



ISSN : 2350-0743

www.ijramr.com



International Journal of Recent Advances in Multidisciplinary Research

Vol. 05, Issue 03, pp.3641-3645, March, 2018

RESEARCH ARTICLE

THE EPISTEMOLOGY OF POWER AND EDUCATIONAL IDEOLOGY PROFESSOR RONALD S. LAURA (D.PHIL, OXFORD)

***Ron Laura**

The University of Newcastle, Australia

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 21st December, 2017

Received in revised form

26th January, 2018

Accepted 09th February, 2018

Published online 30th March, 2018

Keywords:

Environmental education,
Consumerism,
Ideological epistemology,
Knowledge and Power.

ABSTRACT

In this paper I argue that an educational ideology, based on an epistemology of power and consumerism, has become embedded within the structural foundations of Western Education. The combination of a power-based epistemology which informs curriculum design on the one hand, coupled with a consumerist educational ideology of universal commodification on the other, have served to provide the basis for a persuasive but pernicious philosophy of nature. Virtually every relationship we have with nature and in turn with each other is reduced to a saleable item for exchange. The radical shift in socio-cultural perspective which has resulted from what I shall callan 'ideo-epistemological pedagogy' has been monumental and inimical to the ostensible goals of environmental education.. Motivated by an ideology in which knowledge is construed as a 'form of power and dominance', and linked to relentless pulse of economic consumption, contemporary environmental education will simply reproduce, albeit in beguilingly inferential ways, the same contextual dynamics of technological invasiveness and mindless expropriation of natural resources that have ineluctably led to the degradation of nature.

INTRODUCTION

Given the incontestability of the deplorable state of environmental devastation caused by mankind's technological intrusions upon the earth, my objective in this paper is to make explicit a particular facet of the aetiology of this crisis by teasing out the ideological presumptions upon which the purpose and patterns of our technological interactions with nature and the commitment to unlimited economic consumption have been built. One of the fundamental causes of environmental degradations, I contend, is due to the emergence of an epistemological pedagogy based upon humankind's insatiable appetite for power and the technological control of nature. One facet of this lust for power is tacitly entrenched in a dominant educational epistemology which conceptualises knowledge as tantamount to 'power and dominance', exemplified within our culture as an institutionalised form of control over nature. In turn, the primary methodology of science, ie. reductio-mechanism, has itself implicitly become increasingly controlling. Reductio-mechanism operates on the presumption that nature is a machine-like system that can be disassembled into its component parts, such that the parts can be reconfigured, technologically manipulated, and then reassembled to suit the caprice of human consumption. Moreover, all too often, the vested interests of the political brokers of economic growth, become directed by corporate power-brokers. The methodology of reductio-mechanistic science presupposes

the separation of the 'observer' from what is 'observed' (i.e the disconnection of man from nature), because it is assumed that methodological detachment from the things science observes maximises the 'objectivity' of our interpretive assessments of the nature of the things under investigation. I submit that this is an assumption which evinces a deep misunderstanding. In contrast to this philosophy of detachment we shall argue that knowledge and the applied technologies which derive from it are value-laden processes, whose implications for environmental education are momentous. Knowledge is not a value-free enterprise. I shall argue that although we gain a significant measure of control over the world in which we live by methodologically sanitising it, the reductio-mechanistic transformations we make of that world become increasingly chemicalised, inert, lifeless and dead. This being so, I argue that the control which we gain over nature comes at the ecological price of making the world in which we reside less alive and more inert.

Technological intervention and consumer education

It is only in recent decades that we have become aware of the environmental plight which now affects us globally, so it is perhaps unsurprising that we continue to act on the assumption that the same reduction-mechanistic thinking that got us into the morass of environmental degradation will ultimately get us out of it. This methodological presumption is intricately woven into the conceptual fabric of the ideological tapestry which portrays knowledge as a form of power. We have been inculcated with the belief that the power we gain from our technological innovations will serve as the panacea for our

***Corresponding author: Ron Laura**

The University of Newcastle, Australia.

environmental problems, without fully comprehending the additional complications and consequences of technologically mediated interventions (Laura 2010). Even on those rare occasions when we have been able to discern the adverse impacts on the environment associated with the social indiscretions of technology, we continue to believe that we possess the technological ingenuity to deal with any problem that besets us. So we act as if it is only a matter of time before we find the solution. Technology is thus revered as the panacea for all our problems, without understanding that there are bound to be new problems which will inevitably accompany novel technological interventions. The 'Technological Fallacy,' as we shall call it, thus arises from thinking that the continuing commitment to ever more advanced and improved technology is the most effective and appropriate solution to the problems which our technological intrusions have created in the first place. What we fail to realise is that the higher the level of technological intervention in the service of problem resolution, the more disruption we are likely to cause to the established harmony of our delicately balanced ecosystems. Appreciation of this point should encourage environmentalists to be more cognisant of the vicious circle of environmental destruction which results from this mindless belief that improved technological intervention is the panacea for the problems associated with our previous technological indiscretions.

My main contention here is that the degradation and dissolution of the once established harmony of nature's ecosystems are a direct result of economic progress, coupled with ever more intensive levels of high technological intervention. The problem, that is to say, is not just an 'empirical' one of determining whether this or that technological solution works, but rather a 'philosophical' one of understanding that technological solutions, even to technological problems can make those problems worse, if in principle 'technology' is itself the primary source of the problem. We submit that it is becoming increasingly evident that the more society relies on unlimited technological and economic progress to resolve our problems in order to make a better world, the more we actually commit ourselves to a world in which nature and society become progressively fractured and degraded. Relentless technological intervention in this context becomes paradoxically self-defeating (Laura and Ashton, 1990; Ashton & Laura, 2004; Laura and Cotton, 2005).

Despite the enormous drawbacks with technological cures or 'techno-fix solutions', there is still a wide spread culture belief, if not a groundless faith, that technology will find a way out of our multifaceted crisis. Hutchinson (1998, pp.136-137), for example, has alluded to a number of surveys in the United Kingdom regarding children's hopes and fears for the future. The general conclusion of these surveys was that as children grow older, the more pessimistic they become about the world around them, a world which they see in crisis. It is interesting to note, however, that while these children remained pessimistic in their perception of a world future, they – more so the boys than the girls – still embraced "uncritically technocratic dreaming or glamorous high-tech solutions to things" (ibid). Consistent with our mindless obsession with technology and its utopian vision, there is little doubt that the educational promulgation of such faith in the invincibility of modern technology inadvertently increases the hideous magnitude of our current environmental and health crisis. Furthermore, it is important to understand that the western

lifestyle philosophy of relentless consumption is firmly enshrined in an educational epistemology of power as the matrix of academic pedagogy, so we will also embrace the destructive technologies of power and mindless consumerism to which gives rise. As Rifkin has pointed out, the picture is now abundantly clear: "Our entire learning process is little more than a twelve-to-sixteen-year training program for the Newtonian world view" (Rifkin, 1980). Education, that is to say, is tantamount to an institutional initiation into the reduction-mechanistic world paradigm. Following on from his elaboration of the Baconian commitment to knowledge as power which underpins western society's value orientation towards the earth, Rifkin has also argued that the majority of "school children are weaned on Bacon's method" (1985, p.17). From the very outset of our schooling, Rifkin has explained, we are educated to believe that the world is a collection of objective facts. We are then introduced to the Baconian account of scientific knowledge as the best way to discover what those facts are and how best to exploit them purportedly for the advancement of humanity. With regard to this Baconian perspective, the final rub is that: we "...are encouraged to create distance between ourselves and the world, to detach ourselves so that we can sever our natural relationships with things and turn them into objects for manipulation (ibid, 1985, p.17).

Reductio-mechanism and transformative subjugation

In the light of the forgoing discussion it should be evident that the posture we assume and the attitudes we take towards nature have been covertly dictated by the theory of knowledge we have endorsed, along with the reductio-mechanism methodology and technologies of power which derive from it. Given the commitment of western education to an epistemology of power, it is unsurprising that consumerism should be regarded as a way in which our successful conquest of nature is expressed. Education thus functions unwittingly to propagate an ideology which hypostatizes the values of power, control, specialisation and efficiency which lie at the very heart of the educational epistemology to which we have been alluding. Commenting on western style 'mechanistic management', Capra has noted: "The mechanistic approach to management has certainly been very successful in increasing efficiency and productivities, but it has also resulted in widespread animosity toward organisations that are managed in machine-like" (2002, p.91). In a similar way, since the Industrial Revolution, our schools have, in true reduction-mechanistic fashion, functioned as scaled down copies of efficient, specialised, organisations. As Toffler wrote:

The whole idea of assembling masses of students (raw materials) to be processed by teachers (workers) in a centrally located school (factory) was a stroke of industrial genius. The whole administrative hierarchy of education, as it grew up (from the beginning of the mechanical age) followed the model of industrial bureaucracy. The very organisation of knowledge into permanent disciplines was grounded on industrial assumptions. Children marched from place to place and sat in assigned stations. Bells rang to announce changes of time... The inner life of the school thus became an anticipatory mirror, a perfect introduction to industrial society... Young people passing through this educational machine merged into adult society whose structure of jobs, roles and institutions resemble that of the schools it self (Toffler, 1971, p.362). The temptation of educational institutions to replicate by the way of their own organisational structures the industrial contexts for

which they prepare students has been overwhelming (Laura and Cotton, 1999, p. 130). In addition, Chomsky (1975, pp. 206-207), has opined that “labour is a commodity to be sold on the market for maximal return, that it has no intrinsic value in itself; its only value and immediate purpose is to afford the possibility to consume”. In today’s ‘throwaway’ society consumerism is no longer a means to an end, but an end in itself (Laura: Laura and Cotton, 1999, p. 130). Along with the image of consumption as a form of social power comes competition as a measure of social interaction. People are continually aiming for the better life – ‘to keep up with’, or to become better than, ‘the Joneses’. This competitive preoccupation has in itself resulted in massive social and global inequities i.e., the relentless vicissitudes of the ‘haves and have-nots’ (ibid). As Cousteau (1996, pp. 5-6) has explained, on a global economic basis, these inequities are fully consistent with the alarming imbalance of consumption between the western developed countries and those of the third world. The consumers of the western ‘industrial nations’ represent about one billion people, compare to about 4.5 billion for the rest of inhabitants on earth.

However, on average a person in the so-called ‘developed countries’ consumes “3 times as much as fresh water, 10 times as much as energy, and 19 times as much as aluminium as someone in a developing country”. (ibid, p. 5). These very same developed countries also generate “96 percent of the world’s radioactive waste and 90 percent of the chlorofluorocarbons that eat away at the ozone layers” (ibid).

By hypostatizing the presumption of knowledge as power, education serves inadvertently to instil not only competitive consumer values, but the associated ‘throw away’ ethics which conjures the mistake belief that nature is both an infinite reservoir for commercial resources and a boundless sink for the disposal of the by-products of industry. The resultant philosophy as we have contended, is fundamentally anti-ecological and has fostered a false sense of security. It is within this deference that Laura’s ‘theory of transformative subjugation’ proffers that the technologization of nature will lead ineluctably to its mindless rape (Laura and Cotton, 1999). Transformative subjugation stands as a powerful insight designed to expose the menacing process whereby the things of nature, which otherwise be deemed to have intrinsic value by virtue of their purposive connectivity with the whole of nature, are technologically converted and reduced to synthesised and inert fabrications in respect of which their autonomous value is either diminished or destroyed (ibid).

Given western society’s commitment to the value of knowledge as power, the technologies we creat from power-based epistemologies define our relationship with nature in highly disruptive and destructive ways. In order to make the world of nature as predictable as possible, technologies of power reconstruct and fabricate the world of nature in ways which make it more amenable to predictability. Technologies of power transform or convert things as they are found in nature (usually in volatile and highly reactive forms) into things or parts of things which are highly predictable, by virtue of their inertness, chemically exemplified or otherwise. By transforming the things of nature into forms of things which are more inert than the original forms of those things as found in the nature, science can make the world seem predictable. The problem is that the control which we gain over the world comes at too high an ecological price, the most namely, of having made of the world of nature more inert and less alive,

so to say, than it was before our intrusion. We thus succeed in subjugating nature, it is to be conceded, but only because the world over which we have gained power and control has been made inert or ‘deadened’ by our technological transformations of it (ibid). A paradox surrounding transformative subjugation is inasmuch as environmental education continues to rely heavily on technological solutions to environmental problems, it inadvertently encourages at subtle levels of our interactions with nature the substitutions with nature the substitution of living environments with highly inert ones. In this regard we have endeavoured to extend the argument here to reinforce the point that, the more successful we are in making the world scientifically predictable, the more we make the world of nature ecologically inert. This is the deeper sense in which the persistent commitment of environmental education to technological solutions which derive from the specific presumption of epistemologies of power represents a pedagogic strategy ironically inimical to the ostensible goals of environmental education. The very application of such technologies literally exacerbates the more universal and long-term ecological problems we face by substituting increasingly inert environments in place of living ones (ibid).

Moreover, it is by separating ourselves from the world that nature can, through technology’s transformation subjugations of it, be manipulated without conscience, harnessed for commercial exploitation and mindlessly consumed. The conventional concept of knowledge as power assumes a distinction between the knower and the known, or to reiterate the conventional, though in many circles now outdated terminology, the distinction between subject and object. Within the structure of the traditional school curriculum, however, it is still presumed that knowledge is achieved by detaching students from their observations, so that their judgments can be objective. The world exists, so the realist presumption of the educational epistemology of power decrees, independently of what we say and think about it, or even how we behave towards it. The concept of knowledge as power rests firmly on this assumption, and we would further contend that institutionalised distinctions between the subjective and the objective domains of knowledge are tenuous and misleading, as are the distinctions between subject and object, knower and known.

We assert that within this power-laden epistemological domain, for the objective control and subjugation of nature, contemporary environmental education itself becomes unwittingly transformed and subjugated. Given the alluringly effective nature of scientific reduction-mechanistic methodology, students of ecological and environmental studies are provided with specialised answers to environmental problems which are then formulated in the guise of objective knowledge, and applied as interventionist transformative technology. Such a reduction-mechanistic methodological approach severs only to further our disconnection with nature. This explains why there is little hope encouraging ‘environmentalism’ simply by implanting the epistemology of environmental concerns into the existing educative system which continues implicitly to adopt and transmit the anti-ecological values enshrined in its reduction-mechanistic methodology of power epistemology. This being so, the goals of environmental education are unlikely to be well-severed by turning to the existing dominant paradigm of educational knowledge whose technological applications have proved by their very nature to be profoundly ecologically exacerbating.

Towards a theory of empathetic education

To reformulate our introductory remarks: Unless the form of educational knowledge we select is motivated by empathetic connectivity with the world of nature rather than by a lust for power over nature, our efforts to achieve ecological sustainability are doomed to failure. Environmental education will simply reproduce, albeit in alluringly cosmetic ways, the same contexts of technological invasiveness and intrusion that have in the first place led to the degradation and desacrilization of nature. Once the knowledge as power paradigm is shifted from its position of epistemic priority, however, and replaced by empathetic forms of knowledge embedded in participatory consciousness, the real work of environmental stewardship through the educational process can begin. At the heart of a participatory mode of consciousness is an acute awareness of a deeper level of kinship between the knower and the known". This shift of perspective is not so much a methodological transition, as it is an act of consciousness which requires an attitude of profound openness and sensitivity.

In the light of recent discussions on quantum interconnectivity, human consciousness can no longer be described unambiguously as an element which admits of isolation and extraction from the external world. For example, physicist David Bohm (1990, pp. 173-185) has postulated an 'implicate order' to reality in which human consciousness is itself an essential feature of the underlying order and unity of nature. The topology of nature cannot exclude the way in which consciousness is enfolded into it. Nature cannot be objectified in the required epistemic sense because in essence we have ourselves become an element in the subject-matter we are trying to observe. We cannot separate ourselves from nature because we are, in the radically holistic interpretation, a part of it. In our attempts to measure and describe the world outside ourselves, we are at one the same time describing ourselves. Empathetic connectivity with nature affords a new vision of the scope of our ecological responsibilities. Appreciation of the inter-connective complexity of the web of life leads in turn to the necessity of redefining the tools of technology in empathetic-participatory ways. Recognition of this insight explains why technologies which derive from an educational epistemology of power are never neutral. Motivated by power and the human desire that technology will allow us to control nature, technologies will, by virtue of their very conceptions be tools of power, dominance and expropriation.

The technologies we create, as we have consistently argued, are thus saturated with power. Given the fundamental interconnectivity exemplified in the quantum world, for example, it is clear that for every increase in power brought to us by technology, there will be a corresponding diminution of power and consequent disruption to some other part of nature which results. We can look at this by way of a Quantum heuristic. For example, Werner Heisenberg, in his 1930 publication, *The Physical Principles of The Quantum Theory*, showed that whatever one attempts to apply classical mechanistic terminology e.g., wave, particle, position, velocity etc, to subatomic events, they will invariably find that their definitions cannot be applied simultaneously in a precise manner. For example, give that we have two pairs of classical concepts (e.g. momentum and mass), the more emphasis we place on the predictability of one, the less certain we are bound to become about the other. In other words, the more control we place on one aspect of reality the less certain or disrupted our

control becomes over other aspects of reality. Heisenberg has termed this quantum phenomenon, the 'uncertainty principle' (Heisenberg, 1930, pp.10-20). When the concept of educational knowledge is motivated by four faith in the virtue of connectivity as the ultimate form of security within nature, our interactions with the environment will be oriented pedagogically to reflect more empathetic interactions with nature. The measure of security is shifted in epistemic terms from how well our knowledge allows us to dominate and control nature to how well we know how to connect with and participate in the cosmic dance of nature's harmonic unity. This shift of epistemic vision encourages a transition of dispositional posture from doing battle against nature to being in partnership with it.

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper has been show that new directions in educational leadership within the field of environmental education need to challenge the philosophical presumptions of power epistemology and consumerist ideology, if the ostensible goals of environmental education are to be brought to fruition. The traditional reliance on technologies of power, conjoined with unfettered consumerist ideology is doomed to failure. It has been argued that far from being value-free or neutral, both knowledge and technology are epistemically biased towards power and control. Thus, every time technology is used and in whatever way it is used, it will express that bias. A commitment to the epistemology of power is in essence a commitment to the transformative subjugation of nature and therefore inimical to the purported goals of environmental. education itself has become scientifically specialised and technologized.

Within this context we have attempted to show that the dominant educational epistemology which has become virtually pedagogically ubiquitous in the western world enshrines a reduction-mechanistic methodology of transformative subjugation, whose institutional expression gives rise to a consumerist ideology of value which is in principle anti-ecological. Unabated reduction-mechanistic science and its accompanying rationale of technological imperialism betray how easily knowledge of this kind can be used for anti-ecological purposes. The continued expression of this ideological perspective through technologies of transformative subjugation has bequeathed to us a legacy of over-consumption and the concomitant desacrilization of the world in which we live. If we are ever to overcome the environment crisis, we can no longer acquiesce to our obsession with unlimited growth and the continued invention of tools of menacing power consummate with this end. Consistent with this rumination, we suggest that a resolution to the crisis can best be achieved by relinquishing our commitment to the reductio-mechanistic methodology of power epistemology, and by embracing instead a new paradigm of empathetic epistemology. In so doing we thus advance the frontiers of educational leadership forward to encourage a new pedagogy of environmental education, grounded in the holism of empathetic educational epistemology.

REFERENCES

- Ashton, J.F. and Laura, R.S. 2004. 'New Insights in Environmental Education on Harmonising Technology and Nature' Insight Press, US, Boston

- Ashton, J.F. and Laura, R.S. 2012. *'Dimension of Health'* Amazon, New York.
- Berman, M. 1981. *'Rechantment of the World'* New York: Cornell University Press.
- Laura, R.S. 2010. *'Don't Let Technology Steal Your Soul'* Insight Press, US, New York
- Laura, R.S. and Ashton, J.F. 1990. *Hidden Hazards*, Transworld Publications, Sydney/New York
- Laura, R.S. and Cotton, M. C. 2005. *'Empathetic Education'* Farmer, London, New York ISBN-10: 063113414X - ISBN-13: 978-0631134145
- Rifkin.J. and Howard, T. 1980. *'Entropy, A new world view'*. Viking press.
- Skolimowski, H. 1990. *'The world as Sanctuary'* The Quest, 3(2), 27-33.
- Suzuki, D. T. and Dressel, H. 1999. *'From naked ape to super species: A personal perspective on humanity and the global eco-crisis, Stoddart'* Publishing Co., Ltd., Niagara Falls, New York, U.S.A ISBN: 0773761985 / 0-7737-6198-5
- Toffer, A. 1971. *Future Shock*, New York, Bantam Books.
