greater nuance and elaboration by thinkers like Sandy Grande (2004). Instead, this reading follows the guidance of philosopher Vincent Colapietro (2011), who undergoes a similar collaborative reading of Dewey and Foucault, and states that "the junctures at which their paths intersect can be taken as invitations to take an alternative route (to deviate from the familiar road)" (p. 21). Accordingly, I ask how the politics of education can be expanded by using Latour's philosophy to explore routes forged by Freire and other critical educators, and to consider how Latour's thinking might be put to use in reconceptualizing the role of education in mobilizing collectives around new political attractors that might better enable us to grasp with the realities of climate change.

ORIGINS AND CONSEQUENCES OF OUR MODERN CONSTITUTION

In this section, I offer a synthesis of Latour's conceptualization of emancipation as a problematic aspect of the project of Western Modernity. He recognizes that our Modern tendency of conceptualizing the world through binary opposites like Nature/ Culture, Subject/ Object, and Human/ non-Human, is historical and contingent, emerging in the political and scientific discourse of thinkers like Hobbes and Boyle (Latour, 1991). Over time, these onto-epistemic frameworks became inscribed in what Latour describes as a Modern Constitution, which enforces a particular distribution of a priori capacities to the hybrid and heterogenous beings that make up our shared worlds. These capacities come

to define the proper phenomena of inquiry for different fields of study—objects for the natural sciences, and subjects for the social sciences—and consequently, distinctions between objective and subjective knowledge.

Through processes of colonization and the spread of Enlightenment ideals around the world, this framework becomes naturalized, taken as common sense, and tacitly shapes conceptions of what it means to be human (Wynter & McKittrick, 2015), while constraining the relationships between individual humans, society, and non-human others. The Modern concept of emancipation, then, is both a consequence of this Constitution, and a factor that further sediments the categories from which it emerges through a particular set of guarantees. As Mario Blaser and Marisol de la Cadena remind us, "the knowledge practices we (modern scholars) have at our disposal are, in turn, conditioned to reinstate themselves" (2018, p. 6). In the realm of science, Moderns are guaranteed that "it is not men who make Nature; Nature has always existed and has always already been there; we are only discovering its secrets;" in the realm of politics, on the other hand, we have a very different guarantee: "human beings, and only human beings, are the ones who construct society and freely determine their own destiny" (Latour, 1991, p. 30). The project of modern emancipation requires humans to realize their freedom and to overcome the necessities imposed by the natural world; modern forms of education become means for achieving this goal.

Consequently, the possibility for freedom becomes the capacity that distinguishes humans from all non-human others, serving as the foundation for human exceptionalism. In addition, freedom becomes located in the realm of Culture alone, while Nature is a domain bound by necessity. We see this conceptualization in the work of Freire (2012), where he suggests that the oppressed are "almost submerged in nature" (p. 61), and "are almost umbilically linked to the world of nature" (p. 94). Freire defines the historical and intentional potential of humans in contradistinction to animals, who are both "ahistorical" and "cannot commit themselves" (p. 98). Emancipation occurs, then, as humans "separate themselves from the world…[and] overcome the situations which limit them" (p. 99). This possibility of emancipation depends on the particular distribution of agency that made possible by the Nature/Culture binary particular to modernity. The work of contemporary anthropology taking up the ontological turn (see edited collection by Charbonnier, Salmon, & Skafish, 2017) has demonstrated that concepts like Nature and Culture, and especially their binary relationship, do not exist for many collectives not beholden to modern Enlightenment ideals. Just as the terms man and woman are one way of parsing the domain of humans, so too are Nature and Culture (Latour, 2017). Accordingly, it is not that we need to move beyond this binary, but rather understand the consequences of this particular conceptualization. Although our modern vocabulary currently lacks a term that would bring together Nature and Culture as the human does for the male/ female binary, this domain must be reconstructed as we develop new modes of politics.

In *Politics of Nature*, Latour (2004) confronts the role that our Modern construction of Nature plays in shaping the relationship between Science and democracy. He traces the Modern Nature/Culture binary to Plato's allegory of the Cave. In this allegory, there are prisoners chained on the inside of the cave, who mistake shadows on the wall for reality. One day, a prisoner breaks free, and discovers another world outside the cave, the natural world of objects. The inside of the cave forms the basis for modern concepts of Culture, society, and subjectivity, while outside the cave is the realm of Nature and objectivity. Knowledge of Nature, and these mute and unchanging objects is objective and real, while knowledge of the shadowy realm inside the cave, filled with human beliefs and opinions, is subjective and a source of delusion. Latour identifies the anti-democratic

feature of this arrangement, where modernity has decided that a unique group of individuals, the scientists, have unique privileged access to objective facts. These objective facts will always short-circuit the workings of democracy, because they have the a priori capacity to put an end to social debates, which depend instead on subjective values and opinions. At the same time, this strange separation of facts and values simultaneously drives a wedge between science and politics. Because the sciences are deemed objective and descriptive, this same philosophy of science can be used by those who deny climate change to critique science for taking up a prescriptive role when it is used to shape our political response to the problems related to climate change (Latour, 2017).

Importantly, Latour is not suggesting that scientific knowledge is a social construct, but he does suggest that we should understand that the term objective should not be used to decided once and for all on the stability of certain types of knowledge, but rather as a descriptor of knowledge that has held up against objections (2017, p. 33). Moreover, this does not require that we collapse the distinction made between different modes of inquiry; indeed, helping moderns respect the differences among modes of inquiry has been one of Latour's central concerns (2013). At the same time, he does argue that disciplines we typically describe as natural and social sciences can both be better understand as politically charged modes of inquiry responsible for describing and assembling the host of agents upon whose interrelations all beings, human and non-human alike, depend.

It is striking how similar Plato's allegory of the cave is to the modern relationship between education and emancipation. The process of the prisoner becoming freed from the subjective realm of shadows by gaining access to the objective knowledge outside the cave sounds a lot like the process of emancipatory education. Here we are confronted with the strange instability of the concept of Nature (Latour, 2017): on the one hand, Nature is the realm of necessity, and Freire's process of liberatory education, like emancipation in general, requires that oppressed humans become emancipated from a set of material conditions that negates their humanity and relegates them to mute objects lacking in agency. On the other, Nature is also the source of knowledge that will enable the oppressed to finally see things as they really are, freeing them from the confines of their false consciousness. This is why issues of agency are at the heart of Latour's efforts at reconstructing our politics. If we cease to operate from the assumption that Nature is a realm of necessity, composed of mute objects that give rise to objective knowledge, while Culture is the realm of freedom, composed of articulate but subjective beings, we get different possibilities for politics and education.

In *Reassembling the Social*, Latour (2005) recognizes how social theory has also been simultaneously shaped and stymied by this strange distribution of agency. Here, his problematization of emancipation is explicit. He suggests that social theory in general, and critical sociology in particular, have become obsessed with the aims of Enlightenment's emancipatory project:

> [Social theorists] considered that their real duty was not so much to inventory active agencies in the world as to clean out the many forces that, in their eyes, are cluttering the world and that maintain people in a state of alienation (…) The task of emancipation to which they have devoted themselves requires that they rarefy the number of acceptable entities. (Latour, p. 49)

This 'real duty' sounds remarkably similar to the problem-posing and liberatory education that Freire describes. Here, the educational process enables "emancipation" by helping the oppressed in "overcoming authoritarianism and an alienating intellectualism; it also enables people to overcome their false perception of reality" (p. 86). As the work of Biesta (2008, 2010) demonstrates, this taken for granted assumption that the experience of the student is itself a source of their oppression anchors the problematic contradictions in the relationship between education and emancipation.

A fundamental belief in the illusory nature of experience permeates modern social theories, against which knowledge and reason alone provide access to the Truth. This separation of knowledge and experience also maps onto traditional conceptions of agency. For example, Stout (2005) suggests that humans can be either subjects or agents, and the emancipation of student to autonomous adult parallels the shift from the former to the latter. To be a subject is to be an effect, passively shaped by experience, while to be an agent is to be a cause, to act with the deliberate purpose of effecting change in the world. Knowledge and reason emancipate the subject from the distortions of experience, allowing for agency to emerge. Latour's efforts to reconstruct politics and agency are undergirded by a different notion of experience—the radical empiricism of William James—and, by a different notion of emancipation entirely: "From now on, when we speak of actor we should always add the large network of attachments making it act. As to emancipation, it does not mean 'freed from bonds' but well -attached" (2005, pp. 217-218). To make sense of this seemingly contradictory claim, it is important to turn to the role that Gaia theory plays in Latour's efforts at redefining Earth, Nature, and the Globe.

RECONCEPTUALIZING FREEDOM AND NECESSITY

Despite the differences I have discussed between Latour's thinking and the liberatory education that Freire (2012) describes, there are also interesting points of convergence. One of those is their shared insistence that reality is a process, not a fixed and static entity, and that humans must be understood as beings who depend on the world. For example, Freire suggests that the oppressive "teacher talks about reality as if it were motionless, static, compartmentalized, and predictable" (p. 72), while "[e]ducation as a practice of freedom (…) denies that man is abstract, isolated, independent, and unattached to the world" (p. 81). Here, Freire relates an ontology of motionless and predictable reality with the work of oppression, and signals that transforming education into an act of freedom requires that we understand humans as concrete, connected beings who depend on their attachments to the world.

Latour (2017) contends that reconceptualizing politics, including the goal of freedom, requires that we learn "how not to (de)animate nature" by recognizing the agency of non-human beings and their role in maintaining living conditions for all beings, human and non-human alike. Latour describes how particular moments in the history of Western Science, such as Galileo's conceptualization of Earth as a universalizable object like all others, floating in space and best understood from afar, have resulted in the peculiar world view where agency exists for humans, who are also separate and distinct from a natural world utterly lacking in agency. Thus, when Freire (2012) claims that "the more the oppressors control the oppressed, the more they change them into apparently inanimate things" (p. 59), this resonates with Latour's concern that human negligence towards the non-human

world is similarly related to the tendency to de-animate that which we seek to control. In addition, Galileo's scientific advances established the notion that objectivity requires a distant and detached observer, furthering the separation of humans from the world. Here, we see the antecedents of our modern spectator epistemology, and what Whitehead calls the bifurcation of nature into primary and secondary qualities (Debaise, 2017). Only the primary qualities of movement and extension were deemed real and material, while secondary qualities like taste, color, value, and affect are deemed subjective elements projected by human minds onto an inert material world.

Latour suggests that once the distinction between primary and secondary qualities was established in the realm of physics, it spread into other aspects of modern thinking, including the philosophical projects of Descartes and Locke, and had profound consequences on modern science and politics. In other words, Latour argues that although modern understandings of both matter and epistemology began as practical necessities for Galileo, it also "gave rise to the strange opinion that has made it possible to deanimate one sector of the world, deemed objective and inert, and to overanimate another sector, deemed to be subjective, conscious, and free" (2017, p. 85). On the one hand, I think this story is more complex and less innocent than it appears in Latour's telling. This is made particularly apparent in the work of Sylvia Wynter, who notes that "these shifts in epistemes were not only shifts with respects to each episteme's specific order of knowledge/ truth, but were also shifts in what can now be identified as the 'politics of being'" (2003, p. 318). In other words, the metaphysical shift that became sanctioned and normalized in Modernity is inseparable from the logics that framed indigenous collectives around the globe as sub-humans deserving of subservience and domination, and their lands as resources ripe for extraction. At the same time, I agree with Latour that this insidious logic is maintained by the Nature/Culture binary, and the dichotomy between necessity on the side of the first, and freedom on the latter. This is why Latour's turn to Gaia theory as a means of reconceptualizing Nature/Culture has such important political consequences.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF GAIA

Gaia theory is a collaborative concept initially coined by chemist and engineer James Lovelock, and co-developed by the biologist Lynn Margulis. The antecedents of Gaia theory came from Lovelock's investigations of the possibility of life on Mars, and his general conclusion that finding life on other planets could rely on simple studies of atmospheric chemistry. Earth's atmosphere is unique among known planets because its atmosphere maintains a state of chemical disequilibrium that is both necessary for and maintained by living organisms. Latour asserts that this finding—that "the Earth is a planet like no other!" (2017, p. 75)—is a fascinating inversion of Galileo's claim that Earth should be properly understood as a general object falling through space, and the same as any other planet. Accordingly, Latour and biologist Timothy Lenton (2019) argue that "Gaia might be the name of a shift in understanding how to approach many phenomena of what was lumped together before in the notion of nature" (p. 661).

Given the fact that Gaia theory marks a radical break from previous philosophical and scientific articulations of nature, it is perhaps unsurprising that it has met significant resistance from scholars across disciplines. Latour suggests that there are two

characteristics of Gaia that have been particularly surprising, and thus, difficult to conceptualize and communicate. First, Gaia insists that nature is composed of diverse agents who must be neither deanimated nor overanimated, but rather understood as actors possessing both agency and historicity. Second, Gaia should not be mistaken for a superorganism. It is not a system, and cannot be understood by relating parts to the whole. Latour notes how often sociology and biology have exchanged metaphors related thinking about the relationship between parts and the whole, whether they relate to individuals and society or organisms and environment. Accordingly, Gaia theory fundamentally challenges the centrality of our "entrenched attachment to the classical opposition between the individual and the totality" (Latour, 2017, p. 104).

In doing so, Gaia provides an analytics capable of reconceptualizing the problematic dichotomy between what Latour terms the domain of necessity and the domain of freedom. On the one hand, we must recognize that all living things demonstrate the capacity for freedom, as Gaia theory emphasizes the nuanced ways in which all living organisms are co-producing the conditions upon which their existence depends. Or, as Donna Haraway puts it: "Critters do not precede their relatings; they make each other through semiotic material involution, out of the beings of previous such entanglements" (2016, p. 60). It is not longer possible to talk about calculating the interests of individual organisms or species, as there is no longer an independent and inert background environment to serve as the basis for such calculus (Latour, 2017). Accordingly, nature reconceptualized as Gaia becomes "a domain of freedom, where life forms have, in some extraordinary ways, made their own laws" (Latour & Lenton, 2019, p. 20). At the same time, humans must recognize that our freedom is entirely dependent on our relations with non-human others. Here, we return to Latour's earlier claim that we must reconceptualize the notion of emancipation away from the notion of freedom, and towards the importance of describing the attachments that make our freedom possible. To do so, Latour urges us to move beyond a political framework concerned with humans and the Globe, based on the analysis of systems of production, and towards one concerned with Terrestrials and their systems of engendering.

CONCLUSION

In *Down to Earth*, Latour (2018) suggests that if the actions of the elite to hoard resources and isolate themselves defines the political attractor he names the 'Out-of-This-World,' we can also imagine another political attractor, oriented in precisely the opposite direction, which he calls the Terrestrial. The terrestrial becomes a signifier that does for Nature/Culture what the human signifier does for the male/female binary, and is the result of applying Gaia theory to the dichotomy between freedom and necessity. Latour argues that this is the first step towards developing a politics capable of responding to the climate change, and that a second necessary step requires us to give up understandings of human-material relationships that were produced by analyses focused on systems of productions, and towards new relationships made possible by thinking through systems of engendering:

> The two analyses differ first of all in their principles—freedom for the first, dependency for the second. They differ next in the role given to humanity—central to the first,

> distributed for the second. Finally, they differ in the type of movements for which they take responsibility—mechanism for the first, genesis for the second. (p. 82)

If Freire's (2012) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* is a mode of emancipatory education born from the analytics made possible by systems of production, we should inquire into the possibilities of emancipatory approaches to education within this system of engendering. Moreover, that both of these shifts—from nature to the Terrestrial, and from systems of production to systems of engendering—are not yet accomplished, we might ask what forms of education might support their arrival.

Considering both of these challenges, I remain inspired by Freire's advice that we "cannot expect positive results from an educational or political action program which fails to respect the particular view of the world help by the people" (2012, p. 95). This advice was nearly impossible to heed when conceptualizing emancipatory education through modes of production, where the only respectable world view was one afforded by Marxist analyses of labor and a history exclusive to humans (Chakrabarty, 2009). In other words, the pluralism that Freire values is undermined by a problem-posing education that decided from the outset that certain themes, like the concept of culture, are inherently "central and indispensable" (Freire, 2012, p. 123). How else might we think about the aims of problem posing education, without deciding in advance what problems and themes a collective should investigate?

Indeed, one of the first tasks facing Terrestrials who have become disaggregated by the dissolution of the Nature/Culture binary is to redefine the constitution of various collectives. This is a task that Latour considers at length in Facing Gaia, and he offers a set of five questions for all collectives (2017, p. 151), and I suggest that these might form the starting point for new projects of emancipatory education:

- By what supreme authority do they believe they have been convoked?
- What limit do they give their people?
- What territory do they believe they are inhabiting?
- In what epoch are they confident they are living? And
- What principle of organization distributes agency?

None of these questions have easy answers, and I don't imagine that any collective would easily settle on single answers to any of these questions. This is precisely the point: identities and allegiances that were formed within the system of production are gone. Everyone is now simultaneously a potential enemy and a potential ally, including non-human others. Rather than asking what knowledge might enable either collective or individual freedom, terrestrials are given the task of identifying and describing the many other beings on whom they depend. This does, of course, result in conflicts and disagreement, but Latour is clear that "we are not seeking agreement among all these overlapping agents, but we are learning to be dependent on them. No reduction, no harmony" (2017, p. 87). A new and surprising educational aim to say the least. However, given how new and foreign the problem of climate change remains, perhaps this novelty is not so much a problem as an asset for more ethical practices of world building in the New Climatic Regime. This is not a universal project, but one that draws inspiration from the guiding principal of the Pluriverse (Cadena & Blaser, 2018; Reiter, 2018), and the possibility of composing a world of many worlds.

REFERENCES

BIESTA, G. (2008). Toward a new "logic" of emancipation: Foucault and Rancière. *Philosophy of Education*, 169-177.

BIESTA, G. (2010). A new logic of emancipation: The methodology of Jacques Rancière. *Educational Theory, 60*, 39-59.

BLASER, M., & CADENA, M. (2018). Introduction: Pluriverse - proposals for a world of many worlds. In M. CADENA & M. BLASER (Eds.), *A world of many worlds* (pp. 1-21). Durham, N.C. and London: Duke University Press.

CADENA, M., & BLASER, M. (Eds.) (2018). *A world of many worlds*. Durham, N.C. and London: Duke University Press.

CHARBONNIER, P., SALMON, G., & SKAFISH, P. (Eds.) (2017). *Comparative metaphysics: Ontology after anthropology*. London, UK: Rowman & Littlefield International.

COLAPIETRO, V. (2011). Situation, meaning, and improvisation: An aesthetics of existence in Dewey and Foucault. *Foucault Studies, 11*, 20-40.

CHAKRABARTY, D. (2009). The climate of history: Four theses. *Critical Inquiry, 35*(2), 197-222.

DEBAISE, D. (2017). *Nature as event: The lure of the possible*. Durham, N.C. and London: Duke University Press.

Freire, P. (2012). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. (30th anniversary edition). New York: Bloomsbury.

GRANDE, S. (2004). *Red pedagogy: Native American social and political thought*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

HARAWAY, D. (2016). *Staying with the trouble: Making kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham, N.C. and London: Duke University Press.

LATOUR, B. (1987). *Science in action: How to follow scientists and engineers through society*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

LATOUR, B. (1991). *We have never been modern*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

LATOUR, B. (2004). *Politics of nature: How to bring the sciences into democracy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

LATOUR, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

LATOUR, B. (2013). *An inquiry into modes of existence: An anthropology of the moderns*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

LATOUR, B. (2017). *Facing Gaia: Eight lectures on the new climatic regime*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

LATOUR, B. (2018). *Down to earth: Politics in the new climatic regime*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

LATOUR, B., & LENTON, T. M. (2019). Extending the domain of freedom, or why Gaia is so hard to understand. *Critical Inquiry, 45*(3), 659-680.

REITER, B. (Ed.) (2018). Constructing the pluriverse: The geopolitics of knowledge. Durham, N.C. and London: Duke University Press.

SIEGEL, H. (1985). Educating reason: Critical thinking, informal logic, and the philosophy of education. Part two: Philosophical questions underlying education for critical thinking. *Philosophy Articles and Papers*, paper 14.

STOUT, R. (2005). *Action*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

WALSH, C. E., & MIGNOLO, W. D. (2018). Introduction. In W. D. MIGNOLO & C. E. WALSH, *On decoloniality: Concepts, analytics, praxis* (pp. 1-12) Durham, N.C. and London: Duke University Press.

WYNTER, S. (2003). Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, After Man, Its Overrepresentation—An Argument. *CR: The New Centennial Review, 3*(3), 257-337.

WYNTER, S., & MCKITTRICK, K. (2015). Unparalleled catastrophe for our species? Or, to give humanness a different future: conversations. In K. MCKITTRICK & S. WYNTER, *On being human as praxis* (pp. 9-89). Durham, N.C. and London: Duke University Press.

*

Received: May 19, 2020

Accepted: September 22, 2020

Published online: October 30, 2020