

Solvejg Jobst

The Principle of Hope: Bloch's contribution to the praxiological understanding of education

Kurzfassung: Der Beitrag diskutiert Potenziale von Blochs Theorie zur wissenschaftlichen Neuformulierung von Bildung. Die Notwendigkeit eines neuen Bildungsbegriffs resultiert aus der ökonomisch-neoliberalen Vereinnahmung von Bildung sowie aus den Herausforderungen einer „liquiden Gesellschaft“, die kein Ziel mehr kennt. Es braucht heute einen Bildungsbegriff, der praxisorientiert ist und der menschlichen und gesellschaftlichen Entwicklung optimistisch begegnet – insbesondere Bildung als Prozess der gesellschaftlichen Veränderung substanziiert. Blochs Theorie bietet hierzu fruchtbare Anknüpfungspunkte. Seine Hoffungsphilosophie wird im folgenden Beitrag mit einem praxeologischen Verständnis von Bildung verknüpft. Es wird die These vertreten, dass das praxeologische Bildungsverständnis und das Prinzip Hoffnung wechselseitig aufeinander verwiesen sind. Dabei stützt das Prinzip Hoffnung, mit seinen Elementen „antizipierendes Bewusstsein“, „Noch-Nicht-Seiendes“, Heimat und Entfremdung radikal das gesellschaftsverändernde Potential von Bildung.

Abstract: The ongoing capitalization of education provokes an alternative way of thinking about education – one that draws attention to social practice and recognizes its autonomy and complexity. Bloch's theory has great potential for formulating such a new, alternative educational concept. It contributes to a pluripotent, praxiological, and optimistic way of thinking about education. The thesis will be propounded that the praxiological educational concept and the Principle of Hope are mutually referential, whereby the Principle of Hope makes clear the potential of education to change society and thus underlines the political character of the praxiological educational concept. The following article first presents the essential characteristics of a basic praxiological understanding of education. These are then linked with Bloch's Principle of Hope that with its element of "anticipatory consciousness", "not-yet being", "Heimat" and "alienation" radically supports the society-changing potential of education.

1. Indeterminate nature of education and its capitalization

The central characteristics of education are its process-like nature, its openness and indeterminacy.¹ Although these transformative properties have always determined the concept of education (cf. Wilhelm von Humboldt) and have been emphasized by educational theory as the essence of education to this day (cf. Marotzki, 1990: 41ff.; Koller, 2011, 2017: 170; Nohl, 2006: 1), they are often considered problematic in the sphere of politics and large parts of pedagogy. Implicitly or explicitly, an "educational problem" is constructed, in reaction to which there is a corresponding didactic, curriculum or educational standard. The goal is to channel the openness of education and to equate education with an educational outcome or with educational content. In interaction with an economic-neo-liberal educational policy, this constructed "educational problem" and its processing through standardization leads to a previously unknown capitalization of education. After several nation states such as Australia, Britain and the United States in the 1980s based educational reform on the "business principle of efficiency" in order to improve their competitiveness (Welch, 1998), neo-liberal educational policy became global with the end of The Cold War. International educational stakeholders such as the European Union, (the European Commission 2007) or the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD, 1989) urge nation states to focus on directing their educational policy towards the achievement of an efficiently and effectively "produced" result (usually described as human capital) (Jobst, 2013). Thus education is booming as "*an important subsector of the economy*" (McLaren, 1999:13), which is described critically in the literature as a "right turn" with the technology of "accountability, measurement and management" (Apple, 2001, 2000: 230), as a "cult of efficiency" (Welch, 1998), as "conservative modernization" (Dale, 1989), "conservative Revolution" (Bourdieu, 1996b) or as a "New Performance Culture" (Radtke, 2003). All of these reforms reduce human existence and thus education to the accumulation of human capital and thus negate the diversity of social practice related to experience and a life environment. Herbert Marcuse (1932) puts it succinctly: With the capitalization of education, capitalism as the "ultimate crisis of human nature" reaches a new climax.

In view of the numerous risks, crises and uncertainties humanity faces, the practical possibility of capitalizing education and the associated planning optimism must be questioned fundamentally. A "liquid society" or "liquid integration" may be assumed (Skrobanek & Jobst, 2019). This means, that the integration of the individual into society can no longer be based on reliable targets, but "integration is an open and more or less unpredictable and

¹ This view comes mainly from the German discourse on *Bildung*. However, the term education is used in the text. This is because, global educational policy relativizes the country-specific differences in meaning, and a common term is needed. This term can neither be reduced to the subject-centered German discussion on *Bildung* nor to the social-functional direction of the term education. As stated later, in the praxeological concept of education, both go together.

contingent process that produces and depends on change" (Skrobanek & Jobst, 2019: 308). In this context, capitalization and the associated conditions and possibilities of education appear highly contradictory. On the one hand, it can be assumed that the advancing capitalization of existence and the associated standardization of education provide the best framework for a "*Halbbildung*" ("half-education") (Adorno, 1959: 95) – that is, for a "flattened, rigid education that is aligned to the moment of adjustment on one side" (Adorno, 1959: 95). "Rigidity and the urge to classify things and people mechanically, removed from their vitality" are promoted (Adorno, 1959: 93). On the other hand, with regard to "liquid integration", it is becoming more and more difficult to formulate clear targets and guidelines for an adjustment. In this context, traditional educational institutions such as schools have long been in clear competition with other knowledge producers, such as the media (cf. Postman 1994; du Bois-Reymond 2001: 293) or the diverse spaces of experience of the digital world and are thus losing their authority as the central body for imparting knowledge to integrate the younger generation into society. Overall, it may be observed that capitalization, as the optimal social condition for "*Halbbildung*", is increasingly coming into conflict with a complex and fluid reality.

In addition, scepticism about the actual possibility of capitalizing education is enhanced by the fact that the functionality of the capitalist mode of production, as well as political control itself are subject to debate: "The rest of society is concerned with economic questions, because the failure of the economy (lack of jobs and credit with their associated consequences) must be borne in all other functional systems" (Radtke, 2009: 266). However, political planning optimism is also criticized. Generally, it is emphasized that the targeted political control action must be distinguished from its effects, as the "control object" exists independently of political decisions (Mayntz, 2009). In this context, Mayntz refers to the problem-solving and power bias of political action (Mayntz, 2009: 31ff.) – namely that politics, by definition, serves to solve social problems for the good of all and thus obscures social power conflicts and the background to problem-solving diagnoses.

The contradictions associated with the capitalization of education provoke an alternative way of thinking about education – one that draws attention to social practice and recognizes its autonomy and complexity. Such a focus opens up a view of educational alternatives that differ radically from neo-liberal educational policy with its "practical, instrumental, usefulness" and "planning optimism". The following considerations, arising from Bloch's theory, contribute to a pluripotent, praxiological and optimistic manner of thinking about education. Firstly, the essential characteristics of a basic praxiological understanding of education are summarized. These are then linked to Bloch's theory, with the discussion focusing on the Principle of Hope.

2. Principle of Hope as the basis of an optimistic and political concept of education

2.1 Praxiological understanding of education

The following considerations are based on the fact that a modern concept of education is to be thought of in praxiological terms (Jobst, 2014). Education is a social practice and is therefore to be researched as practice theory. The actual epistemological interest of practice theory is to protect "practice as practice" (Bourdieu, 1976: 43), where the essence of practice is described using three basic elements. It is materially anchored, connected to a pre-reflective, collectively-shared and incorporated logic. Practice also has a reproductive, as well as a generating effect (Reckwitz, 2003, 2004; Schäfer, 2017). In relation to education, these can be made specific as follows:

Educational processes are anchored in the material, i.e. to be considered in relation to the concrete existence of non-human things (either in nature or artefacts such as computers, books, school buildings or items of clothing) as well as the human body. This materiality has its own momentum. Thus, the human body is not a mere executive organ of subjective will, cognition or social norms, for example. On the contrary, it is, as with all things, also constituted by social practice through its determined existence (Reckwitz, 2003: 290). In terms of educational theory, one can formulate that materiality has an inherently authoritative, autonomous educational potential: "Only a perspective that abstracts from the subject and its intentions is in a position to take sources of action, other than the human, into account, and thus to investigate the action-constitutive dimension of the material" (Schäfer, 2017: 12). In this sense, the material anchoring of education refers not only to the contextualization of the educational process, but also to the way it relativizes and decentralizes the subject in the educational process. Thus the momentum of the material world implies that we cannot know what it allows us to be. In this sense, Rousseau already spoke of the formative power of nature (Rousseau, 1992), Lewin of the "stimulating nature of things" (Lewin, 1935 in Leontjew, 1982: 89) and Bloch – who will be discussed in detail later, of the "not-yet-conscious" and the "not-yet-become".

Furthermore, every educational process is based on a shared pre-reflective knowledge that can be mobilized. This precedes rational thinking, social norms or an assumed intersubjectivity. In terms of practical theory, it is this practical knowledge that makes the body capable of acting, that "makes it an actor" (Reckwitz, 2004: 44). With regard to educational theory, this puts into perspective the importance of reflection as a driver of education. The educational process is not based solely on reflective processes. Furthermore, the reflective part in the educational process is related to the material, as well as the pre-reflective world. Theoretically, this has so far been most

thoroughly expressed in the habitus concept (Friebertshäuser, Rieger-Ladich & Wigger, 2006; Wacquant, 2004; Kraus & Gebauer, 2002; Jobst, 2010a: 68ff.; Rieger-Ladich, 2005). This suggests that social practices are based on habits acquired unconsciously in the socialization process, which also shape and create future practice, including educational practice (Bourdieu, 1996a: 281). So the question of which part of the material world affects the educational process is answered by the habitus concept as follows. Educational processes occur in the context of a subjective practical sense that has the material world as its subject, in which objective materialism and collective practical sense can be linked through the habitus (Jobst, 2014: 268).

Education remains a social practice. In it and through it there are objective social forces at play, which assume a material, as well as a pre-conscious form. On the one hand, in critical educational research, education is described as a medium for perpetuating social power, rule, dominance, social inequality or discrimination against minorities (Apple, 1999; Bourdieu, 2001; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Giroux & Freire, 1987). On the other hand, the praxiological view highlights the generating side of education. Educational practice also implies 'doing-ness'-*engergeia*' a "systematic, socially meaningful manner of getting things done, *and* actually doing them" (Green, Reid & Brennan, 2017: 49). This makes it clear that although education today takes place mostly in social institutions, it should not be limited to these institutions. It can therefore be assumed that "hereafter educational processes will take place beyond politically-determined institutionalized education," which cannot be interpreted in terms of structural determinism. Neither in the sense that the political announcements nor the hidden ideological function of institutionalized education ... are actually realized. Rather, educational practice is characterized by a high degree of dynamism and openness (Jobst, 2013: 6). The dynamism and openness stem from the fact that education can be seen as a field in which there is a struggle among the recognition, continuation or redefinition of symbolic meaning and capital.

2.2 Principle of Hope in educational practice

The praxiological understanding of education shifts the theorem of theoretical-abstract objectivized educational content, as well as the theorem of the self-educated subject towards the theorem of "education as practice". This praxiological concept of education is a political one. It leads to arguments in the field that show the impossibility of politically-established, goal-oriented education. The implicit claim of (neo)liberal politics that education can become instrumental as a means of achieving goals – for example to achieve economic advantage in international competition – is questioned by the praxiological concept of education. Rather, it can be assumed that if education, the "educational what and the educational how", is determined by politics but also by science and other social authorities ("scholastic reason": Bourdieu, 1993: 148), this is not the same as education, but rather an expression of an ideological dimension of a certain educational practice (Jobst, 2014). This does not mean that education is apolitical, but rather that the political potential of education is inherent in its material and pre-reflexive, logic-anchored openness – in the process-like quality of "not-yet-become", but with a tendency to exist. The philosophy of Ernst Bloch will be drawn upon in the following to clarify further the political nature of the praxiological educational concept. This will not be addressed in its totality, rather the focus will be on the "Principle of Hope". The thesis will be propounded that the praxiological educational concept and the Principle of Hope are mutually referential, whereby the Principle of Hope makes clear the potential of education to change society.

It will be shown that the momentum of the material and pre-conscious world that is active in the educational process does not permit us to refer to the "one correct" education. Increasingly, it appears meaningful to clarify the possibilities of different educational practices and explain their significance in the worlds of life. In the following, a distinction is made between two ideally typical forms of educational practice, each of which is related in a specific way to the Principle of Hope.

In the praxiological sense, a kind of "resistant education" can be assumed. This characterizes a persistent practice, which has its sources in the hysteresis effect of the habitus (Jobst, 2014: 268). This is characterized by self-reliance and the habitual effort of rejecting social pressure to assimilate. As has been illustrated by looking at working class youth counterculture (Willis, 1981, 2004) or disadvantaged migrant groups (Skrobanek & Jobst, 2010), such a resistant practice has always been part of education. Willis, in particular, has shown that disadvantaged youth – in this case, male working class children – produce a resistance culture against the dominant school culture. They generate a common oppositional culture, which corresponds to the culture from which they come. It is indeed the case that this active resistance enables young people in an inferior position to preserve their identity. The paradox, however, is that it is precisely the produced cultural form of resistance to school that contributes to the continued existence of "material production according to the capitalist mode" (Willis, 1981: 247). It doesn't lead to structural change in society.²

² In the transformative educational debate, education avoidance is spoken of if there is no transformation of the habitus (cf. Geimer, 2012). The possibility of a "resistant educational practice" is critical of this thesis. The reference to a possible difference between an explicitly-articulated and a habitually-anchored self image and world view or between wanting and acting is

This resistance practice is reminiscent of Castells' (Castells, 1997) identity theoretical analysis of the current network society, based on the global coordination of capital. He argues that in such a society the search for sense manifests itself in resistance identity. This is commonly constructed by actors who are being stigmatized by a dominant group. The "identity for resistance" is an expression of "exclusion of the excluders by the excluded" and ensures that those who are stigmatized by the dominant group survive on the basis of principles that are different or not recognized by the dominant group (Castells, 1997: 6). Future society demands, however, the construction of a project identity (Castells, 1997: 6; Jobst, 2010b: 23), and on the basis "of social worth orientation and institutional goals, that are attractive to the majority of citizens, without anyone being excluded in principle. What are the elements which actually occur in the discourse and practice of societal actors who oppose globalization and disenfranchisement, without falling back on communalism? Freedom, equality, fraternity; protection of the welfare state and social solidarity, stable business relationships and the rights of all workers, concern for universal human rights and the plight of the fourth world; renewed emphasis on democracy and its extension to citizen participation at local and regional levels, the vitality of historically/territorially-rooted cultures, which often are expressed in language and which do not succumb to the culture of real virtuality." (Castells, 2003: 383)

Project identity is not just a central source of meaning for the collective and subjective self and for one's place in the world, but also includes a purposeful transformation of society. Interesting in terms of educational theory is therefore the question of under which conditions such a project identity becomes a source of meaning for people? Under which conditions is an educational practice conceivable that includes self and structural transformation (Jobst, 2014: 268) and which contributes to a fundamental change of social mechanisms? The Principle of Hope helps to answer this question more fully. In the following, it is argued that an educational practice characterized by persistence has the potential to change society, if the Principle of Hope comes into play in it.

Adorno already saw education "as a stubborn objection to the consolidation of the categories with which the subjects seek to comprehend their relationship with the world and with themselves, as keeping these views open to what is new, different, and contradicts previous thinking" (Adorno in Koller, 1999: 145). There are aspects of the transgressive in Adorno's reference to the "new, other, that which contradicts previous thinking," that is, an educational practice is formulated that overrides existing practice. Going beyond Adorno, this means not just the anticipation of the new, a different spirit of the future, but also implies structural change within the framework of conscious material activity. This thought of the interplay between anticipatory consciousness and material change in the context of educational practice should now be substantiated in the light of the Principle of Hope.

We begin with anticipatory consciousness. This constitutes a central component of the hope principle, whereby Bloch also speaks of the "not-yet-conscious". He identifies it with the opposite side of the unconscious, and the other side of what, according to Freud, has fallen out of consciousness and "as such, only occupies the moonlight landscape of cerebral loss" (Bloch 2011: 8:36). The pre-conscious that he refers to is "not something that has been repressed, but something that emerges, that was not yet conscious at all. But which is now dawning, not dusking." (Bloch 2011, 9:30–9:38).

As explained above, the pre-conscious is also central to setting educational practice. However, this differs from Bloch's "not-yet-conscious". The pre-conscious in the praxiological education concept means a shared, implicit knowledge that guides action and that precedes reflective thinking, for example. In terms of educational theory, this is expressed in the habitus concept. The habitus, on which our actions are based, is acquired through the process of socialization and is internalized history. It is also the basis for future practice. The Habitus is "structured structure" (opus operatum) and "structuring structure" (modus operandi) (Bourdieu, 1996a: 279ff.). In this sense, the habitual pre-reflective in the praxiological concept of education does not quite coincide with Bloch's understanding of the "pre-conscious". The key difference is that Bloch relates the "not-yet-conscious" only to the "not-yet-existing", while in the pre-consciousness of the habitus, both are present – that which has been, as well as the "not-yet-existing", the past and the anticipated. The conflict clarifies a blind spot in the habitus concept. This consists in the fact that the value of the pre-conscious is super-imposed, that is, that the pre-conscious is always drawn from what has been. This is indicative of resistant educational practice. However, a different educational practice is conceivable, namely one based exactly on the intrinsic value of the "not-yet-conscious" in contrast to what has been experienced. At this point, the Principle of Hope is relevant in the achievement of a better understanding. Where does its relevance lie?

The answer is in the following. The thought of the "not-yet-conscious" refers to the possibility of autonomous reflection within the concept of education that goes beyond what has been experienced without being thought of subjectively. Five steps are explained:

relevant in terms of educational theory and pedagogy. However, the persistence of the habitus should not be interpreted as an avoidance of education. Rather, the apparent difference between thinking and actual action is itself an expression of a resistant educational practice.

First of all, it should be noted that with the "not-yet-conscious" Bloch focuses on the "not-yet-experienced" that has its place in daydreams. Daydreams accompany the lives of all people. They offer a flight from everyday problems, and they could also offer a rebellion against the everyday. The (educational) challenge "consists of getting to know daydreams better, and through this, focusing unerringly and helpfully, on the right" (Bloch, 2011: 2:58), and Bloch goes on to say: "If you would like daydreams to be fuller. That means, that they are enriched by taking a sober look at them. Not in the sense of incipient decay, but in terms of getting brighter, not in the sense of pure contemplative mind, which takes things as they are and as they stand, but the participant, who takes things as they go, and they could go better. If you would like the daydreams to be really fuller, that is brighter, less arbitrary, better known, more understood and to be mediated with the course of things. So that the wheat, that is trying to ripen, may be encouraged and harvested." (Bloch, 2011: 2:59–3:49)

Bloch's quote shows that daydreams can be rationalized. The as yet undecided picture of another world and the new person, the "not-yet-being", which can be anticipated, made clearer and better understood, and one can have the feeling of finding oneself in this again. This anticipation and identification process is based on the Principle of Hope. That part of the daydream, which "cannot come to terms with lack of existence and cannot be renounced ... has hope at its core" (Bloch, 2011: 2:34–2:37). Hope is for Bloch no diffuse longing, rather it is a principle. That is, hope is fundamental, anthropological, it is the final reason on which all being rests and the source of everything that exists. "The starting point of hope is life itself, our life force, the urge to be" (Kuhfeld, 2017: 26:00–27:00). Hope means then a movement towards the accessible "something that can be rationally corrected" (Müller-Scholl & Vidal, 2016: 12). The striving and the feeling of longing arise from the non-reflexive, unconsciousness, letting go. This can develop into a directed, targeted longing and from which to turn to the world, with the expectation and consciousness of the future (cf. Kuhfeld, 2017: 30:00–31:00). Including the possibility of an anticipatory consciousness in and through education also means that the Principle of Hope can counter the "anti-rationalistic and anti-intellectual thrust of the praxiological basic vocabulary" (Reckwitz, 2004: 40) without giving up the efforts of the praxiological educational understanding inherent in materializing and de-subjectivizing the concept of education.

Thirdly, hope is interwoven with life. The concept of a better world, a world which does not yet exist, does not require acceptance of what does exist to want and to know. Rather, it requires "people, who actively immerse themselves, in that to which they belong, do not tolerate a dog's life, into which they feel thrown passively" (Bloch, 2011: 137). Hope then becomes reality – formed and materialized in the "doing-ness – *energeia*" (Green et al., 2017: 49) of a certain educational practice. This also means that hope "can, must be disappointed" and that "hoping is to learn" (Bloch, 2011: 0:59). Relating this to education, is to say that the Principle of Hope is realized in and through a practice, in which active, resistant and anticipatory practices allow one to belong to oneself, to find oneself in what one has never experienced before. The aim of such an educational practice lies in the process of abolishing strangeness, of the human being with himself and the world. Bloch speaks of the "darkness of the lived moment" – "the experience of a lived non-identity of the person with himself, which is not overcome even when the world is depicted as 'objective' to him from a distance" (Müller-Scholl & Vidal, 2016: 19). Education is not reduced to (critical) reflection, but means the active alteration of the material and the social, pre-reflexive-collective world on the basis of an anticipatory consciousness.

Fourthly, part of the abolition of alienation is structural change. He who hopes not only interprets and constructs, but acts (Müller-Scholl & Vidal, 2016: 19). Hope is the central force in shaping the society of the future. This connects the subjective not-yet-conscious with the objective not-yet-become, the utopia already behind it (Bloch, 1980: 300; Pelletier, 2016: 65). In the praxiological sense, the "not-yet-become" appears to depend on the material and pre-reflexive habitual world. In this context, Bloch's idea that hope can and must be disappointed becomes understandable. It is a disappointment when it materializes. As shown above, the material world has its own momentum. In this the tendency of social development and the possibility of being human are established. However, it does not allow us to know what it allows us to be. In the Principle of Hope now lies the key to a targeted design of the future, while at the same time recognizing the momentum of the material world.

This vision of the future is given concrete form in dialectical materialism. The objective "not-yet-become" is materialized as a revolutionary transformation of the capitalist means of production: "That daydreams can be 'provocative, is not content just to accept the bad which exists, does not accept renunciation' and it 'has hoping at its core, and is teachable'. It is this hope that the relations of production that have brought them into this state of being can be altered, that the world of misery and exploitation can change, and this process of change does not stop anywhere, as many 'leftists' in past believed, but goes on as a continuous process" (Kumar, 2017: 20). Following Marx, Bloch assumes that the real history of mankind has not yet established itself: "The real genesis is not at the beginning, but at the end, and it only begins when society and existence become radical, that is, are taking root. The root of history, however, is the working, creating man who transforms circumstances and takes charge of the situation. Once he has realized himself and established himself in a real democracy without, something arises in the world that is known to everyone in childhood and where nobody has been: *Heimat!*" (Bloch, 1985: 1628).

The previous considerations are not only relevant in terms of educational theory; in view of the current capitalization of education, they are also highly topical in terms of socio-political issues. Although Bloch sees the Principle of Hope as anthropologically founded, he assumes, however, that it is closely linked to the liberation of humans from an intolerable state. But what does this look like in today's society?³

It can be assumed that in contemporary society, whose form of social integration can be regarded as "liquid" (Skrobanek & Jobst, 2019), the Principle of Hope in general, and as the basis of education, becomes of central importance. Bloch's questions and observations in the preface to the Principle of Hope are: "Who are we? Where do we come from? Where are we going? What do we expect? What can we expect? Many just feel confused. The ground is shaky, they don't know why and from what. "This state of theirs is anxiety; if it becomes stronger, then it is fear," (Bloch, 2011: 00:00–00:30), and it is extremely important for contemporary society. Due to global crises such as the climate crisis or pandemics, the constant change in institutional conditions (e.g. in the context of migration), the dwindling of authorities (such as educational institutions) and the disintegration of the normal life-course, the human condition of existence is characterized by uncertainty and the resulting fear. In order to overcome this condition of existence, it is "important to learn to hope. Its work does not renounce, it loves success instead of failure. Hope, lying above fear, is neither passive, like this ... Hope comes out of itself, makes people expand their minds instead of narrowing them" (Bloch, 2011: 0:59–1:27; Bloch, 2011: 0:59–1:20).

Fear does not work in crises, only hope is a central force in shaping the future. In educational practice, it is important to develop a habit of hope that is able to anticipate the "not-yet-become" and to check and correct it against reality. The habitus of hope means a transgression of the habitually anchored self-image and world view, as well as of social structures. It is an educational practice – a contemporary "practice of freedom" (Freire, 2000: 34), in which the human being comes to himself anew and the world comes to him anew.

In the confrontation of the anticipatory consciousness developed through hope and the concrete manifestation of this vision of the future in reality lies the source of "active purpose". This forms the human basis for action in experimenting with the objectively "not-yet-become", which, along with Bloch, we can paraphrase as "*Heimat*". In the context of the capitalization of life described initially, which leads to heightened tension between the openness of education and the channeling of education, only *Heimat*, according to Bloch, can be the main goal and constant need to be met by education. This at the same time answers to the demands of future society to build a project identity on the basis of solidarity, without falling back on communalism (Castells, 1997: 6).

3. Conclusion

The integration of Bloch's "Principle of Hope" into the educational debate paves the way for a new, changed view of education. It contributes fundamentally to the reorientation of education in times of economic neo-liberal appropriation of education and the challenges of a "liquid society". Education is not only understood as a classic transformation of the subjective self-image and worldview or as a function of society. Including the Principle of Hope in the praxiological understanding of education also implies the possibility of changing society. The Principle of Hope is indispensable for determining an educational practice in a liquid society. It substantiates this as being open to a transformational degree and at the same time a goal-oriented – future-oriented – educational practice.

Such reformulation of education is highly political. It is capable of seeing the social embedding of education, to be accordingly critical of ideology, and at the same time to free education from the pressures of society. That means understanding that education – the practice that works in and with it – contains more than the existing society. The Principle of Hope requires an optimistic understanding of education, which is necessary to actively deal with the challenges of a liquid society. Perhaps the greatest merit in this is to strengthen the idea that education means a process of becoming. Education is opportunity-oriented and optimistic. Bloch's critical view is not deficient – it simply does not address the inadequacies of society and people. Hope as an essential principle of human existence in general permeates educational practice and thus allows education to exist relatively independently – not only in the sense of the classical ideal of "forming one's own personality", but also as a means of changing society. The integration of the Principle of Hope in education is ultimately relevant to action. For example, it makes professionals in the education sector aware that education cannot be predetermined and standardized – neither by professionals nor by politics. Education is emergent, dynamic and open. Hope works within it as a driving and indomitable force. At the same time, openness is anchored in the material and pre-reflective world. In this context, it is important to ensure that hope can be learned within and through education. Hope and the vague notions of the future associated with it can be rationalized. The general goal of hope is *Heimat* – the utopia of a human and natural society (cf. Kuhfeld, 2017: 47:00).

³ For example, what if there is general satisfaction, and the Principle of Hope cannot spread? And if that satisfaction is an enslaved satisfaction in an over-saturated society, as described by Marcuse (Marcuse, 1967) in "One-dimensional Man".

References

- Adorno, T.W. (1959). Theory of Half Education. In: Adorno, T.W. (eds.), *Collected Works. Soziologische Schriften*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 93–121.
- Apple, M. W. (1999). *Power, Meaning, and Identity: Essays in Critical Educational Studies*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Apple, M. W. (2000). "Can Critical Pedagogies Interrupt Rightist Policies?". *Educational Theory*, 50(2), 229–256.
- Apple, M. W. (2001). *Education the "Right" Way: markets, standards, God, and inequality*. New York, London: Routledge.
- Bloch, E. (1980). "Curriculum vitae". In: Traub, R. & Wieser, H (eds.), *Conversations with Ernst Bloch*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Bloch, E. (1985). *Edition, Band 5: The Principle of Hope*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Bourdieu, P. (1976). *Outline of a theory of practice of the ethnological basis of the Kabyle society*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Social Sense: Critique of theoretical sense*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Bourdieu, P. (1996a). *The subtle differences. Critique of social judgment*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Bourdieu, P. (1996b). "Like Mao's Red Book." *The French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu on the Bundesbank and neoliberal economic policy. Der Spiegel*, 50, 172–179.
- Bourdieu, P. (2001). *How culture gets to the farmers. On education, school and politics*. Hamburg: VSA-Verlag.
- Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J.-C. (1977). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage.
- Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Castells, M. (1997). *The Power of Identity*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
- Castells, M. (2003). *Turn of the millennium. The information age III*. Opladen: Leske & Budrich.
- Dale, R. (1989). *The Thatcherite project in education. Critical Social Policy*, 9, 4–19.
- du Bois-Reymond, Manuela (2001). *Lernfeld Europa – Opportunities for pupils and teachers in the 21st Century*. In: *Pedagogics Yearbook 2001 – Future*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 293–314.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed (30th anniversary ed.)*. New York: Continuum.
- Friebertshäuser, B., Rieger-Ladich, M. & Wigger, L. (eds.). (2006). *Reflexive pedagogy. Pierre Bourdieu, Research Perspectives*. Wiesbaden: VS Social Science Press.
- Geimer, A. (2012). *Education as transformation of the self and world relations, and the dissociative appropriation of the discursive subjective figure in the post-traditional society. ZBF. Journal of educational research*, 2(3), 229–242.
- Giroux, H. A., & Freire, P. (1987). *Series Introduction*. In: Livingstone, D. W. (ed.), *Critical Pedagogy and Cultural Power* (pp. xi-xvi). Houndsmills, Basingstoke and London: Berin & Garvey Publishers.
- Green, B., Reid, J.-A. & Brennan, M. (2017). *Challenging Policy, Rethinking Practice: Struggling for the Soul of Teacher Education*. In: Trippstad, T. A., Swennen, A. & Werler, T. (eds.), *The Struggle for Teacher Education. International Perspectives on Governance and Reforms*. London: Bloomsbury, 39–55.
- Jobst, S. (2010a). *Education, Upbringing, Socialisation: Basic terminology of pedagogics*. Opladen: Barbara Budrich.
- Jobst, S. (2010b). *Profession and Europeanisation. As context between teaching. Institution and social change*. Münster: Waxmann.
- Jobst, S. (2013). *Global development in federal politics and educational practice: Theoretical and empirical observations*. In: Dippelhofer-Stiem, B. & Dippelhofer, S. (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Pedagogics Online*. Weinheim und Basel: Beltz Juventa, 1–27.
- Jobst, S. (2014). *The humanist educational ideal in the context of neoliberal educational policy: On the necessity of a praxiological understanding of education. Deliberate – Knowledge – Ethics. Forum for Deliberative Culture* 25(2), 266–269.
- Koller, H.-C. (2011). *The Research of Transformational Education Processes: Exemplary Considerations on the Relation of the Philosophy of Education and Educational*. In: *European Educational Research Journal*, 10(3), 375–382.
- Koller, H.-C. (2017). *Terminology, theories and methods of pedagogics (8th ed.)*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Krais, B. & Gebauer, G. (2002). *Habitus*. Bielefeld: Transcript.
- Leontjew, A. N. (1982). *Activity Theory, Consciousness, Personality*. Köln: Campus.
- Lewin, K. (1935). *A Dynamic Theory of Personality*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Marcuse, H. (1967). *The one-dimensional person. The study of the ideology of the advanced industrial society*. Neuwied: Deutscher Taschenbuch-Verlag.
- Marotzki, W. (1990). *Design of a structural educational theory. Biographical theoretical interpretation of educational processes in highly complex societies*. Weinheim: Deutscher Studienverlag.
- Mayntz, R. (2009). *On Governance The institutions and processes of political governance*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.
- McLaren, P. (1999). *Critical pedagogics in the age of globalisation*. In: Sünker, H. & Krüger, H.-H. (eds.), *Critical pedagogics, a new beginning*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 10–34.
- Müller-Scholl, U. & Vidal, F. (2016). *Ernst Bloch's "new philosophy of the new"*. In: Zimmermann, R. E. (ed.), *Ernst Bloch: The Principle of Hope*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Nohl, A.-M. (2006). *Education and Spontaneity, Phases of biographical change processes in three ages – empirical, reconstruction and pragmatic reflection*. Leverkusen: Barbara Budrich.
- Pelletier, L. (2016). *The "not-yet-conscious"*. In: Zimmermann, R. E. (ed.), *Ernst Bloch: the Principle of Hope*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Postman, Neil (1994). *The disappearance of childhood* Frankfurt am Main: Fischer-Taschenbuch-Verlag.
- Radtke, F.-O. (2003). *The pedagogy of the OECD. Views of the new performance culture* In: Nittel, D. & Seitter, W. (eds.), *The Education of Adults*. Bielefeld: Bertelsmann, 277–304.
- Radtke, F.-O. (2009). *Monetisation*. In: Andresen, S., Casale, R., Gabriel, T., Hurlacher, R., Larcher Klee, S. & Oelkers, J. (eds.), *Handbook of pedagogics*. Weinheim and Basel: Beltz, 621–636.
- Reckwitz, A. (2003). *Basic elements of a social theory of practice A social theory perspective. Journal of Sociology*, 32(4), 282–301.

- Reckwitz, A. (2004). The reproduction and subversion of social practices. A simultaneous commentary on Pierre Bourdieu and Judith Butler. In: Hörning, K. H. & Reuter, J. (eds.), *Doing Culture. On the concept of practice in current sociological theory*. Bielefeld: Transcript, 40–53.
- Rieger-Ladich, M. (2005). Neither determinism nor fatalism: Pierre Bourdieu's habitus theory in light of new work. *Journal of Sociology of education and socialisation*, 3, 281–295.
- Rousseau, J.-J. (1992). *Emile, or on education*. Stuttgart: Reclam.
- Schäfer, H. (2017). Theory of practice as cultural sociology. In: Moebius, S., Nungesser, F. & Scherke, K. (eds.), *Handbook of cultural sociology*. Springer Reference Social Science. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 1–22.
- Skrobanek, J. & Jobst, S. (2010). Cultural Differentiation or Self-Exclusion: On young Turks' and Repatriates' Dealing with Experiences of Discrimination in Germany. *Current Sociology*, 58(3), 468–488.
- Skrobanek, J. & Jobst, S. (2019). Liquid integration. Thinking beyond conventional understanding. In: Ryazantsev, V. S., Khramova, M. & Maksimova, S. A. (eds.), *Migration as a resource for socio-economic and demographic development* (Vol. 5). Moscow Econ-Inform, 307–321.
- Wacquant, L. J. D. (2004). Habitus. In: Beckert, J. & Zafirovski, M. (eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Economic Sociology*. New York, London: Routledge, 315–319.
- Welch, A. R. (1998). The Cult of Efficiency in Education: Comparative reflections on the reality and the rhetoric. *Comparative Education*, 34(2), 157–175.
- Willis, P. (1981). *Learning to Labour. How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Willis, P. (2004). Twenty-Five years on: Old books, new times. In: Dolby, N., Dimitriadis, G. & Willis, P. (eds.), *Learning to Labour in New Times*. New York, London: Routledge, 167–196.

The author:

Solvejg Jobst is professor of Educational Science at the Western Norway University of Applied Sciences (Norway). Her research and work fields include Comparative educational research, migration and education, intercultural pedagogy, *Bildungstheorie*, education and social inequality, teacher research, scientific theory and praxeological educational research.

Address: Western Norway University of Applied Sciences (hvl.no)

eMail: solvejg.jobst@hvl.no

Website: <https://www.hvl.no/en/employee/?user=Solvejg.Jobst>