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Abstract

The question regarding future essentially relates to education, as one of the main functions of education is to support and direct the development of an individual according to the expectations of the future. In the liberal discourse of education future is perceived as open. Yet, what is said about the future portray the horizon towards which an agent should orientate. Those articulations are part of a bigger picture, that is, futurity. This study theorizes futurity leaning on Henri Bergson’s notions on time and space.

The current thesis consists of four essays, each of which frames the thematic of education, individual and futurity from different aspects. The first essay perceives futurity in the liberal discourse of education. Futurity in the liberal discourse of education is paradoxical: simultaneously open and determining. The second part continues this thought from the viewpoints of risk and the element of the unknown. Further, this part discusses the problem of definition through Dennis Atkinson’s pedagogical thinking. In the third essay, an individual positions as subject to the forward drift. Elizabeth Grosz argues that time itself does not loop. Instead, time materializes in the repetitive actions and formations of living entities. This essay investigates the question of development referring to Manifesto for Maintenance Art by Mierle Laderman Ukeles. The final part examines the space between the predetermined and flux. Finally, future seems to be having no demands, and from the perspective of education it is crucial to view future as to be emerging through the past and present.

These essays aspire to understand the outline of futurity through different texts and art works. This study does not wish to demarcate the discussion solely inside the context of art education. Instead, the focus of the examination is philosophical and theoretic. Therefore the objective of the investigation is not to develop solutions or tools for the practice of education. Rather, the present thesis serves as a critical opening for the discussion of the future and education in the time that emphasizes development and newness.

Keywords futurity, time, individual, education, maintenance, development, Bergson.
Introduction

Greater plantain (Plantago major) is a common flowering plant that is native to most of Europe, northern and central Asia and naturalised widely elsewhere in the world. It grows on lawns and fields and does well in disturbed and compacted soils. Plantago major has sturdy leaves that are edible and can also be used as medicine. The sinews from the mature plant are strong and pliant, and therefore can be used to make small cords, fishing line, sutures and braids.¹

Whether I will ever need any of this information is a problem of the future. I might. Or perhaps I should concentrate on developing some other skills to save my resources (do they end one day?). What a risk to gain knowledge! And what a risk it is to teach potentially useless things. Education orientates towards the future that is often articulated as open and unpredictable – or not articulated at all. Nevertheless, what is considered valuable in education relates to those articulations. Therefore how to view future is a crucial question for education.

This study is a collection of four essays, each of which addresses the question of futurity of an individual. Futurity is a perspective of time, a mode where the conception of the future is within. It is essentially a forward-driven mode, but does not simply mean development. Also, it is an image and a horizon: seen and discussed but out of reach. This introductory section provides a brief overview of the central terms, concepts and theories that situate inside two topics of particular interest, time and education. It then goes on to describe and discuss the methodology of this study and finally, outlines each of the essays.

Time and Futurity

The examination of futurity aims at recognizing it in the context of education and theoretically mapping the dimensions of it. What futurity is, remains as a question throughout this study and I intend to rather open the term than define it. My investigation of futurity leans on Henri Bergson’s notions regarding time and space. In Time and Free Will Bergson introduces the concept of duration (dureé), which he distinguishes from space. Central in his thinking as regards to this study and for the conception of futurity is the recognition of time as (1) duration and (2) spatial.

Another important aspect of time and futurity is based on the writings of Elizabeth Grosz. This is the aspect of the forward drift, discussed in her book The Nick of Time.³ Grosz describes the forward drift as time’s own necessity stating the

³ Grosz 2004.
following: “Time remains unidirectional, always forward, taking with it the past as it makes the future, and this will be so to eternity. It is not time itself that loops around, but the forms and configurations of matter that transform themselves, that are capable of repetition, and inevitably must, in the long run, repeat themselves as time’s relentlessness pushes forward, flows into the future.” An individual is subject to the forward drift and the will, then, has only one direction - into the future. This is something we might take for granted, the evolution of things, change and development. Nevertheless, Grosz’s thoughts made me doubt the obviousness of development and question it especially in relation to education: what is development in education? What would education be without development? And why is the connection between the two so close?

**Education**

Throughout this thesis, the term education will refer to the body of practices of enhancing and organizing learning, schooling as one of them. In his essay *On the Essence of Education*, Alexander Sidorkin argues that education is “a response to the shortage of natural learning driven by the child’s interests”. This definition is problematic as it raises the question of naturalness: what is natural learning, or when does learning become unnatural. However, individuals do learn and viewing education as a response to the shortage of the capacity to learn highlights the connection between education and development, which is one of the main areas of investigation in this study.

Education is a concept difficult to define comprehensively and for that reason each of the essays will approach education from a slightly different point of view. I do not wish to demarcate the questions in this study solely inside the field of art education but to apply the discussion to education more broadly. The questions concerning education are rather philosophical ones than something regarding the methods of educating or teaching. My intention is not to develop new pedagogies or tools for making education some ways better, more efficient or even to underline the importance of it. As I finish my art education studies with this final work, this is the time for me to question and speculate education as something that we do, investigate topics I came across with artists and art works that came to be as important for this study as any written source. My sources then, consist of different texts and writings by philosophers - Bergson, Deleuze and Grosz as the most referred ones - educational theorists such as Sidorkin and Dennis Atkinson, and art works (mostly perceived through documentation material) from for example Mierle Laderman Ukeles and Kurt Schwitters.

**Essay as a Method**

As I come from the fields of fine arts and art education, the question of the relationship between the form of the work and the content of it is very interesting to me. This form and content -dualism carries heritage of modernism, as one might think of, for example, Clement Greenberg’s idea of medium specificity and the natural qualities of a medium. Greenberg sees the essence of modernism to be lying in the use of characteristic methods of a discipline to criticize the discipline itself.” In painting this could mean using the methods of painting to reveal the limits of it. By confronting those limit points modernist art often sought for the original, what ever that might be. But defining disciplines themselves became more difficult and Rosalind Krauss’ 1979 essay *Sculpture in the Expanded Field* introduced the concept of the expanded field that anticipated the current understanding of a discipline as something that is transformable and can be expanded or changed by using the methods of other disciplines. During the last five decades or so, there was a transition from using the characteristic
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methods of, for example, painting to thinking through painting and taking painterly thinking to other media.

Essay as a method for examination has no characteristics in itself, but it is crucial to articulate what it means in this case and what are the limitations of it. Approaching a topic that is bit of a mystery and not wholly defined in the beginning leaves a lot of space for wandering. I find it beneficial but simultaneously it is the central difficulty of my method: how to convey and organise. Essay allows a lot and requires a lot. What it allows is the freedom to define the structure and the form of this work, to decide how to arrange thoughts and topics. It is creating a system and then communicating how that system works. The difficulty of this method is precisely in the communication, since thinking that evolves in the writing requires constant arranging and search for the core of each thought. I find repetition and rewriting to be crucial for this method in order to specify to the important. To articulate the message requires constant elaboration of what is done and said. That is something I noticed later, and this study does include some material that could be called raw in a sense that it remains as I first wrote it. But the impotentiality of confusion is a kind of potentiality as well and I wish to maintain some space for that. That is to say, essay, for me, is not a linear approach that develops towards realisation. Rather, it includes contradictions and things that do not seem to be leading anywhere - impotentialities. I will discuss the term impotentiality further in the fourth essay, as it is one of the key concepts of my study.

Methodologically, essay includes a multiple set of ways to obtain and form knowledge and the method of each writer probably is different. I believe a common methodological factor, however, would be the arrangement of ideas according to what Bergson might describe as intuition. Plus the dualism of the duration-space introduced before, there are many other dualisms in Bergson's writings. According to Gilles Deleuze, these dualistic divisions play a significant role in his method of intuition. In Bergsonism, Deleuze analyses and extends Bergson's central ideas. He summarizes the means used by intuition to be "cutting up or division of reality in a given domain according to lines of different natures and an intersection of lines which are taken from various domains and which converge". Dualism, then, must be perceived as a methodological solution rather than a statement about the consistence of the reality. In this study, the bergsonian method of division is adopted as a tool for conceptualization and for the arrangement of "lines of different natures". Deleuze describes the method of intuition to have three rules: problematizing, differentiating and temporalizing. 

I have not followed Bergson's method as a guideline for this study or tried to develop a specific system based on it. The method of intuition has sooner been a methodological inspiration for my work.

---

to Bergson, possibilities are spatial. The first essay will discuss further Bergson’s dualism of duration-space. I will examine futurity in terms of the spatial and the durative and ask, what would it mean to perceive future in terms of duration.

The second essay explores the element of the unknown that signifies risk. The element of the unknown is necessary in capitalist systems as it conditions the emergence of the new. Newness is the fuel of a capitalist system and even the oppositional movements and criticism become part of its logic. This is what Carl Hegemann calls capitalism’s self-overcoming tendency. As a result, risk is perceived as a good and necessary thing as something new may occur. In education risks are individualized along with the increased freedom of choice and adaptability becomes important. This part will address the question of the meaning of risk from agent’s perspective. I will survey that question through concepts of invisibility and visibility and employ them as a description of becoming and being. The paradoxical constitute of the dualism becoming-being comes to be a central issue of this essay itself. Along the examination of the becoming, the concept of potentiality comes up and it will be discussed further in the fourth essay.

The third part moves on to examine the question of the futurity of an individual from the viewpoints of the will and the forward drift. The essay begins with a quotation from Elizabeth Grosz, who, referring to Nietzsche, describes the forward drift to be the will’s “most secret melancholy”. That is because the will has only one direction, forward. The will is subject to the forward drift and therefore can only take from the past. The will is something that living entities have and in this essay living entity is a broadly define concept that includes biological organisms as well as abstract constructions and systems related to human life, education as one of them. As education is essentially forward-driven, it emphasizes development. Alexander Sidorkin’s definition of education adduced before also highlight the aspect of development as enhancing learning is in the core of it. In this essay, I attempt to find another perspective and adopt the idea of maintenance, described by Mierle Laderman Ukeles in her Manifesto for Maintenance Art from 1969. The final essay of this thesis will problematize the relationship between the predetermined and the flux through dualism of potentiality and impotentiality. To discuss potentiality and impotentiality is to question actualization too, and that is one of the aims of this chapter. Potentiality is close to development but I want to ask, what is it in terms of maintenance. In this part I will also introduce the concept of merz by artist Kurt Schwitter. Merz refers to life as flux, unsettled. Contradictory, merz itself became a brand and the avant-gardist, opposing movement of Schwitters actualized as a norm. But as potentiality might be a promise of something new, impotentiality is not. It might not actualize and has no aim to go further.

Futurity in the (Neo)liberal Discourse of Education

“We should teach a bit of everything since we don’t know what kind of professions there will be in the future. We would need teaching in creativity, innovation, teamwork and continuous learning.”

We don’t know. Yet, we would need or we should. I paid very much attention to these words after reading the interview of Maarit Korhonen, a teacher who wants to “blow up the curriculum” according to the headline of the article. Liberal, not the most radical statement though, since a great deal has been written and said about deconstructing institutional education and pushing it to more self-directional course during the last fifty years. But what I find most interesting in this citation is how future is viewed and how teaching and, more broadly, education is set against that horizon. If Korhonen views future as open and undefined, why does she define teaching in creativity, innovation, teamwork and continuous learning as needed? Why to make any exclusion then? And if something is considered important after all, how is that justified? In education, future often is the reasoning or justification behind the judgements concerning the important and the valuable: a quick answer to a student asking ‘why do I need to learn this?’ is that ‘you will need this in the future’ or ‘later you will understand the value of this’.

The future is a horizon against which educational desires are projected. This, I find, is how expectations of the future connects with individualization in education: through educational desires that reflect certain conception of the future. The question that motivates this essay is: what is futurity in the liberal discourse of education. In addition I will ask, how a student individualizes through education and how individualization connects to futurity.

In the citation of Korhonen, future is presumed to be something static: as if it was a place where certain reality exists or will exist. There will be professions – nobody just knows what kind of professions. The educational task seems to be responding to demands that cannot be articulated, and that is why skills of independency should
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be taught. In this way, agents have the freedom to define their areas of interest and themselves as individuals but at the same time they are responsible of doing so, because the future is dependent on their choices and activity. If the position of an agent is open and independent, it is easy to understand why continuous learning, or lifelong learning, emphasizes: *contingency requires adaptability.*

Why cannot the demands be articulated? It could be that articulations are easily considered as fixed, this is to say they do not allow the total openness of the future and freedom of an individual that are central to the liberal thought. Bronwyn Davies and Peter Bansel state that neoliberalism has constructed a subject who is highly individualized and responsibilized, an economic entrepreneur.⁴ They argue that neoliberalism as a social and political order directs the process of individual subjectification especially through education and schooling. Central to their argument is the recognition of subjects as highly governed, and yet defining themselves as free.⁵ Freedom is not contrary to the liberal forms of governmentality – it is a significant feature of it. It is a tool for devolving responsibility of the future from societies to individuals.

*Governmentality* defined by Michel Foucault essentially relates to the question of the subject. Human beings become subjects through modes of objectification, that are, different practices of governing.⁶ They change with time and receive new forms, along the changes of their environments. Relatively recent change has happened from what Foucault calls *disciplinary societies to societies of control.*⁷ Closed environments - home, school, hospital, factory - mark the disciplinary society. An agent passes from one to another, from home to school for example, always starting from the beginning. In contrast, one is never finished with anything in the societies of control because the control takes no location. The free individual of the contemporary is a lonely character, who must be active in order to succeed or to have future at all. In this sense, futurity of liberalism is conditional: future is dependent on one’s activity and choices. What characterizes futurity, then, is risk that is for the individual to deal with. This uncertainty pushes a subject into *self-productive mode*; a subject is individualized through processes of constant redefinition of her abilities, skills, knowledge and interests. The closed environments of the disciplinary society are no more the ones to individualize an agent by offering a set identity. The process of individualization is rather guided by the modes of the societies of control.

It can be asked with a good reason, what does the self-production mean for the concept of identity. As it becomes recognized that an individual cannot be defined externally, idea of identity becomes questioned and trembled. Furthermore, identification starts to appear as use of power: I am, for example, often identified as female, which means that I can be treated as a female. Davies and Bansel stress, that “the liberal model of individual rational-economic conduct has been extended beyond the sphere of the economy, and generalized as a principle for both reshaping and rationalizing government itself”. What follows is that economic performativity has overran other areas as the primary interest of both government and society. In the level of an individual, the rethinking of a subject along economic line means more freedom and increased responsibility. According to Davies and Bansel, “the powers of the state are thus directed at empowering entrepreneurial subjects in their quest for self-expression, freedom and prosperity”. Freedom, then, as they state, is *an economics shaped by what the state desires, demands and enables.*⁸

The new national core curriculum, determined by the Finnish National Board of Education (OPS 2016) supports their notion of a responsibilized, entrepreneurial subject. Development of the individual is being emphasized, and *growth as a person* is first one to be mentioned in the chapter Integration and Cross-Curricular Themes (7.1). ‘Growth as a person’ can be of course understood in many ways. It’s meaning is specified in the following objectives: students should *come to understand their physical, psychological growth, and their uniqueness as individuals. Also they should learn to recognize their individual learning styles and develop themselves as learners,* which can be put into practice through different self-evaluation methods such as learning diaries and discussions. The idea of individual learning styles and self-reflexive learning is grounded in the school critique of the 1960s and 1970s – interestingly, it has become part of the ‘official school’ instead of remaining as a disruptive voice of critique. Ivan Illich’s *self-directed education* has become the norm.⁹ The new core curriculum directs the students to take an active role in their learning - teacher’s role is seen as rather supportive and directive. Korhonen, who wants to question the curriculum, calls for teaching in creativity, innovation, teamwork and continuous learning, yet the four are very much emphasized not only in the new core curriculum but also on the websites of big universities and Sitra, a fund that operates under the Finnish Parliament.¹⁰
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* ⁴ 2007, 248.
* ⁵ Bansel & Davies 2007, 249. Their thought draws from Nikolas Rose’s *Power of Freedom* (1999), where Rose suggests that government and freedom are not opposites. Rather, freedom is a tool for governance.
* ⁶ Foucault 1982.
* ⁸ 2007, 250.
* ⁹ Learning styles became a popular subject of investigation in the 1970s and the idea of different learning styles is still strongly present in education. It is not only something teachers have picked up in universities, but also students are aware of the idea, which – according to my experiences in primary and upper secondary schools - sustains taking the path of least resistance when all the options are available. Theories of individual learning styles have been widely criticised by neurologists and educational psychologists. Doug Rohrer and Harold Pashler argue that there is no empirical evidence to support the style-based instruction in schools (2012).
As a social institution, school's visions about the future, resonates with the society, politics and global events. *Innovation, creativity, teamwork* and *continuous learning* seem to be following liberal rhetoric familiar from other areas of a capitalist society. School cannot be detached from the society since it is a product of the society's economical and social demands. Imagining un-institutional, free school could be like imagining an alien: it always looks like a human, familiar, even though it is supposed to be beyond contemporary understanding and somewhat new. Seemingly, it is impossible to escape the knowledge that already has become present as we are situated in it.\(^\text{12}\)

A descriptive example of this impossibility of imagining school beyond its institutional nature is an exhibition by Jani Leinonen, opened in Kiasma in 2015. The title of the partly retrospective exhibition was *School of Disobedience*. On Kiasma's website, title is explained to be a metaphor for the entire exhibition, but there also was an actual school building with 'teachers' - opinion leaders and activists - giving lessons on disobedience. The lessons came from a video, and the viewer could go inside the building to sit and watch. I find this to be more like an authoritarian than a challenging approach: watch, listen and learn to disobey properly! Again, the alien takes a form of a human in our imagination. A school building itself is a standard that could be criticized, but repeating it does not bring in the critical tendency that is called for - more likely it strengthens the already existing understanding. School institution as a closed environment of Foucault's disciplinary society has been in crisis for long and many have recognized the need for a reform. I view Leinonen's work as another attempt to start such reform, at least it is signalling the recognition of a need for that. Deleuze gives an interesting viewpoint to this matter reminding that the institutions of the disciplinary societies are finished - therefore reforming them is just ensuring their existence.\(^\text{13}\) The new forms and models of schooling might as well merge into the modes of control that are no different from the controlling mechanisms motivating the reform.

\(^\text{12}\) Haraway 1988.
\(^\text{13}\) Deleuze 1992.
The same difficulty of imagining something beyond current understanding and knowledge applies to imagining future. It is difficult without making a connection to past or present moment (which becomes past already in thinking of it). How is the open and unknown future that confronts the students of Maarit Korhonen, then, imagined? To examine that, I will take a look at the quote again: We should teach a bit of everything since we don’t know what kind of professions there will be in the future. We would need teaching in creativity, innovation, teamwork and continuous learning. What ever might occur in the unknown future one can confront it by being creative, innovative, co-operative and prepared to always learn new things. The image of future is open, undefined and happy - and that also is capitalism's promise: happiness through development, freedom of choice and competition.

So far in this essay I have raised the question of futurity in the discourse of liberal education. Liberal education celebrates and boosts the freedom of individuals, which leads to redefinition of a subject as an entrepreneurial, responsibilized being. Further, I briefly examined the conditions of this individualization arguing that those conditions are unstable and uncertain especially in their relationship to future, and this forms an individual who is active but adaptive and constantly self-productive. The new national core curriculum emphasizes that students should take an active and self-reflective role in their learning. Also I pointed out, that critical thoughts about possibilities occur. In the section that follows, I will argue that possibility does not imply freedom to, even though it might be freedom from determinism.

Limitations of the Possible

The unknown future is a world of possibilities. In 0,39 seconds “The future is full of possibilities” gives 161 000 000 hits on Google.14 In their article, Davies and Bansel refer to Foucault’s definition of governing as structuring the possible field of action of others.15 In this sense, possibilities can be understood as multiple, structured fields of action –as spatial. From here, I will turn my attention to more ontological dimension of possibility and examine it through Henri Bergson’s notions of time and space.

For Bergson, possibility itself is fixed and refers to closed systems.16 He understands possibility as something that is essentially spatial. It has limits and it already has a being. Therefore possibilities are not products of the free will (if freedom here would be understood as a state of making undetermined decisions), they are already defined. Possibilities are offered, taken, seen, considered and turned down. They are never made. Following this line of thought, I would argue that futurity based on possibilities is a determined one.

15 2007, 248.

Bergson distinguishes spatial and temporal, constituting a dualism of duration – space. He defines dualism as a moment (temporal), which is open to reformation of a monism. In this sense dualism is not a fixed description of how things are, but an arrangement that can transform. This is significant to mention - even though it is a side path in the discussion of possibility - because dualism is also my way of arranging things and ideas in this study. The two elements, duration and space, are not opposites or extremities, but a composite divided into elements, which differ in kind. As described by Deleuze, for Bergson space is only “the location, the environment and the totality of differences in degree”.17

The duration - space is the most fundamental dualism in Bergson’s philosophy and in Time and Free Will his thinking always comes back to this division. According to Deleuze’s reading of Bergson, thinking in spatial terms is a tendency that is difficult to get rid off. It does not relate to only material world but also to non-material, as long as it is a product of consciousness through processes of symbolization. Symbolization gives things location and in this sense non-material does not differ from material that can immediately be located. To clarify, possibility as spatial indicates location and definition.

That of material objects and states of consciousness are what Bergson refers to as two kinds of multiplicities: “When we speak of material objects, we refer to the possibility of seeing and touching them; we localize them in space --- The case is no longer the same when we consider purely affective psychic states, or even mental images, other than those built up by means of sight and touch. Here, the terms being no longer given in space, it seems --- that we can hardly count them except by some process of symbolical representation”.18 The conjunctive element to both multiplicities is space. Bergson argues that the process of symbolical representation can also be spatial, because through this conscious process, things are arranged in discrete series. A material object cannot occupy the place of another material object in the same space, or to use state differently, two material objects cannot be in the same place at the same time, they are impenetrable and because of that, discrete. Bergson notes, that this is a necessity of logic more than of physical, and he applies the same logic to the multiplicity of states of consciousness. Perhaps this is the origin of a paradox, putting two objects of symbolical representation to occupy the same place. However, the recognition of this logical necessity, spatiality of non-material and the symbolic, is important in order to clarify the idea of possibility as spatial. The other side of the dualism presented above is duration, that is, time as lived.

According to Bergson, conscious states form discrete series in the medium

17 1988/2011, 32. This is yet another bergsonian division: into difference in degree and difference in kind. Thinking in terms of difference in degree, or intensity, is thinking in terms of more and less. Bergson asks: “why do we say of a higher intensity that it is greater? Why do we think of a greater quantity or a greater space?” (Bergson 1913/2001, 85 – 86.) These questions occur when thinking in terms of more and less, when a composite is divided according to intensities - disorder is seen as less of an order instead of imagining two different orders or. Difference in degree refers to augmentation and diminution and difference in kind to alteration.
18 1913/2001, 85 – 86.
of homogenous time. This is different from time in duration, which is virtual and continuous. The second multiplicity (that of states of consciousness) can be both in terms of time: homogenous/discrete, or durative. The first multiplicity, the material, is always discontinuous, actual and spatial. Possibility, as something that is not matter but a mental image deriving from the processes of symbolical representation, is spatial following Bergson’s line of thought. To think about future as an environment of possibilities is to think about time in terms of space. May sound absurd but it is possible if future as well was an image deriving from the process of symbolical representation. It is intriguing as regards to this study, to ask, what would it mean, then, to think of the future in terms of duration?

Korhonen is offering in the beginning a set of fixed possibilities. A possibility of professions, of aiming at professions, of teaching and of contents of teaching, a possibility of possessing certain knowledge or skill and, a possibility of connecting these skills with the professions of the future. Future is understood as a space, where possibilities occur. At the same time, despite the fixed character of it, future is comprehended as inevitable and uncontrolled. I find this contradictory. How can it be open and closed at the same time? Thinking future in spatial terms seems to me be leading to an error.

Temporal future may seem a bit superfluous at first sight, since the word future is connected with temporal anyway. Future comes from the Latin word futurus, ‘going to be or yet to be’. In online dictionary Merriam-Webster, simple definition of future (noun) is the following: (1) the period of time that will come after the present time (2) the events that will happen after the present time (3) the condition or situation of someone or something in the time that will come. Again, having the Bergsonian distinction of temporal and spatial in mind, the definition above inclines to the spatial. Temporal or durative future would be something else than times (past, present, future) in discrete series.

I find that thinking future in terms of the temporal fades out the linear order of past – present – future. It brings future into what is now or what has been and other way around. In this sense, future would be here already and furthermore can be pertained to – not just to wait for to happen. Futurity in the liberal discourse of education is distant and believed to be in the hands of always the next generation, dependent on them. But putting the hope in the new might lead to forgetting the present. To return to the very beginning of this essay, we don’t know. Yet we would need or we should. The old has the power to direct how the new will look. It controls the new, but at the same time the old views that it’s responsibility of what will be ends in the present. What I mean by suggesting that future would be here already is that moving towards is not solely the task for the next generation - it happens in the now.

In education the question remains, how to decide what “needs to” and what “should”. The (neo) liberal world of possibilities is governed by means of freedom. The recognition of this is important in order to bring out a critical tendency, which is necessary for analysing the mechanisms of structuring the possible fields of action. Possibilities are presented as spatial elements that actually do not allow freedom in any other sense than as freedom of choice. In practice, the freedom of choice in schools and universities does not automatically mean that one would have an endless amount of options in hands since the logic is similar to the logic of the liberal market economy: what is asked for is offered, and what is not the interest of the masses is not profitable enough.

Further in the interview, Maarit Korhonen states that greater plantains are not interesting to 8-year-olds. She would like to exclude half of the compulsory school subjects and replace them with something that is more interesting to children. This statement is based on the logic of demand and supply – student is the client and teacher is the service provider. Organizing education based on this logic would lead to a situation where education responds to the needs of the majority and for example courses with small amount of participants might not happen at all because it is not profitable. In this way, freedom to choose actually might cause one-sidedness.

How to define the valuable is the key issue of the rejected importance of a greater plantain. If future is taken as a mystery, so should be the role of the knowledge of flora. A decision to leave out, replace or to include something is making a value judgement. Here, the greater plantain represents knowledge that can be brought into awareness through education. It is the educational task to decide to bring or not to bring it and search for the ways to it. These decisions are made in education constantly on different levels, in the making of national core curriculum as well as in teaching, but the reasoning is often invisible. In most cases the reasoning is the future, and how it is viewed directs educational actions. The futurity presented in the liberal discourse of education is controlling even though it looks like open. It is not determined, but controlling in a more subtle way, freedom and apparent openness as its tools. To think of futurity in spatial terms is to view future as a result of development, as linear. While this interpretation of futurity suggests determinism, taking futurity in terms of duration might serve the conceptualization of the futurity as multidirectional.

The Element of the Unknown

“Forecasting is the process of estimating outcomes in uncontrolled situations. Forecasting is applied in many areas, such as weather forecasting, earthquake prediction, transport planning, and labour market planning. Due to the element of the unknown, risk and uncertainty are central to forecasting.”

The element of the unknown is very essential in systems that seek to maximise an avail or an effect, and are willing to take risks in order to do so, because the unknown might enable something unexpectedly grand. But as ‘something grand’ might mean profit measured in numbers in one's bank account or a great invention that improves the conditions of life globally, it might as well mean actualization of risks, such as loss of all invested resources or global catastrophe. On Merriam-Webster, risk is defined as 1) possibility of loss or injury and 2) as someone or something that creates hazard. Hazard is the ‘bad side’ of the element of the unknown: threat, peril or danger. In spite of the possibility of hazard, the element of the unknown and the undetermined actions of the individuals, are a necessary force for the liberal thought since the unknown conditions the emergence of the new.

Therefore in capitalist societies, in systems that seek to maximise an avail, possibility has two faces: of hazard and of fortune. Dramaturge Carl Hegemann writes on capitalism's undermining tendency: “If capitalism is not to endanger its own foundations, it therefore requires ways of behaving that contradicts its own logic.” Hegemann refers to Tom Peters, a writer on business management who calls on companies to do what is illogical and ‘not profitable’. Fostering a taste for risk also feeds courage to innovate. So the risk here is not in the freedom of an individual and in the unpredictability of her actions, but in the control that does not create space for innovations. Peters’ bottom line is that failure is just as important as success because there is no development without errors. In the spirit of Peters, recently published Negative feelings – positive business by three Finnish authors surveys the ways and mechanisms to channel the negative feelings and criticism to productivity. There is no risk in positivity – therefore development requires negativity too. Clearly, development is what is wanted, but the direction of it is not articulated. Pre-set targets are discerned to be obstacles of development since they shrink the free space where new directions possibly may occur. If the only target is development, which can be interpreted in multiple ways and usually its meaning is not enunciated, it drives individuals to find...

3 Hegemann 1999/2011.
out and take responsibility of the actions that are needed to support the development. Furthermore, Hegemann argues that: “Capitalisms self-overcoming tendencies have shifted from the objective realm --- to the subjective realm of orientation”\(^5\). How an agent orientates is in subversive manner: through resistance s/he pushes forward fulfilment of capitalism's promises of development and happiness. The resistant movements and actions are then absorbed as part of the capitalist system and reframed as tools for development. It seems to be capitalism's character to make use of the critique and resistance addressed to it.

In the first essay I examined the agent's role in the liberal discourse of education and found it to be responsive: creative and innovative people are responsible for their success and this means that they also have to bare the risks. The risks are being transmitted to individuals in education from primary schools to universities, along with the increased freedom of choice - and along with the grown amount of options, grows the incalculability of their consequences. This suggests again open and insecure futurity of individuals. What Korhonen called for, without recognizing or articulating it straight, is actually teaching in flexibility, because that is required under the contingent circumstances.

Individualization of the risks makes adaptability important. Furthermore, adaptation is a way of avoiding the risks or controlling them from the perspective of an individual. As adduced before, the entrepreneurial subject is constantly producing herself in order to success in life. As a process of redefining oneself as suitable, this self-production minimizes the personal risks. What are the personal risks? If the risk is of not being successful, what does it actually mean? Sociologist Pascal Gielen argues that world has become horizontal and liquid as a result from three historical shifts concerning politics, labour and art.\(^6\) As the world becomes liquid\(^7\), the agents become mobile and flexible, which requires maintenance and visibility. The worst thing that could happen would then be disappearance, to become invisible.

Visibility and Invisibility

In Hito Steyerl's video piece HOW NOT BE SEEN: A Fucking Didactic Educational .Mov File (2013) the character (Steyerl herself) is trying to follow the instructions of how not be seen or how to become invisible given by automated male voice. One could try to be smaller than a pixel, or a more than fifty-year-old female in order to become invisible. Images overlap and change on a green screen against the horizon of a desert covered in photo calibration targets that are for testing the focus of airplane cameras. Digital image and representation are central interests of Steyerl's, and the video can be seen as underlining the desire to hide in the time of image proliferation, when visibility and how one is represented through images define the self.

On the contrary, video suggests that disappearance is not always voluntary and that is also something to be afraid of. In that sense, disappearance and invisibility are ambivalent: on one side desired and on the other, a risk. In a Monty Python sketch of the same name, How not to be seen, the risk of invisibility is paradoxically visibility: the characters are first taught how not to be seen - they hide behind the bushes, different objects or in the grass - and when called into sight, they get shot or blown up.\(^8\)

\(^5\) 1999/2011, 174-175.
\(^7\) World becoming liquid relates to sociologist Zygmunt Bauman's concept of liquid modernity, which is continuation of the modern era. What especially characterizes liquid modernity is the information revolution and the capitalist economies becoming global.

\(^8\) Monty Python's Flying Circus 1970.
What does the negation of visibility tell about risk? To develop this further, I would like to apply the visibility – invisibility as a description of being and becoming: being, what is, as visibility and becoming, what is not yet, as invisibility.

The thematic of being and becoming has been a great interest of many theorists in the fields of art and education, and the influence of the work of such writers as Gilles Deleuze,9 Alain Badiou 10 and Jacques Ranciere11 can not be ignored. However, being as a fixed and stable form of 'what is', is questioned whereas the idea of becoming appears as more intriguing for analyses of teaching and learning.

Dennis Atkinson establishes becoming to be central to what he calls pedagogy against the state, which aims at maximizing the power of learning by involving "a disruption of established states of pedagogical knowledge".12 The states are of representation, which refers to assimilated bodies of knowledge and practices, and encounters that causes fracturing of the stabile orders. He explains that pedagogy engaging with the disruption expands the understanding of what it is to learn and leads to the possibility of forming "new and more effective learning communities".13

In this project the element of the unknown is substantial, since it conditions the possible. Pedagogy against the state is a pedagogy focusing on potentiality and becoming. Risks are a necessary part of such pedagogy: taking risks in teaching and in learning liberates pedagogy from the control of outcomes, leaving space for the unexpected. Gert Biesta has similar thoughts in respect of the risk. He defines the risk of education as interruption by the other, arguing that there is no education without interruption.14 However, this does not imply that any educational tasks could not be articulated.

In the pedagogy Atkinson describes, becoming never turns into being. It avoids receiving a form. Becoming or invisibility itself is the priority. What is invisible and yet to come can be anything, it has the potentiality. Nevertheless I wonder if actualization can or even should be avoided in the context of education. What happens to the potentialities?

It seems that visibility and invisibility are understood in terms of more and less, invisibility as less visibility and visibility as fulfilment, as what is. To use the concepts of Bergson, there is a difference in degree between the two. In the case of Atkinson, invisibility is articulated as something that should be pursued and visibility instead is related to fixed categories that are considered as controlling and therefore as something to be avoided. To be less visible would then mean being less fixed. But is the difference between visibility and invisibility in the degree or in kind? I argue, referring to Bergson, that negation of visibility taken as visibility of a kind reveals the paradoxical constitute of the arrangement in which becoming forms an endless loop, a unity. The invisible as visibility of a kind is as actual as is the visible. In this way, becoming emerges in the area of being and what is not yet starts to be something. Instead of escaping articulated priorities, definitions or exclusions the becoming itself appears as one. It loses the power as the opposing force of what is defined or fixed, and turns into a category.

If the becoming itself is the purpose and the meaning, what does it mean for an individual? Atkinson argues that the states of representation as assimilated bodies of knowledge and practices produce normalized subjectivities. In this process the subject is recognized in a narrow way, and within the context of teaching and learning, this leads to “marginalized existence” of the subject within the pedagogical space.15 The pedagogy against the state is all about orientating educational actions against the normalizing tendency of the states of representation through recognition of the becoming.

But when becoming, or invisibility, takes a form and starts to be visible, it becomes a state of representation itself. In the Monty Python sketch, invisibility includes visibility. It is the visibility that is the materialized potentiality and the risk. This is to say, that in the lives of individuals, the becoming (the invisible) actualizes and reaches some potentialities.

To be productive and to develop then is a task for individuals, who are responsible for the actualization of their becoming. Moreover, in the loop of becoming, problems result from development itself, which is subjective, and the risks are defined and created through the process of individualization. While individuals are producing themselves through becoming, they also designate the risks.

The risks are individualized, which might result from shifts in politics, labour and education. Gielen describes the political shift to be from the separation and tension between liberal and socialist to what he calls repressive liberalism, which in a way include both views as they are generally considered: the freedom of liberalism which, at the same time, is very bureaucratic.16 In repressive liberalism, freedom is an instrument, or even a mode of control. It is what motivates the actions of the individuals and reframes the repressive demands as possibilities.

Another particular feature of the repressive liberalism according to Gielen is rationalization, which means standardization, measuring and calculation of risks. This is evident in for example Bologna Agreement (1999) made to control the quality and standards of higher education in Europe: “The course has been set in the right direction and with meaningful purpose. The achievement of greater compatibility and

---

9 See The Logic of Sense, 1993.
10 See Being and Event, 2005.
12 Atkinson 2008.
14 Biesta 2012, 112.
15 Biesta 2012, 112.
16 The black and white juxtaposition of liberal and socialist is similar to separation of the private and the public. Franco Berardi analyses the polarity of public domain and the privatized, arguing that it is the ideological offence of Neoliberalism that has convinced people to view characteristics of the public as bureaucratic and damaging, and the privatized as free and meritocratic (2010).
comparability of the systems of higher education nevertheless requires continual momentum in order to be fully accomplished. We need to support it through promoting concrete measures to achieve tangible forward steps. On the other hand, standardization and measuring are increasingly the responsibility of an individual. Educators and educational planners recognize the problem of standardization, and students are pushed to define standards for themselves and then measure their work in relation to those standards. Yet, this does not set the students free from standardization and measuring of learning, which is a process difficult to measure. (Moreover, one could ask why to measure it.)

The two features, rationalization and taking freedom as an instrument, portray the contradictory combination of liberty and domination in the repressive liberalism. Simultaneously, the shift in labour has happened from Fordism (after Henry Ford) into post-Fordism. What characterizes Fordism is the immobility and fixed working hours of material labour and the standardized production of material products. Immateriality is one of the features that characterize the Post-Fordist labour of the contemporary, and from the perspective of an individual it might be the most crucial one. It means faded border between work and free time, mobility and flexibility.

The reason for bringing up these shifts in politics and labour is to highlight their connection to what happens in the field of education. Education is in the crossing of different interests. There is the interest of the society regarding the aspect of work, by which I mean thinking of education as preparation for certain professions and as developing skills and gaining knowledge for work life. As the work becomes based on information technologies and labour becomes mobile, the new core curriculum reacts and defines technological skills and skills of independency important. Secondly, there is the interest of civilisation, following the humanism’s ideal of the civilized human, which was boosted during the age of enlightenment and has not disappeared. Thought of civilization suggest there to be certain spheres of knowledge that are more important to enter: books everyone should read or historical events and theories everyone should be aware of.

Educators emphasize the growth of the individual and search for the best possible strategies to support the project of growth. These interests come together in schooling, which reflects the necessities of the society, labour market and the interests of the professionals. Atkinson’s pedagogy against the state does not only refer to states of representation as assimilated bodies of knowledge, but also to the political state within which education functions. The political state regulates educational policies and practices, and as a result constructs certain modes of understanding. Pedagogy against the state wants to cause rupture in these fixed modes and interrogate the relationship between pedagogy and liberal politics.

Knowledge seems to be interesting to not only educators and theorists but also from political aspect. Best way to prepare for the mobile and uncertain working conditions is to be in a state of becoming, to be liquid and accept the risks as “part of the plan”. So is the becoming as what is not yet, as invisibility and infinite potentiality really causing rupture or has it settled as a mode (that is being)? And must objectivity or definition be avoided? Is visibility the risk, as in the Monty Python sketch?

Donna Haraway breaks off from the post-modern idea that the world is constructed through language and therefore objectivity becomes impossible, stating that there is objectivity, but it is always unforeseen. According to her definition, objectivity does not refer to singularity or to a primary sphere of some kind. Rather, it should be understood as a multiple vision system in which all the spheres are different but equal. Objectivity is the visible, and it is needed in order to recognize the different spheres of knowledge (there is an infinite number of them), or communities, and to situate oneself as part of them. In that sense, objectivity is also position rationality and has an ethical dimension.

Objectivity as Haraway describes it, does not exclude the element of the unknown because it is not stable. Any sphere of knowledge can transform and can be transformed since there is no primary one. This notion also breaks the spatial, constructivist logic: there is no fundamental knowledge from which other spheres of knowledge start to build –all the spheres exist at the same time all the time. Against this understanding, futurity of an individual does not appear merely as open and unknown but also as definable and, in a way, present. To make a forecast then does not mean much unless it includes action, a materialization of the future. But is materialization the risk? There is something contradictory in the relationship between visibility (being, materialization) and risk. On one hand, what is not yet cannot be risky because it has not actualized. Then on the other hand, invisibility itself carries the risk of never becoming visible or materialized. The question remains, do we want the becoming to actualize?

Recognition of the becoming of the subject in order to create alternative spheres of

The Forward Drift and Will For the New

“There is something, however, of eternity that resists the will, that is the will’s “most secret melancholy”: the will can will only forward, into the future, it can will only in one direction, for it must take from what is given of the past. The will cannot create the past but only the future. Time itself is what limits the will, and it is only the will of the highest that can live with the horror of the repetition of the low. The will cannot conquer time, but must submit itself to time’s own necessity: forward drift. The will is subject to something outside of itself, something greater, not to a God but to impersonality, the hugeness of eternity, the weight of all of the past and the open expanse of all of the future, that is, to its own limits, its own mortality.”

Not very much attention is paid to endings in the world of possibilities. Capitalist belief in perennial growth of capital and wealth ignores mortality as a limiting factor. Yet, human existence does have limits. Words of Elizabeth Grosz capture the sadness of this whole scene in which will of an agent is right there in between the past and the future - both beyond comprehension - willing forward. This essay moves on to examine the question of the futurity of an individual from the viewpoints of the will and forward drift.

The will is a property of each individual as well as of groups, communities and societies, and can be even considered as a quality of somewhat abstract and complicated constructions such as “the market” or “the art world”. The will is central to human experience and integral to different living entities and organisms. I see also abstract constructions as living entities, since an abstraction, an idea or a concept has a material basis: they change and become, and they also must carry the weight of the past just like any other human construction. Having briefly clarified the meaning of a living entity, I turn to discuss education as an organism that has a will and therefore is subject to time’s own necessity, as Grosz expresses it, forward drift.

The idea of development is in the core of education. In his text On the Essence of Education Alexander Sidorkin notes that education “owes its existence to death”: Gods, for example, do not need education because they are eternal and for that reason they are not in a rush to mature. Human life, instead, is relatively short and in order to be productive one must learn fast. But the time individuals spend learning things is not little: soon I have studied for twenty years. After that, if everything goes well, I will have approximately forty years to be productive before retirement. This is, of course, a simplified example and the segmentation presented here offers only a directional description of how my lifetime divides. During learning, I have been productive too – or while being productive, I have learned.

1 Grosz 2004, 150.
2 Sidorkin 2011, 94.
The time spent studying and learning has expanded outside the schools and other learning environments covering the life of an individual from the beginning to the end. This is what lifelong learning is about, life itself being taken as pedagogical. According to the latest national core curriculum for basic education, in order to enhance lifelong learning students must learn to learn. Consequently, it is not only a task for teachers to find ways to enhance learning of their students, that is, to educate, but students themselves must practice learning skills and recognize their ways of learning. On one hand, individuals and societies wish to extend the productive lives (working or doing what one is educated to do) and on the other hand take the whole life as an opportunity to learn. The latter might actually serve the previous, since interlacing time used in learning into the productive time extends both. Here, the will of education is to maximize learning and productiveness.

Throughout this study, education is discussed quite broadly, without specifying what actually is meant by it. That is because every essay approaches education from a slightly different aspect. However, it is necessary to clarify the meaning of it in the context of this essay. In order to find a definition for education, Sidorkin lists forms of learning, roughly divided in five parts. First of them, pre-learning, is based on Darwin's theory of evolution. Pre-learning is adaptation: survival of the new generation depends on their learning. In that sense, curiosity has a biological basis and it exists in each individual before and without education. According to him, history of education has been about inventing ways of artificially extending the capacity and interest in learning. Therefore, education can be defined as set of methods that enhance learning making it more organized and structured. This definition highlights the close relationship between development and education. Education is subject to the forward drift and willing forward towards development. It is perplexing, even melancholic, to ask where to education is willing and where does the development end. More valid for this essay is to ask, what else than development might characterize the will of education. Also it is necessary to ask, how to define development in the context of education and from the viewpoint of an individual.

Moving backwards is an absurd thought in western societies that strongly believe in development. Development is linear without an ending point and taking a step behind feels illogical, it is obvious that the will goes forward. Newness is embraced for the reason that it signifies progress, and the emergence of the new imparts life; progress tells that we are not dying.

In 1969, performance artist Mierle Laderman Ukeles wrote a proposal for an exhibition called “Care”. The proposal was titled as Manifesto for Maintenance Art and it includes Ukeles’ suggestion for the exhibition and her ideas concerning maintenance and development. She begins the manifesto with the separation of death instinct and the life instinct and connects them with two basic systems, development and maintenance.

The dualism of the two is between dynamic change and repetition, progress and sustenance, the new and the preservation of what is. Development relates to death instinct that, following Ukeles’ definition, comes close to individuality: everyone follows their own path to death making small revolutions on the way, bringing in the new and willing for the new. Life instinct instead is about the survival of systems, operations and organisms, that is, maintenance of the species. Maintenance is will for sustainability. As Ukeles puts it: “after the revolution, who’s going to pick up the garbage on Monday morning?”

---

3 Core curriculum for basic education 2014, 17.
4 Sigmund Freud’s conception of Eros and Thanatos could have inspired Ukeles, yet I believe they should not be confused since the motif of Freud differs very much from Ukeles’ approach.
MANIFESTO
FOR MAINTENANCE ART 1969!

Proposal for an exhibition “CARE”

MIELE LADERMAN UKELES

I. IDEAS

A. The Death Instinct and the Life Instinct:

The Death Instinct: separation; individuality; Avant-Garde par excellence; to follow one’s own path to death—do your own thing; dynamic change.

The Life Instinct: unification; the eternal return; the perpetuation and MAINTENANCE of the species; survival systems and operations; equilibrium.

B. Two basic systems: Development and Maintenance. The sourball of every revolution: after the revolution, who’s going to pick up the garbage on Monday morning?

Development: pure individual creation; the new; change; progress; advance; excitement; flight or fleeing.

Maintenance: keep the dust off the pure individual creation; preserve the new; sustain the change; protect progress; defend and prolong the advance; renew the excitement; repeat the flight;

C. Maintenance is a drag; it takes all the fucking time (lit.)

The mind boggles and chafes at the boredom.
The culture confers lousy status on maintenance jobs = minimum wages, housewives = no pay.

clean you desk, wash the dishes, clean the floor, wash your clothes, wash your toes, change the baby’s diaper; finish the report, correct the typos, mend the fence, keep the customer happy, throw out the stinking garbage, watch out don’t put things in your nose, what shall I wear, I have no sex, pay your bills, don’t litter, save string, wash your hair, change the sheets, go to the store, I’m out of perfume, say it again—he doesn’t understand, seal it again—it leaks, go to work, this art is dusty, clear the table, call him again, flush the toilet, stay young.

D. Art:

Everything I say is Art is Art. Everything I do is Art is Art. “We have no Art, we try to do everything well.” (Balinese saying).

Avant-garde art, which claims utter development, is infected by strains of maintenance ideas, maintenance activities, and maintenance materials.

Conceptual & Process art, especially, claim pure development and change, yet employ almost purely maintenance processes.

E. The exhibition of Maintenance Art, “CARE,” would zero in on pure maintenance, exhibit it as contemporary art, and yield, by utter opposition, clarity of issues.
II. THE MAINTENANCE ART EXHIBITION: “CARE”

Three parts: Personal, General, and Earth Maintenance.

A. Part One: Personal

I am an artist. I am a woman. I am a wife.
I am a mother. (Random order).

I do a hell of a lot of washing, cleaning, cooking,
renewing, supporting, preserving, etc. Also,
(up to now separately I “do” Art.

Now, I will simply do these maintenance everyday things,
and flush them up to consciousness, exhibit them, as Art.
I will live in the museum and I customarily do at home with
my husband and my baby, for the duration of the exhibition.
(Right? or if you don’t want me around at night I would
come in every day) and do all these things as public Art
activities: I will sweep and wax the floors, dust everything,
wash the walls (i.e. “floor paintings, dust works, soap-
sculpture, wall-paintings”) cook, invite people to eat,
make agglomerations and disposions of all functional
refuse.

The exhibition area might look “empty” of art, but it will be
maintained in full public view.

MY WORKING WILL BE THE WORK

B. Part Two: General

Everyone does a hell of a lot of noodling maintenance work. The
general part of the exhibition would consist of interviews of two kinds.

1. Previous individual interviews, typed and exhibited.

Interviewees come from, say, 50 different classes and kinds
of occupations that run a gamut from maintenance “man,”
maid, sanitation “man,” mail “man,” union “man,” construction
worker, librarian, grocerystore “man,” nurse, doctor, teacher,
museum director, baseball player, sales “man,” child, criminal,
bank president, mayor, movie star, artist, etc., about:

what you think maintenance is;
how you feel about spending whatever parts of your
life you spend on maintenance activities;
what is the relationship between maintenance and
freedom;
what is the relationship between maintenance and
life’s dreams.

2. Interview Room—for spectators at the Exhibition:

A room of desks and chairs where professional (?) interviewers
will interview the spectators at the exhibition along same questions
as typed interviews. The responses should be personal.

These interviews are taped and replayed throughout the exhibition
area.

C. Part Three: Earth Maintenance

Everyday, containers of the following kinds of refuse will be delivered
to the Museum:

-the contents of one sanitation truck;
-a container of polluted air;
-a container of polluted Hudson River;
-a container of ravaged land.

Once at the exhibition, each container will be serviced:

purified, de-polluted, rehabilitated, recycled, and conserved
by various technical (and / or pseudo-technical) procedures either
by myself or scientists.

These servicing procedures are repeated throughout the duration of the
exhibition.
Both maintenance and development are present in education. The will of education is forward-driven but also in a preserving sense. Education aims at maintaining cultural and communal practices, societal arrangements, knowledge, skills and systems of knowing or understanding. At the same time, how Ukeles depicts development is also central to education: “pure individual creation; the new; change; progress; advance.” Education boosts development of the individuals by setting aims for them to strive for. Or as described in previous essays, suggests individuals to define their own targets and to reflect their development in relation to those objectives. Instead of guiding development in an authoritarian way, education guides it through freedom of choice, which is seemingly more democratic and gives more space for the students.

On the other hand, how much do the two models differ, when one guides development towards certain direction based on strictly named values and objectives, and the other does it without naming, setting options to take?

The last two of Ukeles’ description of development remain unreachable in school education: “excitement; flight or fleeing.” Excitement is the best motivator for those who enjoy and are open to new things, whereas flight is the best motivator for those who want to be free to choose another way to be, do or to participate. Important is that flight signifies freedom to determine the future oneself. Not freedom to choose from possible futures, but freedom to reject them all. It carries development and does so according to internal dictations rather than external. As a manifestation of the will, flight searches for alternatives. It does not necessarily produce something new and carry development forward in linear way since it allows one to flee backwards too. Fleeing breaks off from already set, visible direction of development and defines the direction again. In that sense, flight is an act of dynamic change that characterizes development as Ukeles describes it. Although here, development must be understood as subsidiary to the forward drift, which means that it is alive and moving whether we wish or not.

In the context of education, I find the idea of maintenance intriguing. That is because maintenance, compared to development, seems to be much less discussed topic in educational writings, theories and in the pages of the national core curriculum. It is mostly discussed from the aspect of ecological and environmental sustainability, as for example in the values of basic education stated in the national core curriculum. However, maintenance could be present in education in other ways as well. I would like to conceptualize maintenance in education further with the help of Ukeles’ picture of maintenance presented in the manifest.

Maintenance does not contrast with development but connects with it. Ukeles describes maintenance as keeping the dust off the pure individual creation, preserving the new, sustaining the change, protecting progress, defending and prolonging the advance, renewing the excitement and repeating the flight. It is the doing around and beside development that can occur only after: recognition of development requires perception of the past. Development happens within the timeline, inside the framework of the past – present – future. It is spatial. Doing instead measures time as duration, as lived. Not dynamic changes and linear progress, maintenance is simply about delivering different tasks and repeating them within duration.

As stated in the previous parts, the aspect of development emphasizes in capitalist societies and paradoxically development seems to be a final point that escapes itself. The liberal development-mantra is familiar from business and politics, and so internalized that the fact that it ignores the question what for and where to often goes without noticing. When the resistant actions are assimilated as parts of the will to develop, repetition might be stepping outside the linearity.

To repeat is an act of maintenance. It does not aim for the production of the new. Repetition is unavoidable since also the practices that claim pure development and largely consist of maintenance activities. Ukeles takes Avant-garde art and conceptual art as examples but I believe that is something to think about also in the context of education. Of course, repetition already is a central part of all education as practice is recognized crucial to learning. But repetition as the mode of maintenance is more than just that if we ask what does repetition do. In practicing a skill it is quite clear: when one repeats the physical activity of that skill, she develops in it. Developing here might mean running faster or knowing when the spaghetti is ready. Another dimension of repetition is repetition that is practiced by not just single individual but groups of individuals and societies or other living entities described in the beginning of this essay. Much of the maintenance is shared. Cooking, cleaning, buying, washing – these we all do and usually in the same places too. We maintain our homes, buy things from stores and perhaps we maintain our physical wellbeing at the gym. Therefore repetition is maintaining patterns. It takes from the past and thinks about the future (because the forward drift can not be avoided) but it must be in the now. Important is the recognition of our agency: the patterns do not create themselves. The maintainer is the individual.

If the condition of education is will, there must be something towards which the will orientates to. It could be called a horizon, and terms such as “new,” “possibility” and “unknown” are attempts to describe that horizon. Horizon then, is an image of the fu-
ture. According to Grosz, it is a mistake to consider time as a loop. The time does not loop and repeat itself, instead, *the forms and configurations of matter that transform themselves* do. It is the maintenance of the living entities that loops.

Thinking in terms of time, the concept of newness opens up for different interpretations. First, newness can be understood as to be emerging as future, a horizon towards which we linearly orientate. The new directs the activities of agents, which makes history appear cumulative: as human kind, or an individual, would have started from the point zero and reached more and further, number by number. In the homogenous time, the new pops up creating nodes in the timeline that seems to be continuing as solid from each node. Another way of perceiving newness could be as newness emerging within duration. It does not demand the future to follow it, to form by its terms. It simply emerges as potentiality that might actualize. Here is a place for the will: how the potentiality actualizes, depends on the will. Furthermore, the future does not demand anything from the individuals. It does not define the form of the loop and therefore it is a task for the individuals to recognize themselves as the ones who make the time loop.
The final essay of this study perceives the paradoxical character of simultaneously predetermined and open individualization. I will question the predetermined individualization and the liberal phantasy of totally free individualization and ask, what is there in between the two. This is of course yet another dualism. It is necessary to emphasize, that throughout this study dualism is seen as a conceptual tool for organising and expressing multilateral ideas. It does not refer to Cartesian dualism, distinction between mind and body, or even to Plato’s ontological dualism of some two substances. Dualism simply takes place here as a tool for conceptualization and can always change, divide and reform.

The difficulty of avoiding determination in the frenzy search for the new is discussed in the following section through art and thoughts of German artist, typographer and writer Kurt Schwitters. He was one of the central characters of German modernism and developed the merz that came to describe all his activities. Merz was an avant-gardist project, the new ideal challenging the old and dusty. On the other hand, merz became so pervasive that soon Shwitters called himself Kurt “merz” Schwitters.

Notions on Merz

Kurt Schwitters (1887 – 1948) created the concept of merz to describe his vision of openness and endlessness. Merz covered his whole life being more of a philosophy than something that would only frame his art. Schwitters worked with collage and being connected with the Berlin and Zurich Dadaists influenced his art. The word “merz” is nonsense, in Dadaist spirit, cut from a text fragment Kommerz- und Privatbank. As for dada artists of the early 1900s, Scwitters’ reason-abandoning approach was a reaction to the turmoil of the First World War:

“--- everything had broken down in any case and new things had to be made out of the fragments: and this is Merz. It was like an image of the revolution within me, not as it was, but as it should have been."

Even though the word itself means nothing, the idea of merz grew to be what could be regarded as Schwitters’ brand: he was a merz-artist who would do merz-art and he even gave merz-lectures. Schwitters named his home and studio in Hanover Merzbau, the merz-building. It was a spatial collage, sculptural construction without a begin-
ning and without an end. He started to work on it around 1923, first making sculptures that gradually became one with the space. The Merzbau was never finished - and that would have been against the idea of it anyway - but the work ended in 1937 when Schwitters fled to Norway to escape the threat of the Nazi Germany. The building was destroyed in bombing in 1943. Three photographs taken by Wilhelm Redemann from the main room of the Merzbau ten years earlier are the only documents left from it.
Collage, in all its forms, is a process of construction with found or existing materials. In collage art the materials are arranged in a way that is often fragmented and deconstructs familiar ideas or patterns: cutting and gluing changes the picture, sampling compiles a new whole out of known tunes and the merzbau deconstructs the idea of home as a stable place. Art historian Dorothea Dietrich specifies collage to be “the result of a process of assemblage that in itself highlights the break with tradition and redefines the artist as a manipulator of prefabricated forms.” Artists like Schwitters employed collage as oppositional language and social critique towards capitalist political system and hierarchical structure of Western culture. Merz-art was Schwitters’ response to the tight demands of the academic art education of the time and to political and social upheavals in Germany and in Europe.

Merz is very avant-gardist in its subserviveness and opposition. It brings into mind Ukeles’ manifesto and the Death Instinct she depicts as “separation; individuality; Avant-Garde par excellence; to follow one’s own path to death—do your own thing; dynamic change.” The words describe merz as well - development for the sake of change and forwardness. Interestingly, merz also reached commercial dimensions in spite of the political and critical aspect. In 1924 Schwitters founded the Merz advertising agency, the Merz-Werbecentrale. Already before that he had combined artistic work successfully with typography and graphic design and launched a magazine called Merz in 1923. The distance between cutting advertisements in order to criticize the publicity and hierarchical structure of Western culture. Merz started as a revolution but became a trademark. What, then, happens to the power of oppositional movements when they turn into fixed categories of being or acting?

(Im)potentiality

In the second essay I argued that it is the nature of the capitalist system to make use of the critique and resistance addressed to it: it absorbs the resistant movements and actions reframing them as tools for development. Liberating acts become part of it and the freedom of the individuals serve as fuel for cumulative and growing development of capitalism. In the liberal discourse of education, students individualize through a process of self-definition that they are directed to. That is articulated as freedom, which is dubious because it suggests freedom of a certain kind, defined externally.

Further, I raised the question of potentiality in education, referring to Dennis Atkinson’s pedagogy against the state pedagogy of becoming. In Atkinson’s approach, sustaining potentiality in education through the recognition of the becoming aims at placing against what he calls normalizing tendency of the states of representa-
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potentiality reaches a form and stops being potential. Atkinson’s pedagogy of becoming aims at culturing potentiality without giving much attention to the aspect of actualization. It is my belief that potentialities do actualize in the activities agents deliver. The problem is not about how to avoid actualization totally but rather how to make sure that potentiality does not become determined and one-directional. This is to say that potentiality is also impotentiality, as Tyson Lewis notes in his article on Giorgio Agamben’s philosophy of potentiality. To be in potential means that one has the capacity to bring knowledge into actuality and to not bring knowledge into actuality. Impotential, then, is “an active capacity for not-doing or not-being.”

Impotentiality does not appear as contrasting to potentiality. To refer to Bergson, impotentiality could be considered as potentiality of a kind. In other words, the two differ in kind rather than in degree (in which case impotentiality would be less of a potentiality). Following this line of thought, there is no such potential that could be filled or reached as “full”. Other potentialities rise from the materialization of one potentiality, whether it materializes in doing or not-doing, being or not-being. Actualizations are not endings or stable. On the contrary, they are openings for other potentialities to reject, go along, (dis)agree or flee - therefore they should not be disregarded in education or in other areas.

Schwitters regarded the Merzbau as his lifework and regretted the destruction of it. The Merzbau was just one of the materializations of the merz, but probably the most important one for Schwitters. The matter was gone but he continued searching for new forms of merz through collage and sound, and created two more environments that resembled the Merzbau, one in Lysaker and one in Elterwater. The previous one burnt down in 1951 and the Elterwater Merzbau remained in a state it was when Schwitters died in 1948. Merz actualized countless times during his life and it still keeps on doing so as long as the knowledge of it is present. This is to say that knowledge and abstractions require the material basis in order to be present: bodies and acts. To sustain the state of being in potential with respect to some knowledge requires maintenance, all the doing something and then doing it again.

As noted earlier in this study, the aspect of development gets a lion part in educational speech. Central to development is the avant-gardist orientation towards the new and need for change. Pascal Gielen offers avant-garde as a tool for challenging the prevailing conditions and effects of what he calls repressive liberalism. His strategy of response is to place against: to dis-measure, to be dis-sensual, to nurture dis-sensus and dis-competence. However, approaches of this kind carry with them some limitations. The key problem is the problem of avant-garde: oppositional movements turning into categories and being assimilated as parts of the system that was criticised.

Adopting dis- as a strategy in education confronts a similar problem, the danger of becoming normalized and losing the power of being against. Nevertheless, this is not to say that there is no use to examine those strategies. To particularise, I find the central problem to be the highlighting of the side of development in education, not the exploration of new practices. If development is the only perspective, it frames the futurity of an individual as predetermined. For the process of individualization it means that there is no difference between the predetermined and liberal, open individualization: both take the direction of development reaching towards unarticulated targets.

I believe that choosing the aspect of maintenance instead of development will open another perspective as regards to the question of how to investigate the area in between the predetermined and open. Central to maintenance is repetition, the doing again. Repetition is strongly attached to the present time and it expresses no necessity to set objectives or strive for a destination. In that sense, maintenance and repetition differ from development and its essential feature, revolution that always turns to the future.
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Conclusions

In the beginning of the present study I headed towards a problem that long remained unnamed and fluid. How I came to the issues examined was through questioning and rethinking of what I had found before. This is a critical approach. The questions were not something I had asked when I started, but which now appear to be ghost-questions: questions that are already there, yet never asked and never answered, remaining as questions. Maurice Blanchot writes:

“How to respond to your questionnaire when the writer is always in search of a question that is not asked of him in advance and which obliges him, whenever he believes he can be content with a question, slowly and patiently to put himself into question, faced with the lost question which is no longer the same and makes him turn aside from himself?”

Questions I first found summed up some of my interests of that time, yet being way too formless to grasp. First it seemed quite clear, there it was this question and I would just choose a method and examine it more carefully, then be content with it, but more I looked into it, more I had to question myself and ask: why do I ask this? Why should this be interesting to me or to anybody else? Do I assume things that actually are not there? Since one does not stop changing and learning, during the last two years or so, the questions have drift away many times and came back as different. I have been faced with a lost question and what seems to follow, is not just bafflement but also further understanding of the problem at hand. A state of that kind has let me to reformation and specification of those questions. After that has happened several times, I can feel confident about my work and ideas evolving despite (or perhaps because of) that state of confusion and indetermination.

This is a beginning of a method. I find Blanchot’s response to a questionnaire on committed literature in the special issue of Le Nouvel Observateur to be depicting aptly what it is to start off with a question and search for ways to respond. How to respond is a question of methodology and the main goal of a study is to respond to a question that is being investigated. How to do that, how to respond means search for a method and thinking of ways to react to that question. Online dictionary offers four definitions for the word “respond”:

---
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To say something in return; to answer; to reply.

To act in return; to exhibit some action or effect in return to a force or stimulus; to do something in response; to accord.

To correspond with; to suit.

To satisfy; to answer.

When it comes to this study, I feel that simply answering a question asked is not the objective and even if it would be, it would not be accomplished since the unempirical and qualitative nature of this examination avoid that sort of fulfilment. Rather, the question, or the potential occurrence of it, has been a stimulus to which I respond. Here, responding means examination through texts and ideas, which follows the emergence and recognition of a question and furthermore, leads to the emergence of another ones. It is not giving an answer and closing the case - response also has the potential of controverting the question itself or finding another issue from it. This study has addressed many questions that might not actualize as answers. But when they do, I believe another question will already be on its way.

The first essay addressed the question of futurity in what I named the liberal discourse of education. Throughout this thesis I have tried to understand the outline of that discourse, yet the definition of it remained quite approximate. I applied Bergson’s division of duration and space to conceptualisation of futurity and discovered that futurity in the (neo)liberal discourse of education is understood in spatial terms. This means that futurity is open only apparently: it proceeds to one direction and is determined by the means of freedom of choice. Furthermore, futurity seems conditional since the horizon of the future forms according to ones choices. As if time was dependent on individuals. In the third essay the way of perceiving time changed along the survey of Elizabeth Grozs’ thoughts: time does not loop itself as it is incapable of returning. Instead, individuals create the repetitive patterns. Therefore future itself does not set any demands but we do, and this realisation is in the core the current thesis.

The second part focused on the paradox of the becoming and being. The element of the unknown connects to this paradox essentially. Becoming is the potentiality that has not yet actualized and it wants to culture the element of the unknown. The unknown also conditions the new and to be in a state of becoming is, in a way, waiting for something to actualize as new. In this essay I stated that becoming that tries to avoid actualization has made becoming itself the priority and consequently, it turns into a category. Further I asked, should actualization then be avoided and what for. Atkinson viewed being as fixed and defined and therefore becoming should be supported in education. Definement refers to objectivity that is questioned for a reason, as reality is commonly understood to be multiple. Donna Haraway offers an interesting viewpoint to objectivity defining it as a multiple vision system. Objectivity is position rationality in the mesh of the overlapping spheres of knowledge and it is needed in order to recognize other materializations outside the familiar spheres of knowledge. The recognition of the equality of all spheres is also an ethical statement: objectivity does not necessarily mean there is a single objectivity. There can be many and some of them are unfamiliar.

Development came to be the key concept of the third essay and significant to the whole study. The aspect of development emphasizes in education and the will of education seems to be to maximise learning and productiveness. What kind of position development has in education would be a topic for further examination, as the material used in this study is too limited for making any conclusions as regards to that question. However, the third part introduced the idea of maintenance as another educational perspective. Maintenance is present in education in many ways already and this study did not examine those ways in detail, which would certainly be fruitful to do later.

Potentiality in maintenance is not as obvious as it might be in development. It is also impotentiality: doing and not-doing. In the final essay I argued that potentiality and impotentiality differ in kind and not in degree. Therefore impotentiality does not mean being outside of potentiality, but potentiality of another kind. Potentiality occurs in the previous essays, as it is connected to development in the liberal discourse of education (essay 1) and Dennis Atkinson (essay 2) wants to sustain potentiality as an act of being against. The final essay brought together what came up earlier but also introduced the dualism of repetition and revolution and questioned development as the only perspective.

In this investigation the aim was to identify the aspect of futurity in education and to examine the paradoxes framed by it. The field of investigation, then, is rather large and there are many areas that this study does not cover or specifically get into. I am aware of the shortness of this study as regards to the broadness of the questions presented. Nevertheless, I believe that questions must be brought up first in order to find more specific areas of examination. One of those areas would be the more detailed analysis on the liberal discourse of education through the specific methods of discourse analysis. My intention in this study has been the recognition of that discourse, but for the future it might be something to go more deep into. Surely, the theories of Bergson would deserve closer examination as well. Especially his method of intuition would be interesting to interpret by applying it to other explorations in artistic or theoretical works. Also I feel that involving more voices of educational theorists and teachers would have brought my conceptualization closer to the practice of education.

For the continuation, probably the most intriguing aspect is of maintenance and the theorization of repetition and revolution. The last essay left me with this dualism that now remains open for extension. The recognition of this dualism serves as critique of development. Development seems to be consisting of revolutions one after another, each revolution becoming the new norm. Revolution signifies potentiality that inevitably actualizes in development. Newness is crucial to development and revolution produces this avant-garde, the new. My intention has not been to view
development as bad or to make any statements about what is good and better or bad and worse. However, I argue that development cannot be the only perspective, not in education, society or in artistic work. It frames the futurity of an individual as predetermined and the question of freedom arises: in what sense are we free? I suggest maintenance and repetition here as alternative approaches and as something to be considered in education and in other areas. Development assumes objectives and maintenance instead, does not. Futurity of maintenance is not linear, as it does not suggest movement towards some determined objective. Therefore futurity suggests nothing to be done because of the future itself, but many things can be done because an agent is in potential: there is the potentiality to and not to.

_Vive la répétition_, for a change.
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