Please cite the Published Version

Democracy & Education

Un/learning to Disagree.

A Response to *Pragmatist Thinking for a Populist Moment: Contingency and Racial Re-valuing in Education Governance*

Edda Sant (The University of Manchester), Marta da Costa (Manchester Metropolitan University)

Abstract

How should education governance respond to increasing polarized perspectives? Drawing on contemporary African American pragmatism, Knight-Abowitz and Sellers's article "Pragmatist Thinking for a Populist Moment: Contingency and Racial Re-valuing in Education Governance" interrogated the critical case of Black Lives Matters and anti-critical race theory protests in the USA education governance and concluded that inquiry and deliberation are needed to embrace more pluralistic forms of democracy. In our response, in which we engage with decolonial, agonistic, and speculative theories, we share Knight-Abowitz and Sellers's analytical framings. Yet we wonder to what extent inquiry and deliberation can push off racial habits and whether we should aim to pluralize the same procedures of educational governmental negotiation beyond the traditional pragmatist framework.

Introduction

SCHOOLS ARE CURRENTLY arenas of political disputes. Questions such as "What is taught?," "How is it taught?," and "Who has the authority to teach it?" are now more than ever raised by a wide spectrum of social actors, from Indigenous activists to religious fundamentalists, in a range of contexts from the US to Hong Kong to Brazil (Chong et al., 2020; Sant, 2021). In contrast to what happens in other politicised spaces, oppositional perspectives in schools coexist over long periods of time (Hess & McAvoy, 2015).

The article "Pragmatist Thinking for a Populist Moment: Contingency and Racial Re-valuing in Education Governance" (2023) examined the impact of polarization and culture wars in schools through the case of Black Lives Matters (BLM) and anti–critical race theory (CRT) protests in the USA education governance. Drawing on two prominent African American pragmatists, Eddie Glaude and Melvin Rogers, the authors, Kathleen Knight-Abowitz and Kathleen M. Sellers, interrogated BLM and anti-CRT movements as two very distinct and competing

EDDA SANT is a senior lecturer at the University of Manchester. Her research focuses primarily on issues related to political, citizenship, and democratic education. Her more recent monograph "Political Education in Times of Populism" was published in 2021 by Springer/Palgrave Macmillan.

MARTA DA COSTA is a lecturer at Manchester Metropolitan University. Her research examines the intersections of global citizenship education (GCE) and education for sustainable development (ESD) within decolonial and anti-racist approaches.

forms of populism. In doing so, the authors relied on thin definitions of populism (e.g., "political practices that polarise society into two distinct groups, the elite and the people, where 'the people' underpin the ultimate source of the general will" [Sant, 2021, p. 47]) and acknowledged right-wing/left-wing, non-pluralist/pluralist versions of the same. According to Knight-Abowitz and Sellers, while there is debate over the issue of whether BLM is or is not a populist movement, we can apply the thin definition to conceptualize BLM as a non-unitary movement, where "the people" or the political community of African Americans, and their allies, "largely appeal to the laws and institutions of the state to correct racial injustice" (Knight-Abowitz & Sellers, 2023, p. 4). BLM constitutes an example of how the cultural dynamics of populism can facilitate what Glaude (2017) defined as a "revolution of value" or a breakthrough in dominant racial habits, perceptions, and narratives. Meanwhile, anti-CRT movements delineate a very different (and anti-pluralist) version of the "American people" where CRT works as an empty signifier (Laclau, 2007), encapsulating all threats to America's unity and cohesion. Mentions of "divisive concepts," the authors rightly discussed, here signal an underlying homogenous "cultural narrative about a true and correct legacy of America as a nation" (Knight-Abowitz & Sellers, 2023, p. 5). Schools and other educational settings become the arena and the focus of action for anti-CRT populists. Knight-Abowitz and Sellers quoted a 2021 statement from Stop Critical Race Theory in Ohio as they claimed that "'all persons should be protected from the divisiveness and harm of CRT's singular focus on race, especially children'" (Knight-Abowitz & Sellers, 2023, p. 5).

The question, then, was "How should schools and wider education governance respond to this context?" Following Glaude (2017), Knight-Abowitz and Sellers (2023) manifested that "political liberalism alone are insufficient to push us off familiar habits of racial masking or those performances that allow us to cover up the ways in which racism shows up in our policies and practices" (p. 4). Instead, relying on the work of Rogers building on that of John Dewey, the authors conceptualized democracy as a contingent, evolving, and plural form of politics. In democracies, "publics must push the state and its public institutions to reinvent democratic norms and policies" (p. 7), and the state and its officers might facilitate deliberation or the balancing of "these expressions of the problem with political judgment—the knowledge expressed by local constituents alongside the (more distant, broader) knowledge of experts (however defined)" (p. 7). In response to populist demands, governing bodies of education, Knight-Abowitz and Sellers argued, need to engage with situated inquiry and deliberative processes to allow democratic evolution. Yet "the irony is that populism is necessary to push social reform related to racism and schooling but also creates conditions where that reform is harder to create and complete, due to the distinct tasks and dispositions required in these two political processes" (p. 8). As such, while deliberative processes within education governance are increasingly difficult, deliberation and inquiry are still required "in order for the problems to be addressed and remedied by institutions" (p. 7). Overall, the argument is that despite increasing

difficulties, inquiry and deliberation within education governance might still contribute towards more pluralistic and inclusive forms of democracy.

While expressing deep affinity with the analytical framing, the emphasis on the role of institutions, and the implicit acknowledgment that schools' reactions to the complexity of their contexts should be situated, we would like to expand the discussion to re/consider whether inquiry and deliberation are the only suitable and/or desirable ways to push us off familiar habits of racial masking. Indeed, to question whether deliberation and inquiry in education do support plurality is not new. For instance, in an article in this journal in 2016, Sibbett scrutinized the work of Hess and McAvoy (2015) to emphasize that deliberative practices might be less inclusive than deliberative scholars suspected. More recently, Gibson (2020) has interrogated whether deliberation is unavoidably rooted in racialized discourses of democracy that neglect existing social and political inequalities. In our response, we focus particularly on the case of education governance in polarized contexts. We conceptualize our work as a double process of un/learning (Santos, 2018). In unlearning, we interrogate our habits, normalities, and taken-for-granted assumptions by contrasting hegemonic discourses with practices in the margins. For that, we engage with a relatively eclectic set of decolonial, agonistic, and speculative theories that, despite their major differences, hold a shared commitment to destabilizing known assumptions (e.g., Amsler, 2015; Fúnez-Flores, 2022). Un/learning, therefore, is a process not only of unlearning but also of learning. We ultimately seek to shed light on new, more ethical, politico-educational possibilities.

We are two white, Southern European (Catalonia/Spain and Portugal) female scholars and educators working in England, grappling with extra/intramural racial hierarchies within Europe (see e.g. Mignolo, 2021). As such, we think of our response as less tailored to the particularities and complexities of American/USA schools and the work on "re-storying the country" (Abowitz & Sellers, 2023, p. 24) from racialized injustices, and more widely focused on interrogating how, in a context of polarization and culture wars, education governance could facilitate more productive and ethical engagement with plurality. We deploy our argument in three parts. Firstly, we engage primarily with the work of Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe to discuss the role of educational governance in enabling but also reproducing hegemonic projects. Secondly, we deploy existing decolonial, speculative, and agonistic theories to interrogate inquiry and deliberation as mediating and hegemonic practices in education governance. Thirdly, we conclude by suggesting two alternatives through which educational governance might further contribute to pluralizing democratic arrangements.

Populism, Hegemony, and Education Governance

In examining the context of BLM and anti-CRT movements, Knight-Abowitz and Sellers (2023) highlighted the work of Laclau (2007) on populism. According to Laclau, any populist movement begins with a demand—a dissatisfaction with the way things currently operate—or a "sense of a lack, leading to a demand for

conditions or policies that are viewed as more just, more fair, more correct than now exist" (Knight-Abowitz & Sellers, 2023, p. 3). When different demands exist and they are directed to the same irresponsive body, these demands can be united through a chain of equivalences "in which the plurality of positions and demands must be knit together to form a stronger populist demand" (Knight-Abowitz & Sellers, 2023, p. 3). As the authors highlighted, this two-steps process aligns with what Boyte defined as the "movement building popular power to break up unjust concentrations of wealth and power" and the "culture-making movement, sustaining and advancing values of community, liberty, and equality" (Boyte, 2007, p. 3). The third aspect in Boyte's framework is civic learning: "wherein citizens are developing skills, imaginations, and identities toward public institutions or problems" (Knight-Abowitz & Sellers, 2023, p. 3). As such, the authors concluded that Boyte's framework "shows the potential of democratic populism to ignite real, cultural, political, and institutional change" (Knight-Abowitz & Sellers, 2023, p. 3).

Laclau and Mouffe are particularly helpful for our analysis. Their work, which also influenced Knight-Abowitz and Sellers's piece, offers one of the thinnest theorizations of populism, which allows us to examine a wide range of political movements (Sant, 2021), including BLM and anti-CRT. Drawing on these authors, we conceptualize Boyte's (2007) triple enactment as a process of hegemonization that underlies not only populism but any political "reality." With the help of rhetorical mechanisms (see, e.g., Laclau, 2014), the initial demand needs to be articulated in such a way that "assumes the representation of an incommensurable totality" (Laclau, 2007, p. 70). In this process, the initial demand splits itself between its literal meaning and something bigger than itself. Such is the case, as the authors rightly discussed, of anti-CRT movements, where CRT came to signify not only an explanatory and responsive theory to structural racism in US society but also "'any topics or lessons dealing with race and racism, gender identity, sexuality and sexism'" (Pendarkar, 2022, cited in Knight-Abowitz & Sellers, 2023, p. 5). To become dominant (hegemonic), rhetorized and narrated demands need to be somehow embraced within existing (or new) institutionalized settings.

We agree with Boyte's (2007) and Knight-Abowitz and Sellers's (2023) implicit claim that any process of hegemonization does require education. Despite Laclau's and Mouffe's neglect of the question of education (see Sant & Tryggvason, 2024), in one of her early texts, Mouffe explained how "time and time again Gramsci [from whom she borrows the term *hegemony*] stresses the fact that every single hegemonic relation is necessarily pedagogic" (1979, p. 193). The "culture-making" movement requires the rhetorical—but also the pedagogical—ability to identify your "own interests and to make compromises and alliances against this backdrop" (Sevignani, 2022, p. 103). More importantly, the civic learning stage is eminently educational. As Knight-Abowitz and Sellers (2023) pointed out, educational settings are institutions where political teaching and learning take place, both through the intended and implicit curricula. As Gutmann (1996), among many other deliberative and nondeliberative scholars, has repeatedly highlighted, education governance represents a way through

which political learning occurs *through* democracy (see, e.g., Sant, 2019). Education governance might ensure that civic skills, identities, and imaginations "are preserved from generation to generation" through "customary patterns of political socialisation and institutionalised patterns of political education," to use Habermas' terms (2022, p. 154). In other words, education institutions might well act as "gatekeepers" and "mediators" regulating the entrance of new (counter-hegemonic) political narratives, as Knight-Abowitz and Sellers suggested, but in their capacity as mediators, they still have the power to preserve/change the hegemonic mediation tools.

Inquiry and Deliberation: Mediation or Hegemony?

The authors explained how educational governance can contribute to the difficult task of building a new hegemony that facilitates racial re-valuing. To perform this task, deliberation and inquiry are highlighted as the more (perhaps only) ethical and suitable ways to facilitate this work. In our wider reading, we wish to interrogate deliberation and inquiry as responses. We ask, to what extent can deliberation and inquiry processes be the most (or the only) productive and ethical ways to engage with or respond to or facilitate plurality? Can deliberation and inquiry push off racial habits, or are they covering up such habits? Are deliberation and inquiry mediating forces suited to navigate and readdress existing disparities or hegemonic forces that implicitly reinforce them?

Postcolonial and decolonial scholarship might be helpful in beginning to think through the ways in which Western liberal epistemology has been used to ensure and sustain white supremacy (e.g., Ferreira da Silva, 2007; Mignolo, 2007). Mignolo (2007, 2011, drawing on the work of Aníbal Quijano)[1] referred to the colonial matrix of power (CMP) to mean a racialized system of social stratification that positioned European epistemology as the "zero point" of knowledge ensuring Western control over knowledge and subjectivities globally. Through the CMP, white Europeans were constructed as rational, and therefore civilized (human), and colonized Black people and people of color were constructed as irrational, uncivilized (non-human) (Said, 2003; Wynter, 2003). Importantly, the CMP works by disavowing the violent processes of its creation (e.g., colonialism, slavery, genocide) while dismissing and making invisible a pluriversality of other options that offer different ways to make sense of the world (epistemicide). Deeply socialized into the CMP, we might struggle to notice what has been actively produced as absent (Santos, 2016) and end up reinscribing its violence.

We wonder, to what extent are deliberation and inquiry intertwined within the racialized system of the CMP? In a recent article on pragmatism and racism in education, Mikulan (2022) explained how American pragmatism is underpinned by a sense of "hope and optimism in a sense of well-being and self-determination, and of progress in the scientific/technological advancements" (p. 532). We find this hope and optimism

---

1   Mignolo borrowed the concept of the CMP from Aníbal Quijano, who drew on the philosopher Santiago Castro Gómez's discussion of "zero point" of knowledge.

underlying Dewey's accounts of democracy, which, as Knight-Abowitz and Sellers (2023) clearly highlighted, is an "evolving, inherently impermanent matrix of conditions, (tentative) agreements, and traditions that are at times being revised and sometimes revoked" (p. 7). We also find it in neopragmastist and European-based accounts such as that of Habermas (2022), who recently specified that "the point of deliberative politics is, after all, that it enables us to improve our beliefs through political disputes and get closer to correct solutions to problems" (p. 152).

Despite Dewey's emphasis on contingency, his philosophy is still interconnected with a demand of "carrying forward" (Mikulan, 2022, p. 533), no matter success or failure. And such demand is not universal; it emerges from and is contingent upon "historic and geologic extractive processes, geopolitical dispossession (non-belonging), and the rendering of black and brown bodies as inhuman (non-being)" (Mikulan, 2022, p. 532). In fact, it is interesting that Knight-Abowitz and Sellers (2023), drawing on Rogers (2009), mention Darwin. The authors described the democratic process through what resembles the broad stages of the scientific method, which aims for an evolving understanding, toward tentative conclusions that are always opened for revision, based on evidence. Wynter (e.g., 2003) has shown how Darwinism offered a logic for linking evolution and hierarchy, which contributed to the racialized construction of humanity (see, also, da Costa, Hanley & Sant, 2024). In this respect, we are not convinced that Darwinist inquiry is the most suited way to uncover "the ways in which racism shows up in our policies and practices" (Knight-Abowitz & Sellers, 2023, p. 4). The problem of progressivist conceptualizations of democracy is that, by positioning political beliefs within an epistemological spectrum from success/correction to failure/incorrection and political disagreements as something to be resolved, they paradoxically challenge the pluralism that democracy is expected to protect and nurture. Progressivist conceptualizations of democracy, particularly when emerging from scientific (i.e., Darwinism) paradigms, carry with them colonial logics.

We also question whether deliberation and inquiry are the only possible mediation forces or whether, in their hegemony, they cover up other forms of negotiating differences. Inquiry-based approaches are "bound to the fallibility of all knowledge" (Kauppi & Drerup, 2021, p. 223), and as such they welcome different modes of inquiry and ultimately different inquiry-based approaches. For instance, in the piece we address, Knight-Abowitz and Sellers's (2023) appeal to engagement with lay knowledge and emotions in education governance suggests a wider and more pluralistic conceptualization of inquiry compared to narrower understandings based on hypothesis testing (for examples, see Kauppi & Drerup, 2021). However, inquiry approaches do implicitly or explicitly rely on Western liberal epistemology, which functions as a mediation tool and tends to fall back into hierarchical divisions perpetuated by the CMP. We can see this happening, to an extent, in Knight-Abowitz and Sellers's (2023) discussion of inquiry in relation to Dewey's shoe wearer/shoemaker metaphor. According to the authors, there are two different forms of knowledge: one "often brings 'pinching' complaints, problems acutely or even painfully experienced by some segment of 'the people'" and the "more distant, broader" knowledge of "elected or appointed governing bodies" which are expected to offer a "remedy" (p. 7). As in Dewey, this represents a division of knowledge where "the people" "feel" a more experiential and subjective knowledge, and the governing bodies "hold" a more abstract and objective knowledge. While Knight-Abowitz and Sellers are rightly cautious to specify that this second "expertise" can be differently defined, we still see here how disagreements are to be readjusted through knowledge systems that operate within and perpetuate hierarchical divisions between people/experts and feeling/knowing and assumptions of separability between subject and object (e.g., Escobar, 2020). It is not knowledge per se that mediates but particular "oppressive and normative regimes of knowledge" (Mikulan, 2022, p. 543).

Similarly, in her critique of Habermasian neopragmatism, Mouffe (2013) has repeatedly shown how deliberation relies on a separation of procedures and substance; inclusive mediation of differences is expected to occur by separating the process through which disagreement is negotiated (i.e., deliberation) from the object of disagreement itself. Deliberation, in this respect, works as a "procedural method of legitimation" (p. 46), where deliberation takes a "meta-democratic status" (p. 57). But deliberation, as the process through which we "weigh facts, ask questions, evaluate data, judge implications, listen to stakeholders and to experts" (Knight-Abowitz & Sellers, 2023, p. 7), is not universal. It is another political vernacular, which is contested and partisan; it privileges the mind, consensual resolution, rhetoric, and language over other ways to negotiate political divisions by way of engaging with alternative practices, discourses and "non-discursive sound(s)" (Honig, 2013, p. 26). There is a much wider range of embodied ways to negotiate differences where "rivals" learn with each other, for instance, dramatizing the experiences and feelings, including those of your political adversaries (e.g., Evans et al., 2021; Rodríguez Moreno, 2021), or participating in games and sports that capitalize on entertainment and adversaries' playfulness (e.g., Chow, 2017). However, if the possibility of educational governance operating through these embodied practices might seem unlikely or even esoteric to many, it is because deliberation and inquiry—likely together with voting—are hegemonic in our imagination about democratic decision-making. They take a "meta-democratic status" (Mouffe, 2013, p. 57) not because they are the only option available but because in their hegemonic status, they dismiss and invisibilize non-rationalistic possibilities. Ultimately, what it is reinscribed is a rationalist-universalist way of knowing-being in the world that, as we have seen, is at the core of the CMP.

Given this analysis, we wonder whether "real, cultural, political, and institutional change" (Knight-Abowitz & Sellers, 2023, p. 3) is possible without interrogating epistemological hegemonies and considering the possibilities of epistemological change. Outside rationalist and progressivist confines, there are other forms of knowledge and relationality, even if these are "absent" (Santos, 2016) from hegemonic institutional practices. If we only welcome the "content" of populist demands but do not accept other forms of knowledge and expression, including those

that might be more "more strident, more emotional" (Knight-Abowitz & Sellers, 2023, p. 8), what prevails is the institutional liberal rule that, as Knight-Abowitz and Sellers reminded us, is "insufficient as a foundation for inclusive democratic governance" (Knight-Abowitz & Sellers, 2023, p. 4). What is more, by continuing to push deliberative and inquiry-based approaches as the only options available for educational governance, we might be reinscribing progressivist and rationalist habits that are both historically and theoretically intertwined with CMP practices and their racialized violence. We might open a space to change the content of our discussions, but this will not change the institutional terms of the conversation that have thus far sustained white supremacy (Mignolo, 2021).

Concluding Remarks

Knight-Abowitz and Sellers (2023) argued that liberalism alone is not enough to challenge institutional racism and its denials because liberalism retains a commitment to facts and evidence provided by officials and liberal institutions, which are currently seen as untrustworthy. They argued, instead, that addressing racism is a question of values that is better addressed by populist politics. The authors noted that populism can work just as effectively for the opposite end and promote white nationalism. As such, the authors argued that populism is also not enough to carry the labor of addressing racism in education governance, because populist expression "always requires scrutiny, as populist demands may or may not yield democratic advances in institutions" (Knight-Abowitz & Sellers, 2023, p. 7). Hence, the authors proposed the current reckoning with race is through the lens of Deweyan pragmatism, which is based on inquiry and deliberation. However, as we have discussed, we understand that inquiry and deliberation are underpinned by progressivist and rationalist ways of thinking and being, that ultimately re/produce liberal epistemological hegemonies. As such, to push deliberative and inquiry approaches as the only options to negotiate competing populism is likely to ultimately reinscribe Western liberalism. The Deweyan response based on inquiry and deliberation makes what seems like a circular move back into a liberalist approach that, we agree with the authors, in itself is unlikely to facilitate and support plurality.

Responding to these concerns, we make a case for opening educational governance to new possible epistemological and relational vernaculars beyond deliberation and inquiry. Education governance bodies can democratically mediate among competing political narratives but also preserve or change the narratives of mediation themselves. We suggest that there is a need for governance institutions to consider whether/how hegemonic forms of regulating difference (i.e., deliberation, inquiry) might facilitate addressing existing inequalities or might involuntarily reinforce the inequalities that they seek to address. To be clear, we are not seeking to disregard deliberation and inquiry as processes of institutional mediation all together but to question their hegemonic status, interrogate their epistemological assumptions, and decenter their role as the only possible alternatives. To this latter end, we suggest two possibilities.

Considering that knowledge and politics are intimately related, whereby knowledge refers both to the content and the terms in which political engagements take place, we follow Mignolo (2011) in making a call for epistemic disobedience as key in efforts to engage with difference otherwise. We wonder what other possibilities are offered by acknowledging the limitations of Euro-western epistemological enunciations, and learning from other ways of knowing? Epistemic disobedience requires that we acknowledge not only the different ways of knowing but also the mechanisms by which a particular epistemological position becomes hegemonic, and that we re-position Western liberalism as one available option among many, rather than the default universal framework. As such, epistemic disobedience asks that we delink from the CMP so that we can re-link with other enunciative positions (Mignolo, 2011, drawing on Aníbal Quijano). Empirical agonistic research in a range of disciplines has documented a range of embodied—non-rationalistic practices—which could potentially transform antagonistic opposition into performative praxis in which struggle is ritualized and potentially transformative (e.g., Athanasiou, 2017; Chow, 2017; Postero & Elinoff, 2019). For instance, in Finland, applied theatre workshops, where participants used embodied storytelling, have been capitalized in local planning governance to make planning decisions (Rannila & Loivaranta, 2015). In Chile, researchers have created documents made of seeds (book-seeds) to bring together different ways to understand interactions with natural surroundings (Gómez-Venegas & Álvarez Dumont, 2017). More directly connected to education, in Colombia, there are examples of schools negotiating differences by creating "memory galleries" where different views on the Colombian conflict were creatively displayed (Caballero Dávila, 2017).

These examples illustrate practices from the "margins" that disobey the assumption that only one form of knowledge is possible and acceptable. To learn from the margins or borders is to "take seriously as producers of knowledge those marginalized individuals, communities, and traditions" (Dunford, 2017, p. 388). Concepts from the borders can be helpful in interrupting the universalizing epistemology of Western liberalism at the individual, community, and institutional levels, and can be put into dialogue with Western practices to challenge deeply rooted assumptions and open possibilities for other ways to engage politically (Escobar, 2020). There is a real possibility that, by changing mediation narratives outside the default framework, new opportunities of interaction and relationality emerge even beyond polarization lines. Could the mediation through a memory gallery or through sports and games facilitate political adversaries working together and learning from each other? Could embodied storytelling and book-seeds facilitate different ways of knowing each other (e.g., as a daughter and sister, as a conservationist) that would ultimately allow a "new location from which to articulate our sense of the world" (hooks, 1989, p. 23)?

Alternatively (or simultaneously), we could consider, as Mikulan (2022) did, whether speculative engagements with pragmatism might be helpful in thinking of alternatives for educational governance. In their account "The Insistence of

Possibles: Towards a Speculative Pragmatism," Debaise and Stengers (2017) argued that pragmatist thinking should begin by excluding nothing, or "factor in the multiplicity of the dimensions, which make up an experience here and now, not taking anything away for a priori reasons, whatever disqualifications might apply to it" (p. 15). Yet pragmatism should also consider what makes any experience important or responsible in the sense of the consequences of actions and ideas for those who may be impacted by it (see also, Mikulan, 2022). In that respect, we might wonder what forms of knowledge, relationality, and expression are already present when populist demands impact on educational governance and what would be the consequences of including/excluding these already existing ways of being-knowing from such mechanisms of governance. Perhaps Boyte's (2007) suggestion that democratic populism might ignite real institutional change can also apply to the same procedures of governmental negotiation.

Indeed, as initially mentioned, we feel we are not too far from Knight-Abowitz and Sellers's (2023) analytical framing and purpose, which, overall, we share. If, as Dewey himself did, Knight-Abowitz and Sellers advocated for a democracy that is "inherently emergent, evolving, and plural" (p. 6), we just wish to make a case for expanding our imagination of what an emergent, evolving, and plural democracy could look like. Educational institutions have a unique opportunity and, we would suggest, a responsibility to facilitate the development of skills, imaginations, and identities that might benefit more pluralistic democracies. But for that to be possible, educational institutions themselves might need to be open to the possibility of epistemic change. Only if we are willing to un/learn our own educational and institutional hegemonic habits might we be able to embrace "real, cultural, political, and institutional change" (p. 3), in all their "unknown possibilities" (p. 9).

References

Amsler, S. S. (2015). *The education of radical democracy.* Routledge.

Athanasiou, A. (2017). *Agonistic mourning: Political dissidence and the women in black.* Edinburgh University Press.

Boyte, H. C. (2007, March 29). Populism and John Dewey: Convergences and contradictions [Paper presentation]. University of Michigan Dewey Lecture, Ann Arbor, MI, United States. https://www.academia.edu/33793410/Populism_and_John_Dewey_Convergences_and_Contradictions

Caballero Dávila, L. F. (2017). Hacia una pedagogía de la memoria, el desacuerdo y el acontecimiento: El caso de la galería de la memoria "somos protagonistas de la historia" del Colegio IED Tibabuyes Universal [Working in a pedagogy of memory, disagreement, and event: the case of the gallery of memory "we are the main characters of our (hi)story." *Cambios y Permanencias, 8*(2), 1109–1124.

Chong, E. K., Sant, E., & Davies, I. (2020). Civic education guidelines in Hong Kong 1985–2012: Striving for normative stability in turbulent social and political contexts. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 48*(2), 285–306.

Chow, B. D. (2017). Parterre: Olympic wrestling, national identities, and the theatre of agonism. In T. Fisher & E. Katsouraki (Eds.), *Performing antagonism: Theatre, performance & radical democracy* (pp. 61–79). Palgrave MacMillan.

Da Costa, M., Hanley, C. & Sant, E. (2024, September). GCE in Teacher Education: taking up the huMan in the Humanities in England. Presentation at the British Educational Research Association Conference. Manchester, United Kingdom.

Debaise, D., & Stengers, I. (2017). The insistence of possibles: Towards a speculative pragmatism. *PARSE, 7,* 13–19.

Dunford, R. (2017). Toward a decolonial global ethics. *Journal of Global Ethics, 13*(3), 380–397.

Escobar, A. (2020) *Pluriversal politics: The real and the possible.* Duke University Press.

Evans, S., Pacievitch, C., Donadel, M., & Sant, E. (2021). Voices: Drama and the development of speaking and acting in public spaces. In N. McGuinn, N. Ikeno, I. Davies, & E. Sant (Eds.), *International perspectives on drama and citizenship education* (pp. 141–150). Routledge.

Ferreira da Silva, D. (2007). *Toward a global idea of race.* University of Minnesota Press.

Fúnez-Flores, J. I. (2022). Decolonial and ontological challenges in social and anthropological theory. *Theory, Culture & Society, 39*(6), 21–41.

Gibson, M. (2020). From deliberation to counter-narration: Toward a critical pedagogy for democratic citizenship. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 48*(3), 431–454.

Glaude, E., Jr. (2017). Democracy in Black: How race still enslaves the American soul. Penguin Random House.

Gómez-Venegas, D., & Álvarez Dumont, A. (2017). Naturaleza ex-novo: Aparatos agonistas para el rediseño de la naturaleza y sus márgenes en Chile [Nature ex-novo: Agonistic apparatuses to redesign nature and its boundaries in Chile]. *Kepes, 14*(16), 269–293.

Gutmann, A. (1996). *Democratic education.* Princeton University Press.

Habermas, J. (2022). Reflections and hypotheses on a further structural transformation of the political public sphere. *Theory, Culture & Society, 39*(4), 145–171.

Hess, D. E., & McAvoy, P. (2015). *The political classroom: Evidence and ethics in democratic education.* Routledge.

Honig, B. (2013). *Antigone, interrupted.* Cambridge University Press.

hooks, b. (1989). Choosing the margin as a space of radical openness. *Framework: The Journal of Cinema and Media, 36,* 15–23.

Kauppi, V. M., & Drerup, J. (2021). Discussion and inquiry: A Deweyan perspective on teaching controversial issues. *Theory and Research in Education, 19*(3), 213–234.

Laclau, E. (2007). *On populist reason.* Verso.

Laclau, E. (2014). *The rhetorical foundations of society.* Verso.

Knight-Abowitz, K., Sellers, K. M. (2023). Pragmatist thinking for a populist moment: Democratic contingency and racial re-valuing in education governance. *Democracy & Education, 31*(1), Article 3. https://democracyeducationjournal.org/home/vol31/iss1/3

Mikulan, P. (2022). An ethics of refusal: The insistence of possibles as a speculative pragmatic challenge to systemic racism in education. *Educational Theory, 72*(4), 529–548.

Mignolo, W. (2007). Introduction: Coloniality of power and de-colonial thinking. *Cultural Studies, 21*(2–3), 155–167.

Mignolo, W. (2011). *The dark side of Western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options.* Duke University Press.

Mignolo, W. (2021). *The politics of decolonial investigations.* Duke University Press.

Mouffe, C. (1979). Hegemony and ideology in Gramsci. In C. Mouffe (Ed). *Gramsci and Marxist theory* (pp. 168–204). Routledge.

Mouffe, C. (2013). *Agonistics: Thinking the world politically.* Verso Books.

Postero, N., & Elinoff, E. (2019). Introduction: A return to politics. *Anthropological Theory, 19*(1), 3–28.

Rannila, P., & Loivaranta, T. (2015). Planning as dramaturgy: Agonistic approaches to spatial enactment. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 39*(4), 788–806.

Rodríguez Moreno, L. M. (2021). Colombia—Making other people's memories your own: Theatre practices and citizenship. In In N. McGuinn, N. Ikeno, I. Davies, & E. Sant (Eds.), *International perspectives on drama and citizenship education* (pp. 59–68). Routledge.

Said, E. W. (2003). *Orientalism.* Penguin Books.

Sant, E. (2019). Democratic education: a theoretical review (2006–2017). *Review of Educational Research, 89*(5), pp. 655–696.

Sant, E. (2021). *Political Education in times of Populism: Towards a Radical Democratic Education.* Cham: Springer/Palgrave.

Sant, E. & Tryggvason, A. (2024) Thinking hegemony educationally. An educational supplement to Chantal Mouffe's theory of agonism. *Distinktion, Journal of Social Theory,* https://doi.org/10.1080/1600910X.2024.2365758

Santos, B. (2014) *Epistemologies of the South: Justice Against Epistemicide.* London: Routledge.

Santos, B. S. (2018). *The end of the cognitive empire: The coming of age of epistemologies of the South.* Duke University Press.

Sevignani, S. (2022). Digital transformations and the ideological formation of the public sphere: Hegemonic, populist, or popular communication? *Theory, Culture & Society, 39*(4), 91–109.

Sibbett, L. A. (2016). Toward a transformative criticality for democratic citizenship education. *Democracy & Education, 24*(2), 1. https://democracyeducationjournal.org/home/vol24/iss2/1

Wynter, S. (2003). Unsettling the coloniality of being/power/truth/freedom: Towards the human, after man, its overrepresentation—An argument. *CR: The New Centennial Review, 3*(3), 257–337.