Studies in Philosophy and Education **20:** 361–385, 2001.
© 2001 *Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in the Netherlands.*

Philosophy of Education in Spain at the Threshold of the 21st Century – Origins, Political Contexts, and Prospects

GONZALO JOVER
Universidad Complutense de Madrid

Abstract. This article analyzes the evolution of Philosophy of Education in Spain and its situation at the dawn of the 21st century. Spain's peculiar socio-historical circumstances have largely conditioned the direction this discipline has taken over the last several decades. So, although during a period there was some approximation towards the methods of analytic philosophy, Philosophy of Education has never fully relinquished its normative vocation. To do so would have meant spurning the hopes and fears that had filled Spanish society by the mid 1970s upon the reinstatement of civil liberties and democracy. Indeed, attention to the circumstances and that normative orientation have found their best fit in a practical Aristotelian-based philosophy meant to endow Philosophy of Education with a normative character that do not shun the educator's need for reflection, practical decision-making, and responsibility. Since the 1990s, new directions have been marked by the challenge of postmodernism, inasmuch as it affects not only the technological positivist model but also the reflective educator's model of a practical Philosophy of Education. The new directions spread out in various ways, yet they all fall into a common denominator of narrative trends. The problem posed by these new languages lies in the extent to which they are consistent with pedagogic intent. In turn, the answers take on different profiles depending on whether the stance leans more towards the philosophical or the pedagogical point of view within Philosophy of Education. The complementary nature of both perspectives characterizes the current state of the field in Spain.

Key words: pedagogic intention, practical philosophy, Spanish education reform, Spanish Philosophy of Education

1. Introduction

At the turn of a new century, we can affirm that Philosophy of Education in Spain has achieved a state and status of a consolidated branch of knowledge. Throughout time, education has always been a matter of interest to Spain's most acclaimed philosophers, from stoic Lucius Annaeus Seneca and the master of rhetoric Marcus Fabius Quintilianus to the contemporaries of Miguel de Unamuno, José Ortega y Gasset, and María Zambrano, as well as a whole gamut of historical figures such as Isidoro de Sevilla, Ramón Llull, and Juan Luis Vives. Even so, as Feinberg suggests, a line has to be drawn between the interest that philosophy and philosophers have shown towards education, and Philosophy of Education as a

specialized field of research and knowledge (Feinberg, 1995). In such a strict sense, Philosophy of Education has for several decades now been taking shape as a specific discipline focused on preparing professionals in education. As a result, it deals more with educational problems and topics than with philosophical debates, unless such debates are held from a point of view that affects those problems.

This delimitation of Philosophy of Education, with its relatively well-identified nucleus of advocates,[1] has come about within the context of a progressive emancipation of university studies in Pedagogy from their original philosophical root, often under the guise of setting up a more scientific and technical kind of knowledge. In a way, this helps explain why a well-known Spanish philosopher recently complained that education did not rank high in the priorities of his fellow philosophers:

> [Education] seems to be too restricted, too specialized, too functional and modest to capture any priority attention from the great thinkers of today (Savater, 1997, p. 15).

However, the separation can never be complete. Nor should it. Here as in other places, Philosophy of Education is debated out of a kind of never-ending search for self-identity amidst tensions between a philosophical inclination and one prioritizing pedagogical concerns. Following on the distinction Rorty applies to the situation of philosophy in the Anglo-Saxon world, this tension has in our case meant that the trend towards a more specific, professional Philosophy of Education has not, at least at present, vanquished the more 'romantic' mode of philosophizing in which genius, inspiration, and insinuation take precedence over analyzing and solving problems (Rorty, 1998, pp. 125–140).

In the pages that follow, we will therefore track the evolution and current situation of Philosophy of Education in Spain. It is by no means my intention to make a simple descriptive history, even if such a task were indeed possible. Especially in its later stages, it is not from an outsider's view: it is the history of Philosophy of Education as experienced by someone who is part of its domain. The narrator himself will be narrated here. Nor is it my aim to cover the whole range of possibilities that fit under the denomination of Philosophy of Education, which would entail a broader discussion on the scope of what exactly Philosophy of Education is and is not. My objective is more concrete. It centers on the evolution and situation of Philosophy of Education as an academic discipline linked to university studies in Pedagogy. Finally, I do not hope to provide an exhaustive list of Spanish bibliography in this field, which would in itself require its own space, as well as a different focus.[2] Rather, what I do hope to do is to outline some points that may reveal the direction and meaning that Philosophy of Education has taken on in the broadest context of Spain's social and political evolution.

We will start our journey by making a quick review of the discipline's background from the beginning of the 1930s. The peculiar circumstances of Spanish society throughout the second half of the century have greatly conditioned its later development. Attention to the expectations that rose from the new socio-political

system in the second half of the 1970s left Philosophy of Education practically no choice but to adopt a normative orientation, one that found its greatest inspiration in the realm of practical philosophy. Since the 1990s, propelled by the challenges of postmodernism, Philosophy of Education has been trying out new languages in the realms of narrative trends.

2. Background

As a specific discipline, the beginnings and evolution of Philosophy of Education in Spain parallels the development of studies in Pedagogy at Spanish universities. Its origin may be placed at the early 1930s upon the creation of Sections of Pedagogy at the universities of Madrid and Barcelona (Jover, 1990; Sacristán, 1992).

In 1932 the Faculty of Arts at the *Universidad de Madrid* (today, *Universidad Complutense de Madrid*) set up its Section of Pedagogy with the objective of fostering "the growth of sciences of education and the development of higher pedagogical studies, as well as for teacher training for secondary schools and schools of education, inspectors of primary schools and principals of large grade schools."[3] From the start, philosophical reflection on education was considered a central part of pedagogical training. This was made clear by the philosopher and Dean of the Faculty, Manuel Garcia Morente, who published an article at the time stressing the intimate ties between Philosophy and Pedagogy, insofar as being "two aspects of the same thing: the occupation of thought", and warning that Pedagogy, "seduced by pragmatism and vital efficiency, may very well fall in the error of granting more virtue to teaching methods than to thought, and imagine it possible to teach and learn without thinking" (Garcia Morente, 1931, 1975 edition, p. 192).

Course offerings in those early years at the Section included specific subjects on 'Philosophy of Education' as well as contents on 'the philosophical foundations of education' within broader courses on Pedagogy. These courses were led by professors such as Juan Zaragueta, who years later gathered his ideas on education in the book *Pedagogía fundamental* (*Fundamental Pedagogy*) (Zaragüeta, 1943) and María de Maetzu, a disciple of Ortega y Gasset and one of the key figures in Spanish Pedagogy in the early 20th century, having studied the philosophical foundations of education with Natorp in Marburg (Gamero, 1985; Pérez-Villanueva, 1988).

Similar developments were under way at the *Universidad de Barcelona*, where Philosophy of Education was taught as a main discipline in pedagogical degree programs once the Section was created in 1932. Its most fervent supporter was the philosopher Joaquín Xirau, who saw education as a blend of art, *appropriate* technique (since it concerns the life of the other person), and morality. As a consequence, he considered that "any pedagogical reflection thus lies between the biological sciences, which analyze a life existence, and the philosophical sciences, which determine the realm of values that every conception of reality depends upon" (Xirau, 1930; 1999 edition, p. 376).

After the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939), the 1940s and 1950s saw a reorganization of the Sections of Pedagogy. Philosophy of Education was still present in the various programs of study all the way up to the 1970s. During those years, the predominant view held that "Philosophy of Education is basically Metaphysics of Education" (González Álvarez, 1952, p. 11). For Millán-Puelles, one of the main representatives of the day, pedagogical knowledge had to be established on delving into the basic and essential premises of education, "an indispensable requisite for normative guidelines on concrete educational practices to be built on solid foundations" (Millán-Puelles, 1963, p. 9). As was common practice at the time, Millán-Puelles approached this task taking support from Thomist philosophy.[4]

The 1970s, which began in Spain with new restructuring and reform in the education system sparked by yearnings for modernization, were in some ways a time of jump-starting, developing, and seeking out new perspectives on Philosophy of Education. In one of the main books of the time, professor Fullat, from the *Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona*, aimed to disclose the scientific, ideological, and critical discourses underlying the various conceptions or philosophies of education. At a time when pedagogical studies at Spanish universities were grounded on the epistemological and organizational model of 'Sciences of Education', this book argued against the impossibility of not taking sides, of hiding under neutrality and aseptic scientificism when there is no such thing as neutral knowledge (Fullat, 1978, p. 429).

In wake of what had been a predominant trend in the international panorama of the discipline, these years also witnessed some interesting incursions into methods of analytic philosophy,[5] which had been brought to Spain by the *Universidad Complutense* professor Ibáñez-Martín through the works of Peters, some of the most important of which were published in Spanish in those years (Peters, 1969 and 1977).[6]

Nevertheless, such incursions did not mean that Philosophy of Education would give up its normative vocation. Linguistic analysis, as Esteve wrote at the time citing Austin, helps avoid the confusion that hinders advancing knowledge of education, but cannot provide the 'last word' (Esteve, 1979, p. 120). Through the analysis of educational concepts, what is sought is not so much the *conditions of use*, but the *conditions of action*, which assumes the possibility of a foundation deeper than words. This is the case, for example, in the analysis of the concept of education in Ibáñez-Martín's influential book *Hacia una formación humanística* (*Towards Humanistic Education*). The analysis speaks of a lower sense and a higher sense of the term 'education'[7] in its double meaning of task and achievement, according to the distinction that was common at the time. Ibáñez-Martín, who had previously referred to Hirst's theory of liberal education, concludes his analysis indicating:

> Thus, to summarize what we have seen so far, we could say that education in its higher sense, and meeting the requisites of both education as task and education as achievement, is the transmission (or acquisition) of types of knowledge

> intertwined with the dimensions of the proper human life and endowed with an internal hierarchy, carried out with whatever effort may be necessary, in such a way that it incites not an automatic conformist attitude, but a free, personal position that can be the non-forced beginning of something original on the path towards human fulfillment (Ibáñez-Martín, 1975, pp. 32–33).

More important here than the use of the words are the requisites inherent in education in its highest meaning: an activity geared at human fulfillment, which implies thinking of "the existence of a guiding idea regarding human excellence" (ibid, p. 51). This, then, is a reception that does not deny the limits of analytic philosophy when faced with normative issues and the impossibility of running away from value positions on education.[8] As Halliday put it, at the end "it does not seem possible for Analytic Philosophy of Education to avoid the charge that its method simply reinforces its prior commitment to certain values and norms" (Halliday, 1990, p. 24).

Without taking credit away from the contributions of analytic philosophy and its push to give credibility and rigor to our field, Ibáñez-Martín himself has dedicated several later works (Ibáñez-Martín, 1982 and 1989a) to showing the limits of Philosophy of Education understood just as a linguistic analysis or as a metatheory on education of the kind proposed by Moore (Moore, 1974 and 1982). These approaches mean disconnecting Philosophy of Education from real practice, distancing it from the most pressing educational problems for which it does not seem to offer any help. Understanding Philosophy of Education this way in the end means withdrawing from the arena of educational decision-making, retreating instead to other realms, acknowledging defeat to other, more self-confident modes of knowledge. Yet this is precisely what the peculiar set of socio-historical circumstances in Spanish society of the mid-1970s kept from happening. Retreat to those other realms would have meant turning our backs on the hopes, and uncertainties, that lay before us.

3. Context and Rising Tensions

The 1970s represented above all the beginning of sweeping social and political changes in our country, which were bound to affect the consequent development of Philosophy of Education. After four decades under an autocratic regime, the Constitution was ratified by referendum on December 6, 1978, affirming that "Spain is hereby established as a social and democratic State, subject to the rule of law, which advocates freedom, justice, equality and political pluralism as highest values of its legal system" (Spanish Constitution, Art. 1.1).

According to that article, the Constitution proclaims the rights and freedoms of the citizens, the separation of church and state, the acknowledgment of the historical and cultural differences of the territories composing the country, etc. As befits a pluralistic and democratic society, it also leaves the door open to tension between those who advocate greater government intervention for the sake

of pursuing equality, and those who favor lessening such intervention in light of the formal principle of freedom. This tension is reflected in the article of the Constitution that established the key points to the future Spanish education system, which begins by stating that "Everyone has the right to education. Freedom of teaching is recognized" (Art. 27.1).

The Constitution, then, provides more than just a framework for legislative regulation; it also sets an ethical framework based on the higher values of liberty, justice, equality, and pluralism. For this reason, the study of how that framework should shape specific educational policies is not the exclusive domain of legal experts and education technicians; rather, it also falls to Philosophy of Education to study the most controversial problems of educational policy-making: the political meaning of education, the possibilities and limits of government intervention in education, educational freedoms and the debate on public versus private schooling, the politics of the curriculum, the response to the factors conditioning educational possibilities, the role of the State and education in multicultural societies, the exigencies of the right to education, etc.[9]

The Constitution itself asserts that "Education shall aim at the full development of human personality with due respect for the democratic principles of coexistence and for basic rights and freedoms" (Art. 27.2). The constitutional framework also forces us to take a deep look at the meaning and means of handling moral and civic education in the new political and social context. In early stages, it was a difficult and risky undertaking. For far too long, moral education in our schools had meant nothing more than education in a specific religious content. Moral education as such was almost completely absent from pedagogical research (García López, 1989). For strong supporters of a scientific and technical approach to Pedagogy, any talk of moral education risked bringing back echoes of the past. As Escámez, one of the main specialists in the field, recalled a few years ago,

> With our eyes set on the most developed countries, and without wanting to look back on our own immediate past, it seemed to us that teaching values, although it had a certain musty, outdated taint to it, could be dealt with in meetings and conferences as an ornamental complement to the serious topics we were evidently meant to take up. But one thing was clear: moral education was definitely out of the question; the last thing we needed, now that democracy had been restored, was to waste our time on an issue that smacked of conservative indoctrination, religious manipulation, and even sexual repression! (Escámez, 1997, p. 127).

The situation in which Philosophy of Education found itself enmeshed was not much better, as Sacristan condemned at the time (Sacristán, 1988b). As of the second half of the 1980s, various research groups at several Spanish universities began looking into the possibilities and means of inserting moral education into the curricula and schools. With a few exceptions, interest in the more operative side of the problem outweighed any interest in shedding light on the philosophical foundations. Anything that even sounded like foundationalism, much less adopting

some moral position based on substantive ethics, was discarded. The explicit appeal to a religious conception of person was assumed only by the most daring (Barrio, 1989). Several years behind what had been happening on the international scene, practically the only recourse left in this climate was the appeal to a system of ethics without content. Kohlberg, surrounded by an aura of progressive attitude and scientific backing, represented a kind of guarantee. The result was a considerable imbalance between the predominant trends in moral education, which were closely bound to ethical formalism, and the movements from philosophy that were urging for a revision of the formalistic view (Bárcena, Gil Cantero and Jover, 1995, pp. 189–190). Stages had to be burned through too quickly. For that reason, the trends that have come about since the mid-1990s follow a broader, more integrative line of thought. It is no longer enough to develop moral reasoning; advocated now is the "construction of moral personality" (Puig, 1996). Above the antagonisms between supporters of a cognitive approach and those of a substantive, character-education approach, at stake today is accepting that "a morally educated person must know what has to be done, want to do it, and put it into practice" (Escámez, 1997, p. 306).

The difficulties surrounding the prickly topic of moral education may explain why Philosophy of Education has turned instead towards the subject of citizenship and civic education.[10] The latter is free of many of the negative connotations that make people cringe at the former. In fact, quite the opposite occurs. Talking about citizenship is talking about democracy and democratic values; its discourse brims with words of tolerance, pluralism, and peaceful coexistence among different options.

Unlike the psychological and technical approach that has predominated in moral education issues, the subject of citizenship seems to be one which lends itself better to a philosophical orientation. It has been the focal point of many of the debates on ethics and political philosophy at the end of the 20th century (Kymicka and Norman, 1995). Moreover, as Bárcena has shown, discussion on citizenship and civic education has direct bearing on the purpose of Philosophy of Education in any democratic society. The never-ending question on the relationship between philosophy and politics becomes even more pointed in cases such as ours, where philosophy is aimed at action – educational action. What object can Philosophy of Education maintain within a democratic society in which the legitimacy of the values to be fostered is based on the common accord of its citizens? Who should have the last word, philosophy or politics?

If we have learned anything from the century that has just come to a close, it is that faith in democracy is in and of itself no guarantee. Democracy degenerates when it turns into merely a matter of form and stops being a matter of attitude, a way of thinking, feeling and acting. Democracy cannot be taken for granted; it must be worked at and rediscovered on a daily basis. "This is precisely where a philosophical education provides its greatest contribution to the development of civic life: education for thinking as *understanding* and searching for *meaning*" (Bárcena, 1997, p. 31). Philosophy of Education is an open invitation to thinking

that we send to current and future educators alike. Bárcena grounds this appeal to thought on authors such as Hannah Arendt and John Dewey, for whom philosophy is born out of discord and conflict of interests demanding an answer as a hypothesis. That is precisely why it is so well suited to democratic life: "Where interests are so superficial that they glide readily into one another, or where they are not sufficiently organized to come into conflict with one another, the need for philosophy is not perceptible" (Dewey, 1961, p. 326). In turn, education is the process through which needed transformations may be accomplished and answers stop being mere hypotheses as to what is desirable. To Dewey, the conclusion is clear: "Philosophy is the theory of education as a deliberately conducted practice" (ibid, p. 332). As we shall see, the development of Educational Theory in Spain over the last twenty years can to a large extent be considered a reaction against that kind of identification.

As Kennedy points out, the general interest in the subject of citizenship and civic education that came about in many countries throughout the 1990s can be explained by both the particular circumstances that affect different education systems as well as the set of factors and broader shared concerns on questions such as the recognition of cultural diversity, the demand for greater equality between genders, the globalization of the economy, the impact of new communication technologies, and the development of ways of supranational political organization that blur the boundaries of national identities (Kennedy, 1997, pp. 2–3).

In our case at hand, one of the farthest-reaching factors was the introduction of the concept Citizenship of the Union as established in 1992 in the Treaty of the European Union. Spain had joined the European Community just a few years earlier (1986). Similarly, it had not joined the Council of Europe and its system of human rights until the late 1970s. Despite the rather limited political and legal scope of the 1992 Treaty and its subsequent revisions regarding the idea of citizenship of the Union, Spain's full-fledged membership in European affairs opened Spanish Philosophy of Education to new interpretative horizons and offered the chance to get closer to other epistemological traditions. The reflection on building Europe as a pedagogic common ground, the principles that drive educational policy in the Union, the values and pedagogical meaning behind attempting to give a European dimension to education, the educational implications of the notion of Citizenship of the Union in the context of contemporary civic debate, etc., have been subjects for work and research in Philosophy of Education during these years.[11] This contrasts sharply with what has been going on for some time in other contexts in which, as McLaughlin said a few years ago, these subjects "have not been at the forefront of the minds of those concerned with either the theory or practice of education" (McLaughlin, 1997, p. 48).

The same motive of seeking out a new, wider-reaching dialog was behind the book *La Filosofía de la Educación en Europa* (*Philosophy of Education in Europe*). Published in the same year the Treaty of the European Union was signed, the book reviewed the situation of the field in several European countries. In its introduction,

Ibáñez-Martín pointed out how the few prescriptions the Treaty contains on education – unaltered in this regard in its later revisions – are susceptible in their outward simplicity to being interpreted from the point of view in which they affect such pedagogically relevant issues such as the way of understanding the characteristics of educational processes, the pedagogical knowledge and the activity of educators (Ibáñez-Martín, 1992, p. 14).

Once again, what is being promoted is a Philosophy of Education understood as "guidance on the meaning and direction of future action" (ibid, p. 15) which, without falling into pure factualism, remains alert to the problems and circumstances of the moment. In our case, those circumstances were affected by the institution of a new education system which implied rethinking the nature of teachers' work and knowledge, the school curriculum, the way to respond to diversity in education, etc.

When the Spanish Socialist Party (*Partido Socialista Obrero Español*) won a wide parliamentary majority in 1982, a period of great upheaval began in our education system. New regulations were made regarding constitutional rights (participation of the educational community in running the schools, public funding and accreditation of private educational institutions, school choice, the right of owners of private schools to define their own educational identity, academic freedom for teachers, etc.), which were passed in the 1985 *Act on the Right to Education*, one of the most controversial laws in recent history in Spain. In addition, a new organizational structure was given to the education system, which culminated in the 1990 *Act on the General Organization of the Education system*, which was meant as a new way of organizing school grades, a new framework for the curriculum, a new role for the teachers, etc.

On paper, the reform seemed aimed at a *praxical* conception of pedagogical knowledge and curriculum, joined to an image of the teacher as a reflexive professional. According to the *Libro blanco para la reforma del sistema educativo* (*White Book on the Reform of the Education System*),

> Ongoing teachers' education should mainly be articulated on the teachers' reflecting on their own activity, in such a way as to let them examine their implicit theory of education, the ideas inspiring their work, and their attitudes, in order to initiate a process of self-evaluation which guides their professional development. Thus conceived, teaching practices turn into an action research process (...)
>
> The education authorities' adoption of an open curriculum encourages autonomy in teachers to develop curricular projects (Ministerio de Educacion y Ciencia, 1989, p. 213).

If we add to this the fact that the reform wished to give more importance to the ethical ends of education by means of a series of cross-curricular subjects such as moral and civic education, education for peace, education for equal opportunities between genders, etc., it would come as no surprise that the outcome would

have been a heightened interest in the type of pedagogical knowledge that could be fostered from Philosophy of Education. Indeed, Philosophy of Education has insisted on considering education as a deliberative moral practice, which is not kept to applying a set of predetermined rules aiming at preset goals. Instead, it requires ongoing decision-making as situations and events arise, based on a moral commitment to the good of the learner.[12] In the early 1980s, Altarejos undertook a reading of Peters from the vantage of the Aristotelian philosophy of *praxis* in order to highlight this substantially ethical nature of education and pedagogical knowledge. Like moral action, educating implies contingency: what might and might not be, or what may be like this or like that, which is why any preset prescriptions drawn up outside the specific action being taken are of limited usefulness. "Educational know-how springs from action, and thus, each educator decides how s/he should act" (Altarejos, 1983, p. 124).

Despite the harmonies in many of these views, Philosophy of Education of the day had little impact on the system being designed.[13] To explain this situation, it would do well to bear in mind that, first, the Spanish reform has not been immune to the 'de-professionalising paradigm' and the market forces that clutch education systems and ostracize ethical considerations of education as a valuable practice for its own sake (Hyland, 1996). As this phenomenon became progressively more apparent, it soon gave rise to disappointment felt not only by those who did not share the original political views embodied in the reform process, but also by those who had placed their highest hopes in it, as they began to see how the grand declarations of intentions were giving way to "a rigid, 'technically-oriented' plan based on the assumption of considering education as the product of an investment" (Zufiaurre, 1994, p. 227).[14] Second, when designing the education system, what weighed undeniably heavily in marginalizing Philosophy of Education were a number of previous attitudes against it, including epistemological prejudice based on ignorance of what Philosophy of Education was in fact proposing, and real or imaginary ties to political positions and ways of living. Even so, philosophers and philosophy of education must assume we held some degree of responsibility in that we could not make public awareness of ideas which clearly aligned well with the ones that pedagogues and publishers alike were so avidly seeking abroad.[15]

The reform of the education system also took place in the context of a new policy on higher education. This policy, formalized in 1983 in the *Act on University Reform*, had two consequences: restructuring the old university departments into broad areas of knowledge, and new sets of degree programs. Regarding the first consequence, restructuring brought Philosophy of Education into the area of knowledge labeled 'Theory and History of Education' at the universities that had managed to include it in their course programs. As to the other consequence, the newly organized degree programs in Pedagogy opened the door to a return to 'Pedagogy', in the singular, instead of the old model of 'Sciences of Education', which was by then clearly in decline. The result made sometimes-uneasy bedfellows of an Educational Theory and a Philosophy of Education within the

same epistemological and administrative area of knowledge – which, among other things, affects how associate and full professors are hired and promoted. That Educational Theory succeeded the old General Pedagogy, and was looked to as a major field yet to be built, scientific and technological in nature, by means of which educational processes would become more efficient and consistent. Meanwhile, Philosophy of Education was demanding status not only as an auxiliary discipline, but as a *foundational* one. Philosophy of Education, wrote Ibáñez-Martín at the time,

> cannot be taken as a tasteful ornament for a few select minds. Rather it constitutes the very *first* moment – looking at the end to be achieved – of any educational task, since it lets us determine the structure of the educational process, the criteria for action, and the essential goals that must be sought and met. These questions are previous to the study of the strategies and techniques that lead to achieving the desired end (Ibáñez-Martín, 1989a, p. 416, author's italics).

In his book *Teoría de la Educación* (*Educational Theory*), published in 1987, Touriñán clearly showed how complex the relationships are between the two epistemological stances. He criticized the confusion between them that arises in what he called the marginal and subordinate views on knowledge of education. In the former, education is not a subject to be studied on its own right, but as an accessory to broader philosophical concerns. Educational Theory is equated with philosophies of education, i.e., conceptions of life which ought to inspire educational activity. In the latter, the subordinate view sees education as a genuine object of study, but void of any intrinsic meaning in and of itself. Consequently, from this angle the study of education consists of applying the principles and conclusions of parent disciplines: Psychology of Education, Sociology of Education, etc. Educational Theory has no real consistency, but is associated either with the interpretive or practical theories on education that are handed down from those parent disciplines, or with Philosophy of Education as an application of philosophy to educational issues. "Educational Theory understood as Philosophy of Education is a treatise of philosophy. What is specialized is the task, not the discipline" (Touriñán, 1987, p. 267). Eschewing both views, Touriñán instead advocates an autonomous perspective in which Educational Theory takes on its own identity, since education is seen as an genuine object of study with its own intrinsic meaning.

> In the autonomous view of education, Educational Theory is a construct of the kind of knowledge known as scientific and technological... It comes up with substantive theories of education and specific technological propositions of education (ibid., p. 268).

Autonomy, however, does not mean self-sufficiency. Educational Theory viewed thus, as Escámez points out, rests on a set of assumptions regarding human beings, for example, that need to be clarified, in the same way that the concepts of 'education', 'optimization', 'desired ends', etc., which Educational Theory makes

use of, largely turn out to be empty gaps if no reference is made to values (Escámez, 1988, pp. 14–15). Philosophy of Education is not necessarily annulled, but does lie a long way from being considered as the very '*first* moment'.

For those of us who think it possible to find in the educational relationship a core specific enough to distinguish it from other kinds of human relations (Jover, 1991), there is nothing odd about the attempt to reach an autonomous construct of Pedagogy, the object of which would be defined by that specific core. Logically enough, the problem is to identify that core, to determine what characterizes some relations and actions as educational. We have suggested that we act educationally when, during the education process, we plan the action to be done in such a way as to bear on the moral structure of the person being educated, and help him/her achieve personal and social stances (Bárcena, Gil Cantero, and Jover, 1993, pp. 248–250). By this, we situate ourselves at the midway between those who believe education is basically resolved in technical terms and those who maintain that it is basically a matter of ethics. Needless to say, the former group does not deny the importance of ethical issues in education, nor does the latter group mean to imply that the effectiveness of what is carried out is of little relevance. The problem is not one of *pertinence*, but of *preeminence*. The problem comes up when, after acknowledging both parts, we choose one of them as the *global explanatory conception* of education and Pedagogy (Gil Cantero, 1991). Is Pedagogy a kind of technical knowledge, or an ethical one? In our view, the question formulated that way has no answer insofar as the fact that both parties imply a prior definition of what it is that is being sought. The only way out seems to be taking a leap and placing ourselves above both perspectives in a sort of dialectic movement. That jump leads us to recognize that a technological view of educational activity actually takes on adequate *pedagogical sense* when socio-ethical aspirations are successfully integrated into the idea of education. The concept of pedagogical effectiveness is not just a technical concept, but is ethical as well (Bárcena, Gil Cantero and Jover, 1993, pp. 242–244).

Whether it was because the two perspectives and their protagonists have reached a closer mutual understanding, or because the original circumstances behind the dispute have faded away, the debate today has practically died on the limb, though no one knows if it might spring up again. Evidence of this is the noticeably lesser weight that epistemological contents had on the meaning of the discipline in the 1998 revised edition of *La Filosofía de la Educación Hoy* (*Philosophy of Education Today*) (Altarejos et al., 1998), a kind of mouthpiece for philosophers of education, in contrast to the weight given to them in the 1989 edition (Altarejos et al., 1989). On the other hand, from the field of Educational Theory comes the begrudging acknowledgment that

> The change in names from 'Pedagogy' to 'Educational Theory' has not fulfilled the expectations of those who advocated it, since the drive to find more empirical, less exclusively philosophical grounds for educational activity, which would be left for Philosophy of Education, has been conditioned by the corpor-

> ativist dynamics of university professors, which has come to understand the whole set of disciplines included in the Area of Theory and History of Education as merely speculative, thus doing nothing to strengthen the ties between theory and practice (Sarramona, 2000, p. 8).

The line between the two viewpoints is hazier today. Educational Theory has not been able to establish itself as the autonomous scientific and technological approach as foreseen in the eighties; nor have most of us, the philosophers of education, taken well to being classified as mere speculators whose work has no bearing on practice. It is quite the other way around. For most of us, Philosophy of Education attains its highest meaning as a practical philosophy with real impact on educational contexts and situations, and without disdain at drawing up specific action plans and programs as needed.[16]

4. Opting for a Practical Philosophy

Like other academic fields, Philosophy of Education in Spain has been built up from looking both outward on its neighboring disciplines as well as inward on itself. Viewed inward, the discipline debates between trends that give priority to its philosophical underpinnings and trends that stress its most pedagogical orientation. These two lines of thought differ greatly on how closely bound each is to normative considerations, not just in terms of general educational purposes, but also of specific courses of action.

For the more philosophically minded, the normative aspect falls to Pedagogy, not to Philosophy of Education. From this point of view, Fullat (1989 and 1992) distinguishes Philosophy of Education, as a field of knowledge focused on meaning that analyzes the conditions of possibility and the language of education, from Educational Theory, as an explanatory field regarding learning processes, and from Fundamental Pedagogy, as a normative field prescribing courses of action. Philosophy of Education, he states, is neither a science nor a technology, and neither is Pedagogy. Philosophy of Education is concerned with the *why*, Pedagogy with the *how*. Philosophy of Education consists of a questioning of what is said and done in the spheres of education and Pedagogy. In turn, what characterizes Pedagogy is the normative nature of its statements, which it develops based on data gathered by science and sifted by the sound judgment of what is good for human being. As he has once again stressed in one of his latest works, Fullat says,

> Philosophy does not care about *how* to teach, nor *with what*, nor *in what medium*, nor *to which psycho-biological subject*; at issue is, for instance, *who* the person being educated is in meta-empirical terms, *what* education is and *what* it is *for*. From a technological and scientific point of view, these are useless, impertinent questions. Yet their relevance is undeniable, unless the educator's task, as scientific and technological as it may be, is also foolish and absurd (Fullat, 2000, p. 13).

On the other hand, when priority is given to a concept of Philosophy of Education as something not only about education, but pedagogical in and of itself, the normative element becomes integrated in the very definition of the discipline. Escámez takes this view to criticize the tendency in Philosophy of Education to state such general claims that they lose any tie they may have to the reality of teaching. He proposes understanding it within the realm of practical rationality as a *rational strategy for guiding educational actions*, which should attend to both the ends and the means by which they can be carried out:

> More often than may be desired, philosophers of education have the habit of stating propositions on generalities that can by no means be checked directly or indirectly (...) Their proposals on goals (objectives, ends, ideals) are so abstract, general and disembodied that they no longer attend to the interests of the learners, of the educators, or of the social context. Nor do they refer to the reality of a specific person, in a specific context that is plural, dynamic, and permanently evolving. The goals proposed give little clue as to what the patterns may be for guiding specific educational processes, and thus, we do not know how plausible they are, whether or not they are achievable, and whether or not it is worth making the effort to achieve them at all (Escámez, 1992, p. 143).

As I have tried to justify in the previous section, the socio-political climate in which the discipline has evolved in our country during the last decades, with all its expectations and doubts, has to a certain extent made it necessary to take on a concept of Philosophy of Education that unites the normative orientation with the attention to specific problems and circumstances. This union has found its clearest expression in the realm of practical philosophy. More than an object to be studied, education is conceived as an action to be carried out, "a complex task that must join *praxical* wisdom with the knowledge of certain techniques based on scientific research from a variety of sources" (Ibáñez-Martín, 1989a, p. 414).

This conception is rooted in the Aristotelian tradition of 'practical knowledge', which does not aim at knowing in and of itself, but at action (Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, book A, 1, 1095 a). In contrast to speculative knowledge, the object of which "exists of necessity, and hence it is eternal" (ibid., book Z, 3, 1139 b), the object of practical or prudential knowledge is characterized by its lack of necessity; it "is concerned with things which are human and objects of deliberation; for we maintain that the function of a prudent man is especially this, to deliberate well, and no one deliberates about invariable things or about things not having an end which is a good attainable by *action*" (ibid., 8, 1141 b). In contrast to technical or artistic knowledge, which refers to instrumental activities (production or *poiesis*), practical knowledge refers to actions (praxis) concerning what is good or bad for human beings (ibid., 5, 1140 b). This peculiarity of its object conditions the type of certainty we can attempt to achieve from this sort of knowledge; "for it is the mark of an educated man to seek as much precision in things of a given genus as their nature allows, for to accept persuasive arguments from a mathematician

appears to be as improper as to demand demonstrations from a rhetorician" (ibid., book A, 1, 1094 b). Similarly, the criteria for assessing practical and artistic kinds of knowledge are different (Aristotle, *Poethics*, 1460 b), as are the effects of their respective objects, "for the end of production is some other thing (i.e., a product), but in case of *action* there is no other end (for a *good* action is itself the end)" (Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, book Z, 5, 1140 b).

Understanding education from the philosophy of *praxis*, then, does not mean just the obvious of stating that education is first and foremost something that is done. What makes *praxis* different as a course of action is that the action itself is already an end of its own. This means that in education the relationship between means and ends cannot be thought of in exclusively instrumental or neutral terms. Two consequences are derived from this. The first is that any activity or course of action, in order to be considered educational, must bear witness to the criteria of value that give educational meaning to the intended ends. Tolerance and recognition can also be learned through intolerant means, but no one would call them educational actions. We do not learn only from the influences on us, but sometimes also in spite of them. The second consequence of understanding education as a kind of *praxis* is that it implies thinking of the educator as someone who is not purely neutral regarding the values being encouraged. Educators are not merely executors of pre-designed steps; they are committed to the welfare of the person in their charge:

> The educational relationships has an internal effect on the people engaged, since there is no true education unless there is some influence on the way of dealing with events, unless there is some increase in knowledge, unless we get the other person to figure out the right motives for guiding his/her life and thus optimize his/her operative qualities, etc. But also educators themselves must soon realize that they must be personally committed to their task, in the sense that they cannot just blindly follow the educational steps that others have handed down; rather, they are obliged to think of what is really best for whomever is being educated, first as a person. Only a mercenary would limit him/herself to carrying out tasks handed down from others without further reflection, without knowing that it is not the same to promote racism and hate between social classes as to educate about peace and social harmony. True educators also soon find that their work does not run off their personality, but that when they do it correctly, it is of the utmost value in their own humanization (Ibáñez-Martín, 1989a, pp. 415–416).

The educator's commitment to the other's good becomes the guide for educational decisions. Educational know-how does not boil down to knowing a few ready-made prescriptions. Instead, it requires the educator's tact at figuring out what course of action is best and most convenient for the other person in each specific situation. As a kind of practical knowledge of contingency-based actions, states Altarejos, pedagogical knowledge is first and foremost a kind of knowledge not *about* the action, but *from* the action. Yet this does not mean that the experience

of others is useless. Between the theoretical knowledge of education as an action already done, and the practical knowledge that comes directly from the action itself, Philosophy of Education arises as a theoretical-practical knowledge of the action *to be done*. Thus, it is not a field focused on pure knowledge, nor directly focused on the action itself, but an area of knowledge on how to act, not just in technical terms. Its theoretical side makes it possible to generalize some principles; in its action-based side, its normative character is indirect: rather than being a normative-imperative set of mandates, rules and laws that must be followed to the letter, it is a normative guideline of advice that reinforces the educator's need to think, decide, and take responsibilities. What distinguishes Philosophy of Education from other normative pedagogical disciplines is its teleological orientation. It is not just a cookbook of rules and norms, nor can it be said that it is limited to the study of the great purposes of education. What it attempts is to help adopt decisions on the most adequate courses of action in light of the end to be achieved (Altarejos, 1989 and 1992).[17]

The normative character of Philosophy of Education as part and parcel of practical philosophy, as Gil Cantero has recently pointed out in a perspective that is trying to turn away from the old antinomies between means and ends, technique and ethics, efficiency and adjustment to moral criteria, etc., does not stop at considering the quality of the ends. It should also act as a guide to the various possibilities of how to achieve them, since the value of the end is not equally embodied in every possibility. Thus, it is mistaken to reject Philosophy of Education as an area of knowledge too far removed from real-life practice, or too closely bound to moralizing intentions that stifle any initiative and reflection in the educator. While these kinds of situations no doubt have arisen, to consider them as characteristic features of Philosophy of Education is to ignore the peculiar normative nature that gives meaning and direction to much of the work being undertaken today in the discipline.

> The function of Philosophy of Education is not to present an instructional plan ready to be applied. While the discipline should certainly have permanent ties to educational practices, it would not be by means of some technical norms meant to improve instruction, but by a normative guidance that helps teachers and educators improve, maintain, and commit themselves to a genuinely educational intention. For that reason, there is no sense to questioning the normative extent of Philosophy of Education as if sticking to the indirect nature of its principles and orientations were a limitation. Quite the opposite is true: education implies acknowledging that the specific practical answer finally corresponds to the good judgment of the educators (Gil Cantero, 1998, p. 89).

5. New Challenges

In today's consolidated society backed by nearly 25 years of democracy, with much of the political and epistemological strife regarding Pedagogy having settled down,

the latest developments in Spanish Philosophy of Education have been marked by the brand and challenge of postmodern discourse. One aspect is what postmodernism has implied in matters of cultural and educational change (Colom and Mèlich, 1994; Rodríguez Neira, 1999) and shifting values in the new generations (Gervilla, 1993 and 2000, pp. 111–126). But more important still is what it has meant in terms of questioning the predominant ways of understanding pedagogical knowledge in reference not only to the positivist technological model, but also to the model of the reflexive educator supported by practical Philosophy of Education. As Parker points out, both of them share the same tie to realism that postmodernism rejects:

> For postmodernism, the failure of reflective teaching to provide an appropriate remedy to positivism is consequent on the fact that it shares with its opponent too much of the conceptual and rhetorical pedigree of realism for it to be effective as a cure. This common genetic inheritance can be seen in the eulogizing of rationality as well as in the strategy of doubt (the *sceptical* route to truth of traditional realism). Neither of these pillars of critical reflective rhetoric can provide a foundation for an alternative *attitude* to realism . . . (Parker, 1997, p. 122).

One way out of postmodernism's questioning of any normative aspirations in Philosophy of Education is to seek refuge in very local knowledge, to drop philosophy for anthropology.[18] However, this would mean forgetting the identity crisis that postmodernism has also put anthropological knowledge through (Reyero, 2000).

Another alternative, as Maxine Greene suggests, is to take on the challenge that postmodernism poses, and accept the idea of putting some of our basic assumptions to the test. Postmodernism has taught us to mistrust absolutes and pretenses of wholeness, to understand our own intertextuality as participants in a tradition, to look for other languages . . . (Greene, 1995).

Whether or not one shares the hard-line stances of postmodernism, the call of its challenge cannot go unheeded. Philosophy of Education in Spain has risen to the call and is trying out new languages that can be placed within the revision of the notion of identity as prompted by the so-called crisis of the modern project. The new approaches fall under the common denominator of narrative tendencies, key to which is the idea of a contextual, historical, and biographical self who is real in the here and now, who has a name, face and voice. The trends go in different but interrelated directions: the narrative construction of identity and the rethinking of the educational meaning of the reading experience (Larrosa, 1994, 1995, and 1996), education's recovery of historical memory and the sense of otherness (Mèlich, 1998; Mélich and Bárcena, 1999; Bárcena and Mélich, 2000), and the pedagogic use of life stories and ways to see oneself and the other (Gil Cantero, 1997; Gil Cantero and Jover, 2000; Jover and Reyero, 2000).

Still, lurking below the surface of these new languages is the problem that they may be out of step with any pedagogic purpose. For some, the uncertainty and lack

of stable reference points to use as footholds lead to giving up on any normative position. The only attitude permissible is to "think of education without having any prescriptive idea about its development, nor any normative model for its undertaking. This would mean a creative and plural way of becoming oneself, without pattern or project, with no prescriptive idea of one's itinerary and no normative, authoritarian and exclusive idea of the result, which classics call 'humanity' or becoming 'fully human' " (Larrosa, 1996, pp. 384–385).

For others, the modernity crisis, or rather, its failure, requires us to change our perspective, to give up fruitless epistemological disputes in order to recover the subject him/herself in a sort of return to a renewed humanism. Recalling but going further than Adorno, Mélich draws on Levinas to defend the idea that the only possible criterion in light of the atrocities of the 20th century is that of bare presence of the other, without justifications nor the mediation of ends and purposes:

> Reason no longer has anything else to offer. Reason *ought not to* offer anything else, nor should feeling. We must renounce to the attempt to get any foundation. Trying to justify the new categorical imperative would be an insult to the victims and contempt to the pain of the innocent. Trying to justify the new categorical imperative would mean becoming an accomplice to the killers. *There must not be another Auschwitz!* The new imperative cannot be dealt with through rational discourse; doing so would be nothing short of criminal offense (Mélich, 1998, pp. 33–34).[19]

Education turns into a warm encounter with the other, who flees from any suspicion of intentionality placed on him or her (ibid, pp. 97–108). Yet from a pedagogical point of view, what sticks out is the inconsistency of this kind of thinking, since it shrivels the chance of any educational course of action aimed at some end. As Feinberg remarks, what may be enough from a philosophical point of view is not necessarily enough from the point of view of Pedagogy. Education makes its own demands when it stops being something we can talk about, and becomes something we must do (Feinberg, 1995). A philosophy not just *about* but also *for* education cannot content itself with being 'post' (memory); rather, it should first and foremost be 'ante' (anticipation, proposal).

Education is not stuck in the past, nor detained at the present. Its tense is that of the future. It involves intentionality, because it leans toward that which does not yet exist. Gil Cantero highlights the view that, pedagogically, the biographical and narrative approach applied to pupils' education attains its best when it does not consist "solely of letting each student tell his or her own life story, but leads him or her to a more complete future vision of him/herself, to the point of modifying how s/he assesses his/her personal history. Rigorously speaking, the educator's commitment to the learner is not geared towards what the latter has lived so far, but towards his/her possible future stories still to be lived" (Gil Cantero, 1997, p. 130).

The question, then, is not whether or not there can be any normative or intentional dimension to education, since there is no way to avoid it without dissipating

education into something unspecific, without renouncing any attempt to educate. The question facing Philosophy of Education is what that intentionality should be like, and how it should be turned into concrete practices that can claim to be practices that educate. The educational relationship is by nature paradoxical (Jover, 1991, pp. 167–179, and 1998). It permanently moves between the forces looking at the subject to be educated and the forces aiming at the normative ideal. As educators, we look for something better for the other person, yet what we look for is not something different, but just himself or herself, a set of roughly sketched profiles that are hazily projected into the future and can never run dry in a definitive achievement.

Precisely because of that tension inherent in education, the dividing line between pedagogic intent and zeal for instrumentalization is not always drawn sharply enough. Philosophy of Education thus also has the task of protecting Pedagogy from itself, so to speak: preventing the risk of 'over-pedagogization' and the temptation of absolute planning and control in which the learner's future is already laid out. Philosophy of Education broadens the horizons of Pedagogy by inviting it to jump over the school walls, to question what may seem self-evident, to imagine other possibilities, and to keep ideas from running dry or becoming routine.

The philosophical and pedagogical perspectives of Philosophy of Education are not in fact at odds. They are complementary views that question and reinforce each other. Their coexistence characterizes the discipline's situation in our country at the dawn of the 21st century. Recalling once again the words of Rorty, to whom I referred in the introduction, we may then conclude that, after seventy years of ups and downs, of successes and hardships, Philosophy of Education in Spain is more robust than ever, having the right conditions for creating lively and enriching dialog:

> A humanistic discipline is in good shape only when it produces both inspiring works and works which contextualize, and thereby deromanticize and debunk, those inspiring works . . . (Rorty, 1998, p. 134).

Notes

[1] In Spain today there is no formally constituted association of philosophers of education. For a great many years, this role was filled by the Spanish Pedagogical Society's Section on Philosophy of Education. Since the 1980s, the group of professors who cultivate this field at Spanish universities have been holding yearly meetings in academic sessions fostered by professor Rafael Gil Colomer, from the *Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia* (National Open University of Spain). One of the results of such sessions has, since 1989, been the International Conference on Philosophy of Education, held at that same university every four years. Other universities also host Conferences and Symposia on Philosophy of Education. Over the last ten years, the collective mouthpiece' for this group of twenty-some philosophers of education has been, aside from the proceedings from the Conferences, the collection of books *La Filosofía de la Educación hoy* (*Philosophy of Education Today*), which is now up to four volumes: two monographic pieces (Altarejos et al., 1989 and 1998), a selection of classic texts (Altarejos et al., 1991), and a dictionary (Altarejos et al., 1997).

[2] For a worthy collection of bibliography up to the start of the 1990s, see Sacristán (1992).
[3] *Law of 27 January 1932, which establishes the Section of Pedagogy at the University of Madrid*. Art. 1.
[4] Some of the most representative publications up to the late 1960s include (in addition to those cited in the text): Pacios (1947 and 1954); Yela (1950); García Hoz (1952); San Cristobal (1965); Marín (1969). At the end of the 1960s, Philosophy of Education was also taught for a short time at the Schools of Education, which gave rise to publishing a few textbooks on this matter (Velasco, 1969; Campillo, 1970; Fermoso, 1970; Guil, 1970).
[5] Most significant are the works of Esteve (1977 and 1979).
[6] Published some years later were also the books of Dearden, Hirst and Peters (1982) and Peters (1984). For a time, plans were announced to publish *Ethics and Education* in Spanish, but this seems not to have happened in the end.
[7] The Spanish word used in Ibáñez-Martín's anylisis is *formación*, which, like the German word *bildung*, refers to education in the sense of shaping, giving or taking on *form*.
[8] On this matter, see also the Spanish authors: Cervera (1978), Vegas (1981), and Sáez (1982).
[9] See, for example, Ibáñez-Martín (1977 and 1989b); Touriñán (1979); Fullat (1983); Escámez (1985); Sacristán (1988a and 1989a); Jover (1988 and 1994); Fermoso (1989); García Amilburu (1996b); etc.
[10] See Sacristán and Murga (1994); Jordán et al. (1995); Naval (1995); Bárcena (1997); Ibáñez-Martín (1997); etc.
[11] See Aznar and Pérez Alonso-Geta (1991); Bárcena, Gil Cantero and Jover (1994); Ibáñez-Martín (1994); Jover (1995); Santos (1997); Ruiz Corbella (1999 and 2000); etc.
[12] See, for example, Bárcena (1994). This book is the result of several works on education as a deliberative ethical activity, which were published by the author throughout the 1980s, while education system reforms were under discussion.
[13] The same *Libro blanco para la reforma del sistema educativo* that I referred to previously also indicates the need to blend teachers' experience and reflection with "knowledge coming from disciplines such as Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology, and Pedagogy, which have taken on diverse paradigms throughout history and make it progressively possible to build an Educational Theory with which to structure the activities and facilitate decision-making" (Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia, 1989, p, 213). Philosophy of Education has been wiped from the map of the pedagogical knowledge required by a professional in education.
[14] The disenchantment reached its peak with the 1995 *Act on Participation, Evaluation and Administration of Educational Establishments*, passed by the Spanish Socialist Party shortly before being replaced by the People's Party. It has been said of that law that it is anything but a socialist law on education. In fact, the center-right People's Party has not had great difficulty governing with these same laws even though they have recently announced a few legislative reforms.
[15] In those years, works published in Spanish included those of Schön (1983), Stenhouse (1984 and 1987); Carr and Kemmis (1988); Kemmis (1988); Elliott (1990); Giroux (1990); Jackson (1991); etc.
[16] As examples of recent results of this more practical orientation, see: Sales and García (1997); Escámez (1999); Gil Cantero, Jover and Reyero (2001).
[17] Some of these arguments have been taken up again in Naval and Altarejos (2000, especially pp. 13–17 and 64–79).
[18] This seems to be the option taken by the governmental reform of the studies in Pedagogy at Spanish universities in the 1990s. In the reform, Philosophy of Education was not included in the nationwide core curriculum, although some universities did assess it on their own. In its place, Anthropology of Education has appeared as a core course. The positive outcome of doing so is a higher appraisal of Anthropology of Education, understood as both cultural anthropology applied to education, and philosophical anthropology of education, a field of study that has caught on considerably among Spanish philosophers of education. Some of what this budding field has provided since

the late 1980s can be found in Escámez and García López (1989), Sacristán (1989b), Pagés (1989), Bouché (1993), Noguera (1995), García Amilburu (1996a), Mèlich (1996), Fullat (1997), Jover and Reyero (1997), Barrio (1998), Bouché et al. (1998), Pérez Alonso-Geta (1998), etc.

[19] The quotation alludes to the famous Adorno's claim "The very first demand on education is that there not be another Auschwitz."

References

Altarejos, F.: 1983, *Educación y felicidad*, Eunsa, Pamplona.

Altarejos, F.: 1989, 'La practicidad del saber educativo', in F. Altarejos et al., *Filosofía de la Educación hoy. Conceptos, autores, temas*, Dykinson, Madrid, pp. 357–372.

Altarejos, F.: 1992, 'La naturaleza práctica de la Filosofía de la Educación', in F. Bárcena et al., *La Filosofía de la Educación en Europa*, Dykinson, Madrid, pp. 75–117.

Altarejos, F. et al.: 1989, *Filosofía de la Educación hoy. Conceptos, autores, temas*, Dykinson, Madrid.

Altarejos, F. et al.: 1991, *Filosofía de la Educación hoy. Autores: selección de textos*, Dykinson, Madrid.

Altarejos, F. et al.: 1997, *Filosofía de la Educación hoy. Diccionario*, Dykinson, Madrid.

Altarejos, F. et al.: 1998, *Filosofía de la Educación hoy. Temas*, Dykinson, Madrid.

Aristotle: 1979, *Poética*, Aguilar, Madrid (Translated by F.P. Samaranch).

Aristotle: 1980, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht (Translated by H.G. Apostle).

Aznar, P. y Pérez Alonso-Geta, P.: 1991, 'La dimensión europea de la educación: valores, objetivos y programas de acción', in Departamento de Teoría de la Educación y Pedagogía social, *Homenaje al Profesor Doctor Don Ricardo Marín Ibáñez*, UNED, Madrid, pp. 309–323.

Bárcena, F.: 1994, *La práctica reflexiva en educación*, Editorial Complutense, Madrid.

Bárcena, F.: 1997, *El oficio de la ciudadanía. Introducción a la educación política*, Paidós, Barcelona.

Bárcena, F., Gil Cantero, F. y Jover, G.: 1993, 'The Ethical Dimension of Teaching: Review and Proposal', *The Journal of Moral Education*, **3**, 241–252.

Bárcena, F., Gil Cantero, F. and Jover, G.: 1994, 'Los valores de la dimensión europea en la educación. La política educativa de la Comunidad y el reto de la construcción de una ciudadanía europea' *Revista Complutense de Educación*, **1**, 9–43.

Bárcena, F., Gil Cantero, F. and Jover, G.: 1995, 'La socialización como forma de educación moral. Una propuesta en el contexto de la reforma educativa', *Pedagogía Social. Revista Interuniversitaria*, **11**, 183–202.

Bárcena, F. and Mèlich, J.C.: 2000, *La educación como acontecimiento ético. Natalidad, narración y hospitalidad*, Paidós, Barcelona.

Barrio, J.M.: 1989, 'La educación moral y el proyecto de reforma de las enseñanzas no universitarias', *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, **184**, 507–518.

Barrio, J.M.: 1998, *Elementos de antropología pedagógica*, Eunsa, Pamplona.

Bouché, J.H.: 1993, *Antropología pedagógica*, UNED, Madrid.

Bouché, J.H. et al.: 1998, *Antropología de la Educación*, Dykinson, Madrid.

Campillo, J.: 1970, *Introducción a la Filosofía de la Educación*, Hijos de Santiago Rodríguez, Burgos.

Carr, W. and Kemmis, S.: 1988, *Teoría crítica de la enseñanza*, Martínez Roca, Barcelona.

Cervera, A.: 1978, 'La reflexión filosófica sobre la problemática educativa', *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, **141**, 37–48.

Colom, A.J. and Mèlich, J.C.: 1994, *Después de la modernidad. Nuevas filosofías de la educación*, Paidós, Barcelona.

Dearden, R.F., Hirst, P.H. and Peters, R.S.: 1982, *Educación y desarrollo de la razón: formación del sentido crítico*, Narcea, Madrid.

Dewey, J.: 1961, *Democracy and education. An introduction to the philosophy of education*, Macmillan, New York (First edition: 1916) (Several Spanish editions).

Elliott, J.: 1990, *La investigación-acción en educación*, Morata, Madrid.

Escámez, J.: 1985, 'Marginación socioeconómica y educación', in J.L. Castillejo et al., *Condicionamientos socio-políticos de la educación*, Ceac, Barcelona, pp. 109–126.

Escámez, J.: 1988, 'La teoría pedagógica y el proceso educativo', in Sociedad Española de Pedagogía, *IX Congreso Nacional de Pedagogía. La calidad de los centros educativos*, Instituto de Estudios Juan Gil-Albert, Caja de Ahorros Provincial de Alicante, Alicante, pp. 11–24.

Escámez, J.: 1992, 'La Filosofía de la Educación como praxis educativa', in F. Bárcena et al., *La Filosofía de la Educación en Europa*, Dykinson, Madrid, pp. 135–147.

Escámez, J.: 1997, 'La educación del carácter', in P. Ortega (ed.), *Educación moral*, Cajamurcia, Murcia, pp. 127–137.

Escámez, J.: 1999, *Solidaridad y voluntariado social*, Fundació Bancaixa, Valencia.

Escámez, J. and García López, R.: 1989, 'Antropología y educación', in F. Altarejos et al., *Filosofía de la Educación hoy. Conceptos, autores, temas*, Dykinson, Madrid, pp. 449–463.

Esteve, J.M.: 1977, *Autoridad, obediencia y educación*, Narcea, Madrid.

Esteve, J.M.: 1979, *Lenguaje educativo y teorías pedagógicas*, Anaya, Madrid.

Feinberg, W.: 1995, 'The Discurse of Philosophy of Education', in W. Kohli (ed.), *Critical Conversations in Philosophy of Education*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 24–33.

Fermoso, P.: 1970, *Filosofía de la Educación*, Compañía Bibliográfica Española, Madrid.

Fermoso, P.: 1989, 'Politica Curricular en una Sociedad Multicultural', *Revista de Ciencias de la Educación*, **139**, 287–300.

Fullat, O.: 1978, *Filosofías de la Educación*, Ceac, Barcelona.

Fullat, O.: 1983, *Escuela pública, escuela privada*, Humanitas, Barcelona.

Fullat, O.: 1989, 'Estatuto epistemológico de la Filosofía de la Educación', in F. Altarejos et al., *Filosofía de la Educación hoy. Conceptos, autores, temas*, Dykinson, Madrid, pp. 421–448.

Fullat, O.: 1992, 'La Filosofía de la Educación: concepto y límites', in F. Bárcena et al., *La Filosofía de la Educación en Europa*, Dykinson, Madrid, pp. 149–157.

Fullat, O.: 1997, *Antropología filosófica de la educación*, Ariel, Barcelona.

Fullat, O.: 2000, *Filosofía de la Educación*, Síntesis, Madrid.

Gamero, C.: 1985, 'Aproximación a la labor pedagógica de María de Maeztu', *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, **167**, 111–135.

García Amilburu, M.: 1996a, *Aprendiendo a ser humanos. Una Antropología de la Educación*, Eunsa, Pamplona.

García Amilburu, M. (ed.): 1996b, *Education, the State and the Multicultural Challenge*, Eunsa, Pamplona.

García Hoz, V.: 1952, *Cuestiones de Filosofía de la Educación*, CSIC, Madrid.

García López, R.: 1989, 'La educación moral en el actual sistema educativo español', *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, **184**, 487–505.

García Morente, M.: 1931, 'Simbolos del pensador. Filosofía y Pedagogía', *Revista de Pedagogía*, **114**, 1–14. Reedited in García Morente, M.: 1975, *Escritos Pedagógicos*, Espasa-Calpe, Madrid, pp. 179–194.

Gervilla, E.: 1993, *Postmodernidad y educación*, Dykinson, Madrid.

Gervilla, E.: 2000, *Valores del cuerpo educando*, Herder, Barcelona.

Gil Cantero, F.: 1991, 'Sobre la posibilidad de un conocimiento autónomo de la educación y su aplicación a las finalidades educativas', *Teoría de la Educación. Revista Interuniversitaria*, **3**, 113–126.

Gil Cantero, F.: 1997, 'Educación y narrativa: La práctica de la autobiografía en educación', *Teoria de la Educación. Revista Interuniversitaria*, **9**, 115–136.

Gil Cantero, F.: 1998, ‘La normatividad de la Filosofía de la Educación’, in F. Altarejos et al., *Filosofía de la Educación hoy. Temas*, Dykinson, Madrid, pp. 77–92.

Gil Cantero, F. and Jover, G.: 2000, ‘Las tendencias narrativas en pedagogía y la aproximación biográfica al mundo infantil’, *Enrahonar*, **31**, 107–122.

Gil Cantero, F., Jover, G. and Reyero, D.: 2001, *La enseñanza de los derechos humanos*, Paidós, Barcelona.

Giroux, H.: 1990, *Los profesores como intelectuales. Hacia una pedagogía crítica del aprendizaje*, Paidós, Barcelona.

González Álvarez, A.: 1952, *Filosofía de la Educación*, Troquel, Buenos Aires.

Greene, M.: 1995, ‘What Counts as Philosophy of Education?’, in W. Kohli (ed.), *Critical Conversations in Philosophy of Education*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 3–23.

Guil, F.: 1970, *Filosofía y Sociología de la Educación*, Magisterio Español, Madrid (2nd. edition).

Halliday, J.: 1990, *Markets, managers and theory in education*, The Falmer Press, Basingstoke and Bristol (PA). Spanish edition: 1995, *Educación, gerencialismo y mercado*, Morata, Madrid.

Hyland, T.: 1996, ‘Professionalism, Ethics and Work-based Learning’, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, **2**, 168–180.

Ibáñez-Martín, J.A.: 1975, *Hacia una formación humanística. Objetivos de la educación en la sociedad científico-técnica*, Herder, Barcelona.

Ibáñez-Martín, J.A.: 1977, ‘Familia y Estado ante ideologías educativas totalitarias’, in J.A. Ibáñez-Martín and R. Gómez Perez (eds.), *Familia e ideologías*, IFE, Barcelona, pp. 15–33.

Ibáñez-Martín, J.A.: 1982, ‘La formación pedagógica del profesorado y el plural concepto de la Filosofía de la Educación’, *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, **158**, 61–73.

Ibáñez-Martín, J.A.: 1989a, ‘El concepto y las funciones de una Filosofía de la Educación a la altura de nuestro tiempo’, in F. Altarejos et al., *Filosofía de la Educación hoy. Conceptos, autores, temas*, Dykinson, Madrid, pp. 409–419.

Ibáñez-Martín, J.A.: 1989b, ‘Política del currículo y dignidad humana’, in F. Altarejos et al., *Filosofía de la Educación hoy. Conceptos, autores, temas*, Dykinson, Madrid, pp. 621–640.

Ibáñez-Martín, J.A.: 1992, ‘La Filosofía de la Educación y el futuro de Europa’, in F. Bárcena et al., *La Filosofía de la Educación en Europa*, Dykinson, Madrid, pp. 11–21.

Ibáñez-Martín, J.A.: 1994, ‘Principios de Política de la Educación en la Unión Europea’, in A. Colom (ed.), *Política y planificación educativas*, Preu Spínola, Sevilla, pp. 51–70.

Ibáñez-Martín, J.A.: 1997, ‘La ciudadanía en el siglo XXI: una propuesta entre el realismo y la utopía’ (*Seminario Internacional Complutense ‘Educación y ciudadanía: ideas para un currículo de educación cívica ante el tercer milenio*’, Universidad Complutense, Madrid, October 1997).

Jackson, P.: 1991, *La vida en las aulas*, Morata, Madrid.

Jordán, J.A. et al.: 1995, ‘Educación cívica’, *Pedagogía Social. Revista Interuniversitaria*, **10** (monograph).

Jover, G.: 1988, ‘El derecho a la educación en los textos internacionales de derechos humanos’, *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, **180**, 281–303.

Jover, G.: 1990, ‘Notas para una historia de la Filosofía de la Educación en la Sección de Pedagogía de la Universidad Complutense de Madrid’, in R. Gil Colomer et al., *Filosofía de la Educación hoy. Entorno filosófico y contexto pedagógico*, vol 2, UNED, Madrid, pp. 66–73.

Jover, G.: 1991, *Relación educativa y relaciones humanas*, Herder, Barcelona.

Jover, G.: 1994, ‘Ámbito de la Política de la Educación’, in A. Colom (ed.), *Política y planificación educativas*, Preu Spínola, Sevilla, pp. 41–50.

Jover, G.: 1995, ‘La idea de tolerancia en el proyecto educativo de la Unión Europea’, *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, **201**, 225–247.

Jover, G.: 1998, ‘Del presupuesto antropológico de la educabilidad a la educación como relación’, in F. Altarejos et al., *Filosofía de la Educación hoy. Temas*, Dykinson, Madrid, pp. 139–157.

Jover, G. and Reyero, D.: 1997, ‘Comunitat, cultura i raça. Aportacions de l’antropologia a l’educació multicultural’, *Temps d’Educació*, **17**, 33–47.

Jover, G. and Reyero, D.: 2000, 'Images of the Other in Childhood: Researching the Limits of Cultural Diversity in Education from the Standpoint of New Anthropological Methodologies', *Encounters on Education*, **1**, 127–152.
Kemmis, S.: 1988, *El curriculum: más allá de la teoría de la reproducción*, Morata, Madrid.
Kennedy, K.: 1997, 'Citizenship Education in Review: Past Perspectives and Future Needs', in K. Kennedy (ed.), *Citizenship Education and the Modern State*, The Falmer Press, London and Bristol (PA), pp. 1–5.
Kymlicka, W. and Norman, W.: 1995, 'Return of the Citizen: A Survey of Recent Work on Citizenship Theory', in R. Beiner (ed.), *Theorizing Citizenship*, SUNY Press, New York, pp. 283–322.
Larrosa, J. (ed.): 1994, *Trayectos, escrituras, metamorfosis. La idea de formación en la novela*, P.P.U., Barcelona.
Larrosa, J.: 1995, 'Las paradojas de la autoconciencia', in J. Larrosa et al., *Déjame que te cuente. Ensayos sobre narrativa y educación*, Laertes, Barcelona, pp. 191–219.
Larrosa, J.: 1996, *La experiencia de la lectura*, Laertes, Barcelona.
Marin, R.: 1969, 'La investigación filósofica en la educación: su sentido y métodos', *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, **106**, 465–483.
McLaughlin, T.H., 1997, 'National Identity and Education', in M.A. Santos (ed.), *Educational policy in the European Union after Maastricht*, pp. 45–68, Escola Galega de Administración Pública, Santiago de Compostela (bilingual Spanish/English edition).
Mèlich, J.C.: 1996, *Antropología simbólica y acción educativa*, Paidós, Barcelona.
Mèlich, J.C.: 1998, *Totalitarismo y fecundidad*, Anthropos, Barcelona.
Mèlich, J.C. and Bárcena, F.: 1999, 'La palabra del otro. Una crítica del principio de autonomía en educación', *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, **114**, 109–117.
Millán-Puelles, A.: 1963, *La formación de la personalidad humana*, Rialp, Madrid.
Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia: 1989, *Libro blanco para la reforma del sistema educativo*, MEC, Madrid.
Moore, T.W.: 1974, *Educational Theory. An Introduction*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London. Spanish edition: 1980, *Introducción a la Teoría de la Educación*, Alianza, Madrid.
Moore, T.W.: 1982, *Philosophy of Education. An Introduction*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London. Spanish edition: 1987, *Introducción a la Filosofía de la Educación*, Trillas, Mexico.
Naval, C.: 1995, *Educar ciudadanos. La polémica liberal-comunitarista en educación*, Eunsa, Pamplona.
Naval, C. y Altarejos, F.: 2000, *Filosofía de la Educación*, Eunsa, Pamplona.
Noguera, J. (ed.): 1995, *Cuestiones de Antropología de la Educación*, Ceac, Barcelona.
Pacios, A.: 1947, *Filosofía de la Educación*, Gráficas Orbe, Madrid.
Pacios, A.: 1954, *Ontología de la Educación*, CSIC, Madrid.
Pagés, A. (ed.): 1989, *Hombre y educación*, P.P.U., Barcelona.
Parker, S.: 1997, *Reflective Teaching in the Postmodernity World*, Open University Press, Buckingham and Philadelphia.
Pérez Alonso-Geta, P.: 1998, 'Antecedentes de la construcción teórica en Antropologia de la Educación', *Teoría de la Educación. Revista Interuniversitaria*, **10**, 205–231.
Pérez-Villanueva, I: 1988, *María de Maeztu. Una mujer en el reformismo educativo español*, UNED, Madrid.
Peters, R.S. (ed.): 1969, *El concepto de educación*, Paidós, Buenos Aires.
Peters, R.S. (ed.): 1977, *Filosofía de la educación*, FCE, México.
Peters, R.S.: 1984, *Desarrollo moral y educación moral*, FCE, México.
Puig, J.M.: 1996, *La construcción de la personalidad moral*, Paidós, Barcelona.
Reyero, D.: 2000, '¿Es la Antropología el final de la Filosofía de la Educación?', *Enrahonar*, **31**, 95–105.
Rodríguez Neira, T.: 1999, *La cultura contra la escuela*, Ariel. Barcelona.

Ruiz Corbella, M.: 1999, 'La educación para la ciudadanía europea en la formación del profesorado. Una propuesta', *Revista Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado*, **35**, 103–114.
Ruiz Corbella, M.: 2000, 'Ciudadanos europeos ¿Una utopía?', in E. López-Barajas (ed.), *La educación y la construcción de la Unión Europea*, UNED, Madrid, pp. 83–99.
Rorty, R.: 1998, *Achieving our Country*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge (MA).
Sacristán, D.: 1988a, 'La función sociopolítica de la educación', *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, **181**, 491–498.
Sacristán, D.: 1988b, 'La importancia del esfuerzo en el proceso educativo', in R. Alvira et al., *Dimensiones de la voluntad*, Dossat, Madrid, pp. 115–141.
Sacristán, D.: 1989a, 'La educación como derecho', in F. Altarejos et al., *Filosofía de la Educación hoy. Conceptos, autores, temas*, Dykinson, Madrid, pp. 573–601.
Sacristán, D.: 1989b, 'La antropología pedagógica en el concierto de las antropologías', in P. Fermoso et al., *Symposion Internacional de Filosofia de l'Educació*, vol. 2, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona and Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, pp. 253–264.
Sacristán, D.: 1992, 'La Filosofía de la Educación en España', in F. Bárcena et al., *La Filosofía de la Educación en Europa*, Dykinson, Madrid, pp. 75–117.
Sacristán, D. and Murga, M.A.: 1994, *Educación democrática y cultura participativa*, UNED, Madrid.
Sáez, J.: 1982, 'La filosofía analítica y la educación: Peters', in A. Cervera and J. Sáez, *Filosofía de la Educación*, Nau Llibres, Valencia, pp. 107–139.
Sales, A. and García López, R.: 1997 *Programas de educación intercultural*, Desclée de Brouwer, Bilbao.
San Cristobal, A.: 1965, *Filosofía de la Educación*, Rialp, Madrid.
Santos, M.A. (ed.): 1997, *Educational policy in the European Union after Maastricht*, Escola Galega de Administración Pública, Santiago de Compostela (bilingual Spanish/English edition).
Sarramona, J.: 2000, *Teoría de la Educación. Reflexión normativa y pedagógica*, Ariel, Barcelona.
Savater, F.: 1997, *El valor de educar*, Ariel, Barcelona.
Schön, D.A.: 1983, *La formación de profesionales reflexivos*, Paidós/MEC, Barcelona.
Stenhouse, L.: 1984, *Investigación y desarrollo del curriculum*, Morata, Madrid.
Stenhouse, L.: 1987, *La investigación como base de la enseñanza*, Morata, Madrid.
Touriñán, J.M.: 1979, *El sentido de la libertad en la educación*, Emesa, Madrid.
Touriñán, J.M.: 1987, *Teoría de la Educación*, Anaya, Madrid.
Vegas, S.: 1981, 'La filosofía analítica de la educación, hoy', *Aula Abierta*, **32**, 14–21.
Velasco, C.: 1969, *Apuntes de Filosofía de la Educación*, Lex Nova, Valladolid.
Xirau, J.: 1930, 'Filosofia i educació', *Revista de Pedagogía*, **106**, 433–437. Reedited in Xirau, J.: 1999, *Obras completas II: Escritos sobre educación y sobre el humanismo hispánico*, Anthropos, Barcelona, pp. 376–381.
Yela, J.F.: 1950, 'Lo educativo como acceso a posiciones filosóficas', in *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Pedagogía*, vol. 1, CSIC, Madrid, pp. 331–362.
Zaragüeta, J.: 1943, *Pedagogía Fundamental*, Labor, Barcelona.
Zufiaurre, B.: 1994, *Proceso y contradicciones de la reforma educativa 1982–1994*, Icaria, Barcelona.

Address for correspondence: Gonzalo Jover, Facultad de Educación, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Calle Rector Royo Villanova, s/n, 28040 Madrid, Spain
(E-mail: gonzalo@eucmax.sim.ucm.es)