Living Educational Theory researchers' contributions to Wisdom-Inquiry and Wisdom Inquiry's contribution to Living Educational Theory Research.

An extended review of Nicholas Maxwell's, (2021) The World in Crisis – and what to do about it: A revolution for thought and action. London; World Scientific.

Jack Whitehead, University of Cumbria, UK.

DRAFT 7 June 2021

This review is in two parts. Part One is focused on Maxwell's analysis of differences between Knowledge-Inquiry and Wisdom-Inquiry in relation to the revolution for thought and action in what to do about the world in crisis. Part Two analyses how Living Educational Theory researchers are contributing to Wisdom-Inquiry and how Wisdom-Inquiry can contribute to Living Educational Theory Research in living as fully as possible values of human flourishing in responding to the world in crisis.

Part One

Maxwell has organized his book into the following seven chapters:

The World Crisis; ii) The Key to the Disasters of Our Time: Two Great Problems of Learning; iii) The Profound Enlightenment Idea and Its Bungled Implementation; iv) The Key to the Solution of the World Crisis We Face; v) How Can Wisdom-Inquiry Help Us To Solve the World Crisis?; vi) How Can We Create Wisdom Inquiry?; vii) What do we Need to Do to Solve the World Crisis?

Maxwell lists the world crises and distinguishes between knowledge-inquiry and wisdom-inquiry in two great problems in learning. He believes the knowledge-inquiry has been successful in learning about the universe, and about ourselves and others forms of life as a part of the universe. However, knowledge-inquiry has failed in learning how to create a genuinely civilized, enlightened, wise world. He offers wisdom-inquiry as a way of solving the second great problem of learning.

Wisdom-inquiry seeks to clarify a profound misunderstanding concerning the nature of reason. For Maxwell this includes a distinction between the Traditional Enlightenment and the Profound Enlightenment. He describes three blunders in the Traditional Enlightenment and explains how these blunders can be overcome in wisdom-inquiry. In Traditional Enlightenment knowledge is acquired and once acquired, it can be applied to help solve social problems and promote human welfare. Maxwell acknowledges the immense successes and benefits of the Traditional Enlightenment. But, says Maxwell, what is also astonishing is that these immense successes and benefits have been achieved by putting into practice an idea that is very seriously defective and is influential in contributing to the world in crisis. The defect is the idea that, by means of modern science and technology, we can achieve health and happiness. The Traditional Enlightenment may contain the solution to the first great problem of learning, it does not contain the solution to the second one. This, Maxwell says, is its great defect.

Maxwell refers to the battle between the Traditional Enlightenment and the Romantic opposition that continues to be fought. He claims that the Traditional Enlightenment has defects in its rationality that are responsible for the genesis of our global problems. He explains that In some respect, Romanticism is more rational than the Traditional Enlightenment. But, he says that the defects are responsible for our global problems. Wisdom-inquiry offers a synthesis of traditional Rationalist and Romantic ideas as a great improvement over both.

In overcoming the three blunders in the Traditional Enlightenment Maxwell proposes a new conception of science that is generalized to form an **aims-improving, progress-achieving conception of rationality.** He advocates the transformation of social inquiry and the humanities to get this new conception of rationality into the fabric of social life. Maxwell uses two arguments to put matters right. The first appeals to a "problem-solving" conception of rationality. The second to an "aim-improving" conception, arrived at by generalizing the aim-improving conception of scientific method, an *aim-orientated empiricism* that needs to replace standard empiricism. This aim-orientated empiricism is grounded in an **aim-orientated rationality**.

For Maxwell the object of his book is to make a contribution towards changing the overall aims and methods, the intellectual and institutional structure, of academic inquiry. He gives an absolute priority to the fundamental problem of realizing what is of value in life as we live. Maxwell is clear that the first task in promoting wisdom-inquiry is to create a high-profile campaign devoted to creating awareness of the urgent need to transform the university, so that knowledge-inquiry becomes wisdom-inquiry. Maxwell says that It is not powerful explanatory theories in social science that we need, to grapple successfully with unforeseen undesirable consequences of radical social change.

> Rather, what we need is the social capacity to engage in large-scale, public, cooperative action. That makes possible a kind of social learning, a capacity to adjust socially in a flexible and relatively painless way to new, unforeseen circumstances, to an extent that is quite impossible given any other approach.

Maxwell concludes that wisdom-inquiry should seek to promote **a cooperatively rational world.**

I summarise below what I understand to be the central points in each chapter, before exploring the implications for Living Educational Theory Research. Below the title of each chapter are extensive quotations from Maxwell so that I can do justice to his ideas with as little distortion as possible.

1. The World Crisis

Maxwell lists the following world crises in terms of the:

i) climate crisis is the world of our global problems,
ii) destruction of natural habitats,
iii) rapid loss of animals in the wild,
iv) devasting extinction of species,

v) growing inequality in wealth and power,
vi) lethal character of modern war,
vii) spread of modern armaments around the world, conventional, chemical, and possibly biological,
viii) menace of nuclear weapons ready to be unleashed at the touch of a button,
ix) problem of pollution of earth, sea and air,
x) plastic and acidity in the oceans devastate ocean life,
xi) pollution of air kills millions of people,
xii) CO2 pollution causes global warming,
xiii) growing resistance of bacteria to drugs as a result of the misuse of antibiotics
xiv) the explosive rise in the world's population. In the middle of the 19th century there were 1 billion people, there are now 7.8 billion,
xv) threats to democracy that stem from the internet: governments, political parties, and other interested bodies, spreading deception and lies on social media, and subvert democratic elections,
xvi) coronavirus pandemic, which caused over 1.7 million deaths towards the nd of 2020, and its undermining of economies and disruption of social and cultural life.

2. The Key to the Disasters of Our Time: Two Great Problems of Learning

Maxwell's thesis is that Humanity is confronted by two great problems of learning. The first is learning about the universe, and about ourselves and others forms of life as a part of the universe. The second is learning how to create a genuinely civilized, enlightened, wise world… Now that we have solved the first great problem of learning, it is a matter of extreme urgency that we discover how to set about solving the second one.

Maxwell claims that the first problem was cracked, in essence, in the 17th Century, with the birth of modern science… (p.6). He acknowledges that modern science and technology have had profoundly beneficial consequences for humanity in that they have made possible the development of modern industry and agriculture, modern hygiene and medicine, modern travel, modern communications, and all the multitude of good things that come from these developments. But he says there is a downside:

> These very successes have also led to all our current grave global problems. In every case, current global problems have been made possible by modern science and technology…we could have avoided generating these global problems if we had been wiser. (7)

Maxwell points out that humanities failure to solve the second great problem of learning has put us into a situation of great danger. He says that we must learn how to acquire wisdom – social, political, economic wisdom – or we will end up destroying ourselves. Maxwell says that it is vital that we are able to do the following:

> … we must be able to discover future undesirable consequences of our actions before these consequences become a reality, and we must be able to modify our actions so that these undesirable consequences never become a reality. If by chance we fail to discover some undesirable consequences, and fail for some time to modify our actions, so that the undesirable consequence does begin to become a reality, then (a) we must be able to modify our actions appropriately to put a stop to the consequence

becoming ever more undesirable, and (b) we must be able to act so as to deal with the undesirable consequence we have already created – solve the global problem that has emerged from our actions.
All this might be summed up in two slogans.

Slogan (1): Successfully anticipate, and act!
Slogan (2): If anticipation has failed, even more urgently act! (p16)

… we need to have solved the second great problem of learning: we need to have discovered how to make progress towards a good, enlightened world, modern science and technology being developed and exploited so as to facilitate progress towards such a world. (p.20)

3. The Profound Enlightenment Idea and Its Bungled Implementation

Maxwell claims that we need to learn how to achieve social progress towards as good a world as possible from the way in which science makes progress. (23) He acknowledges that the task of achieving scientific progress differs profoundly from the task of achieving social progress toward a better world. He asks, how can success in the first field have anything to teach us about how to achieve success in the second and considers how dramatically the two fields do differ.

> To begin with, as far as science is concerned, a decisive method exists for assessing the merit of new ideas: a new theory can be put to the test of experiment. If what the theory predicts meets with sufficient success and is more successful than any previous theory, it can be accepted; if what it predicts clashes with experimental results, the theory is to be accepted; if what it predicts clashes with experimental results, the theory is to be rejected. No such decisive method exists in the social world for assessing new ideas, new policies, for solving social problems. A new policy is implemented to build more houses, to save the environment, or to support an industry. Some will benefit; others will be disadvantaged. Some will approve on ideological grounds, while others will disapprove. In the social, political realm, there does not exist a decisive method for assessing the merit of policy ideas of the kind that does exist in connection with science. (23)

Maxwell claims that we may be able to generalize the progress-achieving methods of science so that they become fruitfully applicable to any worthwhile problematic endeavor, however much it differs from science. (25) He seeks to clarify a profound misunderstanding concerning the nature of reason:

> According to this misconception, to think, decide and act *rationally* is to do so in accordance with the diktats, the rules, of reason. It is to submit to what reason decides for us. It is to think and *act in accordance with the rules of reason*. Feelings and desires are irrational, or at least non-rational. In order to think and act rationally, we must ignore the prompting of emotions and desires, and attend only to what reason tells us to think and do. To be rational, according to this misconception, involves ultimately abandoning personal freedom, and enslaving oneself to the diktats of reason.

For Maxwell this whole conception of reason is a grotesque misconception of what we should take it to be. He describes the Traditional Enlightenment and Romanticism in terms of their rationality and irrationality and proposes a synthesis in wisdom-inquiry.

> Reason does not tell us what to think and do, it helps us discover that we want to do, and what is in our best interests to do. It puts us in a better position to discover what we do really want to do. It does not undermine our freedom; on the contrary, it enhances it. It opens up good options for action. It helps us discover and achieve our heart's desires. Emotion and desire are not anti-rational or non-rational; they are vital ingredients of rationality, as we shall see. The rational society is the free society, the society in which individual freedom and mutual cooperation can best flourish. We need reason – the authentic article – for freedom, for everything of value, for everything we cherish. (26)
>
> Unfortunately, in developing this profoundly important idea – this key to the salvation of humanity – the *philosophies* of the Enlightenment blundered. They botched the job. They developed the profound Enlightenment (29) idea in a seriously defective form. This blunder had dramatic and drastic consequences. It adversely affected the way in which academia developed subsequently – the way in which our whole culture and social world developed. Our entire history since the 18th century has been adversely affected by this ancient blunder of the *philosophies.* And the blunder is still built into the intellectual/institutional structure of academia as it exists today; it is still built into our social and cultural world, ignored and unnoticed. But it is this blunder we have inherited from the past that is responsible for our current inability to solve global problems, and prevent them from arising in the first place. It is this ancient 18th century Enlightenment blunder, still built into our institutions, culture and social world, that prevents us from learning how to solve the second great problem of learning, and thus make progress towards a good, enlightened, wise world. (30)
>
> The fundamental social or humanitarian aim of academia may well be to help promote human welfare; the intellectual aim, however, is to acquire knowledge. First, knowledge is to be acquired; once acquired, it can be applied to help solve social problems and promote human welfare.
>
> Let us call this whole idea, coming as it does from the *philosophies* of the 18th century, The *Traditional Enlightenment*. …. Even when taken up and put into practice in a seriously defective form, the profound Enlightenment idea sill does a massive amount of good… The Traditional Enlightenment may contain the solution to the first great problem of learning; it does not contain the solution to the second one. (31)
>
> The Counter-Enlightenment does not object to the idea that social inquiry and the humanities should have the basic intellectual aim of improving knowledge and understanding of our human world; it objects simply to the Traditional Enlightenment thesis that the kind of knowledge sought, and methods employed,

ought to be as similar as possible to those of the nature sciences. It objects to the idea that scientific rationality ought to prevail in all areas of thought and life.

Academic inquiry today is by and large an uneasy, confused mixture of what we have inherited from the Traditional Enlightenment – knowledge inquiry as I shall call it – and from Romanticism, the Counter-Enlightenment and postmodernism. The natural and technological sciences, mathematics, so-called analytic philosophy, economics, physical anthropology, and parts of the other social sciences are primarily infused with Traditional Enlightenment values and ideals; social anthropology, some social psychology, cultural and literary studies, so-called continental philosophy and other branches or traditions within the humanities are infused with Romantic and counter-Enlightenment values and ideals. And in other areas of our cultural and social life today – in education, politics, medicine, psychotherapy, the arts, the green movement – the battle between the traditional Enlightenment and the Romantic opposition continues to be fought.

Romanticism objected to the Traditional Enlightenment on the grounds that it valued too highly reason, intellectual rigour, method, logic, evidence, and by contrast deplored the influence of passion, imagination, desire, fiction and myth on how we think and what we do. But Romanticism got matters entirely wrong. What is wrong with the Traditional Enlightenment is not its rationality, but quite the opposite, its *irrationality*. The Traditional Enlightenment is a *characteristic kind of irrationality* falsely masquerading as rationality. Furthermore, it is the quite basic rationality defects of the Traditional Enlightenment that are responsible for the genesis of our global problems. In some respect, Romanticism is more rational than the Traditional Enlightenment. But both are defective. Both need radical improvement. We need, as I have said, progress in our ideas about how to achieve progress. Correct the defects of the Traditional Enlightenment and we have a view that is a synthesis of traditional Rationalist and Romantic ideas, and a great improvement over both. (33)

4. The Key to the Solution of the World Crisis We Face

Maxwell identifies what he calls the great blunder of the Traditional Enlightenment as the pursuit of disciplines devoted in the first instance to the pursuit of knowledge. He says that they are not pursued as *methodological disciplines* devoted in the first instance to help people in their work and lives put *progress-achieving methods* into practice, generalized from those of science. (36)

The Traditional Enlightenment also made two other serious blunders as well. These can be understood in terms of three crucial steps that need to be got right:

i) The progress-achieving methods of science need to be correctly identified.
ii) These methods need to be correctly generalized so that they become relevant and fruitfully applicable to any worthwhile human endeavor with problematic aims, whatever the aims may be, and not just applicable to the endeavor of improving knowledge.

iii) These correctly generalized progress-achieving methods then need to be exploited correctly in the great human endeavor of trying to make social progress toward the immensely problematic aim of creating an enlightened, civilized, wise world.

The *philosophies* got all three steps wrong in the traditional Enlightenment (37)

It is these three blunders that we need to put right to develop a kind of academic inquiry, rationally devoted to helping humanity solve the second great problem of learning, and thus make progress towards as good, civilized and wise a world as possible:

> First, we need to adopt and implement a new conception of science, one that acknowledges profoundly problematic metaphysical, value and political assumptions inherent in the aims of science and, as a result, adopts a meta-methodology designed to facilitate improvement of aims as science proceeds. Second, this aims-improving, progress-achieving conception of scientific method needs to be generalized to form a new aims-improving, progress-achieving conception of rationality, fruitfully applicable, potentially to all worthwhile endeavours with problematic aims. And third, social inquiry and the humanities need to be transformed so that they take up the task of helping humanity get this new conception of rationality into the fabric of social life, into all our other human endeavours besides science: politics, industry, agriculture, economics, the media, the law, finance, and international affairs. As a result, humanity would have what it so urgently needs, a kind of academic enterprise rationally devoted to helping us make social progress towards a genuinely civilized, wise, enlightened world – a world that has the capacity to discover undesirable consequences of new actions made possible by new technology, and then modify actions before their undesirable consequences become too widespread. (38)

Maxwell believes that there are two conceptions, and kinds, of academic inquiry that we need to consider: *knowledge-inquiry* and *wisdom-inquiry*.

> Knowledge-inquiry is what, by and large, we have today. It has the three blunders of the Enlightenment built into it. The basic intellectual aim is to acquire knowledge; the basic social aim to help promote human welfare by means of the application of knowledge, technological know-how and expertise. First, knowledge is to be acquired; once acquired, it can be applied or used to help promote human welfare. Values, politics, policies (41), problems of living and their proposed solutions must all be excluded from the intellectual domain of inquiry, to preserve its objectivity and intellectual integrity (although factual claims about these can be included). According to this view, paradoxically, human values must be excluded from the intellectual domain so that authentic factual knowledge may be produced, and academic-inquiry may be of genuine human value, and not degenerate into mere propaganda and ideology. (42)
>
> Wisdom-inquiry is what emerges when knowledge-inquiry is modified just sufficiently to eliminate the three great Enlightenment blunders inherent in its

structure, and thus cure it of its gross, wholesale irrationality. Wisdom-inquiry is rationally designed and devoted to improving our (42) solutions to both great problems of learning. It has, as its basic intellectual-social aim, to seek and promote wisdom, understood to be the capacity, active endeavor and desire to realise what is of value in life for oneself and others, thus including knowledge, technological know-how and understanding, but much else besides. (43)

I now indicate what is wrong, and what needs to be done to put matters right. There are two arguments: the first appeals to a "problem-solving" conception of rationality, the second to an "aim-improving" conception, arrived at by generalizing the aim-improving conception of scientific method that needs to replace standard empiricism. (43)

Four absolutely elementary, uncontroversial rules of rational problem solving are:

i) Articulate, and improve the articulating of, the problem to be solved.
ii) Propose and critically assess possible solutions.
iii) When confronted with a recalcitrant problem, break it up into specialized preliminary problems.
iv) Interconnect fundamental and specialized problem solving, so that each influences the other. (45)

… in order to pursue the goal of promoting human welfare in such a way that elementary rules of rational problem solving are complied with, academia must:

i) Articulate, and improve the articulating of, the problems of living.
ii) Propose and critically assess possible solutions – possible actions, policies, political programmes, ways of living, philosophies of life.
iii) When confronted with a recalcitrant problems of living, break them up into specialized preliminary problems of knowledge and technological know-how.
iv) Interconnect fundamental and specialized problem solving, so that each influences the other.

Academia as it exists today, massively influenced by knowledge inquiry puts rule iii) into effect brilliantly… But disastrously, it fails to put rules i), ii) and iv) into practice. (46)

The social sciences need to be transformed so that they cease to be sciences, or even disciplines devoted primarily to the pursuit of knowledge, and become instead enterprises that seek to promote increasingly cooperatively rational resolving of conflicts and problems of living in the social world. Insofar as social inquiry seeks knowledge, it is to improve knowledge about what our problems of living are, and how good proposals for action are from the standpoint of helping us to solve our problems of living, and realise what is of value in life (and thus, ultimately, make progress towards as good a world as possible). The relationship between academia and the social world needs to be transformed, so that academia actively promotes

public education about what our problems are, and what we need to do about them, by means of discussion and debate --- (50).

Wisdom-inquiry I have argued, seeks to help people resolve conflicts and problems of living in *cooperatively rational ways*, so that all concerned may realise what is of value to them in life. (51)

Given the argument so far, the crucial question becomes: How can the profoundly problematic metaphysical assumption of physics, all too likely to be false in the specific version implicitly accepted at any stage in the development of physics be improved? How can we best improve the specific assumption that is accepted?

The solution to this problem is to adopt a view I can *aim-orientated empiricism:* see Figure 2. Aim-orientated empiricism represents the currently implicit assumption of physics in the form of a hierarchy of assumptions. As we go up the hierarchy, metaphysical assumptions become less and less substantial and thus more and more likely to be true, and also such that their truth becomes more nearly required for science, or the pursuit of knowledge, to be possible at all. Assumptions high up in the hierarchy, and associated methods, provide a relatively secure, stable framework within (63) which much more substantial and insecure assumptions, and associated methods, low down in the hierarchy can be developed, assessed, and improved. (64).

According to standard empiricism, the intellectual content of science is, crudely speaking, made up of two domains: (1) evidence, and (2) theory. According to aim-orientated empiricism, our whole conception of science needs to be transformed so that its intellectual content is made of three domains: (1) evidence, (2) theory, and (3) aims (aims including problematic assumptions or conjectures concerning facts, metaphysics, values and politics or the social use of science). Sustained discussion of problems association with (3) is just as important as discussion of problems associated with (2) and (1). Journals needs to be devoted to (3); Nobel prizes may be won as a result of contributions to (3).

Once the scientific community has brought about the scientific revolution involved in rejecting standard empiricism, and adopting and implementing in scientific practice aim-orientated empiricism instead, the first blunder of the Enlightenment will have been corrected.

The second *Enlightenment blunder* has to do with how scientific method is to be generalized to become fruitfully applicable, potentially, to all that we do. (66)

Aim-orientated rationality provides a meta-methodological framework for the improvement of ideas for action, and of action itself, in the light of what we experience when actions are performed, or what we imagine we would experience if ideas for action were to be performed. In provide the means to improve our aims as we act, it facilitates realization of what is of value in life. (69)

The third Enlightenment blunder, still built into academia today, is by far the worst, the most damaging. Progress-achieving rationality is not applied directly to *social life* to help solve global problems and achieve social progress towards as good and enlightened a world as possible. Instead, it is applied to *social science,* to the task, merely , of making progress in knowledge of social phenomena. It is this monumental blunder developed throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries, that is responsible for the creation of what we have today – academia shaped by knowledge-inquiry.

In order to correct this third and most disastrous blunder, the social sciences and humanities need to be radically transformed so that their fundamental task becomes to help get the progress-achieving methods of aim-orientated rationality into the fabric of personal, social, institutional and cultural life, so that progress may be made towards as good a world as possible. (70)

Aim-orientated rationality is especially relevant to the task of resolving conflicts about aims and ideals, as it helps disentangle agreement (high up in the hierarch) and disagreements (more likely to be low down in the hierarchy). It is especially helpful in facilitating cooperative rationality. (73)

In order to enhance our understanding of persons as beings of value, potentially and actually, we need to understand them empathetically, by putting ourselves imaginatively into their shoes, and experiencing, in imagination, what they feel and think desire, fear, plan, see, love (76) and hate. For wisdom-inquiry, this kind of empathic understanding is rational and intellectually fundamental. Articulating problems of living, and proposing and assessing possible solutions is, we have seen, the fundamental intellectual activity of wisdom-inquiry. But it is just this that we need to do to acquire empathic understanding. Social inquiry, in tackling problems of living, is also promoting empathic understanding of people. Empathic understanding is essential to wisdom. Elsewhere I have argued, indeed, that empathic understanding plays an essential role in the evolution of consciousness. It is required for cooperative action, and even for science…. We need a change of paradigm in the whole conception of what constitutes intellectually worthwhile inquiry devoted to the best interests of humanity. (77)

5. How Can Wisdom-Inquiry Help Us To Solve the World Crisis?

Maxwell tackles the question, 'How would it help us resolve the world crisis to transform universities around the world so that knowledge-inquiry becomes wisdom-inquiry. As a precursor to answering this question Maxwell lists 23 structural changes that need to be made to academia as it exists at present, dominated as it is by knowledge-inquiry, in order for it to become wisdom-inquiry. He claims that:

> If individual scientists and scholars bear some responsibility for the current situation, it is their failure to appreciate that science shaped by standard empiricism, and academic inquiry more generally shaped by knowledge-inquiry, are profoundly and damaging irrational, there being an urgent need to bring about scientific and academic

revolutions so that aim-orientated empiricism and wisdom inquiry are put into practice. (87)

Wisdom-inquiry holds that inquiry at its most fundamental and important is the thinking we engage in as we live, guiding our actions as we seek to achieve what is of value to us in life. A fundamental task of academic thought is to help promote this personal and social thought, active in personal and social life. Academia exists as a resource for non-academics to exploit to help wisdom-inquiry flourish in life. As I said in the last chapter, academia needs to become a people's civil service, doing openly for the public what actual civil services are supposed to do in secret for government. (96)

A basic task of wisdom social inquiry is to help humanity get aim-orientated rationality into the fabric of personal, social and institutional life, so that aims at all these levels may be improved as we act, vitally needed if we are to resolve the multifaceted aspects of the world crisis. Knowledge social science, by contrast, provides no such service. (97)

Aim-orientated rationality and wisdom-inquiry are especially well designed to facilitate improvement in institutions, so that there is as much gain as possible and as little loss. It would be a primary task of the wisdom-inquiry academy to ensure that each important, problematic institution has, associated with it, a meta-institution concerned with problematic institutional aims and methods, and how they can be improved. If such an institution persistently turns a deaf ear to the recommendations of its meta-institution, and continues rigidly on its way, that would become a scandal requiring action in a wisdom-inquiry society. (98)

The object of this book is to make a contribution towards changing the overall aims and methods, the intellectual and institutional structure, of academic inquiry. But the book also has a more direct and personal message: it seeks to indicate a new way of thinking about ourselves in the world, a new way of seeing, a new vision. This gives absolute priority to the miracle of our existence in this strange universe, the supreme value of conscious life, and sentient life more generally, our fundamental problem being the problem of realizing what is of value in life as we life.
(110)

6. How Can We Create Wisdom Inquiry?

Maxwell claims that the first task is to create a high-profile campaign devoted to creating awareness of the urgent to transform the university, so that knowledge-inquiry becomes wisdom-inquiry….

Every university should be encouraged to create a symposium, open to everyone at the university, that meets regularly and explores questions about how the university needs to change to become actively engaged in helping the public take steps towards solving global problems.

At once the question arises: How is such a campaign to be created in the first place? That seems to me to be a crucial issue. I have been (115) struggling to get such a

campaign up and running for over 40 year, and so far I have failed….(116)… But what is lacking is a group effort to transform university institutions so that such work is recognized and rewarded – or at least a group effort to get into the public domain the idea that such institutional change is urgently needed (122)

7. What do we Need to Do to Solve the World Crisis?

For Maxwell, we now need to cooperate in producing a cooperatively rational world:

> We know – or some of us know – what to do, but we don't do it. Why not? Essentially, as before, because our governments don't act. Why not? Because they have other things on their mind. In democracies, individuals and campaigning organisations, such as Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace, and WWF, do what they can, but as yet there is not a public outcry, a public clamour, to save species and the natural world. Why not? Because the public is not, on the whole, aware of the full extent of the disaster that is unfolding. They have been betrayed by universities, our institutions of learning that ought to have been devoted to helping people get a good idea about what our problems are, and what we need to do about them. Universities do not think that that is their job at all. Their basic task, they believe, is to devote themselves to the pursuit of specialized knowledge and technological know-how – amongst other things, specialized knowledge about the rate of extinctions, and specialized technology which, all too often facilitates the process

> It may be thought that the idea that we can learn how to resolve our conflicts and problems of living cooperatively is a pipe dream. It is not. In the Mondragon region of Spain, everything runs along cooperative lines; businesses, shops, banks, schools, even the local university. It is astonishingly successful. And it came into existence as a result of a remarkable individual act of wisdom-inquiry. The whole world should be able to do what Mondragon already does so successfully. Why this disastrous failure to give absolute priority to public education about what our problems are, and what we (139) need to do about them? It comes, as we have seen, again and again from the general acceptance and implementation of a conception of the inquiry – knowledge-inquiry – that violates three of the four most elementary rules of reason one can think of. And no one notices – or hardly anyone. The vast majority of academics are content to spend their professional lives within the framework of knowledge-inquiry, blind to its gross structural defects. The pursuit of specialized knowledge persists at the expense of the effort to encourage the public to learning about unfolding disasters, and what needs to be done about them. (140) …

> It is not powerful explanatory theories in social science that we need, to grapple successfully with unforeseen undesirable consequences of radical social change, as Popper suppose. Rather, what we need is the social capacity to engage in large-scale, public, cooperative action. That makes possible a kind of social learning, a capacity to adjust socially in a flexible and relatively painless way to new, unforeseen circumstances, to an extent that is quite impossible given any other approach. (154)….

> That, at any rate is what in my view wisdom-inquiry should seek to promote: **a cooperatively rational world.** (156)

Part Two

The contribution of Wisdom Inquiry to Living Educational Theory Research? The contribution of Living Educational Theory Research to Wisdom Inquiry?

A) The contribution of Wisdom-Inquiry to Living Educational Theory Research.

In Living Educational Theory Research, practitioner-researchers explore the implications of asking, researching and answer questions of the kind, 'How do I improve what I am doing in living my values as fully as possible?'. They generate and share evidence-based explanations of educational influences in their own learning, in the learning of others and in the learning of social formation that influence their lives, work and research.

The following ideas from wisdom-inquiry can contribute to Living Educational Theory Research, especially in relation to research that is seeking to enhance its global influences. Wisdom-inquiry is focused on a form of rationality the can solve the second of the two great problems of learning. The first is learning about the universe, and about ourselves and other forms of life as a part of the universe. The second is learning how to create a genuinely civilized, enlightened, wise world. Living Educational Theory research, with its focus on exploring the implications of asking, researching and answering questions involving values of human flourishing is focused on the second problem of learning whilst offering validated, evidence-based explanations of educational influences in learning as contributions to knowledge-inquiry.

Wisdom-inquiry generalizes the progress-achieving methods of science so that they become fruitfully applicable to any worthwhile problematic endeavor, such as the inquiry, 'How do I improve what I am doing in living my values as fully as possible?' One such progress-achieving method is the use of action-reflection cycles used in scientific inquiries. This method of problem solving involves:

i) clarifying a values-laden question of the kind, 'How do I improve….?';
ii) imagining possible solutions;
iii) choosing one possibility in an action plan;
iv) acting and gathering data to make a judgement on the influences of the actions;
v) evaluating the influence of the actions;
vi) modifying the question, plan and action in the light of the evaluation;
vii) generating and sharing an evidence-based, validated, explanation of educational influences in one's own learning, in the learning of others and in the learning of the social formation that influences practice and understanding.

In applying a process of validation, as a progress-achieving method of science, Living Educational Theory Research draws on Popper's (1975, p.44) insights that objectivity is grounded in intersubjective testing. We can enhance the objectivity of living-educational-theories through **the mutual rational controls of critical discussion**. This process of validation includes questions to be asked of validation group of some 3-8 peers. In a validation group a researcher's explanation of educational influence is subject to questions

that are influenced by Habermas' (1976, pp. 2-3) ideas on communication and the evolution of society:

- How can I improve the comprehensibility of my explanation?
- How can I strengthen the evidence I use to justify my assertions or the claims to knowledge I make in my explanation?
- How can I deepen and extend my sociohistorical and sociocultural understandings of their influence in my explanation?
- How can I enhance the authenticity in my explanation in terms of demonstrating that I am living as fully as possible the values I claim to hold?

B) The contribution of Living Educational Theory Research to Wisdom- Inquiry

The contributions of Living Educational Theory Research to Wisdom-Inquiry are:

i) The acceptance of educational responsibility as a global citizen in living values of human flourishing as fully as possible.

ii) Overcoming a limitation in printed text-based representations of knowledge-inquiry (Maxwell, 2021) related to life-affirming energy-flowing, values-laden explanations of educational influences into improving practice. This contribution can be understood in relation to propositional, dialectical and inclusional or living logics. It can be understood through the use of digital visual data from practice in clarifying the meanings of the embodied values that practitioner-researchers use to judge improvements in their practice and to explain their educational influences in learning.

iii) Holding oneself to account in contributing to the generation of **a cooperatively rational world.** (Maxwell, 2021, p. 156) through generating and sharing one's living-educational-theory with a life-affirming energy and values of human flourishing.

I) The acceptance of educational responsibility, as a global citizen, in living values of human flourishing as fully as possible.

I believe that Living Educational Theory Research can contribute to Wisdom-inquiry through the acceptance of educational responsibility by citizen-scholars to generate and share their living-educational-theories as explanations of their educational influences in learning with values of human flourishing.

For example, one such citizen-scholar is Marie Huxtable. Huxtable (2021) presented her research on 'The Contribution of Educational Conversations to the flourishing of humanity to the 2021 Action Research Network of the Americas (ARNA) Conference with the theme of 'Co-creating knowledge and empowering communities'. You can access the power-point slides for this presentation at http://www.spanglefish.com/mariessite/documents/papers/21-arna-mh-june-presentation.pdf

Huxtable stresses the importance of educational conversations in the generation of living-educational-theories with values of human flourishing. It is these educational conversations that I am claiming are contributing to Wisdom-inquiry.

You can also access the presentations in the Symposium on 10th April at the 2021 Conference of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) on Accepting Responsibility with Jacqueline Delong (Canada), Jack Whitehead (UK), Shivani Mishra (India), Michelle Vaughan (USA) and Parbati Dhungana (Nepal). These are accessible from: https://www.actionresearch.net/writings/aera21/2021aerasymposiumfull.pdf

The presentations show the acceptance of educational responsibility, as citizen scholars (Harper, et al. 2020) and global citizen, by the contributors in living values of human flourishing as fully as possible.

The texts I draw on in understanding living global citizenship are:

Coombs, S., Potts, M. & Whitehead, J. (2014) I*nternational Educational Development and Learning through Sustainable Partnerships, Living Global Citizenship*. London; Palgrave Macmillan.

Potts, M. (2012) How can I live my life as a living-global-citizen? From action research to political activism. *Educational Journal of Living Theories*, 12(2); 20-33. Accessed from https://ejolts.net/node/347

As you will see above, Mark Potts' paper on living-global-citizen has been published in EJOLTs.

These are the kinds of contributions I have in mind when I claim that Living Educational Theory Research is contributing to Wisdom-Inquiry.

II) Overcoming a limitation in printed text-based representations of knowledge-inquiry (Maxwell, 2021) related to life-affirming energy-flowing, values-laden explanations of educational influences into improving practice.

This limitation can be understood in relation to propositional, dialectical and inclusional or living logics (Whitehead & Rayner, 2009) . It can be understood through the use of digital visual data from practice in clarifying the meanings of the embodied values that practitioner-researchers use to judge improvements in their practice and to explain their educational influences in learning (Whitehead & Huxtable, 2006a &b).

The limitations of printed text-based representations of educational inquiries can be clearly seen in the differences between the multi-media presentation by Whitehead & Huxtable (2006a) on the co-creating of living standards of judgement, at the 2006 World Congress of the Action Learning, Action Research Association and the distortion of this presentation required in fulfilling the requirements of a printed text for publication in the conference proceedings:

Whitehead, J. & Huxtable, M. (2006a) How are we co-creating living standards of judgement in action-researching our professional practices? Multi-media text presented at the World

Congress of ALARPM and PAR 21-24 August 2006 in Groningen. Accessed from https://www.actionresearch.net/writings/jack/jwmh06ALARPMmulti.pdf

Whitehead, J. & Huxtable, M. (2006b) How are we co-creating living standards of judgement in action-researching our professional practices? Printed text in the Conference Proceedings of the World Congress of ALARPM and PAR 21-24 August 2006 in Groningen. https://www.actionresearch.net/writings/jack/jwmhalarpmtext06.pdf

I am claiming that the presentation of multi-media explanations of educational influences in learning enable the embodied expressions of energy-flowing values to be comprehending in a way that adds meaning to what can be communicated through printed texts such as that published by Maxwell (2021). It is these meanings communicated with the help of digital visual data in EJOLTs that I am claiming are making a contribution to Wisdom-Inquiry.

III) Holding oneself to account in contributing to the generation of a cooperatively rational world, (Maxwell, 2021, p. 156) through generating and sharing one's living-educational-theory with a life-affirming energy and values of human flourishing.

I identify with the way that Delong holds herself accountable:

> One of the basic tenets of my philosophy is that the development of a culture for improving learning rests upon supporting the knowledge-creating capacity in each individual in the system. Thus, I start with my own. This thesis sets out a claim to know my own learning in my educational inquiry, 'How can I improve my practice as a superintendent of schools?' (Delong, 2002, Abstract)

In concluding this extended review I am holding myself accountable in my educational inquiry, 'How am I improving my practice in contributing to the generation of a cooperatively rational world?'. In the following presentations I am working to improve my practice in contributing to the generation of a cooperatively rationality world through enhancing the flow of life-affirming energy with the values and understandings of living-educational-theories.

In the following presentations between March to June 2021 I am presenting ideas to UK and global audiences that are intended to enhance the global educational influence of Living Educational Theory Research. In doing this I believe that I am showing how Living Educational Theory Research can contribute to Wisdom-Inquiry as understood by Maxwell (2021).

i) Jack Whitehead's keynote on 'Living Educational Theory Research and the teacher as a professional' to a webinar on 5th June 2021 organised by Sardar Patel University in India . Accessed from https://www.actionresearch.net/writings/jack/jwindianwebinar050621.pdf
ii) Marie Huxtable's and Jack Whitehead's presentation on 'Enhancing your professionalism through Living Educational Theory research.' Paper presentation for the online programme of the scientific colloquium for PhD Students with

Branko Bognar on the 5th June 2021, in Croatia. https://www.actionresearch.net/writings/jack/mhjwbranko5June0621.pdf

iii) Jack Whitehead's presentation on 'Generating living-educational-theories in enhancing evidence-based educational practitioner, pedagogic research'. Paper for the SOLSTICE/CLT Conference on the 2nd June 2021, 14:00-14:45, held virtually from Edge Hill University, UK. Accessed from https://www.actionresearch.net/writings/jack/jwsolstice020621.pdf

iv) Marie Huxtable's and Jack Whitehead's Lightning Talk at the University of Cumbria on 19 May 2021 on 'A Living Educational Theory research approach to the professional development of educators and educational practitioners.' Accessed from https://www.actionresearch.net/writings/jack/lighteningtalk190521.pdf

v) Jack Whitehead's introduction to a Froebel Research Seminar at Maynooth University on the 14th April 2021. Accessed from https://www.actionresearch.net/writings/jack/jwfroebel140421.pdf

vi) Symposium presentations on 10th April at the 2021 Conference of the American Educational Research Association on Accepting Responsibility with Jacqueline Delong (Canada), Jack Whitehead (UK), Shivani Mishra (India), Michelle Vaughan (USA) and Parbati Dhungana (Nepal). Accessed from https://www.actionresearch.net/writings/aera21/2021aerasymposiumfull.pdf

vii) Jack Whitehead's presentation on 'Making Connections with People, Purpose and Place through Living Educational Theory research' at the Educational Studies Association of Ireland, virtual conference 26 March 2021 with the theme, 'Possibilities in Education: Reimagining connections with People, Purpose and Place.' Accessed from https://www.actionresearch.net/writings/jack/JWESAI250321.pdf

viii) Living-theory-posters of 2021. Accessible from https://www.actionresearch.net/writings/posters/homepage2021.pdf

ix) Current issue of EJOLTS, June 2021, 14(1) freely available. Accessible from https://ejolts.net/current .This includes:

Williamson, B. & Whitehead, J. (2021) Living Meta-Analysis: what contribution could the Living Educational Theory research literature make as a resource that informs our meta-analytic inquiries? Educational Journal of Living Theories 14(1); 92-110. Accessed from http://ejolts.net/drupal/node/375x

x) The Jack Whitehead's writings section of http://www.actionresearch.net at https://www.actionresearch.net/writings/writing.shtml . This includes:

Huxtable, M. & Whitehead, J. (2021) 'Enhancing educational influences in learning with a Living Theory approach to Pedagogical Action Research in Higher Education.' Educational Action Research 29(2); 310-327. Accessed from https://www.actionresearch.net/writings/jack/mhjwEAR0620.pdf

In contributing to the educational influence of Living Educational Theory Research in Wisdom-Inquiry and in a cooperatively rational world, I am asking for your responses that could help me to improve my practice and improve my knowledge-creation and sharing of my living-educational-theory. I hope that this extended review has captivated your imagination in a way that is encourage you to do something similar in improving your

practice in contributing to the creation of a more cooperative rational world with values of human flourishing.

References

Delong, J. (2002) *How Can I Improve My Practice As A Superintendent of Schools and Create My Own Living Educational Theory?* PhD Thesis, University of Bath. Accessed from: https://www.actionresearch.net/living/delong.shtml

Habermas, J. (1976) *Communication and the evolution of society*. London : Heinemann

Harper, S. R., David, L. P., Jenkins, R. S. & Soodjinda, D. (2020) *Accepting Educational Responsibility: 2021 Annual Meeting Theme.* Accessed from : https://www.aera.net/Events-Meetings/2021-Annual-Meeting/2021-Annual-Meeting-Program-Information/2021-Annual-Meeting-Theme

Popper, K. (1975) *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, London; Hutchinson & Co.

Whitehead, J. & Rayner, A. (2009) *From Dialectics to Inclusionality: A naturally inclusive approach to educational accountability*. Accessed from https://www.actionresearch.net/writings/jack/arjwdialtoIncl061109.pdf

Whitehead, J. & Huxtable, M. (2006a) *How are we co-creating living standards of judgement in action-researching our professional practices? Multi-media text presented at the World Congress of ALARPM and PAR 21-24 August 2006 in Groningen*. Accessed from https://www.actionresearch.net/writings/jack/jwmh06ALARPMmulti.pdf

Whitehead, J. & Huxtable, M. (2006b) *How are we co-creating living standards of judgement in action-researching our professional practices? Printed text in the Conference Proceedings of the World Congress of ALARPM and PAR 21-24 August 2006 in Groningen*. https://www.actionresearch.net/writings/jack/jwmhalarpmtext06.pdf