### AT: Not our Critical Pedagogy

#### They still link—their project is still beholden to utopianism—only our strategy of counter-education which explicitly abandons the normalizing constraints of their framework can make possible meaningful social change.

Gur-Ze’ev 98 (Ilan Gur-Ze’ev, Education—Haifa University, 1998

“Toward a Non-Repressive Critical Pedagogy,” http://construct.haifa.ac.il/~ilangz/Critpe39.html)

“Critical Pedagogy” has many versions today, as does “critical theory”.(1) With important differences between critical theories and the variety of “critical pedagogies”, identifying the problems of current Critical Pedagogies becomes problematic, and the development of a positive utopian alternative Critical Pedagogy becomes impossible. For all their differences, all current versions of Critical Pedagogy function as part and parcel of normalizing education and its violence. In this article I suggest an alternative critical education as counter-education. Within counter-education no room exists for a positive Utopia, and it does not promise collective emancipation under present circumstances, but counter-education suggests possibilities for identifying, criticizing, and resisting violent practices of normalization, control, and reproduction practices in a system which uses human beings as its agents and victims. Counter-education opens possibilities for refusing to abandon human potential to become other than directed by the system and the realm of self-evidence. It enables a chance - which is to be struggled for again and again - to challenge normalizing education in all its version, including Critical Pedagogy. As I shall show, positive utopianism is the main weakness of current critical pedagogies that challenge the present philosophical, cultural, and social reality. Philosophical negativism, I argue, is a pre-condition for the development of a non-repressive Critical Pedagogy, which is essentially different from normalizing education. Current versions of Critical Pedagogy lack this negative dimension; all are united by a commitment to positive utopianism, even when explicitly denying it. With all their differences, today’s versions of Critical Pedagogy are all based on weak, controlled, and marginalized collectives for their common optimistic view of the possibilities of changing reality and securing unaothoritative emancipation, love and happiness: they forget that the violence of self-evidence and power are the main obstacles to the human’s transcendence and realization of her/his potential autonomy. The possibility and the nature of a non-repressive pedagogy is at the heart of my project. Here I suggest an initial step: to explore the exact relation between the philosophical framework and the social tasks of Critical Pedagogy. I begin by concentrating on the Critical Theory of the Frankfurt School as a historical and conceptual framework for developing a non-repressive Critical Pedagogy. I hope thereby to encourage a counter-education to hegemonic education and to oppose the dogmas and illusions of the hegemonic versions of Critical Pedagogy.

### AT Perm

#### Counter education is mutually exclusive with their project—we refuse their attempt to ground our pedagogy in one particular liberatory framework—the alternative is less than the aff.

Biesta 98 (Gert J. J. Biesta, Educational Sciences—Utrecht, 1998

“SAY YOU WANT A REVOLUTION…SUGGESTIONS FOR THE IMPOSSIBLE FUTURE OF CRITICAL PEDAGOGY,” Educational Theory 48:4)

Negative utopianism provides the starting point for Cur-Ze’ev’s nonrepressive form of critical pedagogy called ”counter-education. ” Counter-education radically differs from the conception of education of critical pedagogy, because it “refuses all versions of educational violence” and has no positive alternative to false consciousness, such as the memory or knowledge of the marginalized and oppressed. Yet, if I see it correctly, counter education also has a positive dimension, in that it wants ”to educate to decipher reality,” and wants to struggle for the development of the ”reflective potential of human beings and their ability for articulation of their worlds as a realization of their reason.” And, because its aim is to strive for conditions under which everyone will be able to become part of the human dialogue, to work toward the possibility that the human subject will be able to stand up and confront ”the forgetfulness of being.”