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Abstract
This master essay starts with the author having an encounter with two 14-years old boys who claim that they are Nazis. In a school project where the pupils made films about norms in the society they made a film with a clearly racist and homophobic message. As a freelance artist the author was a part of a school development program in aesthetic learning, and the assignment in the actual school was supposed to teach the pupils about norms and how they effect people on an everyday basis. All the films fulfilled this purpose, but the actual film did something more: it revealed the zero-tolerance rule in this particular school as a norm that silenced not only these boys, but also any pupil having a different opinion than the teachers.

The situation described took place in a classroom in primary school in the area of Stockholm some years ago and even though the film was never shown to anybody that could be offended except the author herself, the author left the school with a feeling of total failure, and two questions craving for answers: Why couldn’t she, nor the teachers, find the time and space to meet the boys, taking their invitation to discuss the zero-tolerance-norm seriously? And what role did the fact that the school had a “zero-tolerance-for-racism rule” play in the cultivation of the boy’s feelings of exclusion and in the way the teachers treated their obvious need for recognition as sane and (soon-to-be) grown up men?

Using Hannah Arendt’s ideas of action as the fundament of the investigation, the author poses questions about what space for action there is in the daily work of a teacher today, but also what happens when there is no room for action, when we become the blind administrators of homo faber. The method of the study includes 1) a dialogue seminar with teachers from elementary school, 2) examples and reflections from the author’s own teaching practice at the teacher education and 3) a philosophical investigation focusing on the concepts of aesthetic experience, aesthetic learning, not-knowing and unlearning. In dialogue with Sarah Ahmed, John Dewey, Hans-Georg Gadamer, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Jacques Rancière, Cusanus and Jonna Bornemark, she further tries to understand what role the film, as an aesthetic experience, played in the example with the Nazi boys. Is there a radical possibility in art that can create space for action in Arendt’s sense? Further, in dialogue with the poet Wiszlava Szymborska, the clown Nalla Laanela, and two novelists; Rachel Cusk and Albert Camus, she tries to understand the possibilities that lie within aesthetic learning when it comes to re-thinking the role of the teacher aiming for a sustainable approach to teaching and learning in a society where teachers work themselves sick.

Key words: aesthetic experience, aesthetic learning, teaching, phenomenology, clown knowledge, not-knowing, unlearning, space for action, homo faber, sustainable teaching, constructive alignment, NPM.
Swedish Title:
Estetiska erfarenheter och handlingens mirakel
Om konstens radikala potential i undervisning och lärande

Sammanfattning

Den ovan beskrivna situationen utspelade sig i ett klassrum i Stockholmsområdet för ett antal år sedan och även om filmen aldrig visades för någon som hade kunnat ta illa upp – förutom författaren själv – lämnade författaren skolan med en känsla av totalt misslyckande och två frågor ringande i öronen: Varför kunde inte hon, och ingen av lärarna i skolan, ta deras inbjudan till samtal om noll-tolerans-normen på allvar? Och vilken roll spelade det faktum att skolan hade en noll-tolerans-mot-rasism-regel i kultiverandet av pojkarnas känslor av exkludering och i lärarnas hanterande av deras uppenbara behov av erkännande som sunda, snart vuxna unga män?


Sökord: estetisk erfarenhet, estetiska lärprocesser, undervisning, fenomenologi, clownens kunskap, icke-vetande, av-lärande, handlingsutrymme, homo faber, hållbar undervisning, konstruktiv länkning, new public management.
Prelude

Example 1: The Nazi boys

- Do you know that there are pupils in 8b that identify themselves as Nazis? I asked.
- Oh, you mean Adrian and Milos? Yes, we know there are some of the guys that have friends in a local Nazi gang, but since we’ve got zero tolerance they keep their opinions from the school area.
- Ok…but I talked to them about what Nazism is for them, and it seemed they don’t know much at all…for example they don’t associate it with Hitler…
- Yes, I know, that’s a problem…you see this is a problematic class and when we were supposed to teach them about the Holocaust and World War Two in the 7:th grade, we had to do other things. They are so weak in all subjects, we have to focus on making them achieve the curricular goals.
- But it seemed like they wanted to talk about it, and the film was pointing to the zero tolerance thing you have here, as a norm that they are silenced by. I think you could have some interesting conversations here….

Wisława Szymborska, poet

Poetry –
but what is poetry.
Many a reeling answer
has been given that question
And I don’t know and don’t know and I keep holding to it
as to a saving rail

Wisława Szymborska, poet

I’m so glad you are here to take care of this! We really have no time, so many of us are on sick leave, and we have so many temps that don’t know the kids. And if the kids don’t achieve the curricular goals they can’t manage in life…

That last comment comes from Björn, the Swedish teacher and suddenly I don’t know what to say. Björn continues talking to the teachers around the table about other things, but my thoughts are somewhere else: First thing - I wasn’t invited to the school to work with or make visible the values of the pupils. It was a Skapa och Lära assignment and the subject of the assignment was norms, the teachers wanted me to work with the pupils to give them the opportunity to reflect on and become aware of how different norms about men and women, about sex and relations, have an impact on our lives.2 The teachers and I had decided that they should make short films with their mobile phones and simple tools for editing, with the instruction to gestalta norm, a norm break and a consequence. They could choose any norm they wanted, but I wanted them to try to say something to the audience, something about this norm that they had chosen and that they found relevant to discuss. The first time I met the pupils I introduced myself, and together we discussed what defines a norm. Then I introduced them to their task and they started to work on their films by doing picture manuscripts. During the second session I was giving them feedback on their films, 10 minutes for each group of two to four pupils in each group, and the main questions we addressed were whether the settings in their films seemed credible, what the message to the audience could be and what effect this message might have on an audience. The last time, we were supposed to watch the films together, and discuss their messages. This situation took place on the second session, and it all started with the two boys showing me their short film.

2 Skapa och Lära is Swedish for “Create and Learn” and it used to be a school development program (2004-2015) inspired from the Canadian program LTTA (Learning Through The Arts, http://www.indigenousartists.ca/ltta/). In this program freelance artists from different art disciplines were involved in school projects where they met experienced teachers in developing new tools for teaching and learning, using art and art tools in subjects like mathematics, natural sciences, language development etc.
3 In Swedish gestalta, a term that means to picture or to make visible and that comes from drama and theatre, but also from psychoanalysis where it points at something whole (see p. 32 for how Merleau-Ponty is using it.)
The film
The film shows two male persons, one of them is a policeman, the other one a prisoner. The policeman is trying to interrogate the prisoner, but he keeps being interrupted by the prisoner trying to make sexual advances to him. The police tells the prisoner to stop, over and over again, but he keeps trying. It is obvious that the prisoner speaks bad Swedish, and comes form another culture than the Swedish culture, and the police keeps calling him “blatte” and “bög”. After a while the police gets really pissed and starts beating the prisoner, he beats him over and over again in a very brutal way, until the prisoner lies there, dead. In the end a sign comes up on the screen that says: “Consequence: The police is sentenced to life time prison for murder.”

The other movies that I had seen before this one touched on subjects such as what happens if someone sits down next to a girl that is alone in a bus instead of choosing any other seat in the bus, or if someone breaks the Swedish queue norm by passing the queue. One subject was about how girls are supposed to act as girlfriends, and what happens if they don’t. We had several interesting discussions about how the actual norms could become clearer to an audience, and about their choice of consequences in terms of credibility. We had a lot of fun since they had chosen situations that they had a lot of thoughts about and found important to discuss. But the film about the police brutality was something more complicated, and I suddenly felt very unsure about what to do. I also got very conscious about the fact that we only had a few minutes left, and that another group was waiting for their turn. So I decided to stick to my prepared questions, and I turned to the two 14-year old boys who had made the film, as well as played the roles in it. They were sitting beside me, waiting for me to give my thoughts on the film.

My response

- Eh, that was…violent, I said.
- They nodded, giving each other a smile.
- Ok, but I don’t really understand it, I said. Why would a prisoner act like that?
  It’s not credible to me….what did you think when you worked on that part?
- He’s a faggot, that’s what they do, one of the boys, Adrian, said. They’re always trying to get to a guy if they’re alone, it’s in their nature, sort of. Everyone knows that, he continued. Milos nodded.

- Hm, well, I don’t, I said. I have many friends that are gay and I couldn’t see anyone of them act like the prisoner is acting. There must be something else that made this person do what he did. Could you explain that further to me, because if not, I just won’t believe this, and then you would be the ones that look….a bit weird. Do you understand what I mean?

They smiled, looking at me as someone that is very predictable.

- So to me the film seems homophobic, but also quite…racist.

I said this to Milos who I knew had parents from Serbia, and who spoke Swedish with a noticeable accent. Adrian responded:

- Racist…no I wouldn’t say that. It’s more….Nazi I would say.

For a short second I tried to digest what he just said. This conversation had taken a totally different turn than I had expected it to do.

- Ok, I said. So you’re Nazis? Both of you?

I tried to catch their gaze, they looked at each other at first and then they looked back without hesitation, and nodded. I had a strange feeling of being in a place that I hadn’t expected to be, a place where things were upside down. I hesitated and looked at the time, we had just a few minutes left before next group would come in. I tried to decide how to go further.

- Interesting, I said. I’ve never met a Nazi before. But, can you tell me, what does Nazism mean to you?

- It’s when you feel in your belly that what the faggots do is sooo wrong, that’s when you are a Nazi, Adrian responded.
I looked at the two boys sitting in front of me. I had their attention, they wanted me to understand, and they were very interested in my response.

- Aha, I said. To me that’s something different. What about the world war two thing, does it have anything to do with Nazism for you?
- You mean Hitler, Adrian said. That’s old, that’s not Nazism today.

I looked at the time and realized that we had to stop here, so I went to my last question.

- Ok. There is another thing that I’m curious about here. What norm were you thinking of when you made the film?
- It’s this school. The norm here is to like immigrants and faggots, the teachers say they have zero tolerance for racism which is bullshit, they mean differing opinions, and we can’t say what we think. We’re silenced by the norm, and if we break it we will be punished, just like the policeman in the film.
- Ok, well, you made your point very well here, but still you have to work on showing the motivation for the prisoner, doing what he did, to make the scene credible. And I will talk to your teachers to see if it’s possible to find time to talk more about this subject. Ok?

Back to the staff room
Later I met up with the teachers in the staff room, and the conversation described in the beginning took place. I sat there quiet, listening to the teachers planning for the rest of the week, and hoped to get an idea on how to proceed in this matter. I looked around in the staff room where we had our meeting. I could actually feel the stress, and there were also quite many young people there who I assumed were temps from some staffing company. The meeting was over and I went home, thinking over and over again on what the two boys actually said to me, and reflecting on my responses. Could I have done something more? When I came home I started to plan what to do at the last session with the kids. We had two hours to watch 7 short movies and discuss them. I sent an email to the teachers and asked if we could add an hour, but I
didn’t get any response. A week later when I got there, Adrian and Milos were not there. We watched the other films, we had interesting discussions about norms in different relations at home and in public spaces, and we got into ideas about structure and power. In many ways this assignment was to be considered successful, but I had an itching feeling that there was something I didn’t manage to reveal in these discussions, something very important. Looking back at it now I think I know one thing for sure: The discussions never went outside the “zero-tolerance norm”.

This situation has bothered me for some years now, and I keep returning to it in my reflections on the role of the teacher, both for myself and together with my students at the teacher education. At a start I was shocked over the neutrality of the teachers which I interpreted as resignation, like if they had given up on reaching these pupils – even though they hadn’t really tried. But at the same time they did do quite a lot. The teachers organized a project on sex and co-habitation that was crossing the borders of their subjects of biology, Swedish and social studies, they engaged me to work with aesthetic learning on norms in everyday life. All activities were clearly connected to the curriculum and they had clearly formulated what the pupils were supposed to have learnt after the closing of the project. Still there was something missing: There was no time to meet these two boys here and now, to meet their needs, to take in their situation, their interests, no time to talk with them about their questions about life. There was no room for the unexpected. How could it be? – There is nothing we can do, we have to focus on the goals, said Ylva, referring to the curriculum for the subjects involved in the project. – I’m not here to work with the pupils on their values, I said.

Now, after some years, from reading Hannah Arendt and reflecting over her way of examining the conditions that are given human life in general, I’ve been able to enter another perspective on the situation. In The Human Condition she writes:

> Whatever enters the human world of its own accord or is drawn into it by human effort becomes part of the human condition. The impact of the world’s reality upon human existence is felt and received as a conditioning force."}

---

I believe that one way of understanding my own and the teacher’s way to handle and reason in the situation above is that we felt and received the goals of the curriculum as such a conditioning force. We all felt that there was nothing else we could do, under these conditions. So what conditions are we talking about here? To dig deeper into this question I would like to examine this situation, using Arendt’s three forms of human activity that corresponds to three different conditions, three aspects of human life that she uses to frame her investigation; that is labor, work and action. Later on I will come back to these three, but I will start here and introduce her concept of action. For Arendt, to act is to do something that you know will get consequences, but without knowing what the consequences will be. To act is to open up the possibility for the unexpected to happen; on the contrary to make something is to stick to what’s already known, to continue the natural course of cause and effect. Arendt writes about the miracle of action in contrast to the ordinary making of things. An act becomes making when plurality is lost, when we “are only for or against other people, as for instance in modern warfare, where men go into action and use means of violence in order to achieve certain objectives for their own side and against the enemy.”5 Could it be that the teachers and I had started looking at the Nazi boys as “the enemy”, and thereby lost our sense of togetherness, a togetherness where the boys were included? And by doing that, we failed on being the teachers that we all strive to be? Could it be that we, under these certain conditions, failed to be agents in the meaning that we looked away from the possibility to act in relation to the boys? And that we did this by holding on to what we knew would be able to control the consequences of?

Lack of slack

In my meetings with teachers within different areas from preschool up to university level the discussions tend to end up in an experience of lack of space to act (slack). The experience of being controlled from a distance, as by a remote control, is crucial. Someone else has decided what I should do and how it should be done, I do things and every “doing” is meant for achieving a certain, on beforehand given, goal. It comes down to the rule of law, keeping your back free, it’s about showing the costumers, the parents, the pupils, the students, that what we do is in accordance with the curriculum, which in its turn assures us that the pupils will be accepted at the next

level, at the university, or that they get their exams. It’s important to, continuously, know what to and how to do it. Under these conditions the unpredictable, what breaks the already planned way forward, becomes annoying or even a threat. In other words: There is no room for action, in Arendt’s sense. And it seems like these are the conditions for being a teacher today, in elementary school as well as in the university.

What about my role in this? Looking back at the situation with the two boys I can see that I had all possibilities to do something else since I wasn’t their teacher. I was free in the sense that I had the possibility and was even expected to do something else, to contribute in a different way by being an artist. And still I didn’t. Even though I had this freedom, I was stuck to the same remote control as the teachers. But who says that being an artist, or just using artistic tools like film in this example, would make any difference? In this situation it didn’t – or maybe it did. When talking to people about this situation people have told me that something actually did happen, the boys did talk to me, I did listen to them etc. I never had or took the chance to continue the conversation at that time by going back to the school again which means I will never know what happened to these two boys, but still something happened when they showed their film, something that would never have happened if we had had ordinary lessons with discussions and written tasks. The film opened up a possibility for the boys to make their voices heard, maybe in a way that could be called radical since it cut through, revealed and thereby questioned what was given as a basic rule in this particular school, this particular period: that they had zero-tolerance for racism. This rule came from the intention to make every pupil feel included, but this incident made it clear that it also created exclusion. Two questions arise here: Is there always a risk that the intention of the teacher, here: to include, turns into its intentional opposite, to exclude? And could it be that certain possibilities, maybe even radical possibilities with the power to challenge a system in its foundations, reveal themselves when aesthetic experiences are given space and are taken into serious consideration within the educational system?
The aim of my investigation and some opening questions

To turn a liner
Reflecting on this situation has forced me to take on perspectives that are bigger than the situation in itself. I see now that what happened that day in the room with the boys is that the very fundament of my teaching was shaking, and it hasn’t stopped yet as I am writing this. I will treat this shaking, this rupture, as an opportunity to examine these shaking grounds with the hope to learn something new about them, something that might be a contribution to the fields of practical knowledge, aesthetic learning, and philosophy.

I can see now that from this moment I started an investigation that slowly changed my daily teaching practice that is teaching in aesthetic learning at the teacher education at Södertörn University. Since that day I have had an underlying question in my head that is: How can I teach my teacher students in a way that makes them feel prepared to handle this kind of situations? What can I do in my own teaching practice to help them prioritize when it comes to dilemmas like this? What do the students need to know to create and become a part of a team that prioritizes in a similar way?

Some weeks ago this comment came from a student after a seminar on teaching mathematics in classes with 7-11 year old children with drama-inspired exercises:

- I would like to work like this, actually I think this is the way we all should work, this contains everything I believe is important and if I had been taught like this…. but how can I do that? My supervisor would never let me, and when I get my first own class I will not be prepared….I’m afraid that I will just do what everybody else does, how can I myself change the system?

“The system” she’s talking about is the way “everybody”, that is most of the teachers she has met, do things in school, it is the praxis, and this system is the condition under which she is going to work as a teacher. The system contains of what she experiences as what is given: it’s the way things are “in reality”. The system gives what she feels, or thinks, that she can do under the given conditions. I believe there is a resemblance here with trying to turn or even question the direction of something big, something
that you can’t control by yourself, something so big that you can’t really get a grip on
the whole thing. When students say things like this I have the feeling that I am trying
to turn a liner, one of these big boats that are crossing the Atlantic ocean, boats that it
can take days or maybe even weeks to turn once they have reached their maximum
speed. It’s just that this liner that I want to turn is so much bigger than any existing
Atlantic boat, and this particular boat has at least thousands of small engines, each
engine controlled by an individual teacher, student, parent, journalist or politician. To
turn this liner it takes something more than a few people changing direction in their
own corner of the boat. It takes something radical. I know I will never do this on my
own, but perhaps my investigation will put something or someone in motion, and in
the end, hopefully, many little helps.

I have chosen to think about the problem from two perspectives: The
perspective of a university teacher at the teacher education as well as the perspective
of a teacher in elementary school. For this reason I use the term pupil for school
children even though I know it might sound a bit old fashioned. Another aim here is
to examine what impact my phenomenological training might have on my teaching
practice. The investigation circulates around experiences of teaching in aesthetic
learning and aesthetic subjects on these two levels, but I think it can be of value for
any teacher, or anybody who has a teaching practice related to curriculum objectives.

Questions.

1. Why did I and the teachers in my example fail in meeting the Nazi boys?
What is missing here?

2. What role did the film, as an aesthetic experience, play in the example with
the Nazi boys?

3. What possibilities are there to create spaces for action as a teacher within a
goal oriented system, and what role can aesthetic experiences and a
phenomenological approach in the teaching situation play in this?

6 The students have regular practice in schools with personal supervisors, teachers that are
introducing them to their coming profession.
7 In 2012 I wrote my magister (“half master”) essay in the phenomenological tradition of
Practical Knowledge. Since then I have been using this method for investigation in my own
reflections, but I can also see that is has deeply affected my approach to teaching.
Methodological considerations
This master essay is written as a scientific essay in the tradition of the field of Theory of Practical Knowledge, where the investigation is slowly developing during what is named *process writing*. My main focus will be on trying to do a phenomenological investigation where I put concepts and thoughts connected to aesthetic experience as a phenomenon in relation to each other and to the examples I have chosen. Hannah Arendt’s ideas about how we, as humans, are conditioned in the sense that we act and think in relation to what we consider as given, is a perspective that I will try to maintain all the way through the essay, including her concepts of action, plurality and art as a thought thing. My aim is to let Arendt’s ideas meet and interact with other thinkers’ related ideas as well as the empirical material of the study.

The empirical material consists of two parts: 1. The Dialogue Seminar from the field of Skill and Technology, and 2. My own teaching practice and examples from meetings with teacher students during the past ten years. In this chapter I will explain why I chose this method and how the different parts relate to each other.

The scientific essay
This master essay is written as a scientific essay in accordance to how the method has been brought forward at the Center of Practical Knowledge at the University of Södertörn. Essay means “a try”, which in its turn points to the *process nature* of the method. Lotte Alsterdal writes in her text *Essäskrivande som utforskning* about writing an essay as an aesthetic learning process. By writing slowly under a certain amount of time, letting theoretical perspectives, empirical material as well as your own experiences interact, in a process that includes supervising from an experienced researcher as well as the input from other participants in the master program, the material forms itself in a dialogue between the writer and the text. This movement where the material “speaks” to the writer has a lot in common with creating an artwork, the kind of creative process where the result of the process is unknown; the result slowly grows out of the interaction between the different parts and participants.

---

in the process, leaving space for unexpected and as well as silent or silenced knowledge to reveal itself.\textsuperscript{11}

When I started writing this essay I had no idea where the writing process would lead me or what the result might be. By choosing my dilemma with the two Nazi boys, I finally found a direction, something that has been bothering me for a while that revealed itself in that situation and that I want to examine. After that I made my choice of literature, and since philosophy is one of my big interests as well as tools for developing my teaching practice, I decided to let this work have its main focus on examining the phenomenon and the concepts related to it from different philosophical perspectives. To remain in contact with contemporary teaching practices the empirical examples are crucial, and since I wanted this study to cross the borders of different levels in the educational system I decided to include the method of the dialogue seminar with participants from elementary school.

One choice of mine that could be challenged, is that I have chosen to treat my own teaching experiences as empirical material, a choice that I defend under the line “My own teaching as empirical material”.

The Dialogue seminar
I’ve chosen to use the form of the dialogue seminar as an empirical resource to give others than myself and through me, my students, a voice. This certain type of seminar was developed by Bo Göranzon and his fellow researchers and students in Skill and Technology at the Royal Institute of Technology and Linneaus University during a number of research projects that focused on the tacit knowing of practitioners from different professions, approximately between 1975 and 1995.\textsuperscript{12} In these different projects there were also participators from theatre, music and visual arts, which ended up having a big impact on the developing of the method. For example one of the entrances to it was the aim to be creative, since the knowledge one was looking for often lay beyond the personal experiences of the academic researchers. To be able to reach, to see, to understand what is beyond your own experiences you have to be able to use your fantasy, and your creativity. One of the things that were taken in to the research field was the use of analogies, to think different examples in analogy to each

\textsuperscript{11} Alsterdal, “Essäskrivande som utforskning”, p. 67.
other. Another was to take into consideration experiences from the praxis of the art field, for example experienced problems in relation to the creativity of the musicians when performing older music. Ratkić is referring to the flutist and professor at Royal College of Music in Stockholm Clas Pehrsson to exemplify this:

The music of the old masters is performed over and over again. When there is a need for more creativity in a performance it is usual to handle this by letting the musicians do what they want. But there is a paradox here: When you do this the performances start looking like each other. Someone makes a great performance and the others start copying it. Thus the reproductive aspect starts taking over from the creative aspect. This is a contradiction to the idea that great creativity comes from absolute freedom.

One way of dealing with this particular problem has among musicians been to study historical resources in terms of contemporary history, written music or stories about the composer’s lives, with the result that individual performances got more creative and started to become more different to each other – even though they read the same material. An analogy to teaching in the university could be what happens if you read only secondary literature instead of reading the source itself. An interpretation of an idea can get famous and in the log run form or at least inform a whole field, hiding the source from individual creative interpretations.

Searching for analogies is a vital part of the dialogue seminar and one could say that the method is characterized by a gentle search for a language that support and visualize the praxis of the participants rather than penetrate and criticize. In his dissertation, Adrian Ratkić describes eight different steps that has been used in various combinations in the history of dialogue seminars. Nr 1) is called reading and writing, which means that the participators are asked to read the assigned texts “with a pencil in their hands”, writing down associations in terms of examples from their own practice during the reading process. Nr 2) is reading out loud which means that the participants read their own texts loud to the others without interruption. After every reading everyone can comment on the one reading, preferably with analogies in terms of examples from their own practice, which is Nr 3). Nr 4 and 5) is exploring the epistemological perspectives of the participants. Here the seminar leaders play an

---

13 Ratkić, Dialogseminariets forskningsmiljö, p. 62.
14 Ratkić, Dialogseminariets forskningsmiljö, p. 63. (My translation)
15 Ratkić, Dialogseminariets forskningsmiljö, p. 63.
16 Ratkić, Dialogseminariets forskningsmiljö, p. 41.
important role in giving space to the participants and pointing out concepts and ideas that comes up in their stories (4), but also to put related concepts in play with the already existing to find analogies on an epistemological level (5). The idea protocol is used as a tool for the last part. One of the two seminar leaders is responsible for taking notes focused on what ideas are actualized in the seminar discussions. After every seminar he or she writes independently a protocol where actual concepts are put in relation to new ones with the aim to capture and influence the conception of the dialogue.\(^\text{17}\) Nr 6) is qualification of new reading and writing tasks, which the leader writing the idea protocol is responsible for. While working on the protocol, the task is to find texts or artworks that can help the seminar develop the dialogue further. The aim is to constantly deepen the reflection from one seminar to another. Nr 7) is fictive concepts. This comes from finding that metaphors sometimes can capture something that is hard to explain. One example that Ratkić describes is “trattkantarelleffekten” or “the chanterelle effect”.\(^\text{18}\) Trattkantarell(swe) is a certain chanterelle mushroom that is popular among mushroom pickers and that is hard to see on the ground, but once you have spotted some you suddenly see them everywhere. This fictive concept was used by a group of technical troubleshooters while trying to describe an aspect of their working process. Nr 8) is the importance of feedback from the participants to the writer of the idea protocols to make sure that their experiences are expressed in a way that they can relate to.

Some comments on this particular dialogue seminar
The dialogue seminars in this study are inspired from these 8 steps, and the aim has been to stick to the phenomenon, to the core of our experiences, trying to find out what role aesthetic experiences play in our teaching, using the space of the dialogue seminar to try to think analogically by letting our examples meet and encounter with what we have read. But they also differ from the descriptions of dialogue seminars that I have read in certain ways. One thing is that we have been only three participants, myself included, while there are usually more. I have been the seminar leader and instead of taking notes in the seminar I have recorded the dialogues and then written the idea protocol later. The participants have read the protocols and impulse texts before every seminar, and I have asked them to write down examples

\(^\text{17}\) Ratkić, Dialogseminariets forskningsmiljö, p. 42.
\(^\text{18}\) Ratkić, Dialogseminariets forskningsmiljö, p. 42.
from their own practice that relate to the texts. In the seminars we have read our notes out loud, and discussed them. The participants have also come with feedback on the protocols.

The way I see the method is that the seminar leader(s) offers time, structure and space for the participants to share thoughts, feelings and analogies/associations between themselves, the texts and their professional praxis. I have used this space to try different concepts and ideas that have occurred during the process in relation to the experiences of the participants.

We were three participants in the dialogue seminars: Tindra, Pia and myself. This makes it uncertain if I can use the term Dialogue seminar since there are usually 5-10 participants or more. But reading the idea protocols I still find that the voices of the participants are relevant since they mirror the experience of being confronted daily with the problems and possibilities that are inherent in an everyday teaching practice on elementary school level.

Tindra is an experienced teacher who has been working for many years with children at after-school centers. In after-school centers the informal learning is central, as a complement to the formal learning during ordinary school time, that is being able as a teacher to reveal and put words on what the children learn when they play or participate in different projects that they have chosen to be a part of because they think it is fun or interesting, not because the school law says they should. Tindra uses drama, painting, moviemaking and other artistic tools for working on subjects like conflict management, empathy, tolerance and the human rights.

Pia is also a very experienced teacher, in the subjects of Music and Swedish, but due to the conditions created by the evaluation system she has quit working as a Music teacher. For the last years she’s been teaching Swedish to children between 4th and 6th grade. Pia is called “First teacher in aesthetic learning” which means that she has been pedagogically evaluated and found good enough to inspire and to lead other teachers in their professional development with focus on aesthetic learning. Among her experiences are leading a manifold of successfully performed cross-subject projects where teachers from different subjects - social studies, languages, history, mathematics etcetera - has collaborated on specific themes and where aesthetic expressions like drama, music or painting in different ways have been integrated in the daily studies of the pupils.
Due to certain circumstances of a personal kind, the dialogue seminars in this study couldn’t be held as regularly and with the same focus that is needed to achieve all the possible outcomes that the method offers. This is why I have chosen to give the philosophical investigation the main space, letting Tindra’s and Pia’s voices from the dialogue seminar comment on the topic rather than being the “material” in focus for the investigation.

My own teaching experiences as empirical material
Every semester I teach about 15-20 courses with between 20-100 students in every course, and I have done this for ten years. The first five years it was not full time, but for 5 years it has been so. With a quick calculation this gives approximately 6300 students that has shared their experiences of either working in schools and preschools, or being a student on the field with a supervisor, in the seminar, in a very concrete way using drama and by telling their personal stories. In the chapter named ”What my teaching looks like” I give an example of a typical seminar of mine to give the reader a picture of my teaching in general since it differs a lot from what one could call a traditional academic teaching in terms of more or less one-way communication lectures and seminars with discussions in smaller or bigger groups.

The examples from my own teaching are there for several reasons, and I would like to say something about them both regarding the ethics of the study and the validity that they might add. They are chosen from my everyday teaching practice. In my seminars the students show their own experiences from preschool and elementary school. In a 2 hours seminar there are usually four dramatized examples, and I give approximately 30-40 such seminars every semester. That makes, low counted, 120 examples per semester. During the last two years I have participated in and thoroughly discussed about 500 such dramatized examples, examples that has happened recently in the students either daily work within the educational system or in their supervised practice as students. (I have been working like this for a longer time than two years, this is just to show that it is something I do on a regular basis). Worth to note is that in a seminar with 25 students there are also 25 different schools represented. It is rare to find two students working in or doing their practice in the same school.

The students choose these specific examples for investigating something they find hard to tackle in their profession, and a question that is always addressed in these
seminars is if the other students recognize what they see. So far they always do. Since the situations on beforehand are carefully discussed, chosen and prepared by a work group, they are always interesting examples of actual and common problems teacher face on different levels in the school system.

Among all these examples I have chosen to describe some in this essay. They are chosen because they are regular examples, no extremes, so that they could not be identified. I do not use them as “evidence” of what has happened, but at the same time they are examples of events that actually has taken place in preschools and schools and that the majority of the students recognize as dilemmas that occur on a regular basis in their profession of today. I believe that they mirror something that is going on, and that “something” can contribute to sketch the outline of the liner.

Ethical considerations
All examples used in this Master essay, from elementary school as well as from the university, are anonymised, which means that I have replaced details in them, for example I have changed names, sex, time, geographical region etc. to make the persons in the examples impossible to trace. I have also used examples that are not unique, which means that I have seen or been into similar situations on other occasions than the described.

The participants in the dialogue seminar have chosen to let me use their real names, Pia Påltoft and Tindra Hilding. They have read and commented on the dialogue protocols during our seminars, and they have read and accepted their contribution to the final text that is this Master essay.

The validity of the study
I’m well aware of the fact that these dialogue seminars has had very few participants and that the “result” of the seminars are to be considered as subjective. Still I think that by choosing participants that share the experience of teaching with focus on aesthetic experiences, within the educational system but outside the usual art subjects, I have got an opportunity to reveal specific values that I couldn’t have caught sight on by my own.

I am also aware of the fact that using my own experiences the way I do could be problematic since there is no guarantee that experience in itself gives a deeper understanding. It takes reflection to develop expertise, as Dreyfus & Dreyfus points
out in their study of the development of practical knowledge.\textsuperscript{19} It might be of interest here that I have recently been pedagogically qualified and received the grade “excellent teacher”, an evaluation process that focuses on 1) the quality of the practice, 2) how the practice correlates to my ideas about teaching, and 3) the quality of my reflection over the practice and 4) the quality of contribution to other practitioners in the same field. This might add some scientific ground for using my own experiences as empirical material.

The aim of this study is to try to understand something about the conditions for being a teacher today and to think seriously on how these conditions can be changed by action. The aim is not to prove anything that can be measured. If I hope for something it is that the reader will continue thinking and acting, from having seen or sensed something new, something that can contribute to the consciousness of, or even a turning, of a system that, as I see it, keeps decreasing our ability to act.

**Former research on the field of aesthetic learning in teacher education**

The Swedish committee for Teacher education (SOU 1999:63)[…] suggested that ”aesthetic knowledge constitutes an important knowledge base for all teachers – irrespective of school subjects or type of school” (p.55). The Committee noted that knowing and aesthetic expression are often looked upon as opposite instead of supplement aspects of learning. The members introduced the concept ”aesthetic learning processes”(ibid.) to denote learning that integrates both aspects.\textsuperscript{20}

Due to the Swedish Degree Ordinance for Teacher Education of 2011, teacher students are to have ”knowledge about” and ”acquaintanceship to” aesthetic learning.\textsuperscript{21} Taken into consideration the interpretation of the subject suggested by SOU 1999:63, different practices has developed on teacher educations over the country, practices where aesthetic expressions are integrated in the teaching practice. The research that has been done within the field of educational science about these

\textsuperscript{19} Stuart E. Dreyfus, & Hubert L. Dreyfus, ”Fem steg från nybörjare till expert”, in Jonna Lappalainen, (red.), Klassiska texter om praktisk kunskap, p. 327.
\textsuperscript{20} Lars Lindström, (red.), Nordic Visual Arts Education in Transition. A research review, vetenskapsrådets rapport 14:2008, s. 61.
\textsuperscript{21} Examensordning för lärarutbildning 2011, (Eng: Degree Ordinance for Teacher Education of 2011).
practices cannot be considered as voluminous, and the studies I have found comes in general from a discourse theoretical perspective.

Lindgren and Ericsson (2012) writes about discursive certifications of aesthetic practice in teacher education, and Fihn (2012) studies, as the headline points at, *Aesthetic learning: Myths and meanings in teacher education.*22. Hansson-Stenhammar (2015) does not write specifically about teacher education, but in her thesis *A de-aesthetified learning culture* she points at a number of problems when the concept aesthetic learning is interpreted from the assumption of the curriculum that the aesthetic aspects are to be taken into consideration in the teaching practice of all school subjects.23 In their article *Arts Education in Swedish Teacher Training – What’s at Stake?* (2011) Lindgren and Claesson argues that aesthetic activities no longer has a clear identity in the context of teacher education, a situation they mean is a consequence of being situated in an academic knowledge discourse with no language for the forms of knowledge that are specific for aesthetic activities.24

In 2002 Lena Aulin-Gråhamn and Jan Thavenius wrote a report on their study of integration of aesthetic activities in elementary school.25 Their suggestion was a to split the concept of aesthetics into radical aesthetics and modest aesthetics. The reason was that they had seen that there was a difference in how teachers were using the aesthetic activities in their teaching, grounded in how they think of art and the role of art in society either as entertainment/ornamentation (modest Aesthetics) on the one side, and the possibility of life-changing experiences (radical aesthetiscs) on the other.

In my bachelor thesis in philosophy I tried to develop this thought in relation to Husserl’s phenomenological epoché, suggesting the possibility for the teacher to develop an aesthetic epoché. In this essay I will try another perspective on the idea of

---

The radical aesthetics by taking in Jonna Bornemark's remarks on the critical potential of art.\textsuperscript{26}

\textbf{The expected contribution of this study and some limitations}

From what I can see these studies, except from Aulin-Gråhamn and Thavenius, are focusing on problems in language when two fields meet in theory and in practice, and they all share the assumption that there is no language within the academic discourse of teacher education to describe or understand aesthetic practices. In this master thesis I will try to come from a different perspective, using a phenomenological approach from my position as being both a practitioner in art and art teaching and, on the other side, educated in philosophy. I will use my experience of almost 10 years of reflecting philosophically on my own teaching practice, a practice that has led me to the insight that there is an academic language for aesthetic experiences, that is, the language of philosophy. This essay can also be read as an attempt to argue for the subject of philosophy to be taken into a more serious account within the teacher education since philosophy has the ability not only to articulate aesthetic aspects of teaching and learning, thereby making these aspects visible and available for reflection, but it has the ability to deal with important values that go beyond evaluations and rational systems in today's school, for example values inherited in concepts like \textit{Bildung}, where the free search for knowledge and meaning rather than short-term benefit is highlighted.\textsuperscript{27}

Since this is a master thesis there will be no room for comparison between the way former research has been done and this study, instead I will focus on doing \textit{philosophy} in relation to the examples given in the essay, using philosophical concepts to describe and to try to understand the phenomenas that come forward during the writing process and in the dialogue seminars. By this I hope to contribute to the theory of practical knowledge as well as to the subjects of philosophy and aesthetics, but also to my own field of practice: aesthetic learning in teacher education and elementary school.


\textsuperscript{27} Anders Burman, \textit{Kultiverandet av det mänskliga, Essäer om liberal education, bildning och tänkande}, Daidalos, Göteborg, 2018, p. 11 & 16.
An introduction to my teaching practice and continuous reflection

In order to introduce the reader who has never heard of a university teacher in aesthetic learning I will here try to show what I am doing in my seminars, why I do it, and how I reflect over my teaching practice on a regular basis.

Background and connection to this study

This year is my 10th year at the teacher’s education at Södertörn university. I started working here as an freelance artist with many years of experience from the school development program *Skapa och Lära*.28 During my ten years in *Skapa och Lära* I had approximately 50 different assignments from preschool to gymnasium and university level. The assignment where I met the Nazi boys was one of my last ones, after that I concentrated on the teachers education where my role has been to, through my everyday teaching, explore and develop the possibilities with aesthetic experiences in higher education within various types of courses in different programs at the teacher education. At the beginning I found myself being something different, something even exotic, in the environment of the university. The expectations were big on what this subject, aesthetic learning, could become, but at the same time there were some critique coming from both academics and art teachers who thought that we were using art as an instrumental tool for learning. To deal with this critique and to develop the basic idea of *Skapa och Lära* into an academic context, I started to study different pedagogical philosophers, putting their ideas in relation to what I was doing. I took the magister course in practical knowledge at Södertörn University in 2012, and after that I continued my education in philosophy, all the time using my studies to be in continuous reflection over my full time teaching practice in the teacher education.

These years have been a journey, a learning process that is still going on, a process where I learn new things every day of teaching and reading. But there is also something that can be called a result from this development process, a result in terms of a teaching practice that has been tried, evaluated, developed, tried again, evaluated, and so on, over and over again for these ten years. This result is the fundament in my teaching today, and another aim of this study is to bring this fundament into light and

---

28 *Skapa och Lära* is Swedish for “Create and Learn” and it used to be a school development program (2004-2015) inspired from the Canadian program LTTA (Learning Through The Arts, [http://www.indigenousartists.ca/ltta/](http://www.indigenousartists.ca/ltta/)). In this program freelance artists from different art disciplines were involved in school projects where they met experienced teachers in developing new tools for teaching and learning, using art and art tools in subjects like mathematics, natural sciences, language development etc.
to scrutinize it in dialogue with the thinkers invited into this essay, and, hopefully, with the reader.

**Example 2: She is me, but I would never admit it**

*This is an example of what happened in a seminar. I chose this one because it shows an ordinary day at work; there is nothing special about this situation, what happened in it is typical for what usually happens when I give these kind of seminars.*

- *A big applause and “folkets jubel”!* I say, and start an applause.

A group of students enter the scene, followed by our applauses and hurrahs. After a short organizing they are ready to act, and the room gets quiet. Seven students are now sitting on the floor in a small circle. One of them, Sarah, says to the audience:

- *I’m the preschool teacher, and Farah here is helping me at the gathering, and the others are children. The children are three to five years old.*

I nod, were all ready. Sarah begins by saying hello to the children, and telling them about what she has planned for today. Some of the other students, acting like preschool children, are being curious about what Sarah says, putting up their hands when they want to ask something. But some other children are starting to get a bit restless. They don’t like sitting like this, they want to move around! Sarah has started by telling them about the United Nations, and the children’s rights convention. She has brought flags from different countries that are represented in the UN, and she is spreading them out on the floor asking if the children know anything about them. Some children are truly interested, but the ones that want to move around are starting to take over the situation. Farah moves herself to sit in between two of the children that have started a fight with their legs. She is trying very hard to support her colleague who is starting to sweat. Now the children have lost their focus because a girl is standing up, trying to reach her nose with her tongue. While trying very hard she is at the same time standing on her toes as if her tongue would be longer if she could be tall enough. Sarah says, with a voice that reveals her disappointment:

---

29 “Folkets jubel” is Swedish for “the people’s cheers”.

---
- Please, can you listen to me for once? Can we for once talk about something that we adults find interesting? Dahlia, sit down!!

Dahlia doesn’t want to sit down, and Farah moves herself slowly towards her, but on the way Sixten grabs her arm:

- Farah, I don’t wanna be here, he says. After saying this he starts to crawl away from the circle, Farah trying to keep him in place.
- Sarah, I take Sixten and Dahlia to the playroom, ok? Farah asks.
- No! This time I want you to listen!

Sarah explodes. She crawls over the floor, grabs Dahlia and Sixten by their arms and forces them to sit down in the circle.

- This is important! she yells, anger and disappointment pouring out of her body, through her voice.

END! says Farah, and they stop acting. The applauses and the ”jubel” comes, and laughter! The audience is laughing and the students start talking to their neighbors. When they calm down I start to speak:

- Ok, everybody, I have a feeling there is a lot of recognition here, is it?
- Yeees! the audience answers, still laughing and wiping tears.
- Sarah is me, but I would never admit it! a student says, and this is followed by even more laughter.
- But you are admitting it now? I ask.
- Hey, all of us have been there, none of us wants to be there, but it happens….
- I have definitely been there with my kids, I respond, and then I look around the circle we are sitting in. - So now: What’s happening here? How can we understand this situation if we look at it in the light of the literature of today? Discuss it in your groups of two.
They start discussing, with strong intensity. After one or two minutes I ask them to stop, and then I ask a couple that hasn’t started before:

- **What were you talking about?**
- **We were talking about what happens when we become stressed. I could feel Sarah’s stress in my own body, you made it so real!** The last sentence was directed to Sarah. - **And also what happens when we come from the university with new ideas and how easy it is to forget the children while trying to give them what we think is important…this is a perfect example of the difference between taking the children’s perspective as an adult and the children’s perspective.** This difference is one of the main points in one of the texts for today’s seminar.

- **And you, what were you talking about?** I continue to another couple.
- **We were more into Farah, her role in this. When a colleague looses it, and you want to be loyal…where’s the limit? Farah is doing one thing with her body, and another with her mind….trying to look like nothing has happened, showing interest to what Sarah is saying and at the same time moving her body around trying to calm the children….I don’t know what I would have done if I had been her, when Sarah started grabbing and dragging them back…**

The word goes around the group, and after a while I ask if they have something to add, that hasn’t been said yet.

After this example, another group shows their example, then we take a break and after that the two last groups do. We use the same procedure with applauses to get energy from and to give energy to each other, the students always start by discussing in pairs on their direct impressions of the play before I take the discussion up in the whole group. The last thing that happens is that I ask the group that did the drama to say what they think of the reflections, and to add what they have prepared in terms of connections to the theme of the course and the literature. In the end of the seminar, after 4 examples has been examined, we do a short meta-reflection, a round-up where everyone says something about what they bring from the seminar In terms of
knowledge, insights or questions. I always say that it’s ok to say “pass”, and it’s ok to say the same thing as anyone else.

This particular seminar took place at the experienced-based preschool teacher program, which means that every student in the room has at least three years of experience from working in preschool, some of them much longer; 10 or 15 years of experience is not unusual. This means that these students together have thousands of examples from their daily practices to choose among when they are asked to bring an example to the seminar.

Someone might think that this sounds difficult, that students in general are afraid of doing dramas in front of each other, that acting is an art form that requires certain knowledge, etcetera. I agree, to be an actor requires certain knowledge, but there is a big difference here. The students are not being trained to be actors, they are being trained to become better teachers, or just teachers. I never tell them to “act”, I tell them to show me and the group what happened in situations where they were present at the time the situation occurred, as good as they can do it. I also tell them that doing this as good as they can, is good enough.

Another thing that is important is that I often want them to show situations where they failed in some way, and this requires that they know that failing is ok. They will not be judged for having done something wrong. I emphasize that: 1. It’s human to make mistakes. 2. It’s impossible not to make mistakes, and 3. We can learn from mistakes that we have done, especially if we can laugh at them. Actually laughter is an important ingredient in my seminars, something I will come back to later on p. 70.

Reflecting with Maurice Merleau-Ponty and Alexander Baumgarten

I decided to put this reflection here for two reasons: to give the reader an example of what I mean when I say that I have been reflecting philosophically over my teaching practice for many years, and to hopefully broaden and deepen the readers understanding of the situation. The questions in the beginning of each part are questions posed by either colleagues, students or myself, questions that I felt an eager to understand and examine from different perspectives than my own.

- What happens to the student’s consciousness after taking part in this kind of seminar?

Something that often comes up in our meta-reflections where the students reflect on their own learning processes, is that during and after these seminars they experience a
certain consciousness in terms of being able to deliberately posit themselves within a range of possible actions when they are about to act, or in the present action, instead of acting as they always have acted in similar situations. They say that they become conscious about how they stand, how they accentuate things in their dialogues with children and colleagues, and about how they literally handle situations in terms of how they grab and put their hands on someone. This reminds me of when Merleau-Ponty describes the relation between consciousness and intentionality when he writes that the life of our consciousness is underpinned by an intentional arc:

...an intentional arc that projects around us our past, our future, our human milieu, our physical situation, our ideological situation, and our moral situation, or rather, that ensures that we are situated within all of these relationships. This intentional arc creates the unity of the senses, the unity of the senses with the intelligence, and the unity of sensitivity and motricity.\(^{30}\)

So, this certain consciousness that the students are experiencing during and/or after these seminars, have become aware of how they relate to the world, that is, to their intentional arc? And that it is changing? In my example one of the students says \textit{I am her, but I would never admit it!}, a comment that rendered a big laughter out of recognition among the others. She also said that she could \textit{feel it in her body}. Merleau-Ponty says that our consciousness is not located in our heads, it is spread out in the body; my legs think when I walk, my brain doesn’t.\(^{31}\) And, like intentionality, it is always directed to something, it is not an object in itself.\(^{32}\) So, when the student sees her fellow student acting as this stressed preschool teacher her body schema and thereby her intentionality is directed to this specific situation. If she had read about or heard about the situation she would probably have resisted any resemblance to it since the preschool teacher was “doing everything wrong”. But, because she was there, intellectually \textit{and} bodily present and directed to what was happening in the act, she was able to take the whole situation up. And this in its turn makes it possible for her to identify her own approach in stressed situations and reflect over it as a new object for investigation.


\(^{31}\) Lecture in practical knowledge at Södertörn University 2017-11-08, master level. Lecturer: Patrick Senyuck.

\(^{32}\) Lecture, Senyuck, 2017-11-08.
- What’s so special about this kind of reflection, and how does the aesthetic element of “drama” contribute in this reflection?

In Merleau-Ponty’s work on the cogito – “the one who thinks” - the cogito is the inner self that knows, and it is also the self that is known. These two are intertwined. Merleau-Ponty calls these two sides of the cogito the Cartesian cogito and the tacit cogito. One could say that the Cartesian cogito has a certain distance, an objective approach to things, while the tacit cogito is closer to the things, experiencing them in a subjective sense. Husserl is in a similar way describing the natural approach as objective and the phenomenological as subjective, and he puts it like this:

> It is a question not of putting the perceptual faith in place of reflection, but on the contrary of taking into account the total situation, which involves reference from the one to the other.

According to Husserl the body itself is holding two distinct perspectives: “[on the one side] as a physical body (Körper), i.e. as an object among others, and [on the other side] as lived body (Leib), my own, experienced body.” Merleau-Ponty uses the word chiasm for the same phenomenon, and exemplifies it with our ability to at the same time, when our one hand touches the other, experience ourselves as the one who touches. Put in relation to the two cogitos this becomes quite interesting. The Cartesian cogito according to Merleau-Ponty is what gives us a thetic consciousness, that is, a consciousness that is distant, reflective. On the other hand we find the tacit cogito that is un-thetic; the tacit cogito works through the body schema which is un-reflective, and this gives us an un-thetic consciousness. The consciousness of the tacit cogito is pre-reflective and in his later work Merleau-Ponty refers to it as naïve, like the consciousness of a newborn child. But I find it more interesting when he writes about a certain thickness in describing the tacit cogito, and here I would like to compare this to Alexander Baumgarten’s poetic representation, which he compares to a conceptual representation.

---

33 Lecture, Senyuck, 2017-12-06.
34 I know this interpretation of M-P:s discussion of the cogitos could be questioned, but since this way of putting it is fruitful in relation to the phenomenon I want to point out I choose to keep it this way.
35 Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of perception*, s. 35.
36 Nicholas Smith, “Husserl och kroppen”, i Wallenstein, Sven-Olov (red.), *Edmund Husserl*, s. 97, (my translation).
Baumgarten writes that the poetic representation is blurred or un-sharp, while the conceptual representation is sharp. As a metaphor he uses the image of a stonecutter, cutting piece by piece from a rock until the figure that he saw in it emerges. Baumgarten is by this saying that to say something exact, something “sharp”, we have to take something away, and the whole of which the figure was a piece gets lost. I believe that this is what Merleau-Ponty means when he talks about the tacit cogito being “thick”. In the Cartesian cogito our consciousness is sharp, and we are perceiving the world through concepts that we already know, but by using the thickness of the tacit cogito we can perceive the world as a gestalt, we can take the whole up with our senses, with our body and our feelings as guides. Maybe this is what happened when the student in my example felt in her body that she had done the same thing as the stressed preschool teacher in the sketch many times in her work, and when she also felt ashamed over it; maybe in that moment she was in her tacit cogito. But since she was attending an academic examination of the situation, well aware of the situation being as if it was for real and not for real, she could shift to the Cartesian cogito and use her known concepts to reflect over the situation. Worth noticing here is that she is then reflecting over the situation as a whole, a gestalt that is non-sharp, blurred, a situation that she took up while consciously being in an open, naïve state of mind – put in contrast to if she had read or heard about the situation as an ordinary case/situation presented in a conceptual way.

Put in the light of Merleau-Pontys ideas one could say that a difference between reflecting over a situation that is written down and a situation that is performed in the room by living bodies is that you are able to take the whole situation up into your reflection, and to refer to Baumgarten: Instead of only taking already known concepts up into the reflection, the possibility to let something un-known, something you could not or would not imagine, into your thoughts will appear. This means that it could be the case, that in my drama seminars the students are able to consciously use their tacit cogito in their reflections and also to practice a shifting between cogitos.

- What happens to the relation between theory and practice in these drama seminars, and what effect do they have on the students and my own understanding of the two concepts?
Put in relation to one of the main critiques of the academic teacher education that there is no link between theory and practice, that there seems to be a common agreement that they are or even should be separated, maybe this kind of seminars could be one among other ways to develop the academic teaching practice. But then we come up to another problem. Many of my colleagues at the university finds it problematic that the students acted situations or drama sketches are not for real; they are interpretations of the situations represented. I am beginning to think that this comes from their lack of knowledge about the phenomenological perspective. To be in a phenomenological investigation is to take notice of and try to describe how things appear to us instead of trying to explain what they are. This means that it is not important whether the situations really happened that way or not, because we are not searching for evidential truth. What we are doing is that we are investigating situations that could happen in the future; that is, we are not valuing them as being “good” or “bad”, but we are using them to find and focus on new objects for investigation, objects like preconditions, unconscious choices and values, objects that would have been hard to find without doing what we do.

Summary

Now there are two examples on stage: The example with the nazi boys from my experiences of Skapa och Lära, and example 2, “She’s me but I would never admit it” coming from my everyday teaching practice at the teacher education. The reason why I put these examples in the beginning of the essay is that I hope to reveal something I’m not able to see, something that might help me understand what was missing in my teaching approach when I met the two boys and that could be of help in guiding my students on their way to become teachers.

The other thing that comes to my mind is that I have tried now for many years to articulate what I do and what is happening to the students when I teach. I have tried to go into detail as well as sketching a more or less blurred gestalt to capture what I find important, but I always end up feeling unsatisfied. I have the feeling that the only way to express oneself in academia is by choosing one perspective and then stick to it – which for me is totally against the very heart of the aesthetic. From this concern this question arises when it comes to my methodological choice in this study: Is it possible to think, to talk and to write
about aesthetic experience as a phenomenon without changing its quality of fluidness - of constant changing, of being alive - into being fixed, un-moving, un-living? To avoid the latter, I will try here by offering a multiple of perspectives, a plurality that has this certain phenomenon, this underlying experience that they are trying to get to, in common.

**Stage 1: No space for action**

_In this chapter I will examine what happens when a teacher has no space for action by putting some different examples on stage. First I will reconnect to the example with the Nazi boys. The next one is an attempt to look at the university teacher through Arendt’s concepts of animal laborans and homo faber. The third one is an example from a music class, and the last example comes from the participants in the dialogue seminar._

**Experiencing a lack of space for action**

In the example with Adrian and Milos, the two boys who claimed that they were Nazis, the teachers and I experienced the curriculum as a conditioning force that left us no space for action. In this particular case it had the result that the boys felt excluded from the school community, not only by the rule that said “we have zero tolerance for racism” but also by what could be addressed as the zero-tolerance norm, a norm that says that any talk that could violate anyone from certain groups of students, is forbidden. Given that norms are part of the conditions for being teachers and pupils in school, this norm had also become a conditioning force, leaving no room for meeting the boys in their concerns about how to navigate in the world as grown ups. Since I and the teachers couldn’t act, we also limited the pupils’ possible space for action: There was no room, no space in school, where these 14 year old boys could try or even get a response to their ideas. I find it important here to emphasize that I don’t think that anyone should be able to say anything, all the time, but I am interested in how the teacher’s lack of space for action is connected to the possibility of the pupils to speak and act into the community of the school. Could it be that if the teachers experience a lack of space to act, this means that the pupils in their turn are denied their space for action?

On the other hand, taking this specific situation into consideration, the boys had and took the possibility to act since they were offered an alternative way to
express themselves: the film. This actualizes Arendt’s idea about art as a thought thing as well as the idea of a radical aesthetics or the radical possibility of art: By using an art tool the boys were able cut through the zero-tolerance norm, by that creating and at the same time entering a space for action, a space were all of a sudden all three of us had the possibility to act. This points to the temporal character of this space for action. According to Arendt this certain space for action only appear during certain conditions:

This space does not always exist, and although all men are capable of deed and word, most of them - like the slave, the foreigner, and the barbarian in antiquity, like the laborer or craftsman prior to the modern age, the jobholder or businessman in our world – do not live in it. No man, moreover, can live in it all the time”.

So what are the conditions under which the space for action disappears? To shed light on this I will put Arendt’s ideas of animal laborans and homo faber, as two different conditions that every human is bound to by being alive, into play with the life of the university teacher of today as I experience it from my own and some of my colleagues perspective.

The life of the university teacher seen through labor, work and action
A frequent idea that reveals itself in my seminars as well as in discussions with my colleagues at the university is the idea that the teachers’ room for action has decreased. Since action is connected to the unexpected, this is relevant to the investigation. Arendt writes in the human condition about what I have chosen to interpret as two different states in the human existence, she calls them animal laborans and homo faber. These states are something that all of us are going in and out of, but they can also, under certain conditions, become fixed as a certain way of being. In the long run such fixation will render consequences for the experience of having room for action or not. In the following I will try to look at the work in the university through these states.

37 In the curriculum of the Swedish elementary school these groups are clearly pointed out since it says that no one should be discriminated because of sex, sexual orientation, colour of skin, religion, ethnicity or physical disability.
38 I hope the reader can follow me here: I don’t mean that ”coming out as a Nazi” by definition is an act, I am talking about the possibility of speaking up, to express an opinion into a space where it is accepted as an act, where it is seen upon as a post in the debate and thereby possible to debate. No voice, no debate, and their opinion will not be questioned – instead they might get confirmed over and over again from their elder Nazi friends.
The university teacher as *animal laborans*

- *The work never ends, it has a crazy speed, the courses come one after the other, there’s no time to reflect, I’m surviving, that’s all.*
- *I’m so tired, I can’t be happy anymore, it all seems meaningless…*
- *I’m stuck in the squirrels wheel, I have to watch out not to end up, you know, in that place….*

This is how it sounds in the queue to the university restaurant, in the kitchen and the corridor outside my room. Sometimes it comes as a confession in a facebook state, sometimes as a phone call from a sad friend. What’s still making everyone go forward is the engagement, the commitment, the wish to get somewhere, to the end of the stack of student papers, the staffing file, the end of the course, the semester…but the feeling is you never get there.

- *When this stack of papers is finished, the next will come…*
- *When this staffing period is over, the next will start….*
- *When this course is over the next will come, and the next….*

Hannah Arendt writes about labour as what we do to survive, what is needed to keep our bodies alive. “The human condition of labor is life itself”, she writes, and by that she refers to life as “the biological process of the human body ”whose spontaneous growth, metabolism and eventual decay are bound to the vital necessities produced and fed into the life process by labor.”⁴⁰ In greek Polis this was the task of the slaves, they did what no one else wanted to do, the things that disappear as soon as they are consumed, or as with cleaning: as soon as you are ready cleaning in one place, it starts getting dirty again. *Animal laborans* does what is necessary for keeping the society going but never gets any credit for it. This kind of work, the labour, is wearing out body and soul since the work never ends, it’s an endless cycle. For the labours in Athens there were no rest or reflection, the slave worked until he died – which could be early in life. Is there a simularity here between the Athenian slave and the

---

overwrought university teacher? But hey, in the university there are no slaves, someone might object, an no, we are not, but what difference is there when work becomes labour with no end, when either something whole is to be seen nor a chance to take credit for or even reflect over your work? When the feeling of being professionally skilled has vanished? Is the way we are being burned-out the animal laborans of our time? Arendt writes that "the human condition consists in man’s being a conditioned being for whom everything, given or man-made, immediately becomes a condition of his further existence". The conditions of the slave, as subordinated his masters, by his conditions reduced to being the one who does what has to be done but that no one wants to do, made him a slave. The conditions of the university teacher in terms of a prevailing workload, an existence where the equation time and the number of obligations does not conform to each other, conditions her life in a way that what is seen as a worthy life – for example things like experiencing freedom and the ability to feel joy – just as in the example with the slave disappears from her life.

The university teacher as homo faber
In homo faber you make things that last, that has the possibility to outlast yourself. In this sense homo faber and the activity of work is connected to eternity. The human existence and its bodily appearance will come to an end, but the book she wrote, the chair she made, will be there even after her death. The condition of homo faber is unnatural and by this she refers to an activity

which is not embedded in, and whose mortality is not compensated by, the species’ ever-recurring life cycle. Work provides an “artificial” world of things, distinctly different from all natural surroundings. Within its borders each individual life is housed, while the world itself is meant to outlast and transcend them all. The human condition of work is worldliness.

In Arendt’s sense the university world is such an artificial world and the researchers are making artificial things. So what things are we talking about? As I see it, the life of homo faber is reflected today in the goal oriented management, management by objectives, that run through our educational system. If the university teacher has time

---

41 Arendt, The Human Condition, p. 147.
and money for doing research or some other position that contains responsibility for the organisation in some sense, then the goal gets clearer, and so do the conditions: The students are supposed to learn this and that, they shall be examined and get a grade. Check. The report, the thesis, the article are to be written. Check. When you are done, when the course is over, the article is published, the thesis printed the teacher/the researcher tells herself: I did a good work! Check! The article got accepted! Check! The students got their grades, an exam! Check! The work has resulted in a thing, in this example a thought thing. This thing: the education, the course rating, the report etcetera will follow its creator and hopefully be of importance for a while. But it will not in any way change the conditions for being a homo faber. In this process the meaning of the work is on beforehand given. The goal is clear, and when you are done you are satisfied: I did it! The problem arises if you never leave this state, when you realize that everything you do, all results of your work, is just a part of a continous cycle, in many ways simular to the state of animal laborans. Arendt writes about the satisfaction of having created a beautiful chair, a thing that will be appreciated by generations after your own death, but still:

If left to itself or discarded from the human world, the chair will again become wood, and the wood will decay and return to the soil from which the tree sprang before it was cut off to become the material upon which to work and with which to build⁴³

In this system, peopled by homo faber, it’s easy to find oneself valuing the accomplishments of ones everyday work in terms of quantity: how many goals have you reached? How many articles have you got published? The students invest in their education and thereby expect that it is solid and predictable. Scientists publish reports and articles that no one is reading. Education becomes a thing to buy and to sell, it gets commodified, the list of publications becomes an argument for a higher wage, higher status, for becoming a professor. The university can check off the number of students that pass the system, the students can put the exam in their CV. As a part of the students CV the education lives for a while in this world as any other commodity. Or as some sort of key that gives you the access to certain places but not to other. Everything predictable, on beforehand given, with clear means and ends and with a simple administration: We know what we have and the students know what they get,

⁴³ Arendt, The Human Condition, p. 137.
the council of science get what they asked for, the research they ordered, with no surprises. But we are still a part of “[t]he life process which permeates our whole being” and that conditions the life of *homo faber* – which, as we will see, in its turn has consequences for our ability to act or even to become aware of the lack of space for action.

**The music teacher as *homo faber***

*This example comes from a classroom where pupils at the age of 13 had a music lesson. The story that I present comes from a friend of my daughter who attended this actual class. I have chosen to present this example, not to miscredit a certain music teacher, and not to say that every music teacher is doing this, but to give an example on what is possible to do under the certain conditions that I am trying to understand here. In the dialogue seminar when I presented this example, Pia directly said that this is the reason why she quit her job as a music teacher, and instead started working with aesthetic learning in the subject of Swedish. “The feeling is that the system wants you to work like this”, she said. I also know from my own experiences and from the stories my students bring to my seminars as well as from my meetings with music teachers on different conferences, that this is not a unique situation.*

- Hello Norah!
- Hello…
- Has something happened?
- Yes, we had music in school…..
- Aha, but you like music, don’t you?
- …eeeh…our music lessons suck!
- Yeah? Well I’m sorry to hear that…but is it really that bad?
- Oh yes!
- But tell me, what did you do today?
- The teacher made us stand in a line, all 28 pupils, and then she put on a cd-player with music and told us to sing along. Then she took her Ipad and started filming us, each of us very close. Everyone hated it, so it took the whole lesson to do it.
- Ok that sounds strange, I said. Why did she do that?
- Because she has to evaluate how we sing, for the grades.
So, what’s the problem here? As I see it the conditions under which music teachers in elementary school today do their work are of a kind that actually supports this kind of music lessons. Now I’m one of them who truly believes that anyone who has chosen to work as teachers in the school world do have a true engagement in children, teenagers, teaching and/or their subject. When it comes to art education, the aesthetic subjects, I believe it’s also about passion – everyone I know who are musicians or music teachers have a passion for music. So, if we presuppose that Norahs music teacher is a person who has a passion for music and an interest in children and learning/teaching – how can she possibly end up in such a situation where she actually plans and performs a music lesson as the one described? I think that Arendt would have said that this teacher, from the conditions given her stated by the evaluation system of the school, and by present norms about presentation and grounds for credentials, etc., has become a homo faber. This particular homo faber finds herself being remote-controlled, with no room for action, without any possibility to think by herself outside the frames that are given. The result is a music lesson that has nothing to do with music as a subject, or as an art, and that violates the children in different ways leaving them with the statement “Our music lessons suck!” Still, if the society, the headmaster or a parent asks: - What are you doing in your music lessons? she can answer: - We work towards the goals, I have evaluated the children and given them their grades in accordance to our criteria. I’ve also documented the grounds for assessment if someone wants to question my assessment. By that she can give herself credit for doing a good job. In my opening story about the Nazi boys, me and the teachers - due to the prevailing conditions - could give ourselves credit for having done a good job. In spite of sick leaves and insufficient resources on many levels there were enough students who reached the goals. Bravo!

Voices from the dialogue seminar:
This conversation took place at the first dialogue seminar. We had read an article in the official paper of the teachers’ union 44 that focused on an interview with Jonna Bornemark on her new book on measurability and quality assurance in the public

sector.\textsuperscript{45} Bornemark claims that the focus on quality assurance is problematic since it, in reality as she shows in many examples, counteracts quality. Pia starts by saying that she can recognize herself and her situation at work in Bornemarks text:

It’s very much about results, I do feel managed and controlled, and what I find important and what I consider as long-term work for the good of the pupils, I find hard to motivate within this structure.\textsuperscript{6}

Pia works in classes at the fourth grade, and she told us that she is obliged to put all her planning on the internet platform the school uses to communicate with parents and pupils in the beginning of every semester. She is supposed to write down a plan for every lesson, how it is connected to the curriculum and what the pupils are expected to learn from this. What she finds problematic here is that there is no room for following the pupils, to meet them where they are at the moment. This is why she quit working as a music teacher some years ago. “I just can’t work with children and music under these conditions, It’s impossible.” Instead she uses music and other art forms when she teaches Swedish, something that gives some space for her and the pupils, and as many other teachers she has decided to write one thing on the platform and sometimes do another – to be able to stand up for what she finds important in her work. But then here comes the problem with the actual increasing engagement of parents of our time, into the picture: The headmaster is clear on saying that if the parents ask their children what they have done in school, it must be what is written in the plan. Another problem is that many things Pia finds important, for example to meet the pupils and connect her teaching to their own experiences, doesn’t show at all. Tindra, who works in an after-school centre, an activity that is situated after school time and has its own curriculum, and usually its own specially educated teachers, shares this image of the system:

Yes, things like communication, being engaged together, the relational...it can’t be measured, it can’t be presented, it can’t be sold in...it’s hard with these soft values, contact between people, relations, it’s not valued, on the contrary we are going the other way with harder attitudes towards the pupils, longer schooldays, more homework where the teacher is replaced by internet-based teaching rooms...

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid.
Pia continues:

If I change plans and do something else than planned to meet the pupils, the stress comes immediately because I have written that this and that is what we are going to do, and it’s visible to the parents, to our bosses, the border of the school etc.6

Tindra wants to develop the thought, referring to the article on quality assurance in school that we read before the seminar:

Quality assurance, the bad word as J B writes, what is it? Something measurable…that we can show off, to show off gets more important than what we actually do, after-school centre is still somewhat more free than regular school but it’s coming here too, even though our teaching is supposed to be situation based: something happens, a child has an idea, you go with the child’s idea and build something further from what the child wants to know…most learning in school is about something that others has decided for the children to learn anyway, as becoming citizens…I think it is important that after-school centre keeps its own way, to let the children decide what is important and what they want to learn.7

This homo-faber-way of approaching teaching that Pia and Tindre feel forced to embrace and that they are fighting in a sense, could be seen as the opposite of the idea of Bildung.6 An association that I get here is the fact that in university pedagogy today there is a craze for something called Constructive alignment.

Constructive alignment' starts with the notion that the learner constructs his or her own learning through relevant learning activities. The teacher's job is to create a learning environment that supports the learning activities appropriate to achieving the desired learning outcomes. The key is that all components in the teaching system - the curriculum and its intended outcomes, the teaching methods used, the assessment tasks - are aligned to each other. All are tuned to learning activities addressed in the desired learning outcomes. The learner finds it difficult to escape without learning appropriately.46

This might appear as obvious, but in the sphere of academic teaching it is not since there is a tradition of one-way communication in lectures, leaving the students to see to that they reach the goals of the course. When interpreted through the glasses of new public management, constructive alignment has become the practice of splitting up the curriculum goals in smaller parts that is to be taken care of at on beforehand defined occasions. This is not specific for the academia, Norah’s example shows the effects of this in ground school music education, and the examples of Pia and Tindra speak for themselves.

6 Bildung as the personally motivated and meaningful creation of knowledge that is a life long process.
47 John Biggs, Aligning teaching for constructing learning.
Summary: What happens when there is no space for action?
I think that what happens when a teacher is unable to act in Arendt’s sense is that, over time, you forget why it is important to act. What shall we do with this space for action? After a while there is no point in it; after all, the curriculum goals tell us what to do and if we do what we are told to do no one can say I didn’t do my job. In the long term action might become frightening. To act is to throw yourself out, uncertain of the consequences. In my work at the university I have met pedagogues who are afraid of what might happen if teachers get too much of this space, of this room for action. Teaching is supposed to be grounded in science, in research, by that using only the methods that we know is working. Why should we bother thinking on our own? What if we act and the consequences are bad? Of course it’s better to use a method proven by science, then if it fails, it’s the method that’s wrong, not me - or the children/the students. I can’t count how many times I have heard colleagues (or sometimes myself) saying: - I have such a bad group of students, they just don’t understand.

We are perhaps the first generation which has become fully aware of the murderous consequences inherent in a line of thought that forces one to admit that all means, provided they are efficient, are permissible and justified to pursue something defined as an end…As long as we believe that we deal with ends and means in the political realm, we shall not be able to prevent anybody’s using all means to pursue recognized ends.48

In this passage Arendt is warning for the consequences of letting people in the political realm (and I truly believe that today Arendt would say that school is a part of the political realm, even though she didn’t think so in the sixties) become homo fabers by only dealing with means and ends, the consequences will be that they use any means, even horrible means, to get to the ends.

An important difference between animal laborans and homo faber
An important difference, as I see it, between animal laborans and homo faber is that while occupied with the duties of animal laborans we don´t consider ourselves agents in the world. But while being in the state of homo faber we might think that we are. We believe that doing research makes a difference, that educating students makes a difference – difference in the sense that it has an effect upon the conditions that are given. But thinking with Arendt on this, working in the university does not mean that

we are agents. We can be, there are agents everywhere, in every part of the society, but if there is no room for action, if we keep doing what is expected of us and holding on only to what gives expected results, we become a part of the same natural cause and effect pattern that *animal laborans* is caught up in, becoming more and more blind, unable to see in what direction the liner is taking us. Just like Adolf Eichmann we become silent administrators, doing our jobs, checking our lists, with no sense of responsibility for the consequences, and one day we might end up recognizing that we have been working in a system that kills people. We are already there – life-draining is a word that is used more and more regularly – ok, we might not die in this system, but we are constantly at risk of getting very sick.

**What was the contribution of the film to my encounter with the Nazi boys?**

I have explained how the film cut through the zero-tolerance norm, creating a space for action where me and the boys suddenly had the space to act in a context where we usually experienced no space for action. Since I wasn’t ready, this put me as a teacher in a situation where I had no idea of what to do. At the moment, I felt two things: I felt unsure since I didn’t know what to do, but I could also sense the possibility that suddenly appeared: the possibility to act, to actually do something that would get consequences unpredictable to me. Since to act is to do things even though you don’t know what the consequences might be, to act you must be comfortable to be unsure. Thinking back on the situation I think I can say that I was quite comfortable in the situation in relation to the boys. I found it interesting to talk to them, to hear them explaining their ideas and sharing their experiences. What I was totally uncomfortable with was the time, the fact that we didn’t have the time to continue our talk. This points to something that I always take into consideration in my teaching practice today: The aesthetic elements in my seminars are always followed by reflection, and a part of the fundament I’m standing on is the assumption that aesthetic experiences has to be reflected in relation to the aim of the course to become meaningful. In the following chapters I will look at this assumption, as well as the assumption that the film generated an aesthetic experience that created a space for action, from some philosophical perspectives by first trying to understand what an aesthetic experience is, its connection to action and the role it could or should play in the knowledge of a teacher.
Stage 2: Aesthetic experience and related concepts

In this chapter I will get deeper into the aesthetic experience itself: What is it and what can make it happen? And what concepts do we need to talk about this? On stage here is Aesthetic experience as a concept, as a phenomenon and as a quality. I will try to frame these perspectives using concepts from Jacques Rancière, Hans-Georg Gadamer, John Dewey and Anders Burman. Then I will invite the Clown Nalle Laanela and the journalist Marie-Louise Knott into the conversation.

Aesthetics and aesthetic learning

Aesthetics refers to a specific regime for identifying and reflecting on the arts: a mode of articulation between ways of doing and making, their corresponding forms of visibility, and possible ways of thinking about their relationships. If Rancière in this quote is maintaining the general or universal level, Anders Burman in the preface of Konst och lärande – essäer om estetiska lärprocesser suggests the concept of the aesthetic to point at the particular in the aesthetic practice, that is what art is doing. He also mentions Hans-Georg Gadamers das Spiel as a possible way to understand this, and I will get deeper into this concept soon. I find this split between aesthetics and the aesthetic interesting and in an essay in the same volume I write about the aesthetic as what touches you, in the sense that it puts your thoughts and feelings in motion. I also connect this movement to the concept of Bildung – to strive for Bildung can be understood as striving to constantly be in motion, to avoid rigidity and keep your curiosity alive.

The concept of aesthetic learning as I have chosen to understand it points to a field where the agents uses, examines, and develops the possibilities with aesthetic experiences in education by forming and organizing teaching practices where aesthetic experiences are given a place and are taken into consideration in the creation and assimilation of practical as well as epistemological knowledge.

---

52 In swedish: estetiska lärprocesser. I have chosen to use ”aesthetic learning” instead of ”aesthetic learning processes”.
53 In Swedish: Begreppet estetisk läroprocess pekar på ett fält där aktörerna använder sig av, undersöker och utvecklar möjligheterna med estetiska erfarenheter genom att skapa undervisningssituationer där estetiska erfarenheter ges plats och tas tillvara i skapandet och tillägnandet av såväl praktisk som epistemologisk kunskap.
conceptually from an aesthetic perspective, and you can take interest in what the aesthetic activities/expressions/experiences actually do when confronted to the students, that is as a phenomenon, as an aesthetic experience.

So what is aesthetic experience? For a start, an experience is what you bring from something that has happened. In Art as Experience John Dewey claims that every experience is aesthetic. He makes a difference between just being in a stream of circumstances and feelings, and an experience coming from reflecting over that stream; an experience as something that is perceived as at the same time something whole and a unity.\(^{54}\) He also claims that experience is the fulfillment of an organism in its ambitions and accomplishments in a world of things, and therefore it is the seed of art.\(^{55}\) I would like to suggest that Dewey in this passage is talking about the same phenomenon as Gadamer is when he uses das Spiel. While in das Spiel you are in a state similar to this stream, and in this state you are open and sensitive to the world, by that open to associate and think things over from new perspectives. You give yourself up and take the other subject in – either if it is a person or a thought thing – and you change in a certain sense that that you come to a new understanding of the matter. For this state of being to become an experience, you have to add something. According to Dewey this adding is an act of creation: you create your experience.\(^{56}\) I will come back to this later since it corresponds to my own experiences of teaching and learning, and the assumption that aesthetic experiences need to be reflected to become meaningful in relation to the aim of the aesthetic element.

When you have created your experience, when the experience has been fulfilled in Deweys terms, you understand something new or anew. This is how I understand Gadamer when he writes that das Spiel is connected to understanding. So, by using Deweys distinction I believe I have come to a deeper understanding about das Spiel, and I agree with him when he writes that an aesthetic experience is an experience that appears when you have an encounter with art.\(^{57}\) By that I would like to add that this encounter doesn’t necessarily have to be an encounter with someone else’s artwork – while creating art there is a dialogue between the creator and the

\(^{54}\) Jonna Lappalainen, ”Innan erfarenheten – estetiska lärprocesser i ljuset av John Deweys estetik”, in Burman, Anders, red., Konst och Lärande – essäer om estetiska lärprocesser, p. 33.
\(^{56}\) Lappalainen, ”Innan erfarenheten”, p. 39
\(^{57}\) Lappalainen, ”Innan erfarenheten”, p. 39.
artwork that contains numerous encounters that is or could become an aesthetic experience.

An aesthetic experience, if we go with the concept of the aesthetic, is an experience that engages you, that makes your ground shiver, or puts your feelings and emotions in motion. This points to a certain phenomenon, a feeling that most people can relate to as being moved by a book, a film or another artwork. This is also the way I choose to understand it. For Arendt art contributes to the human community as a thought thing that puts thoughts and feelings in motion, it is challenging and it has the possibility to keep mankind from rigidity. I believe one could say that Arendt would agree that art as thought things give aesthetic experiences. This could also be understood as follows: there is a certain quality inherent in the aesthetic experience, a quality that is of vital importance for the individual as well as for society. This is how I understand the connection between aesthetic experiences, understanding and Bildung.

Important to notice here is that not only art can give an aesthetic experience, nor do all art give everyone an aesthetic experience. Aesthetic experiences cannot be measured, they are experienced on a personal level, they happen - or they don’t. But as we will see, this does not mean that an aesthetic experience only appear as an individual experience.

Gadamer’s das Spiel
In Warheit und Methode Hans-Georg Gadamer speaks about das Spiel, that is what appears in between the spectator and the artwork – if it is a true work of art. Gadamer claims that “[t]he way the artwork is, is play”58, and if the play, das Spiel, does not appear, then it is not a work of art. An example of das Spiel is what happens when children play: someone starts the play and it continues “on its own” which also means that the players are feeling played by the game. To Gadamer the artwork is a subject, a participator, among others. The play plays itself according to Gadamer, meaning that it is something that comes to life between the participants. Once the play has started it can go on for a long time, for example if a person reads a book that starts

58 Das Spiel is the german word for play, but I have chosen to use the german word because it has a slightly different meaning than play, and because it’s impossible to translate into swedish without choosing between ”lek” as in childrens play or ”spel” as in gambling. To Gadamer das Spiel means both, and goes beyond them.
something that will follow her for the rest of her life, because something has been put into motion.

Gadamer also writes that das Spiel is related to understanding. Understanding for Gadamer is experiencing common meaning, and this is what happens when we are in das Spiel. But das Spiel requires that we open up for the other player(s) and that we also give out something of ourselves: Since the game is between persons, or between an artwork and the spectator it cannot appear without communication, interaction. The players put something into play, something is at stake, for a moment you are not safe anymore, you challenge yourself, you say yes to the other person’s impulses – otherwise the play/das Spiel stops immediately. This is the best place, the best mood to be in to truly understand something according to Gadamer, and thereby it is also the best place to learn.

My suggestion is that the “aesthetic” in aesthetic learning or aesthetic experience is das Spiel, it is a constant movement that keeps the participants in motion, it’s something communicative, something inter…, it’s something relational, something that requires an openness towards the other, and a willingness to participate, to play, to put oneself at stake, to be in motion. And this is also why it is impossible to measure and hard to plan for, which makes it hard to find a place for in a system where we are always at risk at being homo fabers and thereby the blind followers of constructive alignment.

Laanela’s The Game
In this master essay I will also let art speak in itself, or more specific: I will invite a master of contact with the audience from another paradigm of our world, a master in play and in improvisation, to take place in the text. In The Clown Manifesto The clown Nalle Laanela writes about the clown’s technique to create contact with an audience. He calls it the idea of “the game”. The game is what makes this specific audience, this specific day, in contact with this specific clown; the game is what make the people in the audience start laughing and thus puts their playful attention to what is happening on stage. Once the clown enters the room the first thing for her to do is to find the game, then she do things to define the game, after that she needs to play with the game, and so on until the last: enjoy the game. Once this is done you have established a room, a scene that could be considered a space for action, a room
created by the clown where the audience as well as the clown are invited to act. Laanela writes:

[A] lot of clown training is based on being able to enter a room and not know what the game is, on discovering the game as it emerges. …[What is a game? A game could be an exploration of a phenomenon or a problem that has to be solved. A game needs enough rules so that you can play, but not so many as to hinder the playing.]

A reader interested in teaching might wonder what Gadamer’s ideas about art and a Clown’s ideas about clowing might add to the knowledge of the teacher. This is why I let Pia and Tindra read a part of the clown manifesto, just to take notice of their reactions.

**Some voices from the dialogue seminar on The Game:**

*Before the second dialogue seminar we read a part of "The clown manifesto" and then we started sharing our reading experiences. This part is translated directly from my recording of the seminar.*

Pia: To me Nalle describes the core of the pedagogical encounter, especially when you are in to creative things. To really meet the group, to sense it, to listen, and for yourself to feel joy and enthusiasm – this is actually what we were talking about last time but I think he describes it in a nice way, in a way that makes it important, it’s like – yes, this is it, it’s the core of the whole thing, in what I do – and it’s so satisfying to read it so clearly outspoken that this, this is what’s important, if you don’t do this nothing will work, and I feel such a relief to read this when there are so many other things that we are supposed to do, things that comes from ”upstairs”, different methods, different ways of organizing things…and then I read this and I feel that no, THIS is what is important, THIS is the core: I need to want to do what I do, and I need to know who I am doing it with, if I don’t do this nothing will work, no new methods, no old methods, and I just thought: Wow! He’s so good! (everybody else laughing) I red this on the subway and went like this: Wohooo! (more laughter)

Tindra: You can look at the teacher as a performer, as Nalle describes it, as someone who stands before an audience trying to touch them, and what’s so important with Nalle is that the audience is the only thing that is meaningful, without the audience there is no art, it’s not the performance in itself, how he does it and how he performed the act but how the audience perceived the act that is his focus […]it’s this contact and the respect, the honour of the feelings of the audience that, the alpha and omega of creating relations, I believe this is so important…because when standing in front of a big group of children with 54 eight-year olds and try to make them listen, then it is exactly this, to sense the group and be in the moment that makes them listen.

Petra: When I hear that you find that Nalle as a Clown nails the core of what you think of as our professional knowledge, to create contact, to catch the interest in a group, I think of all pedagogical research, all the theories about this phenomenon, when you read about it, it all seems so complicated, and it is complicated……

Pia: Yes, it’s complicated, but at the same time I feel this relief in reading The Clown Manifesto, it’s that feeling of, Yes, finally, he nailed the core, exactly…..

---

Petra: I agree, and he comes from...he's writing some sort of philosophy, or....is it a method? I don't know, but it works as a guide to find an approach that works in practice....

Pia: But he's not just anybody who writes something, he has tried and failed loads of times and surely he has been through disastrous encounters where everything fucked up, and asked himself why it didn't work and then tried again, changed things, refined it, over many years....

Petra: [...] I'm interested in what words that do the work, words that do work in relation to the practice, words that open up, that creates frames but at the same time opens up for improvised encounters...I have the feeling that these words are here somehow...and this discussion comes from your comment Pia about the simple, the simplicity of Nalle’s text...

Tindra: Actually I think that when it's joyful, it gets simple.

**Tension and relief**

After this we continued reflecting on the simplicity of Laanela’s text, and what happens when the school system is creating more and more advanced systems for measuring quality, which in its turn means that everything you do has to fit into scientifically proven methods that are thoroughly described so that anyone, or at least any teacher, could follow it without thinking, without reflecting. Reading Laanela made Tindra and Pia laugh out of relief, which points to a tension created by the conditions for their teaching practices. By the simple suggestion to find the game, the clown puts attention to what Tindra and Pia as experienced teachers know is the core of all teaching, and actually this relief comes every time I introduce the idea of the game to my students, especially the ones that has some experience of interacting with children.

**Marie-Louise Knott, aesthetic experience and Arendt’s notion of plurality**

In my teaching as well as in my writing the aesthetic experience of the students or the reader is my goal. My aim is never to tell anybody how things are, or how they should be, or how something should be handled. The aim is to offer time and space, a place, where the students or the readers and I are put into play with different things – theories, philosophical concepts, poetry, dramatized authentic actions, the students own stories, role plays - and with each other. If I look at this through Marie-Louise Knott’s reading of Arendt, I find connections to the way Arendt uses the text as stage, by this developing the concept of the world as stage from for example Plato, Heidegger, Rilke and Shakespeare.

The aim is to be able to think beyond the expected, to force ones thoughts into new patterns instead of repeating old ones, to put the writer and the reader in places of uncertainty instead of being certain, or feeling safe. For an

---

example Arendt puts poetry on stage, in her texts, according to Knott inspired by the method of the poet himself:

[M]etaphors from outside the poet himself – the bread of poetry – break open the writer’s own language, creating a heterogeneity from which the text gains the power to relativize its own convictions and destroy its dogmas. The foreign images as well as the foreign sounds and rhythms in the text form places of meeting and zones of uncertainty. They contribute to the fact that Arendt’s texts are not exhausted by one reading but are capable of an ongoing inner unfolding. Arendt adds what she heard to what is her own. Thus arises a polyphonic, shared present that is also an aesthetic experience.62

Hereby unfolds the idea of an aesthetic experience as the experience of having been put into play and thus forced into being present, to take part in an open, polyphonic, communicative space, that is based on plurality. By choosing various thought things to put on stage, into this plurality, to intervene with what is given, Arendt tries to create conditions for developing thoughts that can radically change the world – or at least the person who dares to get into the aesthetic experience of thinking with her for a while. This is what I am aiming for and also very close to what I am experiencing in my drama seminars. Another important thing here is that the aesthetic experience that is the goal of my teaching is shared; it is a shared aesthetic experience.

The problem with flow – an aesthetic experience where plurality is lost
In the dialogue seminars as well as in general in the context of art teaching, the word flow is used to point to an important quality. Being in flow is understood as a state where things go your way, everything finds its place, a state where things that usually is hard to do suddenly get easy. It’s also connected to being effective, to do something quickly and with as little effort as possible. Several times I have got the suggestion that flow and das Spiel is the same thing, but I would like to use Arendt’s notion of plurality to take a closer look on what could be a difference here.

Flow, as I see it, is something individual. You get inspired, you get “high”, you ride on a wave of things going your way. You don’t need another person to be in flow, you can be completely alone, working on something, or you can perform something in front of others, but not necessarily in contact with others. Being in a flow might make you change in terms of practice: you can practice staying in the flow, you can be better and better at finding flow. But since you are in contact

62 Knott, Unlearning with Hannah Arendt, p. 97.
primarily with yourself your change is not related to the impact another person has on you.

*Das Spiel* on the other hand is the experience of being one subject in relation to another, which means that it has an important aspect of communication. Communication is giving and taking, speaking and listening, but it is also giving something up on yourself in order to take something from the other subject in. *Das Spiel* is relational and, as Gadamer points out: It is related to understanding, which in its turn is connected to an experience of common meaning. A condition for experiencing common meaning is, as Arendt points out, plurality.

**Summary:**
We have seen the connection between *das Spiel/the game* and the aesthetic experience. We have discussed aesthetic experience from three different aspects: 1) The experience of a certain aesthetic quality, *das Spiel*, that is a certain attention, something positive to strive for. 2) Aesthetic experience as a phenomenon, something that is possible to relate to as the feeling of having been moved by an artwork (individual level). 3) Aesthetic experience as an experience that creates a new understanding, and at the same time an experience of common meaning, by that inheriting the radical possibility to change the world/the situation (collective level, based on plurality). I would say that what the clown is doing is precisely this: He is creating a shared aesthetic experience, by that letting the audience experience common meaning.

Reading this so far I get the feeling that what Tindra and Pia is trying to articulate is something that keeps them from doing this, something that is a part of the conditions for being a teacher that we discussed in the beginning of this essay. There are so many things that they have to know, so many methods to learn and to try, by order from supervisors or from their own curiosity or willingness to develop themselves in their profession, and still, while reading Laanela, they get this feeling of relief: Finally someone that points to the very core of being a teacher, that thing that every experienced teacher knows but that is so often forgotten, hidden behind everything that you know about teaching: The ability to catch the pupils, to get their attention, to find and define the game for today, for this class, for this year. To be able to find the game, to play with the game, you have to leave what you already know behind, you have to stand on *intellectus*, in contact with the area of not-knowing. The
clown does this in a very simple way, by focusing on the phenomenon: *The game.* And he is improvising, which means that he is open, participating in *das Spiel* as a participant among the others, the audience.

**Stage 3: The thought thing as the aesthetic element**

*In this chapter I will put Arendt’s idea of art as a thought thing in relation to Jonna Bornemark’s notes on the critical potential of art, and then I will put these concepts in relation to my encounter with the Nazi boys. I will also suggest the concept of aesthetic element to be included into a possible conceptual framework supporting the practice of aesthetic learning.*

The radical possibility of art: art as a thought thing

The Swedish philosopher Jonna Bornemark writes in a book about the crisis in the public sector in Sweden, about the critical potential of art. As a practice of *intellectus* art has the ability “to scrutinize contemporary central systems and concepts” by “questioning, examining and rethinking them.”

63 This can be related to Arendt’s notion of art as a thought thing, a thing with a certain agency, a possibility to set our thoughts in motion, to avoid the risk of stagnation.

64 Bornemark develops the idea about *ratio* and *intellectus* in terms of two sides of reason in a dialogue with the philosopher Nicholas Cusanus (1401-1464). *Ratio* is what we already know, and *intellectus* is the border of what we know, a place where we are in contact with the not-knowing. Not-knowing in this sense is not the same thing as what we don’t know yet, it points at the possibility of collecting new knowledge from the unexpected, from what we had no idea even existed. Certain practices, like being a nurse or a teacher, practices that contain meetings with human beings and where the job is built on abilities like communication, listening and taking the other persons perspective into consideration, can be named *practices of intellectus*. Looking into another persons eyes, knowing some things about the person but at the same time knowing that there are endless things you don’t know, is to stand on the border of *intellectus*. *Intellectus* has two sides, of which this is one. The other side is where the critical potential of art comes in: Art, according to Bornemark, is a practice of *intellectus*, since it has the ability to take things from the *ratio*, what we already know, and to put it on the border of *intellectus*, that is in relation to the area of not-knowing. In doing or encountering

63 Bornemark, *Det omätbaras renässans – en uppgörelse mred pedanternas herravälde*, p. 250. (my translation)

art there is a possibility that we end up standing on intellectus, experiencing what we already know in a new way, which in itself creates a new space for action. The artwork, the thought thing, puts our thoughts and feelings in motion, opening up the possibility for us to keep the intellectus perspective, which, as we also learnt from Gadamer’s *das Spiel*, is connected to understanding new things and understanding things anew. In this passage Bornemark concludes the relation between ratio and intellectus and also how intellectus is related to life as motion and as the opposite of rigidity:

Where intellectus is constricted and pressed away, the ratio is at risk of getting stuck in solidified, dying, categories. It gets stuck in patterns that keep increasing the distance to the motion of life, it gets rigid and ungainly and must maintain an increasingly harder power to survive. But the intellectus cannot survive without the ratio, it is the ratio that is capable of creating a cohesive and understandable world.65

I would like to pose the question if the film in the example with the Nazi boys could be understood as an example of how a work of art can be critical, or maybe even radical in the sense that it cuts through, reveals, what is not known? All the other films kept themselves inside the zero tolerance-norm, and working with them did not force me as a teacher into any kind of situation that I didn’t know how to handle. But the film about the policeman and the prisoner did. It was totally unexpected to me, and it definitely put me in contact with my area of not-knowing, it put something in me in motion, making it possible for me to look at my ratio, what I already know about teaching, from a totally new perspective.

**The film as an aesthetic element**

As already mentioned, one thing that I became painfully aware of in the situation with the two Nazi boys was the fact that my choice of teaching tool, the film, did open up for the unexpected to happen. The unexpected is something that I have been arguing for so far in this master essay as something valuable in teaching. Still the situation became what I at that moment felt was a total failure. So what was the problem?

One of the problems as I see it now was that in my planning I didn’t create enough room for reflection. Looking at it from a didactic perspective it’s a question about where in the imagined learning process of the pupils I placed the aesthetic

---

I will try here to use the term aesthetic element to, from a didactic perspective, point out where in a thought learning process the students/pupils get the opportunity to express themselves through art. The aesthetic element is what I as a teacher hope will result in an aesthetic experience for the students. Aesthetic experiences happen, or do not happen – I can never plan for them - but I can plan for the aesthetic element. The films made by the pupils in 8d can be pointed out as the aesthetic element in the learning process I imagined as their teacher, but if they resulted in meaningful aesthetic experiences in the pupils education, is another question.

Today when I teach I always put the aesthetic element in the beginning of the process, as a start from which the rest of the seminar or the rest of the course gets its form. This is very different from how aesthetic elements often are used when being understood as different ways to show that the students have learnt something, that they have achieved knowledge in accordance to the curriculum. Letting students/pupils present their ideas in a film, a picture, a dance, in an attempt to use different languages to communicate a result that are to be evaluated, could be a way to create equality in terms of letting every pupil choose the language that he or she is most comfortable with. But it also creates a new problem. This idea forces the question: How is this possible to evaluate? And it often ends up in students/pupils performing aesthetic activities in situations where they are, precisely, evaluated, which in itself is problematic. I think what is important here is to keep two different activities from each other: doing exercises and doing evaluations. When exercising you do things to improve yourself, you focus on what you are exercising. In a situation when you are being evaluated in relation to others it is very easy to focus on the evaluation itself: Who did the best performance, or what does the teacher want from me. I believe that if aesthetic elements are to be turned into aesthetic experiences of value in education, they should be protected from the huge area of evaluation that has invaded the educational system today. As Laanela says: the game needs enough rules to play, but not to many rules that they hinder the playing. In evaluations there are criteria that might be considered as rules that interfere with the play, and if the play doesn’t start there will be no new knowledge, no extension of the ratio, no actualization of the radical possibility of art – just like in the example with Norah’s

---

66 Swe: estetiskt moment
music lesson. So maybe one way of talking about aesthetic elements when planning for them could be: Are there enough rules to let the game play itself? Or are there too many rules, with the risk that there will be no play?

How can I be sure that an aesthetic experience becomes a meaningful experience in relation to the aim of the activity? The way my meeting with Adrian and Milos turned out it might as well have been an examination of their film. There was an aesthetic element, their film had the function of a thought thing that put our thoughts and feelings in motion, I think I can say that all three of us went from the situation with another aesthetic experience added to our life experience. But was it meaningful in the boys’ education? I don’t know, and this time not-knowing is not what I’m looking for. For me personally this was an aesthetic experience that in the long run made me change the very conditions for how I teach, but how about them? I have no idea since the experience was left unopened, unprocessed, since there was no room for reflection.

The way I changed my teaching after the situation with the Nazi boys is that I am even more careful when introducing the students to my seminar room, the stage that I offer where we put experiences, dramatized examples, thoughts and possible actions. I always point out that this will not be assessed/evaluated in terms of grades. The students have to participate in an active way to get approved, but that’s it. I want the aesthetic element to be free from the system of evaluations, I want to create a free-zone were the students can experiment with different actions and where we can experience and discuss possible consequences without getting disturbed by trying to figure out who is better or worse. In short, one could say that the biggest change was that from that moment I never let a student or a group of students present what is the aesthetic element if there is not enough time for reflection, or to use the words of Deweys: I always give the students time to consciously create a meaningful experience in relation to their becoming or ongoing professional practice.

Summary:
There are two things that are important here: An aesthetic element planned by the teacher, can result in an aesthetic expression like the film, and in its turn the film can be understood as an artwork and an act in its sense, an act that is impossible to
predict the consequences of. This points to something that I experience over and over again in my teaching practice: that aesthetic experiences has a radical possibility to break out of what is given and put the participants in contact with the realm of not-knowing.

The other thing is that for an aesthetic experience to become meaningful in a certain sense it has to be reflected, it has to be taken care of, it has to be accepted, the aesthetic element must be embraced as an act. If the teacher denies the pupil/student that act she denies him or her entrance into polis, the polyphonic community that is required for an act to become an act, the community Arendt is pointing at with her concept of plurality. In theatre improvisation we speak about saying yes to each other, to the impulses of the other, otherwise these impulses will never develop, they will die. Adrian and Milos’ film had the potential to become an act, but since I and the other teachers did not treat it as an act, it never reached its potential when it comes to possible consequences. By making the film, the two boys made an invitation, they opened up for the possibility to be questioned, to be included in the discussion about norms and values; through their action they exposed themselves to something they could not predict the consequences of. There was actually a possibility for them to change their view. But since we didn’t respond to their act nothing happened. We, the teachers and I, had the possibility to act but we didn’t take it.

The aesthetic element can be planned for as a didactic choice, but the aesthetic experience in itself is unpredictable: It happens sometimes and sometimes not. The aesthetic element is something that can result in aesthetic experiences in the participants. Thinking with Cusanus the aesthetic experience is what puts the teacher and the student in contact with the not-knowing. Being in contact with the not-knowing can be frightening, especially if you are used to do what you are told to do. If we can’t stand being in a place where we can’t predict the consequences of our actions, we can’t act. Not-knowing thereby seems to be something to strive for – that is if we want people to act.

Next thing to get into is the question of what direction the movement created by the aesthetic experience is taking, and what it takes to move to the area of not-knowing.
Stage 4: The area of not-knowing
In the first part of this chapter I will present some different thinkers and their perspectives on not-knowing as a positive phenomenon, and I will also put these ideas in relation to the concepts of aesthetic experience and action. The thinkers on stage here are: Cusanus, Rancière and the poet Wislawa Szymborska.

Cusanus: *Intellectus* as the constantly moving state of not-knowing
Cusanus interested himself in not-knowing, not as a negative term as in “you don’t know yet”, but as a *state of new possibilities*. According to Cusanus our reason has got two sides; The *ratio*, and the *intellectus*. *Ratio* is what we already know, it is what we remember and it is structured in a way that makes us feel safe. *Intellectus* is the border of what we know, standing on *intellectus* puts us in contact with the area of what we don’t know. Bornemark exemplifies this by reminding the reader of what it is like to look into another persons eyes: there are things that we know about this person, but at the same time there is no way we could know everything about her: her thoughts, her desires, her fears, her beliefs. Further there are things about this person that we know that we don’t know – what we don’t know yet - but there are also things that we don’t know that we don’t know. Cusanus argues that it is important to endure this uncertainty, to accept this state of not-knowing, and to look upon it as the possibility reach out and ask: What do you need? What are you thinking of? But to do that you have to be open for the other, not trying to guess or predict what she is going to say. There is a connection here to *das Spiel*: to participate in *das Spiel* you have to give something up, you must dare not-knowing so that the game, or the person in front of you, can inform you of the next step in the game, or her perspective on the matter. Standing on *intellectus* can be scary, but it is the only place to gain new knowledge.

Jacques Rancière: The constant movement of the aesthetic regime
Another perspective on the same phenomenon comes from Jacques Rancière. In his work he pays a lot of attention to the connection between politics and aesthetics. The political in Rancière’s philosophy is an act, an event, a sudden rupture in the order, in a sense very close to Arendt’s notion of action. The political can never be an order for Rancière, and in the same way the aesthetic regime is always a break in the common

---

68 Swedish: icke-vetande.
69 Bornemark, *Det omätbaras renässans – en uppgörelse med pedanternas herravälde*, p. 35.
order that is the representative regime of art.\textsuperscript{70} This can be understood by reading it as a parallel to Cusanus’ *ratio* and *intellectus*: When what an artist does can be found within what is already known, what is common sense (swe: gemensam ordning), he can be considered as operating inside the representative regime, which in its turn can be placed in the area of the *ratio*. On the contrary, standing on the border of *intellectus* the artist puts things from the representative regime in motion, into play, with what is not known, by that becoming a part of the aesthetic regime. Precisely like the border of *intellectus*, the aesthetic regime holds no constant, what’s in it is motion. From the experience of being in that motion comes a new understanding, which in its turn becomes a part of the order of the representative regime, and finally of what is common sense. This motion can in itself be understood as *the aesthetic*, as we discussed this concept earlier. By using these concepts Rancière is, as I see it, framing the fluidness of both the political and the aesthetic. This explains why it is so hard to describe what is happening in the aesthetic regime. By describing the things that you get in sight from being in the aesthetic regime, on the border of *intellectus*, you make these new findings a part of the representative regime, and thereby the *ratio*. This, as we have seen, is the way the *ratio* grows, which gives us two things: It takes motion to grow, and to be in the aesthetic regime, on the *intellectus* border, you have to be in motion. Her comes another metaphor into my mind, the metaphor of a shark. A shark, due to its anatomy, has to be in constant movement since it can’t breathe by its own, it has to move to keep the water in motion through its gills, otherwise it will sink down to the bottom and die. If we go with this metaphor for a while one could say that the moment the motion stops we sink to the bottom, to that comfortable *ratio*, which means that we are in the representative regime again, and it’s very easy to just lean back and look at what we already have, to be content, safe and in order.

So how do you keep yourself in the aesthetic regime, how do you stay in motion, like the shark, in play with the un-known and thus in the aesthetic regime? When put like this it seems to be quite exhausting. There is a resemblance here with Arendt’s idea of a space for action, this space where no one can live, it is a space that appears under certain conditions – for example it might appear in relation to a shared aesthetic experience. And put in relation to *das Spiel*, one could say that Rancière is saying that being in *das Spiel* is being in the aesthetic regime, and to go with the

\textsuperscript{70} Rancière, *The politics of aesthetics*, p. 22-23.
Shark metaphor and Hannah Arendt’s remarks on the risk for rigidity in the Homo Faber state: With no possibility for action and *das Spiel*, you sink to the bottom and slowly die.

Wislawa Szymborska: Not-knowing – as a saving rail?  
In the poem by Wislawa Szymborska in the beginning of this essay Szymborska offers a certain view on what we don’t know. As a poet, an artist, the biggest threat is to finally understand what poetry is: “I don’t know and don’t know and I keep holding to it - as to a saving rail”.71 Being a poet is to constantly examine what poetry is. To know means that you are done, there is nothing more to do. Obviously a poet knows something about poetry since she has spent her life doing it, so this poem points to an ability to over and over again un-learn what we know to be able to be open, to be creative, instead of leaning back on what we already know or holding it in front of us as a shield. Looking back on the radical possibility of art and the kind of art that keep in motion, thus entering the aesthetic regime, striving for not-knowing is of vital importance for the artist, but also for anyone who has the aim of being creative. Being “a saving rail” adds another aspect to the phenomenon: not-knowing as something that can save your creativity from dying: Szymborska points not only to the space for action but also to the willingness, and ability, to act without knowing the consequences, when such a space appears.

Summary:  
Not-knowing, seen from the perspective of being a teacher, can be seen as something provocative since it can be connected to the opposite of what school is for, that is learning about things. Still, we learn new things all the time, and I don’t think that this state of not-knowing is about to stop learning, or forgetting what we have learnt. It points to the ability to stand on *intellectus*, to clear yourself for a while to be able to be open, creative, to learn new things. Maybe Arendt again could be of help here: The rigidity that she is talking about and that art as a thought thing can protect us from, comes from knowing how things are. Her examples come from totalitarian regimes with rules and laws that are not negotiable, and from Eichmanns claim that he only did what he knew was his task: He did his job, and he did it well.

---

So how can we get to *intellectus*, to save us from the firm grip of what we know, from rigidity? Since we already know a lot, and we learn even more for every year of our lives, I guess we have to *unlearn* what we already know: unlearn to get to *intellectus*, to the point where we deliberately don’t know.

We have seen that neither I, nor the teachers in the situation with the Nazi boys, were able to handle the unexpected. We chose not to handle what fell outside our subjects, what was not mentioned in the curriculum goals of our teaching – that is what we already knew that we should be dealing with. We hid behind the fact that in terms of the law and what is counted for in school evaluations, the subject of the boys film fell outside our individual responsibility. Our backs were covered, we did what was stipulated in our assignments. From the perspective of not-knowing, we just didn’t know how to un-learn what we already knew.

**Stage 5: What is it to unlearn**

In this chapter I will take a closer look at the notion of unlearning, unlearning as a movement towards intellectus, that is to deliberately move yourself to the point where you don’t know. I will invite Marie-Louise Knott, Antony Fredriksson, Maurice Merleau-Ponty and Edmund Husserl, Sarah Ahmed and the novelist Rachel Cusk up on this stage.

**Unlearning with Arendt**

Hannah Arendt is a philosopher who constantly keeps my own thinking in motion, and reading the German writer and journalist Marie-Louise Knott I think I might have found out why. She writes about Arendt’s phenomenological approach as a pathway of *unlearning*. Knott identifies four different pathways, forming what she calls four different “re-actions to the shock of what is purely factual.”72 The way I read Knott she points at the phenomenological approach of Hannah Arendt as including a willingness to let oneself become involved with the world, of being touched into a movement in thought and action. Knott writes:

> The acts of laughing, translating, forgiving, and dramatizing keep open the rift caused by the shock and keep us moving in relation to that rift.73

---

Arendt is laughing, translating her texts from German to English, from English to German, she is forgiving and she dramatizes – all of this deliberate actions that exposes her to the shock of reality, in order to keep open, moving, to keep being touched by the world. Seen through the eyes of not-knowing she is unlearning to come to intellectus. This also gives me an association to a text by Anthony Fredriksson where he writes about the special attention that is activated when a person gets into a town where she has never been before. That special gaze when you know that this is a new place, and the way things appear when approaching the unfamiliar. He speaks about this as a certain quality of attention that comes from a break in what is familiar, and that is the opposite of the habitual:

The habitual is comfortable and familiar, to break with it entails an existentially loaded event. However, without this challenge, posed by the unfamiliar to the familiar, life becomes repetitive, inanimate, dull and void of attention.74

I believe one could say that Arendt’s pathways, sketched by Knott, constitute an attempt to avoid that repetitive, inanimate, dull approach that is void of attention, and which she identifies in her meeting with the Nazi administrator Adolf Eichmann, responsible of thousands of deportations of Jews during world WW2. The questions that are always actualized at the basis of Arendt’s work is the question: How could it happen? Under what conditions is a person capable of committing this kind of crimes? Put in relation to teaching this might seem as a bit overdramatic, but I don’t think so and neither would Arendt. I think that this dull life that is void of attention is precisely what happens to all of us if we live in the certainty of knowing what we do and what to do at all times; this is when we become animal laborans and homo faber, unable to act or even to recognize the a space for action when it appears. This dull life has no space for action, while dwelling in it we don’t know how to let go of what we know, we don’t know how to unlearn and thereby we have no access to intellectus and the not-knowing.

What Knott points at is what Arendt does in her texts to deliberately get there: She un-learns what she already knows about the situation. So what is it that she is un-learning? According to Knott Arendt is unlearning what is taken for granted by generations of authorities and therefore are looked upon as un-avoidable or natural. She keeps unlearning to be able to think (as re-think), or actualize, old ideas, poems

and images in the present. To do this she needs a stage or a space that is consciously limited, where there is an agreement of what thought-things to put on the stage, in the space. Knott stresses that Arendt uses the idea of the world as stage as an image of the public dialogue/speech, the space for action, and the idea of the text as space as its equivalent in writing. The space for action is to be considered an aspect of the stage, a space where thought things appear in an organized way, a space where it is possible to speak and to act:

The space of appearance comes into being wherever men are together in the manner of speech and action, and therefore predates and precedes all formal constitution of the public realm and the various forms of government, that is, the various forms in which the public realm can be organized.75

The space of appearance is a space for the political, a space for speech and for action. It can appear anywhere were people get together. The participants must know what we have. Once the stage, the space, is settled, the play can begin. The play as the constant movement, as the river that finds its way among stones in a riverbed; the water as the ever changing mood of the participants, their openness, their sensibility as well as their curious participation in the play. To be a part of the political life in Arendt’s sense, you need to stand on intellectus, to be open, ready to either speak or act, or to be a part of the space of appearance where others speech and action is being seen and heard as acts. Thinking further on this, taking part in Polis, in a political space of appearance, can be understood as an aesthetic experience.

**The simple move of the artist – Merleau-Ponty and Cezanne**
In western philosophy the activity of putting what you already know into brackets, something that might be called an act of unlearning, is called phenomenology. Or at least this is what phenomenology aims for, using the reduction to be able to see and describe the world with “clear eyes”. But in my readings of Husserl and Merleau-Ponty I have found their phenomenological method technical and hard to get a grip of. The reduction seems like something that is very hard to even understand, it’s almost mythical, and out of reach for common people. But does it really have to be that hard? Can aesthetic experiences be of any help here? Actually Merleau-Ponty himself has

---

presented some thoughts that could go for a start in investigating these questions, when he writes about the simple move of the artist.  

In Cezanne’s doubt Merleau-Ponty expresses a humble admiration of the working process of the great artist Paul Cezanne. He describes how Cezanne in one simple move with his brush solves a problem in the painting that would have taken a theorist like himself “ages” to solve. Merleau-Ponty poses the question if phenomenology – as the ability to put what we already know about the world into brackets so we can see the world appear as it is - is a practice mastered by artists like Cezanne, even if they don’t name it phenomenology. The simple move of Cezanne’s hand stands out like a role-model for the phenomenologist.

Cezanne uses his brush to “listen” to the artwork and thereby he solves the problem, the clown tries some small tricks to make the audience react and thereby she can recognize “the game”. They both do something to arrive at the border of what they know, to become intellectus and thereby be able to create an intimate relation with what they do not know. They do things to unlearn, to come to intellectus, to the area of not-knowing, to be able to establish a fruitful relation, to participate in the play, an experience from which both parts are going to change, to learn.

Unlearning with Sarah Ahmed – Snap!
In Att leva feministiskt (Living a Feminist Life) Sarah Ahmed writes about the feminist Snap! as an act, as a rupture in the order similar to the political move of Rancière. But there is difference: A feminist Snap! is a consequence of a tension, a consequence of living under the conditions of some sort of oppression. Sometimes Snap! is something that happens to you, which means you can’t resist snapping, but sometimes you can make the choice to hold it back. Ahmed describes the unbearable tension that comes before the feminist Snap! and that appears when finding yourself as a woman of colour in a situation were women or people of colour are getting belittled, for example by comments about their sex, the colour of their skin or their looks, without anyone else taking notice. It’s like the elephant in the room that everybody else is ignoring except you. In that specific moment, you know that if you say something, the whole situation will change, suddenly everybody will be able to

---
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see the elephant, but you don’t know how the reaction will be. Are the other persons in the room going to thank you for making them aware of the elephant, or will they ignore your comment since they don’t want to talk about the elephant? Will they even accuse you for spoiling the party, making the elephant visible in the room even though both of you know it’s not accepted to have elephants in the room, and they have done everything they can to hide it? Snap! And suddenly everybody in the room become aware of what they are talking about and how it effects you, as being the one they are talking about. The feminist Snap! is an act into a community with the attempt to change the attention of the group, to create a game or to change the game. If you Snap!, you act without knowing the consequences.

Going back to the two Nazi boys I wonder if their film could be considered an Aesthetic Snap!, and that this actual Snap! was a consequence of a tension created by the zero-tolerance norm, a norm that kept a huge elephant hidden in the room: the fact that the teachers aim for inclusion created a total exclusion of every child, every pupil, that did not follow the norm.

Unlearning with Rachel Cusk – to put yourself in situations where you can’t predict the consequences
The final thinker I would like to invite up on this stage is Rachel Cusk, a novelist known for her documentary writing. This quote comes form her Novel Outline:

‘I would like’, she resumed, ‘to see the world more innocently again, more impersonally, but I have no idea how to achieve this, other than by going somewhere completely unknown, where I have no identity and no associations’. ⁷⁹

Outline is a series of intimate, sketch-like portraits of people that the author meets in different places: on an airplane, on a boat, in a university classroom, etcetera. The portraits are sketch-like because they are not regular interviews trying to cover the highlights of a life. On the contrary, Cusk is interacting with these people; she is listening, with her attention sharp, but still with a certain distance. The people she meets are telling her their stories, that is, certain kinds of stories, the stories you tell someone that you want to give a picture of yourself as worthy of getting to know. The quotation in the beginning of this essay is from Penelope, one of Cusk’s students, and the way it is placed in the novel, the way it is “framed” by two other stories who stands in beautiful contrast to Penelope’s story, it gives me the impression that this is

⁷⁹ Rachel Cusk, Outline, p. 154.
about Cusk herself. She is putting herself in these situations “to see the world more innocently again”. By putting herself in contact with these people she is “going somewhere completely unknown, where [she has] no identity and no associations”.

When I read this novel I immediately got an association to my teaching practice, and the fact that every time I let the students bring their own experiences into the seminar room, I put myself in front of situations that I have never seen before, leading the students in reflecting over situations that I don’t know how to handle. Over the years I have to admit that there are some similar situations that keep coming up, and that this stream of situations is doing something to me: it makes me more and more comfortable in doing what I do, and that something has changed: For a while I was a little bit nervous that the students would come up with situations that were totally new to me, but today this is where I participate fully in das Spiel with the students. Working with situations that put me in contact with my area of not-knowing makes me inspired. I guess its because I truly like to be engaged, to participate in the game, and loosing that feeling in a seminar gives me the feeling of failure, or of boredom.

Thinking on this through the concept of unlearning, maybe aesthetic experiences in education are one way to keep yourself in motion, to force oneself to unlearn to come to intellectus.

Unlearning in my teaching practice
So what role does unlearning play in my seminars? I will try here to look at my teaching with focus on the concept of unlearning from the different angles shown above.

As I describe in Example 2, one of the things that happen in my drama seminars is that the students become aware of their own perspectives as perspectives; they “see” their own preconditions, their expectations, and become aware of patterns that has petrified in their own behaviour and in their colleagues/crew. One could say that they learn something about what they need to un-learn to be able to meet their pupils here and now. A usual comment is that they have become aware of how they say things, how they stand, how they organize things, how they think about things. This points to a certain kind of attention, close to what Antony Fredriksson is writing about when he, in close dialogue with Maurice Merleau-Ponty and Bernard Waldenfels, presents the concept of attention in relation to the alien and the habitual:
To be present or attentive means that one is engaged with the world, and to be engaged is characterized by being able to go beyond repeating one’s habitual ways of perceiving. I believe this might be called standing on intellectus, and that once recognized, this is possible to live, to deliberately move oneself to.

Another thing that is also usual (it happens every seminar) is that situations that at first did appear as impossible to handle, after a seminar opens up as a situations that actually can be handled in many different ways; suddenly there is a space for action were there was no space for action before. This could be connected to the difference between living the dull and life-draining life of animal laborans or homo faber instead of feeling alive as an agent that has the capacity to re-write the conditions for being a human, a teacher. In this way there is a connection between teaching for the unexpected, for opening up for action on different levels, and living a healthy life as a teacher.

A third thing that is important here also reveals the fact that my seminars are cross-disciplinary in the sense that I don’t use drama theory, I use pedagogical, sociological, mathematical or philosophical theory since one of the aims always is to train the students in thinking with the tools that are offered from the theoretical material of the course. To be comfortable in doing that there are some things that I as their teacher have to settle. The students must feel that they can trust me and each other, and they must trust that they won’t be judged in relation to anything else than what has been stated from the beginning – that is: the stage has to be clearly set, they need to know what’s on the stage and what doesn’t belong there. What we do in my seminars is that we are doing exercises, which means that they are not evaluated in terms of who is better or worse. They need to know that there is no such thing as doing or thinking the wrong way in this seminar - actually this is one of the main points with dramatized situations: They are not for real, but they show what is possible, that is what has happened and what can happen. Since they are not real we can do anything we want, we can try things that we can’t try in reality since there are real people, real dramas happening the very moment we are in reality.

---
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In the situation with Adrian and Milos the aim was the same as it is in my seminars: To train their eyes to be able to identify norms, to become aware of them in order to be able to decide to keep to or to break them. But what happened was that I as a teacher learnt more about my own approach than they did about norms – or at least this is what I think. They taught me something very important, they showed something to me that I couldn’t have caught sight if being on my own. They put me in touch with my area of not-knowing and made me realize that the way I had arranged my knowledge about norms and how to work on them in my ratio, had a huge blind spot when it comes to the pupils who are excluded by the zero-tolerance norm. They helped me un-learn what I knew before, to re-arrange my former knowledge about how to work with aesthetic experiences. This is also how I see the relation between myself and the students: I’m there to guide them, my role is to be of help in their ongoing reflection on their role as teachers and humans. Their role is to participate, and by participating also to help me reflect on my role as a teacher. Since every seminar is an example on how a teacher can act and do things, I always give the students the possibility to reflect upon the way we have approached the theme of the course, what role the ELP\textsuperscript{81} seminars have played in their learning process in the actual course and/or in their education as a whole. By doing this I hope to keep myself in movement, to stay in contact with the student’s needs and to continuously get the student’s help to unlearn what I already know about teaching to be able to learn something new. By doing this I also hop to stay alive as a human being, being a teacher in a place where the conditions for being a teacher easily make you feel other things than alive.

Summary: To open up for or close the possibilities of the unexpected? Maybe the ability to unlearn is a skill that can be and should be trained as well as other skills? To deliberately un-learn is one thing, but there is also a possibility to let the pupils or the students contribute to this unlearning as a development of the role of the teacher?

I can open up for the unexpected, but I can also close for the unexpected – this lies in the power of the teacher. Together with the teachers in the example with the Nazi boys I closed the room, we never let them up on the stage. We used our power to

\textsuperscript{81} Seminars in aesthetic learning.
silence their voice, we made what could have been an action just another making of a film.

Re-thinking the role of teacher – the possibilities of the stage, the space for action, as role-model for a sustainable teaching practice

Credo
My drama seminars is a space, a room for action, a plurality, a community were the participants have the possibility to act; they are encouraged to act, I hope to inspire them to act, but there is no force. My role as a teacher is to set the stage, to strive for equality, to clarify the rules of the game. One of my responsibilities as their teacher is to show the participants the possibilities in action, by that I have to act, I have to become a part of the plurality in a way that makes my voice equal to the others. Still I am aware of the fact that I, as their teacher, can never be equal to the students. Being an authority, the one with the power to evaluate and give grades, is a part of the condition for being a teacher. I can’t choose not to use it, it’s there whether I want it or not and I have to be aware of how I use it. I use the power to set the stage the way I believe it should be, and then I use it to strive for equality. There is a progression here: The first time I’m very active to make sure everybody understands the game, to make sure the space is a space for subtle as well as outspoken acts, but after every seminar we meet I become more and more one out of 25 or 28. After maybe 5 seminars, they can play the game themselves. By being an agent, the students in their turn have become agents. I have made myself superfluous – they don’t need me anymore.

The aesthetic element, the including element, the democratic element: a possible approach for searching critical points where the intention of the teacher can turn into its intentional opposite

The idea of the aesthetic element came to me quite recently as a result of my teaching practice, a specific seminar that I have been giving for two years now. This seminar puts the concepts of inclusion and exclusion in focus, and the students come to the seminar prepared with drama sketches that show what they consider as successful moments of inclusion in their daily work. The students know that we are going to turn our “critical eye” towards the situation, meaning that we will scrutinize the situations to learn more about inclusion and exclusion in practice. In these particular seminars while trying to find adequate concept to talk about the situations, I tried to use “the
including element” as a concept pointing towards what we were looking for. The including element is *what the teacher is doing* to create inclusion. It can be something you say or something you do, it can be how you place the pupils in the room, it can be what you say to make someone feel comfortable and willing to participate. The students discussed every sketch coming from these questions:

1. What’s the including element(s) in the situation? (there can be several in a situation).
2. Do you think that this is a good example of inclusion? Try to relate your answer to the literature of today.
3. Which are the critical points where the intention of the teacher, to create inclusion, might turn this situation into its intentional opposite: an act of exclusion?

I tried the last question, number three, with the students and asked: *Do you understand what I mean? Does it cover what we are doing here?* They said yes and started discussing immediately. Since then these are the questions I use with every group, and the discussions are very fruitful, giving the students a space to try their thoughts and to scrutinize the situations using all their practical as well as theoretical knowledge to reflect and create new knowledge about the situations and about the practice of inclusion. This is also an example that have led me further and that has improved my teaching in different areas: Not long ago I did a similar thing in a course where we examined democratic teaching in practice. I wrote down three concepts on the whiteboard, concepts that are historically connected to the concept of democracy: freedom, equality and solidarity. We started with a short reflection on which one of these three concepts that could be considered as having most influence on their democratic work today in school, and then we examined dramatized situations that they considered as good examples of democratic solutions of dilemmas in the same way as I did with the concept of inclusion/exclusion, looking for critical points where the aim for democratic teaching turns into undemocratic teaching. It turned out well and an unexpected outcome was that it was refreshingly fruitful to use the three concepts, and it rendered some deep insights among the students. I’m looking forward
to develop this idea next time I get the opportunity to teach in a course where the
democratic aspects of teaching are in focus.

Example 5: Laughter, Action and Forgiveness – to set up the seminar as stage

Here comes my last example, it’s from another drama seminar, and this time I will focus on the role Arendt’s concepts of laughter, action and forgiveness is playing in it. I will invite Antony Fredriksson again and I will also invite Susan Sontag, Rachel Cusk and Albert Camus on stage to mirror my role as a teacher.

This situation took place quite recently at the preschool teacher program for students who already have at least three years of experience from working in preschools. At this program the students continue their regular work at a preschool and study one day a week at the university. These students are attending their fourth term, and the seminar aims to give them ideas and questions to examine in their upcoming thesis work at level B:

We are in the drama room, and six students are preparing to do a drama sketch (in Swedish: gestaltning). They sit down in a circle on the floor before us, the audience containing of the other 18 students in the seminar group and me, the teacher. One of the students informs us that what we see is four children playing, and one preschool teacher attending their play. Beside the scene, the sixth member of the group is waiting, playing the father of one of the children. The audience gives the actors a big applause and when it is quiet again they start acting. The preschool teacher playing with the children starts to talk:

- “Do you want to go out for a while?”
- “Mmmmm…” one of the children says, still very into what she is doing.
- “Where?” another child asks.
- “Well, maybe we can go to the forest and see if something has happened since last time we were there? Maybe we can find some new leaves, or some traces of animals in the snow…or some beautiful icicles?”
- “Yeeeeeese,” say all the children.

The preschool teacher tells her colleagues that they are going for a short walk and then she helps them with their outdoor clothes. The children leaving for a walk with
the preschool teacher are: Tindra, Stephanie, Inez and Alfred. They are friends and they play together almost every day at the preschool. It is early afternoon and the children are excited about what they might see in the forest, talking about different animals that they have seen or would like to see. On the way to the forest suddenly Alfred’s father shows up. He has decided to take Alfred home earlier than usual, but he forgot to tell the staff at the preschool about it. When he catches sight of the little group he turns angry, asking what Alfred has done to deserve being punished by being forced to play with girls. At first the preschool teacher finds herself at a loss, but then she tries to defend herself and the preschool by saying that this is not a punishment, these children are friends...but the father doesn’t listen to her, instead he grabs his son by the hand and walks away upset. One student shows that the sketch is over, and the group gets a huge applause. Some students are laughing, others are still seemingly in shock from what happened on stage.

This example generated a lot of recognition among the students. This kind of clashes, between the essential values of the preschool and those of a child’s family, are a part of everyday work as a preschool teacher, even if they are not always made visible in such dramatic expressions as this. Everybody in the room has experienced something similar though. So why are the students laughing?

In my seminars there is always laughter. But it is not any kind of laughter, I would say that this laughter comes from a certain kind of relief. The students recognize themselves in the situation above, they identify with the teacher who is trying her best but still fails in doing what she wants to do: to treat children equally and with respect and to have good relations with their parents. In everyday work this kind of situation would result in feelings of failure, or of anger towards “stupid parents” or maybe even shame. But here, in the seminar room, the students laugh. If I put this in relation to Fredriksson he writes about how our attention is put into play with what we perceive as the alien and thus creates knowledge. The alien here is to be considered the same as the unexpected, or the not-knowing. This play is also to be understood as a dialectic movement:

Returning to the discussion of the habitual and its relation to the alien, there is a dialectic at play here. In a situation in which we realize that our life has become too
repetitive and that we have become too set in our ways of seeing, the disruption, provided by the encounter with the alien, can be a relief.\textsuperscript{82}

Maybe this recognition of the students could be seen as an encounter with the alien, a disruption in their usual way of seeing these situations, and their laughter then comes as a relief after the tension that this encounter puts them into. One could say, with Fredriksson, that if you dare standing on the \textit{intellectus}, your attention will shift, meaning that you will be able to see what is familiar with new eyes, as if you saw it for the first time - just like Ahmeds \textit{Snap!} changes the attention of everyone in the room. The students always say that they see these familiar situations in a completely new way at these seminars. By habit, in their professional life, the students view these kind of situations as unsolvable dilemmas, situations that are impossible to find good solutions to and therefore not very interesting to reflect on. By laughing at the situation in this way the attention of the group do shift in a certain way.

Back to the example.
After the sketch I asked the students to discuss in groups of two or three starting with some questions that was pointed out on the whiteboard: \textit{What kind of dilemma is this? Who is confronted to a dilemma here? What kind of knowledge is needed to be able to act professionally in this dilemma? Is this knowledge something that you already have?}

Preschool pedagogy deals with mediating values, for example, that girls and boys have equal value, that it is important to be able to play with, and become friends with, anyone regardless of who they are (girl, boy, Christian, Muslim, etc.) The preschool teacher in the actual situation is faced with a number of dilemmas and many questions arose in the reflection: How do you, in a professional way, explain what happened to the remaining children? If you say that “things are different at Alfred’s home”, that the rules of the preschool do not apply there, then what signals are you giving the children? How do you address Alfred in this matter when he comes to the preschool next day? The preschool teacher in this situation ended up in a defensive position versus the angry father; could she have approached him differently? What could have happened if she had confirmed his worry about his son, if she had expressed that she understood his worry, and then had explained how the

\textsuperscript{82} Fredriksson, \textit{The Alien World, Attention and the Habitual}, p. 12.
preschool works? How do you show respect to the father and the child in this situation at the same time as you stand up for the values of the preschool activity? Is “educating” the parents in the rules and values that runs the preschool activity a part of the responsibility of the preschool teacher?

In the next step, the aim is to formulate interesting questions to examine in a thesis. From this example we could extract a number of interesting questions, and it was followed by three other examples during this two hours seminar. In the end of the seminar we had a finishing roundup where I asked them to take a meta perspective on their own learning process. The students expressed, among other things, that they experienced the value of taking part of former research, that they now knew what they wanted to examine in their thesis, but also that they appreciated that their spontaneous questions and reactions got “translated” into an academic context. So what does this mean?

Thinking with Fredriksson this could mean that their everyday experiences, questions and reactions is put into a place where they can see them as if they were “new”, and the context with 25 other preschool teachers recognizing themselves in the situations makes it easier to look at the situation without their habitual feelings of failure and shame. And this in its turn puts them in a position that support them in formulating questions, valuable questions that could lead to new knowledge in their field, questions that they would not have been able to formulate if they had not had this encounter with the alien.

Reading this I can see that these seminars are valuable to the students. But what are they to me, as a teacher? I do know that I get a lot of energy from these seminars, there is something in them that makes me choose this method before other methods not only because its valuable to the students, but also for myself. So maybe I should change my question to what I am doing in the seminars to why I am doing it and what this says about me as a teacher.

My role, as I see it, is primarily to lead the seminar. I keep an eye on the time, tell the students when, and get them instructions on how, to discuss what they have perceived. I ask different kinds of questions to help them come deeper into and become clearer in the new perspectives or questions that they find in relation to the sketches. I also make sure the student’s reflections on the situations have a certain direction: I want the aesthetic element, the drama sketches, to become meaningful in
relation to their profession and professional development, and to achieve this the reflection needs to become a creative act where the students together create their shared aesthetic experience.

From the beginning I emphasize that the main questions to investigate is not: “How should this situation have been solved?” Instead we ask: “How can we understand this situation?” And after that: “How come we perceive and understand the situation the way we did in the first place?” Here I would like to dig a bit deeper into how we examine the situation, since it is not the same thing as doing an *interpretation*. In her essay *Against interpretation* Susan Sontag writes about interpretation as the *way to understand* of our time. The way I read her, I see a strong connection between interpreting and being in our *ratio*: interpretation as taking a rational decision on how to read a story instead of letting yourself into the story, discovering it from its inside, letting it happen to you. Of course the students come up with interpretations of the situation, for example a spontaneous comment like “I think the father reacted like this because he is a muslim and muslims don’t like when their boys play with girls”. Actually we don’t know what made the father react like he did in the situation above. We can speculate by coming up with more interpretations, but this is not the interesting thing here. What is interesting is the *interpretation in itself* and this comment becomes an opportunity for the student to become aware of and to examine what knowledge and/or preconditions he or she has about muslims. I have always thought about this phenomenon, that happens in every seminar to some of the students, as a phenomenological turn, that is, going from reacting spontaneously on a situation and then stepping back, asking the question: What knowledge, what preconditions that I have, made me react like that? This turn, this movement, is also something that is appreciated by the students and a usual comment in the finishing roundups is “I never realized that my perspective is a perspective!” Read with Arendt this is also an act of unlearning.

It is also important to notice that we are not doing *observations*. The situations have happened, they come from the student’s own experiences, but we are not treating them as truths that can be observed the way they do in their field works. When they observe actual situations in their daily work they usually look for something they already know what it is, like if the teacher is including all children in the room, if they treat boys and girls differently etc. Instead these specific situations in the seminar
room happen to us, the goal is to perceive them precisely the way they show
themselves to us, and we – the students and I – direct our attention to what is
happening to us: Are we laughing at the situation? Do we feel the sweat of the
stressed teacher? Are we crying with the kid that gets rejected by his father when he is
arguing with the preschool teacher? Can we feel the anxiety of the father? This brings
us back to the concept of attention that Fredriksson through Waldenfels articulates as
follows:

Perceiving does not start with an act of observation; on the contrary, it arises with an
event of attention that is aroused and provoked by what strikes me.”83 In this sense,
attention is primarily something that happens to us, it is not set into play by our
conscious “knowing” or “willing”, and is therefore not like the act of observing.84 85

The thing I recognized in Cusk’s Outline was the positive experience of being at loss,
not having any answers, not knowing on beforehand what to do or how to act, and the
feeling that I often learn as much as the students, or more. Somebody might get
provoked by this. I’m their teacher, surely I must know more about what I am
teaching than the students do? I would say that yes, there are things that I know more
about than they do, but the students do know more about how to handle the actual
situations we are examining than I do. They do this all the time, everyday at work,
while I have never worked as a preschool teacher. So how can I be their teacher? How
can I show or give them something new? Here I would like to turn to Fredriksson
again, in a part where he discusses the alien as a new, or novel, experience:

In contrast to what are [the experiences] novel? My suggestion is that the novel, the
alien and the not-before-seen stand in contrast to our habitual ways of perceiving.
This entails that to have a novel experience is not simply to perceive a new object, it
also consists of a new way of seeing, i.e., a perceptual action that breaks with the
habitual ways of seeing.86

To break the students habitual way of seeing a situation, for example if they seem to
have come to “the perfect solution”, I problematize it to make them un-sure again.
The thing with drama is that it is not for real. It is as if it was for real, and this makes
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84 Waldenfels, Phenomenology of the Alien, p. 47.
85 Fredriksson, The Alien World, Attention and the Habitual, p. 5.
it possible to experiment in a way that we can’t do in real life. The situation that happened will remain the same, nothing has changed in the students everyday lives after one of my seminars. But still something has changed, in them as well as in me. Fredriksson again:

>[W]hen the unfamiliar becomes familiar, or the unknown becomes known, due to a certain unity of perception, we do understand that the objective world has not changed; still our relation with the world has changed[^7]

What puzzled me before I wrote this essay was that despite the fact that I, in a certain sense, can’t say what the students learn in my seminars, the students express that these seminars are where they get the grip of the whole course. Sometimes they even say that this is where they find the meaning with the whole thing, and that they find themselves in it. I realize now that in a sense, this goes for me as well. The energy that I get from these seminars comes from my experience of getting in contact with why I am doing this, why it is worth it, why I love being a teacher.

I can see that what I do is that I put my students and myself in new situations to get alienated to the familiar, to unlearn in order to learn something new from it, and that this is similar to what Cusk is aiming for as a writer in yet another aspect. The stories told by the individuals she meet, and the way Cusk describes how they interact with her in these various situations, sketches an outline of these individuals as well as of Cusk herself. Actually it is quite obvious that she is doing this to find herself, an identity that has been lost. Put in relation to these seminars I would say that the students stories, and the way we interact in the seminars, sketches an outline of the students, of their profession as well as of their professional knowledge, opening up the possibility for them to reshape their identities as teachers. And at the same time it sketches an outline of me, of my role as a teacher.

So maybe what I am starting to get a grip of here is my identity as a former artist that has become a university teacher. Or more precise: Maybe I am trying to rewrite the normative role of the university teacher as a quality secured, rational, evidence based machine, habitually mashing in knowledge into the brains of becoming teachers that are supposed to produce pupils with high grades when they become employed in a school. This is a role that I sometimes feel forced to embrace,

[^7]: Fredriksson, The Alien World, Attention and the Habitual, p. 17
or at least to accept as the main condition for working at the university, and as we have seen, it is the role of a teacher working under the conditions of homo faber.

Thinking about this, I can feel that there is something instrumental about my interpretation of Cusk’s *Outline*. What touches me in it is something more than a longing for a technical move done by someone who wants to know more, or to be more productive. I would even say that it has something to do with surviving. This may seem very dramatic, but maybe Albert Camus might be of help here, since I got a sense of what this might be about while reading one of his short stories, *Jonas, or the artist at work*. Jonas is an artist that believes in his star.\(^88\) He experiences this star as a light inside of him that makes him see the meaning with things clearly, an that guides him in his artistic work. When he is young and promising, and when he gets his big breakthrough, and even when he meets his wife, Louise, his star makes him shine within and feel that he is at the same time the world’s master and it’s servant.\(^89\) Louise and Jonas live in a quite small apartment, and suddenly they have three children. Jonas has to move his painting to smaller and smaller spaces, at the same time as friends, admirers, customers and others that has a relation to his art, is taking up more and more of his mental space. He can feel his star shrinking, until one day it’s gone.\(^90\) It’s really sad, his life has become a place where he has to repeat himself to keep his family alive. Painting is something he must do, and the more he tries, the harder it gets. He has become a homo faber, and he is unable to break this evil circle, since this life of his has become a habit. Finally Jonas loses himself, in a way that seems similar to how Cusk’s Penelope describes herself before her journey:

> Her consciousness, at this point […] was so crammed full not just of her own memories, obligations, dreams, knowledge and the plethora of her day-to-day responsibilities […] that she was no longer certain what had happened to her and what to other people she knew, or sometimes even what was or was not real. […]\(^91\)

Penelope comes to the conclusion that she needs to do something “to see the world innocently again”, but Jonas pretends that everything is fine, becomes an alcoholic, and in the end his star dies. Reading this I realize why Cusk is doing what she is doing: She is confronting all these new situations to get rid of her firm identity as a

\(^88\) Albert Camus, “Jonas, or the artist at work” in *Exile and the Kingdom: Short stories*, p. 87.

\(^89\) Camus, “Jonas, or the artist at work”, p. 115.

\(^90\) Camus, “Jonas, or the artist at work”, p. 115.

writer, a mother, a partner etc., but she’s not doing it, as I first assumed, to instrumentally find new stories. She’s doing it to survive as a creative being. And looking at my own teaching, how I repeatedly strive to put myself and my students in situations where we have to confront the alien: So am I.

**Final conclusions: Aesthetic experiences and the miracle of action**

_in this final chapter I will go back to my opening questions and the aim of the study to see if there are any discoveries of value. Then I will get back to Arendt's claim that action is a miracle. I do this to fulfill the experience of having spent some time trying to understand action from a multiple of perspectives._

What have I learnt from this investigation?

Did this investigation answer any of my opening questions?

1. _Why did I and the teachers in my example fail in meeting the Nazi boys? What is missing here?_

I believe the answer is that neither the teachers nor I were able to see that we were homo fabers blindly sailing with the liner, and when Adrian and Milos made us aware of it, we didn’t want to see it: we just couldn´t stand the elephant in the room. What was missing was our readiness for the unexpected, a willingness to stand on the edge of _intellectus_, accepting that we didn’t know what to do, using the opportunity that the boys act had created, the space for action that suddenly appeared.

2. _What role did the film, as an aesthetic experience, play in the example with the Nazi boys?_

Their film was an aesthetic _Snap!_, the boys took the chance to let an artwork loosen up the tension, letting the film speak into a space where their own voices were silenced by the zero-tolerance norm. By letting the film speak for them, they opened up a space for action.

3. _What possibilities are there to create spaces for action as a teacher working in a goal oriented system, and what role can aesthetic experiences and a phenomenological approach in the teaching situation play in this?_
I think one of my most important findings is that my investigation has shown the critical and sometimes even radical possibility of art and aesthetic experiences in education. I have come to the conclusion that certain possibilities, maybe even radical possibilities with the power to challenge a system in its foundations, reveal themselves when aesthetic experiences are given space and are taken into serious consideration within the educational system. I believe that in doing this, a teacher is able to create space for action for herself and her pupils/students.

When aesthetic experiences, understood as a consequence of the encountering with thought things in Arendt’s sense, are taken into serious consideration and are given space in practice within the educational system, they open up for the possibility to broaden and deepen knowledge from different areas - including knowledge about art in itself – at the same time as it creates new knowledge in a way that could not be predicted. Therefore would like to add that it is possible to work with aesthetic experiences and aesthetic expressions within an objective oriented system without loosing their nature of fluidness – if you consciously create spaces for action and at the same time fight for your own space to act.

I have also become aware of the fact that I do teach with a phenomenological approach. In my seminars we are, in a sense, doing philosophy, and maybe one could say that by doing this, the students and I are revealing the radical possibility of philosophy in education. This is something that I would like to explore further at another time.

An additional question that arose during the writing process deals with the intention of the school in my first example; to include all pupils by having a zero-tolerance-against-racism rule. In reality, they excluded not only the two Nazi boys. This rule, this norm, was at risk to exclude any pupil who was even the slightest unsure whether they agreed, or disagreed, with the teachers on any subject whatsoever. The zero-tolerance-norm excluded Adrian and Milos from exactly the kind of conversations, the kind of community, that might have made them think once more, maybe even to change their minds. These two boys were 14 years old and had never been taught about WW2. They had older friends outside school that told them that “you are a Nazi when you feel in your gut how wrong what the faggots do to each
other is”. No one asked them for example: What is your gut feeling when you imagine people over 40 having sex? The normal questions about who am I, what is sexuality, what would I like to do, or not do, and who would I like to do it with – nothing of that was addressed since these boys, by expressing their pubertal questions, was told to shut up by the zero-tolerance norm. The question that arises here is: Is there always a risk that the intention of the teacher, to include, turns into its intentional opposite, to exclude? From what I have experienced in my seminars on this subject and from this investigation I would say: Yes. But I would like to add that there are ways to develop your readiness for the unexpected, and to keep in contact with what is actually happening in the classroom, or the seminar room.

The miracle of action
Another discovery is that I have found the metaphor of the stage as productive in many ways, and for that reason I would like to add one final comment. As already mentioned Arendt developed the idea of the text as stage from her reading of the greek Polis as a stage where “[e]veryone was able to be in turn both audience and contributing actor.”92 Read with Arendt, Polis represents the idea of a space that offers the possibility to view our everyday big or small “doings” as actions in Arendt’s sense, that is as conscious representations of ourselves, of who we are and how we think. Participating in polis, in this certain space, makes it possible to resist the human tendency of accepting laws and norms as natural laws. This is important since man has the tendency of taking the conditions under which we live our lives as natural laws, which forces us to do things that we don´t really believe in. We do it because we think it is the only way, or because we don’t have the strength or the motivation to ask why we are doing it. According to Arendt, being able to act consciously when finding oneself in such situations, is a miracle:

[T]he world , fabricated by men and constituted according to human and not natural laws, will become again part of nature, and will follow the law of ruin when man decides to become himself part of nature, a blind though accurate tool of natural laws, renouncing his supreme faculty of creating laws himself.93[...] The miracle, the saving grace, lies in the human capacity to change the world and its ‘natural course’.94

92 Marie-Louise Knott, Unlearning with Hannah Arendt, p. 93.
94 Knott, Unlearning with Hannah Arendt, p. 94.
This is a very powerful passage in her work, saying that by choosing not to act we renounce our supreme faculty of creating the very conditions we are given. But by entering a Polis, a political space, that has been set up as an artistic stage to inspire to, reflect over and give room for action, we can avoid being this “blind though accurate tool of natural laws” that Homo Faber is. The important aspect here is that Polis is a space that can appear anywhere, at any time, wherever people are together. This means that a seminar room, or a classroom, can be such a space.

At the same time it is important to consider the fact that animal laborans and homo faber are vital functions in the life of a human being. We need to eat, to do our laundry, we need to feel stable and safe, and to appreciate – even enjoy – the natural course, the daily routines, the well known faces and doings of life. We also need to know that we are doing a good job, that we are doing what is expected from us, that we are reliable and that we can rely on other people. As Arendt writes:

This space does not always exist, and although all men are capable of deed and word, most of them […] do not live in it. No man, moreover, can live in it all the time”.\(^{95}\)

It might seem like a contradiction that if we become homo faber, we will be drained of life, and on the other hand it’s not possible to live in polis all the time. I guess the trick is to consciously see to that we are changing position sometimes, if not to be constantly in motion, to exercise our moves. And by doing this regularly, we can achieve a sense of being stable in situations that are new to us. The space for action is to be seen as a complement, or a place where the tension created by the conditions for animal laborans and homo faber are permitted to Snap!

What is also important is that as a teacher there are a lot of possible actions to take. It is possible to act by creating and reflecting over artworks, by thinking thoroughly, by speaking up, by listening and thereby accepting someone else’s speech as an act, and by offering spaces where people can speak and act. An action can be to take in, and start with, the student’s own experiences – as we have seen this is one way of unlearning, to immediately put yourself as a teacher in contact with what you don’t know. I know this last part can be frightening – a colleague once asked me: \textit{How do you know they will come up with examples that are relevant to the course?} I digested that question for a while, thinking that it hardly ever happens, but then I

\(^{95}\) Knott, \textit{Unlearning with Hannah Arendt}, p. 199.
changed my instructions to the students, by adding that the whole group must agree that their example is relevant to the course. A simple move that made a difference, and since then every example has been absolutely relevant.

Does this mean that I’m trying to create a new norm, the zero-tolerance-for-
homo-faber norm? The answer to that question is no, I hope not. We need to do administration – administration is the most important tool for democracy, for equality, for distributing resources instead of letting people fight over them. We also need to do what is necessary to be alive. I think we must be aware of what happens if we lose the whole picture, if we dig too deep into our individual deeds and needs, if plurality is lost. If we loose the sense of plurality, our lives will be drained of life, or – if individuality leads us into that nice feeling of being in a flow where everything goes our way – our family’s, our friend’s or our neighbour’s lives will be drained of life because we, maybe unconsciously, don’t understand what our dull and void attention does to them.

What about the liner? In this master essay my attempt was also to try to understand if a focus on aesthetic experiences in this certain sense could contribute to a turning of the liner, reminding the reader of my students who say that they will never be able to work in this way in “reality”. The question that arises here is: Is it useless to teach the teacher students in a way that they don’t think they can achieve themselves? Should I give up the fight because the liner is going in a different direction than my teaching? Or could my choice to turn my seminars into a stage, a space for action where they get the possibility to train themselves to meet the unexpected as well as to catch sight of the liner, in itself be considered as an example of the radical possibility of art?
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Original text in Swedish transcribed from the recordings of the dialogue seminars:


ii Det handlar så mycket om resultat jag känner mig styrd och kontrollerad, att det som jag upplever som viktigt och långsiktigt för elevernas bästa är svårt att motivera inom den här strukturen

iii Ja det här(närvaro, kommunikation, gemensamt engagemang, det relationella) går ju inte att måta, det går inte att visa upp, det går inte att sälja in, det är svårt med de här mjuka, kontakt människor i mellan, relationer, det värdesätts inte(i systemet), vi går åt andra hålet med hårdtag i skolan, utöka skoltiden med en timme, mer läxor, lärande ersatta med internetbaserade lär-rum...

iv Om jag planerar om och gör något annat för att möta eleverna kommer stressen att ja har ju skrivit att vi ska göra det här, och det är ju synligt för vårdnadshavare, chefer, ledning etc.

v Håller med, kvalitetssäkringen , det fula ordet som JB skriver, vad är det? Något som går att måta...och därmed att visa upp, att visa upp sig blir liksom viktigare än vad man gör, fritids är fortfarande något friare än skolan men det kommer även där trots att fritidspedagogiken ska vara just situationsbaserad. Att nätting uppstår, ett barn har en ide, att man hakar in den iden och bygger vidare utifrån vad barnet vill lära sig, det är så mycket åndå i skolan att någon annan har bestämt vad barnen som medborgare behöver ha med sig, och när de ska lära sig något, här är det viktigt att fritids uppdrag får fortsätta låta och lära barnen bestämma själva vad som är viktigt och vad de vill lära sig. Jag önskar att skolan kunde närma sig fritids istället för att det som nu hela tiden är fritids som närmar sig skolan.

vi Nalle beskriver i Clown Manifesto kärnan av vad alla pedagogiska möten handlar om, men kanske särskilt när man håller på med kreativa saker. Att verkligen möta gruppen, känna av, lyssna in och att man själv ska känna glädje, lust och entusiasm – det var ju också det vi pratade ganska mycket om förra gången men jag tycker han skriver det så fint, så det blir viktigt när man läser det som att - just det, det är ju det här som är kärnan i det jag håller på med, och det är så skönt när det står så klart och tydligt, när det står att det är det här som är viktigt, om du inte gör det här så kommer det inte att funka, och det känns på nåt sätt lite befriande att låsa det när det kommer så mycket annat utifrån och uppifrån att vi måste göra det här, vi måste prova den här metoden etc, och så läser jag det och känner att, nej, det är faktiskt det här som är kärnan: jag ska vilja göra det här som jag gör och jag ska veta vilka jag gör det tillsammans med, om jag inte gör det kommer inget att funka, inga nya metoder kommer att fungera, och jag tänkte Yes! Vad bra han är! (skratt från övriga) Jag
satt och läste det här på tunnelbanan en morgon och blev verkligen så här wohoooo!

vii Man kan se läraren som en performer, som Nalle beskriver det, som nån som står inför och försöker beröra en publik liksom, och det som är så fint med Nalle är att publiken är det enda som är meningsfullt, utan publiken har han ingen konstart, det är inte uppträdandet i sig, hur han gör och hur han tycker att han har presterat utan hur publiken har uppfattat det som är i fokus det tycker jag är jättefint precis som du säger Pia, sen så eftersträvar vi ju inte katharsis (skratt) men det är den här kontakten och vördnaden för publikens känslor som, relationsskapandets a och o, det tror jag är jätteviktigt...för när man står som fritidslärare inför en stor grupp barn, 54 åttaåringar t ex och försöker få dem att lyssna, då är det just det där att känna in gruppen och vara i stunden som får dem att lyssna.

viii Och när jag hör det där att du upplever att Nalle Laanela som Clown sätter fokus på kärrnan i det du ser som vårt yrkesutövande, att skapa kontakt, att fånga ett intresse hos en grupp, jag tänker på all pedagogisk forskning och alla teorier som finns, där de hår sakerna verkar så oerhört komplicerade och det är de ju också...

ix ja men det är ju komplicerat och samtidigt är det så befriande att läsa Clown Manifesto, det är som att man känner att ja, här, äntligen, han har satt kärrnan här, precis

x ja och han gör det utifrån...han skriver liksom en filosofi, eller...kan man kalla det metod? Jag vet inte....det är som en hjälp till att hitta ett förhållningssätt som funkar i praktiken

xii Jo, men det är ju inte vilken tjomme som helst som skriver utan han har ju provat och misslyckats massor av gånger och säkert varit med om helt katastrofala möten där det har gått åt helvete, och ställt sig frågan varför det inte funkade och sedan provat igen, förändrat, förfinat, över många år...

xiii ja, och inte minst undervisat! Alltså han har ju undervisat också i sin konst. Tindra du har ju haft honom som lärare, på gymnasiet i drama/teater/clown, så i minst 20 år har han dessutom undervisat och slipat på de här orden/verktygen både för sin egen konst, men också för att undervisa andra i samma konst, och apropå ord: Jag intresserar mig för vad det är för ord som fungerar i relation till praktiken, som öppnar upp, som skapar ramar men öppnar upp för improviserade möten...de där orden finns här känns det som... Ja, det här kommer alltså utifrån din(Pias) kommentar om det enkla, enkelheten i Nalles text...

xiv Men jag tycker ju faktiskt att när det blir lustfyllt så blir det enkelt.