

LIVING TOGETHER in our MODERN WORLD:

Reason and the Role of Dialogue

CONTRIBUTORS' PAPERS AND WORKSHOPS

Papers are listed in alphabetical order of the first Presenter

Those not attending to present but who have been involved in the preparation of the work are indicated by names in brackets.

The Session Number is given together with the designation of the Room in which the presentation will be given.

Please be prompt for the beginning of Sessions and plan to end in good time as a courtesy to other groups

Groups may wish to elect a Chairperson from amongst those attending.

Please note that Angella Hodgson's Socratic Dialogue can only accommodate a maximum of 10 people. Please sign up at the Conference Desk if you wish to join Angella so that you will not be disappointed.

LIVING TOGETHER in our MODERN WORLD:

Reason and the Role of Dialogue

SYNOPSIS OF PAPERS

Paper

Sarah Banks, UK

Session 4 LO4

The place of passion in social welfare work: using Socratic dialogue in research

Key words: Socratic dialogue, social welfare, research, passion, vocation

This paper will discuss the use of Socratic dialogue with professional practitioners in social work, youth and community work. Professionals in these and other public service occupations operate within increasingly tight frameworks for targeting their interventions, assessing needs and measuring outcomes. The space for critical dialogue with colleagues to reflect on the nature and purpose of their work is limited; the possibilities for creative and committed practice seem constrained.

As part of a small research project on the theme of vocation in social welfare work, I offered a series of Socratic dialogues in various parts of Britain to explore with practitioners a number of related questions, including: 'What is the place of passion in social welfare work?'; 'What is the place of vocation in social welfare work?'; 'What is integrity in youth work?'; 'What is good youth work?' and 'What is distinctive about youth work?'

The paper will explore issues in the use of Socratic dialogue in research; aspects of the process of the dialogues, including how participants co-construct the context of the chosen example and perform as 'good professionals'; and some of the substantive ideas that emerged from the dialogues about the purpose and value of professional practice in the social welfare field.

Workshop

Erik Boers, Jos Kessels, The Netherlands

Session 1 LO3

Philosophical Conversations in Organizations: A Field guide

Key themes: Philosophy in Organizations; The Art of Conversation; Facilitating Reflection; Leadership; Variants of Socratic Dialogue; Professionalism; Excellence

A management team which talks about its own moral teachers, a group of professionals who try to identify their long cherished illusion, directors of health care who reflect upon the essence and excellence of their work, software developers who engage in a debate with their managers about the idea that management interferes with the professionals' work, help desk staff who try to find the middle position in emotionally loaded situations. With many different groups and in many different ways we have been practising philosophical conversations and have developed many new forms to facilitate them. We experienced that a Socratic Dialogue in itself was not always appropriate or sufficient. During this workshop we'll introduce some of these new forms to people who want to start and conduct philosophical conversations in organizations - or in a more informal setting.

A first choice: Figures of thinking; The question behind the question; Short dialogue; On the horns of a dilemma; Pursuing a definition; Investigating an illusion; Contemplative dialogue; Short speech; Opposition; Sic et non ; Exercise in brevity; True or false?;

LIVING TOGETHER in our MODERN WORLD:

Reason and the Role of Dialogue

Lamentation ; Ode; Personal manifesto; Unnoticed moment; Poetic argument; Moral teachers; Middle position; Interviewing your inner pilot; Atlas of values; Clearness committee; Tetractys.

Jos Kessels, Erik Boers, Pieter Mostert, *Free Space, Philosophy in organisations*. Boom, Amsterdam, 2004.

Jos Kessels, Erik Boers, Pieter Mostert, *Free Space, Field guide*. Boom, Amsterdam, 2009

Workshop

Oscar Brenifier, France

Session 2 LO6

Individual consultation

Key words: Individual, questioning, hypothesis, problematize, conceptualize.

Practical philosophy can be characterized as the art of questioning. One of its modalities takes the form of an interview with a single person. In general someone comes with an issue that interests or worries him. Through his questions, the philosopher's task consists in those main points: to clarify the issue, to deepen the understanding of it, to produce hypothesis, to problematize hypothesis, to produce new hypothesis, to examine the resistances and difficulties in the thinking process.

In this workshop, one participant will be asked to undergo an actual consultation, then, in a second moment, the other participants will be asked to analyze, comment and evaluate the overall process that went through, its general dynamic and efficiency.

This type of consultation is specifically philosophical since it puts into effect the main skills of philosophy, according to the Socratic path and Hegelian dialectics: to deepen, to identify, to conceptualize. It is not the place for "sharing ideas", "spilling guts" or "telling a life story". We work with ideas, with thinking, in particular with "thinking the thinking", which defines philosophy. And the role of the philosopher is to ensure his interlocutor does this work by himself, through the questioning process.

Workshop

Oscar Brenifier, France

Session 5 LO4

Mutual questioning

This workshop technique is inspired by Plato's maïeutics: the "long method". The competencies it will call upon are: deepening an idea (analysis, synthesis, searching for presuppositions, reformulation, argumentation, etc.), conceptualization, and problematization.

The functioning of this exercise is to pick out a given theme and install a discussion where questioning is privileged, rather than asserting. After one of the participants has spoken to give his reading of the subject by answering the initial question, others will be invited to question him on his hypothesis, a questioning that should allow the furthering of the idea, generally revealing blind spots and contradictions. Reformulation is used as well to ensure that both questioner and interlocutor understand each other, showing the difficulty of expressing precise ideas and getting them through. Different participants afterwards propose a hypothesis, and each will be questioned as well for a while.

LIVING TOGETHER in our MODERN WORLD:

Reason and the Role of Dialogue

Hypothesis will then be compared, their issues examined and conceptualized, often through fundamental antinomies.

Little by little, we will see on the board the elaboration of a thesis, in a problematic manner, similar to what we expect from an essay. In the process we will have slowly analyzed the method by which ideas can be generated and identify a number of difficulties which can arise in the process.

Paper

Daniela G. Camhy, Austria

Session 2 LO3

Developing Philosophical Dialogue in a Multicultural Society

Key words: Mutual, questioning, hypothesis, problematize, conceptualize.

The ongoing globalization of the world creates a multicultural society in nearly every country in the world. In every day situations people, institutions and organisations face cultural differences, similarities and new aspects of living together in a society which contains groups of people with different cultures. What can we do to prevent conflicts, to reduce tension and to increase understanding? What can we do to actively promote intercultural dialogue, the values of tolerance, openness to others, human rights and democracy? How can we prepare children best to live in a globalized world?

Preparing children to live in a pluralistic society requires educational change – there must be a shift in the educational world. There must be a shift from the accumulation of knowledge to the importance of developing skills to help every individual to find a place in the world and to make active contribution to a democratic and tolerant society. Education that prepares children for the globalising world they are to live in must be such that children are equipped with dialogical inquiry and thinking skills. But how can they develop the essential skills that are necessary for them to live in a multicultural society?

Helping children to think philosophically can actually give children the opportunity to construct broader self-concepts, broader visions, broader purposes that take into account the problems and thoughts of other people, as well as the consequences of their actions in society in the world.

In this paper I want to elucidate the process of developing a philosophical dialogue within a community of inquiry in multicultural society. The building of a community of inquiry is a cooperative and collaborative process. It is crucial for doing philosophy and “it is an exemplar of democracy in action” as Lipman stated.

Developing cognitive, creative, social and caring abilities through philosophical dialogue can help young people to make them capable of resisting various forms of doctrine, intolerance and exclusion, fanaticism and dogmatism.

Implementing democracy involves dialogue and understanding, human action, empathy and trust. A philosophy for children community provides an ideal framework for working out intersubjective perceptions and understanding of complex cultural differences. It is one way that the next generation will be prepared socially and cognitively to engage in the necessary dialogue, judging and questioning what is vital for a democratic society.

LIVING TOGETHER in our MODERN WORLD:

Reason and the Role of Dialogue

Paper and Discussion

Jayne Crow, Shirley Jones & Lesley Smith, UK

Session 1 LO6

An Introduction to Action Research and a consideration of the similarities with Socratic Dialogue

Key Words: Action Research, Socratic Dialogue, Communication

Action Research has been described as 'The study of a social situation carried out by those involved in that situation in order to improve both their practice and the quality of their understanding' Winter and Munn-Giddings (2001).

In this session we will briefly introduce Action Research as a research approach for those unfamiliar with it. Joint decision making is often highlighted as a key distinguishing feature of Action Research but these features are not easy to accomplish effectively in practice and published Action Research reports often include accounts of the difficulties involved in effective group working and problematic group dynamics. It is therefore an aspect of the Action Research process that we believe requires and deserves more attention.

Our interest and participation in Socratic Dialogues have led us to a realisation of the potential benefit that Socratic Dialogue may have for Action Researchers. We propose to highlight what we see as the parallels and common values exhibited by Action Research and Socratic Dialogue and hope to begin a discussion of possible ways in which experience of Socratic Dialogue may benefit Action Research.

Workshop

Peter Garrett, UK

Session 6 Lecture Theatre

The theory and practice of dialogue to support the offender's journey from prison to resettlement in the community

Key words: Theory and practice of dialogue; prison and community; facilitation; multi-agency; integration

The prison gate separates community and prison. On crossing that threshold, individuals travel from freedom of movement to institutionalised constraint and boredom. They suffer a crisis of detention going in and a crisis of release coming out – yet many offenders cross that threshold repeatedly with minimal support because of poor policy and funding for short-term prisoners.

In Bournemouth we are using dialogue to form the kind of relationships that are needed to help such people spend longer out in the community as responsible citizens. We are aiming to spring individual offenders from the 'revolving' gate by integrating the often fragmented efforts of the criminal justice and other agencies to provide end-to-end support for an offender's life journey.

Participants are recruited in HMP Dorchester and HMP Guys Marsh, engaged in weekly dialogue groups in prison, then invited to continue on release in the Bournemouth community dialogue. Prisoners and ex-offenders are joined in these dialogues by staff from Police, Prisons, Probation, Courts, Local Authority, drug and alcohol, mentoring, crime reduction and housing agencies.

LIVING TOGETHER in our MODERN WORLD:

Reason and the Role of Dialogue

Prison Dialogue provides facilitation and facilitation training, which is critical because everything depends on the quality of dialogue. We will explore our theory and practice of dialogue.

Workshop

Peter Garrett and Jane Ball, UK

Wednesday evening E124

Concentric Circle Dialogue

Integration through polarisation

During the past two decades we have been using various approaches to dialogue as a means of enquiring into the human condition and addressing the successes and failures of communication and their consequences. The key individuals we have worked with directly, and whose work we have incorporated into our thinking are David Bohm (whilst he was Professor of Theoretical Physics at Birkbeck College London), Patrick de Mare (whilst at the Median Group section of the Group Analytic Society, London, which he founded) and David Kantor (Kantor Family Institute, Cambridge, Massachusetts, whilst with international corporate consulting firms Dia-logos and Monitor).

Our research and practice have led us to form an integrated theory about how to create the necessary conditions for people to talk and think together successfully about the things that matter to them, including divisive and contentious issues. We have found two routes into good face-to-face communication in larger groups. One starts with teaching generic skills to develop proficiency over time in dialogic actions, practices, leading energies and principles (all of which are all incorporated into the Implicate Change model) and then engaging specific issues of interest or concern for those involved. The other route is practice led and starts with facilitated dialogic patterns through which skills are developed later.

This session takes the practice led route. It is a participatory and experimental session led by Peter Garrett and Jane Ball, based on the concentric circle pattern (which is just one of a number of patterns we have developed for dialogue). We have used this particular pattern with groups of 20 to 50 people including corporate executives, refinery workers, MBA students, uniformed prison staff and prisoners. The pattern is best suited to working on the interface between two (or more) sub-cultures within an organisation or community. Skilled facilitation is required to work through a sequence of steps of engagement and dialogue successfully.

The first step is to identify the need or opportunity inherent in the group based on the sub-cultural groupings and the nature of the interface between them. The second is to name the groupings in a way that invites (or provokes) the energy for everyone to engage in the pattern. This is followed by an enquiry by the two sub-groups - first meeting separately to formulate a question to discover something meaningful they did not know about the other group, then exploring these questions in a sequence of concentric circles followed by a single circle plenary conversation about what was heard and learnt. This may be followed by smaller mixed groups if what has been discovered is to be taken into action.

Typically the pattern makes the covert issues (the elephants in the room) openly discussible, whilst engendering a higher degree of understanding and respect between members of the different sub-groups. The pattern is based on dialogic actions, dialogic practices and advocacy/enquiry skills, but these emerge because of the structure of the pattern and the facilitation, rather than being taught didactically.

LIVING TOGETHER in our MODERN WORLD:

Reason and the Role of Dialogue

Paper

John Halliday, UK

Session 5 LO6

Informal learning, working and living together

There is a deeply held pessimism about the cumulative effects of a world view that might be termed modernist instrumentalism. According to this view, all problems are technical and capable of a definitive solution. Even technical problems are believed to be capable of being broken down to the lowest level where humans should act according to a predetermined script or procedure. Formal learning forms part of this view through the provision of qualifications. Even a technical problem is solvable through the employment of people with qualifications disengaged from direct communication. Living becomes an endless attempt to solve a series of problems manufactured partly by legislation designed to prevent people without qualifications from working together or privatising communal assets.

This paper will argue that such privatisation and barriers should be dismantled. It will argue that there needs to be a radical shift in the provision of resources away from formal learning towards informal learning. Such a shift would enable those who live together to work together to solve their technical problems together in a practical way. A practical way necessarily involves thinking not only about what to do immediately but also thinking about how best to live.

Paper

Guro Hansen Helskog, Norway

Session 1 LO4

Practical philosophy as relationship education

“From consciousness of the ego through consciousness of the situation to consciousness of the world.

Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge? Where is the knowledge we have lost in information?” T.S. Eliot, 1934

This presentation aims at giving an introduction to Dialogos – a series of books on practical philosophy and the art of leading philosophical dialogues, written by Guro Hansen Helskog, partly in cooperation with Andreas Ribe. The series also outlines a theoretical basis for thinking and practising philosophical dialogues in various contexts, primarily in schools, but also in public preventive work for children, youth and grown ups, in dialogue between different religious and ethical groups, in professional context and so on.

The name Dialogos comes from Greek, and consists of two words: dia, which means “through”, and logos, which can mean “reason”, “word”, “speech” and “wisdom”. The name points both at the practice and the aim of practical philosophy as seen in Dialogos. In the philosophical dialogues we are

- working with and investigating our words, or our language, concepts and imaginations
- speaking together, and thereby creating and investigating relationships
- training our ability to reason, hoping that it will lead to reasonable and prudent action

LIVING TOGETHER in our MODERN WORLD:

Reason and the Role of Dialogue

- the work is driven by the search for wisdom through this work.

The word Dialogos also refers to dialogue philosophy and the idea that in order to talk about an “I”, one is dependent on other people. We are shaped as human beings through the relations we create to each other and to the world. Philosophical practice conducted in the spirit of Dialogos implies investigating these relations. In the dialogues we meet each other with a shared will to engage in a community of openness, of wonder and of investigation. In this we step out of ourselves – out of our more or less ego conscious perspective, in order to take the perspective of others in investigating a common matter. The idea is that such experiences can lead to a more general situational oriented perspective also in every day life. This is a necessary move in order to act morally. The situation is the place for moral action, and requires an ability to understand what the situation demands in order to act with prudence and foresight - for the best of oneself and others. This is true for all kinds of situations, from private life to global policy making.

Dialogos also draws upon the etymological and classical meaning of the word philosophy – philo sophia. Philo means “love” or “friend”, and “sophia” means “wisdom”, “insight” or “prudence”. A philosopher in this classical interpretation is then a person who is a friend of wisdom, or one who loves insight and prudence. At the core of true wisdom lies love: the love of oneself, of others and of the world, and – for the religious person – of God. It is not possible to be a lover and friend of prudence and wisdom without being a lover and friend of other human beings, and of all the good things that exists in the world. Friendliness, connectedness, humbleness and giving hospitality are aspects of the way a wise person acts towards others and in the world. In this perspective prudence and wisdom without universal love is a contradiction. Dialogos intends therefore to nourish not only a move from ego consciousness to situational consciousness, but also in direction of a holistic, loving consciousness of the world. Hopefully working with Dialogos will lead towards a sense of connectedness with humanity as a whole, and with all living creatures, as well as the globe and the universe.

- In the dialogue Symposium Socrates talks about the philosopher as a person who is searching for love. Other aims of the search are truth, beauty and goodness. The philosopher has not reached all this, but he is searching for it, and it is eros – the longing for love – that drives him. When Socrates did his philosophical investigation with people on the agora of Athens, it was this longing for love, truth and goodness he nourished in the other. And one day all this could be born in the person, and the person would possibly become truly wise. A wise person is no longer a philosopher. He has gone all the way, and has become a person who is resting in what is. In him truth, beauty, goodness and love exists.

It is in this perspective Dialogos is written. Dialogos can be seen as books that intend to inspire the teaching and self creation of good and loving people who are able to do the right, in the right way, at the right time and at the right place. This certainly is relationship education. The hope is that working with Dialogos will nourish the longing for wisdom in those participating in the dialogues. In a religious perspective this would be the longing for unity with God or the transcendent other.

LIVING TOGETHER in our MODERN WORLD:

Reason and the Role of Dialogue

Socratic Dialogue Workshop

Angella Hodgson, UK

Sessions 1 and 2 H149

Please attend BOTH Sessions

What are the limits of tolerance?

Socratic Dialogue Taster: Interactive workshop with evaluation

Key words: Socratic Dialogue, values, principles, criteria, enjoyable, challenging, discipline, context based

This session aims to offer attendees the opportunity to take part in a short Socratic Dialogue following the model used by the SFCP in Great Britain and to investigate the question 'What are the limits of tolerance?' following the Nelson/Heckman method.

The Socratic Dialogue will focus on the key question and allows the group to draw on their experience, using a real example as a tool to investigate the question. It is hoped that by going on this journey either as an individual or as a group we will be able to develop a personal and collective insight into our central question, whilst all the time being able to use the 'concrete example' as our point of reference. The journey taken is one where we are able to examine our values, why do we do what we do. The process the group goes through to answer the question is as important as the answers themselves.

Paper

Aliaksiej Ihnatovich, Belarus

Session 3 LO6

A worldview component of Socratic Dialogue

Keywords: worldview (evolution of the notion), cognitive science, worldview aspects, open worldview, closed worldview, subject-subject relationships, synergetic thinking, systemic causation, direct causation.

The article studies the evolution of the notion "worldview" from Kant's philosophy and German Romanticism when it was interpreted as ability, its transformation into property to the newest cognitive interpretations of the notion. The main objective of the article is to find an adequate connection between the author's concept of worldview and the practice of Socratic Dialogue. For this purpose worldview as a phenomenon was divided into four aspects integral to it (content, value, structural and functional). Then the author divided all worldviews into open and closed. The open worldview is seen as a kind of frame for Socratic Dialogue being at the same time its necessary precondition and its desired result. Systemic and synergetic thinking, constructive, subject-subject relationships with both social and natural environment are not only the worldview foundations of Socratic practice but can also be seen as necessary conditions for overcoming the social and environmental crisis which mankind is experiencing now because of the prevalence of subject-object consumerist attitude to the world.

Workshop

LIVING TOGETHER in our MODERN WORLD:

Reason and the Role of Dialogue

Michael Imison, UK

Session 3 LO3

“Ethical Juries”

The religious often say that Humanists, in rejecting a Supreme Being, have no basis for morality. However, Humanists see morality arising from basic instincts which are genetically biased towards care for others. As social animals, humans also feel obligations towards their community. As rational beings, humans are obliged to look at the consequences of their actions. The preferable action is that which does least harm. However choosing this action can be difficult. Michael felt from his experience with Socratic Dialogues that a small group could examine a particular issue in detail, question the person whose dilemma it was and arrive at a solution which might seem arbitrary, and which would specifically not form a precedent, but would allow the person to feel he had fulfilled his human obligations. To this extent the jury is comparable to medical ethics committees which have to take moral decisions on the best evidence available. The workshop will demonstrate a jury in action using Socratic techniques and will try to assess its effectiveness.

(Michael has worked with independent Humanist Groups in developing the concept of “Ethical Juries”, which are not yet part of the BHA’s official activities.)

Paper

Dimitar Georgiev Ivanov, Bulgaria

Session 6 LO6

What Epistemological Approach does SD presuppose?

Key words: Truth and investigation in SD; epistemology, first person knowledge vs. third person knowledge, reflection, privileged access, behaviour analysis, speculation, example “genre”, story, observation, investigation vs. decision-making, truth, correspondence, convention.

I will discuss certain points from my personal SD experience: particular situations of example analysis and discussion development, the problems they lead to, and their alternatives from epistemological point of view.

Firstly, I am going to address the issue with first person and third person knowledge in its relation to particular SD examples and draw philosophical implications from the way in which the group has approached those examples.

Then I will tackle the problem with the “genre” of the example, namely, should it be a story or observation, and what follows from choosing either one of these two options.

Finally, I am going to delineate another epistemological opposition, this time relating to the SD process as a whole: the opposition between investigation and decision-making. I will argue that this opposition implies different theories of truth: truth as correspondence and truth as convention and I will make an attempt to support the former as more suitable for SD.

The title is literally a question: having little experience in SD, I hope that after I put forward my impressions and views, more experienced practitioners from the audience will share their thoughts on the subject.

LIVING TOGETHER in our MODERN WORLD:

Reason and the Role of Dialogue

Paper

Evelina Ivanova, Bulgaria

Session 1 Lecture Theatre

Socratic Dialogue as “Community of Inquiry”

Key words: community of inquiry, socratic dialogue, consensus, communication, learning through doing

At least since the culmination of the transcendental philosophy by Kant it is not possible anymore to place cognition just in the separate subject. It is a historical merit of the American philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce to treat cognition in an intersubjective manner using the concept of the endless interpreting and communicating community of researchers. This notion emerges initially as a purely theoretical concept, but afterwards it develops in a very fruitful way in the field of education.

The notion of “community of inquiry” plays a fundamental role in two didactic concepts – p4c (philosophy for children) and the (Neo)Socratic method. Philosophy for Children is based explicitly on the pragmatism and especially on the philosophy of Peirce and Dewey. The systematic similarity between the American pragmatism and the (Neo)Socratic Method could be explained on the basis of their common roots in German critical philosophy.

In this paper Peirces’ notion of “community of inquiry” would be analysed shortly. A brief operational description of this notion, based on the previous analysis, will be introduced. This preliminary description will be revisited by comparing it with the characteristics of the “community” in p4c and the (Neo)Socratic Method.

Workshop

Loes de Jong and Olga Plokhooij, The Netherlands

Session 3 H149

The Concept of the Day of Dialogue

A Short Overview

In the present climate in which the distance between citizens is increasing and the growing diversity in our society is looked upon more and more in a negative way, there is an urgent need for powerful instruments that can help decrease the distance between social groups and individuals. In this framework it seems of great importance to increase the knowledge people have of each other and thus, to foster a positive attitude towards “the other”.

The “Day of Dialogue” (DoD) is such an instrument that can be used in a relatively simple way for people of different ages, diverse cultural backgrounds and ethnic identities to talk with each other about living together in a city that can draw from its diversity.

It was first initiated in Rotterdam in 2001. Amsterdam followed in 2004. From 2005 on the Dutch organizations Art.1 (Rotterdam) and Nieuwe Maan (Amsterdam), together the national coordination of the Dutch DoD, started to spread the instrument and its dialogue method to other cities. The “Days of Dialogue” has been adopted by 25 other Dutch cities in the past 2.5 years.

The initiative has also inspired organisations and institutions in German and Belgian cities to get active. In the course of 2008, European Year of Intercultural Dialogue, a

LIVING TOGETHER in our MODERN WORLD:

Reason and the Role of Dialogue

European seminar about the Day of Dialogue as a good practice in the Netherlands was organised by European Network Against Racism (ENAR), the Dutch national coordination of the Day of Dialogue in cooperation with Aric Berlin.

How does the Day of Dialogue work in practice?

The project is an initiative of citizens and organisations to organise dialogue tables. At these dialogue tables 6-8 people are invited to talk to each other about a central theme. Local organisations are asked to organise dialogue tables to which they themselves invite people. Due to the mixed background of the participants, diversity is achieved at the different tables.

A dialogue takes 2 – 3 hours. Participants are asked not to try to convince each other (as in a debate) but to share their personal experiences and build on each other's ideas. Since people are invited to talk about experiences, the Day of Dialogue is accessible to everybody. High school students can talk to politicians and religious leaders.

Each table is led by a facilitator trained in the specifically developed, accessible dialogue method. Emphasized in this training is that many of us are accustomed to arguing, discussing or analyzing topics as opposed to carefully listening what the others have to say.

The purpose of the dialogue at the DoD is to give every participant the space and opportunity to express his/her opinion based on their own experiences.

Equality of the participants in this sense creates a safe space and positive atmosphere in which people really get to know each other.

Paper

Aneta Karageorgieva, Bulgaria

Session 5 Lecture Theatre

The Dialogical Self

Dialogue in philosophy has a long history both as a genre and as a method. What interests me here is how the situation of participating in a dialogue – i.e. the dialogical situation – shapes the identity of the participants, including their knowledge, values, and judgement. In a (Socratic) dialogue a person does not pursue their own private train of thought. Rather, they built on the thoughts of the others and share with them their knowledge and judgements.

Reasoning in the dialogue is not being centred on a single person, or on the topic alone. Reasoning is distributed among the participants and guided by the topic. Therefore the self of each participant is also as if distributed within the group and is being shaped and further specified by the very situation of dialogue. This is what I call 'dialogical Self' and this is what I consider to be the most important educational consequence of SD: building of a dialogical Self, of a person that is open to the needs and deeds of their (immediate) community and is aware of the fact that their identity and the identities of the others are interdependent via dialogue.

LIVING TOGETHER in our MODERN WORLD:

Reason and the Role of Dialogue

Paper

Dubravka Knežić, The Netherlands

Session 6 LO4

Socratic Dialogue and Teacher Communication

Every lesson affords individual teacher-pupil dialogues. Much too often do such affordances go wasted as scarce research in this field shows (Elbers et al. 2008, Lockhorst 2003). Even experienced teachers do not seem to communicate successfully in such situations. The communicative competence needs greater focus from teacher education. An additional challenge lies in reaching second-language learners.

This PhD research set out to help student teachers become successful communicators in individual dialogues with pupils. The central question is “Will the training in Socratic Dialogue (SD) produce effects on teacher communicative competence as manifested in teacher-pupil learning dialogues (TPLD’s) with second-language learners?”

The SD as developed by Nelson and Heckman (Saran 2004, Kessels 1999, Nelson 1994) will be employed as a substantive method for an integrative development of teacher competence during seven-week training. The effects will be looked for in teacher beliefs and teacher behaviour in TPLD’s. In order to heighten the intersubjectivity of the method of SD, an assessment form has been developed and proved reliable (SDaf).

The research is currently (the time of the conference) at the stage of comparing and analysing the data. Both quantitative and qualitative methods will be used in forming an account of the effects of the SD on teacher competence.

References

Elbers E M, Hajer M, Jonker, T, Koole & J. Prenger. Instructional dialogues: Participation in dyadic interactions in multicultural classrooms. In: Deen J., M. Hajer en T. Koole (eds.) *Interaction in two Multicultural Mathematics Classrooms. Mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion*. Amsterdam: Aksant, NWO-reeks 2008 p.141-172

Kessels J. 1999. *Socrates op de markt. Filosofie in bedrijf*. Amsterdam: Boom

Lockhorst, D. 2003. *Leerling en leraar in samenspraak: De betekenis van onderwijsleerdialogen voor de zelfstandigheidontwikkeling van leerlingen in het voortgezet onderwijs*. Dissertatie. Leuven: Garant.

Nelson, L., 1994. *De socratische methode*. Translated by Kessels, J. Amsterdam: Boom

Saran, R., Neisser, B., eds. 2004. *Enquiring Minds*. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books

Workshop

Dieter Krohn and Kirsten Malmquist, Germany

Session 6 H149

Introduction to Socratic Facilitation

The workshop will provide an overview of what it takes to perform the role of SD facilitator. It will serve as no more than an introduction to the role and would need to be followed up by training before “novices” are ready to start the varied work of facilitation. But all participants should become more effective members in future SD groups.

LIVING TOGETHER in our MODERN WORLD:

Reason and the Role of Dialogue

Content

General Survey main aspects of SD long compared with short SDs
Role of facilitator Role of participants Examples: how many? which are suitable?
Regressive abstraction and consensus Meta-dialogue

Method

The two presenters will share with workshop members their varied experience of acting as SD facilitators. Information giving, questions and discussion will lay the basis for gaining practical experience through improvised exercises, some of which may simulate 'difficult' individual and / or group situations that can arise in SD groups. Depending on how many wish to join the Workshop, activities may be organised in two or more sub-groups.

Paper

Heidi Elisabeth Malmquist, USA

Session 2 LO6

Diversity and the Principle of Tolerance A Philosophical Exposition

In our post-modern world diversity is a fact with tremendous implications and consequences. As a positive idea it presents a vital force for the progress of human interaction on a global scale. As a positive practice it holds the promise to unify diverse cultural as well as socio-economic expressions for the benefit of all.

Diversity and unity, however, occupy the opposite ends of the conceptual spectrum. Thus the challenge is to construct a harmonious mean. The Principle of Tolerance might provide just such a mean when limited by the Principle of Harm. But what constitutes harm is not as obvious and non-controversial, as it might seem at first glance.

In this exposition I shall explicate how the categories of gender, race, and religion are root problems in the acceptance of diversity as a positive practice, not only for particular societies, but globally. Knowledge and compassion, which are essential to the Principle of Tolerance, can provide a prima facie foundation for conflict resolutions that arise from the reality of diversity.

Workshop

Kirsten Malmquist and Dieter Krohn, Germany

**With Angella Hodgson, Celia Hawkesworth, Jayne Crow, Kate Nathoo, GB;
Aneta Karageorgieva, Mitko (Dimitar) Ivanov, Valeriya Terziyska, Evelina Ivanova,
Bulgaria**

Session 3 Lecture Theatre

Training Socratic Facilitators: Experience gained in different countries

Origins of new training methods

SFCP had the idea to train Socratic facilitators in the Nelson-Heckmann tradition in GB some years ago. In contrast to the individual mentor-trainee method used by the GSP

LIVING TOGETHER in our MODERN WORLD:

Reason and the Role of Dialogue

in Germany, the idea of training facilitators in a small group evolved. In 2004 & 2005 group training in the Socratic Approach to Learning and Teaching was piloted. From this experience, a small group emerged and a structure for the new course was developed, which started in GB in March 2006. In November 2007 a potential group for a training course in Bulgaria met at Sofia University. In February 2008 the training started there.

Aims

This workshop demonstrates possibilities of group training in the Socratic Method and/or Socratic facilitation in other countries. You will get to know about the course aims, its structure, experiences and difficulties, etc.; it can be only an introduction to this kind of training; trainers will need proficiency in theory and practise of Socratic facilitation as Socratic Dialogue is not a 'technique'.

Content

General information about the course, its basic structure and aims, preconditions of participants, conditions of the training.

Outline of the courses in GB and Bulgaria.

Reflection on the experiences in both countries and subsequent alterations.

Methods

The presenters will share their different experiences with workshop participants by hand-outs, evaluation of questionnaires, short video clips and some practical exercise.

Paper

Omar Mizel, Israel

Session 5 LO3

School-Based Management in Arab-Bedouin Schools in Israel

Key words SBM, Bedouin, Israel, Teamwork,

The term unrecognized village refers to a Bedouin village in the Negev Desert which the Israeli government does not recognize as a legal settlement. Approximately half of Bedouin citizens of Israel live in 39-45 such villages. According to the Israel Land Authority, in 2007 40% of the Bedouin lived in Unrecognized villages, although the Regional Council of Unrecognized Villages (RCUV) refers to Bedouin in unrecognized villages as half the Negev Bedouin population. The unrecognized villages are ineligible for municipal services such as connection to the electrical grid, water mains or trash-pickup. Homes in the villages have been subject to demolition by the Israeli authorities. The unrecognized villages are not precisely marked on any commercial maps.

Paper

Wijnand Noot, The Netherlands

Session 4 LO3

The failure of reaching consensus and the end of Socratic dialogue

Without questioning, we ordinarily take 'successful communication' to be some kind of ideal, something to be strived for. But what is 'communication' – and how is it related to

LIVING TOGETHER in our MODERN WORLD:

Reason and the Role of Dialogue

dialogue? What does the notion of 'success' – 'successful', 'to succeed' – presuppose? (It won't go unnoticed that we attend a conference by the 'Society for the Furtherance of the Critical Philosophy' – a philosophy characterized by its quest for presuppositions – itself an elaboration of 'the Socratic spirit'). For a project to succeed or fail, it has to be motivated by an aim, purpose or target.

An example of 'successful communication' is given by Ludwig Wittgenstein in his *Philosophical Investigations* (§ 2): "Denken wir uns eine Sprache, für die die Beschreibung, wie Augustinus sie gegeben hat, stimmt: die Sprache soll der Verständigung eines Bauenden A mit einem Gehilfen B dienen. A führt einen Bau auf aus Bausteinen; es sind Würfel, Säulen, Platten und Balken vorhanden. B hat ihm die Bausteine zuzureichen, und zwar nach der Reihe, wie A sie braucht. Zu dem Zweck bedienen sie sich einer Sprache, bestehend aus den Wörtern: 'Würfel', 'Säule', 'Platte', 'Balken'. A ruft sie aus; B bringt den Stein, den er gelernt hat, auf diesen Ruf zu bringen. – Fasse dies als vollständige primitive Sprache auf." ("Imagine a language, to which the description that St. Augustine has given, applies: it's to serve the communication between a builder A and his assistant B. A is conducting a construction out of building blocks: bricks, columns, slabs and beams. B has to hand over these building blocks to him, and that in the order in which A needs them. To this aim they make use of a language, consisting of the words 'brick', 'column', 'slab' and 'beam'. A calls them out; B hands over the building block which he has learned to hand over at any one of these calls. – Take this to be a complete primitive language.") This is a pragmatic approach. Words are tools and if they function well in a particular 'language game', then understanding – and, in fact, a 'form of life' – runs smoothly. There is no redundant noise, everything in this 'practice' is effective and efficient. The participants coincide restlessly with their respective roles.

The word 'communication' has its root in common(!) with the word 'community'. Where there is communication, there's a system in which the participants are interconnected, levelled and related to each other.

Of course, the context for communication is usually much wider than the narrow and sharply defined situation of 'the worker and his assistant' Wittgenstein sketches in § 2 of his *Philosophical Investigations*. (He himself emphasizes that the 'language-games' he conjures up in that book only serve to clarify certain aspects of ordinary language – not to suggest that language in this ordinary – rich! – sense is in any way reducible to these 'games'.)

As the purpose, aim or target of (human) communication in general, two aspects could be discerned: the aim to express oneself – looking for acknowledgement for what one has to say (and, by means of that, for oneself as a unique person – someone who 'makes a difference') – and the aim of testing the validity of what one is saying. An 'act of communication' then is 'successful' if it leads to acknowledgement (rather than indifference – if one is 'heard', perhaps even 'appreciated') and if one learns something from the experience (if it makes one 'a little wiser'). For instance: if I submit a poem, I'd like my 'voice' to be heard – and I'd like to find out how a public relates to my poetry.

In this presentation, I'd like to confront this 'technical' account of 'successful communication' with a possible critique by Martin Heidegger. Heidegger would say that the account I have sketched is 'correct', 'right', but not necessarily true. Here, 'truth' obviously is to be understood as something other than 'rightness', 'correctness'. 'Truth', in a Heideggerian context, is to be understood as something which 'happens'. Heidegger likes to quote his favourite poet Hölderlin: "Seit ein Gespräch wir sind..." (Friedensfeier).

So: wir sind ein Gespräch. 'Das Sokratische Gespräch' is usually translated as 'the Socratic dialogue', in these quarters. If a 'Gespräch' is a 'dialogue': is a dialogue,

LIVING TOGETHER in our MODERN WORLD:

Reason and the Role of Dialogue

then, a form of communication? If not: what could be the difference? Could it be that a dialogue is something which 'happens' – without a predefined purpose, aim or target? Could it be that a dialogue occurs if there is no common system into which its participants are levelled and 'tuned'? Could it be that a dialogue lays bare a kind of discrepancy, a tragic quality which could even be taken to be a kind of failure – from a technical point of view?

Is not the 'dialogue' which unfalteringly seemed to lead to failure – aporia – the (original) 'Socratic' one? And to what kind of failure did it lead? A failure to reach consensus? And what is this mysterious thing 'consensus' which is allegedly the aim of 'the Socratic dialogue'? Does it have anything to do with the desired outcome of a democratic process? The Socratic 'consensus' rather seems related to Rousseau's *volonté générale*...

So, I'll finish my presentation by situating 'the Socratic dialogue' and its alleged aim of 'reaching consensus' in the field of tension between the 'technical' explanation of 'successful communication' and the 'tragic' explanation of an 'uninvited visitation'. We'll look at this by sharing our common experience of and with 'the Socratic dialogue'.

Paper

Denis Pym, UK

Session 4 LO6

The myth of Universal Employment and the Community Economy: Empowering people rather than bailing out Industrial Institutions

The decline of employment

The crises of Western society are inextricably associated with the imprisonment of its thinkers and policy makers by their own employment and its artefacts (writing, the print, the computer) through which we attempt to define reality. The condition of employee, no matter how great the rewards, remains a servile state incompatible with democratic and emerging ecological imperatives.

We are not recommending the end of Employment but the end of its monopoly over the creation of health and wellbeing.

The revival of community economy

The educated, literate mind cannot begin to grasp the potential of the community for reuniting social and economic life because its most essential activities are invisible and covert and therefore lack legitimacy. Its prospects will improve vastly when we break through those collusive arrangements which currently prevent people from acknowledging the trivial, demeaning and fraudulent aspect of employment.

The community economy is founded on the oral tradition, social network, mutual aid in and around the household as well as a commitment to maintenance ethics and human resourcefulness, which has always been essential to the discovery and development of resources.

Its contributors will be:

The self employed, the home based enterprises including social and recreational activities, small businesses, builders and users of local facilities, markets and volunteers.

Reason and the Role of Dialogue

Paper

Alison Taysum UK and Sergey Trapitsin Russia

Session 4 Lecture Theatre

How educational leaders learn to mediate complex policy contexts: co-constructing evidence based practice in partnership with English and Russian Higher Education Institutions

Key words Social justice, postgraduate research, political spaces, mediation, critical-thinking, reflexivity.

How leaders learn to engage with complex policy contexts in their educational institutions to work for social justice is problematic. This paper aims to examine how educational-leaders learn to mediate the policy process by engaging with a pilot-postgraduate research 30-credit Masters module; 'Managing the Curriculum'. This module was developed as part of a British Council funded project; British Degrees in Russia (BRIDGE) worth 52500 GBP. The project enabled Russian and English academics to develop a dual-award Masters degree in Educational-Leadership. This paper presents the findings of the educational leaders' perceptions of the pilot module. The data was gathered through questionnaires, and semi-structured interviews from four different iterations of the pilot module in England and Russia. The data is still being interrogated, but initial findings reveal leaders identified face-to-face teaching, tutorials, seminars, lectures, and distance learning as modes of study that potentially offered opportunities to examine alternative ways of thinking and doing. They were also able to critique current knowledge. Barriers to learning were lack of time. Some leaders preferred regular contact with their tutor, initiated by the tutor whilst they took a passive role in the communication. Finally benefits identified were improved school standards, leading to personal and professional development.