



## ARTICLE

### Arctic Pedagogy

Louis Waterman-Evans

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6080-0243>

[louis.waterman-evans@stud.ph-karlsruhe.de](mailto:louis.waterman-evans@stud.ph-karlsruhe.de)

Karlsruhe University of Education, Germany

[louis.d.waterman-evans@uit.no](mailto:louis.d.waterman-evans@uit.no)

UiT The Arctic University of Norway

**DOI Number:** <https://doi.org/10.26203/p47e-7k61>

**Copyright:** © 2023 Waterman-Evans

**To cite this article:** Waterman-Evans, L., (2023). Arctic Pedagogy. *Education in the North*, 30(2) pp.9-23.



This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-commercial License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

## Arctic Pedagogy

Louis Waterman-Evans,

[louis.waterman-evans@stud.ph-karlsruhe.de](mailto:louis.waterman-evans@stud.ph-karlsruhe.de), Karlsruhe University of Education, Germany

[louis.d.waterman-evans@uit.no](mailto:louis.d.waterman-evans@uit.no), UiT The Arctic University of Norway

### Abstract

The concept of an 'Arctic Pedagogy' is enticing. Arctic branding sells: for example, UiT is not just the 'University of Tromsø' but also the 'The Arctic University of Norway'. Moreover, research in Scotland as part of the 'New Northern Pedagogies Project' is now investigating "how the principles of Arctic Pedagogy can support teacher education provision across Scotland". Such conversations invite a discussion of the concepts being used: 1) how is 'the Arctic' conceived and, importantly, what aspects are relevant for an understanding of pedagogy?; 2) what is 'pedagogy'?; 3) in what ways (if any) do features of 'the Arctic' affect how pedagogy is understood?

This article addresses these questions to propose a construction of Arctic Pedagogy that should not be seen as a fundamental rewiring of pedagogy, but instead more of a retuning in which the direction to answers raised by pedagogical questions takes on more of an Arctic hue. Arctic Pedagogy sees the educator's responsibility toward nature as critical, since nature is a part of the world to which education is trying to conserve; Arctic Pedagogy emphasises the need for educators to not only conserve the world that exists, but also envision a better future for the world that will be; and Arctic Pedagogy should consider the ethical question of whether or to what extent the uncertain future to which students' present is partly sacrificed through education can be justified.

**Keywords:** Arctic, pedagogy, education, Schleiermacher, nature

## Introduction

Invoking 'the Arctic' likely conjures up imagery of polar bears, northern lights, or explorers such as Roald Amundsen. Or perhaps it imposes the immediacy of climate change, as a region experiencing rapid warming at up to three times the average rate for the rest of the world, causing biodiversity collapse in an already threatened environment (Trenberth et al., 2007). Pedagogy, however, is unlikely to be the most immediate collocation that comes to mind.

Yet, 'Arctic Pedagogy' has a ring to it and now the *New Northern Pedagogies* project (a collaboration between the University of Strathclyde, UArctic, the Nordic Educational Research Association and the open-access journal, Education in the North) - funded by the Scottish government and in line with their *Arctic Connections* policy brief - is seeking to explore "how the principles of Arctic Pedagogy can support teacher education provision across Scotland" (UArctic, 2022). The purpose of this article is to contribute to this shaping of 'Arctic Pedagogy' through a hermeneutic discussion of the concepts involved, 'the Arctic', 'pedagogy', as well as their conjunction, 'Arctic Pedagogy'. This discussion is timely and needed considering that, up until 2010, there had been no mention of 'Arctic Pedagogy' in the available literature (based on a Google Scholar search of "Arctic Pedagogy"), but in the past 5 years there have been over 40 published works in this area. Evidently, 'Arctic Pedagogy' is still in its conceptual infancy, but interest is growing, making this an opportune moment for a conceptual discussion of what it means or could mean going forward.

This paper is not the first to suggest a definition of Arctic Pedagogy. One existing definition is offered by UArctic – an international network of universities, colleges and research institutions concerned with education and research in the North. UArctic (2017) "regards Arctic pedagogy as a combination of several factors. Communities and cultures as well as the local knowledge of elders should constitute the premise of education. Arctic pedagogy seeks to preserve and revitalise local languages, [...] views digitalisation as an opportunity for developing innovative solutions for arranging education, [...] Arctic pedagogy is a comprehensive *method of teaching and learning*, and culture, language and communities enrich educational experiences and strengthen the learners' identities" [emphasis added] (p.5). UArctic highlights many interesting dimensions of how Arctic Pedagogy might be conceived but, most fundamentally, it is constructed as a *method of teaching and learning*. Määttä and Uusiantti (2015) agree and, in their effort to detail "the basics of Arctic pedagogy" define Arctic Pedagogy as a method of teaching, constructing it as an "action and teaching tool" (p.30). But such an equation of pedagogy with "method of teaching and learning" glosses over the important relational aspect of pedagogy, which Adams (2022) notes as "the inherent relational element in pedagogy both in terms of between people and between people and the world" (p.108). Either way, to understand the term 'Arctic Pedagogy', one needs to ground the discussion with the concept of 'pedagogy' more fundamentally.

Accordingly, this paper is structured as follows. In a first step, I will consider the term 'Arctic' to ask, what is the Arctic and, pertinently, what features of the Arctic are relevant for an understanding of pedagogy? Second, I will discuss 'pedagogy', first outlining some differences between the Anglo-American and Continental traditions, before expanding on a conception offered by Friedrich Schleiermacher as one of the 'founding fathers' of pedagogy in the tradition of Continental Pedagogy.

In a final step, I will bring together the notion of the Arctic with that of pedagogy to suggest what might be conceived as an 'Arctic Pedagogy'. This construction of Arctic Pedagogy should not be seen as a fundamental rewiring of the meaning of pedagogy, but instead more of a retuning in which the direction to answers raised by pedagogical questions takes on more of an Arctic hue. This contribution is needed at a time when 'Arctic Pedagogy' is in its infancy, yet increasingly being used, discussed, and lauded.

### **What is the Arctic and what features of the Arctic are pedagogically relevant?**

The idea of an 'Arctic Pedagogy' rests on an understanding of what 'the Arctic' means. This is not straightforward because there is no universally agreed definition of the Arctic and, notably, it can mean different things depending on how it is being used and the purpose of invoking 'the Arctic' (Barentswatch, 2015). Etymologically, the Arctic's Greek root ἀρκτικός (*arktikos*) can be translated as "near the Bear, northern" (Lidell and Scott, 1940), referring to either the constellation *Ursa Major* ('the Great Bear'), which is prominent in the northern hemisphere, or *Ursa Minor* ('Little Bear'), which contains the celestial North Pole. Perhaps the most commonplace understanding of the Arctic is to refer to the area above the Arctic Circle, i.e., above a line of latitude approximately 66.5° north of the equator, which demarcates the line above which the sun does not set on summer solstice, nor rises on the winter solstice. However, this line is not of much geographical value since it indicates very little about the nature of the region, nor does it reflect changes due to climate change; it is simply a mathematical line drawn around the globe at a particular parallel. An alternative is to use a definition of the Arctic based on temperature as the region north of the 10 degree isotherm, i.e., north of the area which has a mean July temperature of 10 degrees (Stonehouse, 1989). Associated with this are indicators such as permafrost and the treeline, where the Arctic can be demarcated by the boundary between coniferous forest and tundra. A challenge with adopting such a definition is that it indicates little about the region in political or cultural terms. So, instead considering the important role of nation states in international politics, the starting point for defining the Arctic can thus be the 8 countries that sit on the Arctic Council (Finland, Iceland, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Russia, Canada and the USA). But that is not intuitively obvious, since the political centres of gravity of those nation states lie much further to the south. Defining the Arctic culturally would necessarily include and centre Indigenous Peoples, who have been historically marginalised, and whose cultural and linguistic traditions have been undervalued and oppressed by those abovementioned states (Keskitalo et al., 2013).

Given such a myriad of broad understandings, the challenge with constructing an 'Arctic Pedagogy' will be clear to readers: how can commonalities and defining features of the Arctic be drawn out whilst not falling into indiscriminate generalisations? Does it make any sense to make sweeping claims that include both the indigenous Sámi people of Scandinavia and Alaskans, not to mention the over 2 million people living in Arctic Russia? It is indeed at first a seemingly futile endeavour (admittedly not unique to just 'the Arctic' but one that presents itself as a challenge when generalising about any region). But such an attempt to highlight distinguishing and pedagogically relevant features of the Arctic is necessary for further conceptual discussion of an Arctic Pedagogy. Otherwise, it would not make sense to coin the term at all if one were in fact discussing a more specific locale, such as 'northern Norway' or 'Nunavut', for example.

To advance the discussion and engage with the concept of 'the Arctic' in a coherent manner, this paper takes up the definition used by the Arctic Council in their Arctic Human Development Report (AHDR) as a compromise among various definitions that incorporates elements of the Arctic Circle, political boundaries, vegetation boundaries, permafrost limits, and major oceanographic features. Furthermore, because the AHDR's focus is people, the area by which the Arctic is defined partly reflects administrative boundaries of relevant data on human indicators, such as educational outcomes. Since the focus of this paper also concerns a human endeavour – education – the AHDR delimitation of the Arctic seems well-suited to the purpose of this paper. The AHDR Arctic is shown in figure 1 below. In total, the Arctic by this definition encompasses an area of over 40 million square kilometers (8% of the Earth's surface), but with a human population of approximately only 4 million (AHDR, 2004, p.18).



*Figure 1: the AHDR Arctic (Source: Arctic Centre, n.d.)*

Working with this definition, one is then able to identify and highlight defining features of the Arctic. Määttä and Uusiaini (2019) put forward the following common features of the Arctic: 1) its rurality and associated importance of traditional livelihoods – many Arctic communities live in small, scattered settlements in geographical isolation from large urban areas, meaning that traditional livelihoods such as hunting and fishing have been left more alone from metropolitan and colonial pressures; 2) Indigenous Peoples – as mentioned above, the Arctic is distinguished, at least from the rest of Europe, by a wealth of Indigenous populations who have historically been marginalised and whose cultural and linguistic traditions have been undervalued and repressed; and 3) the distinctive Arctic environment –

or what could be termed 'nature' – characterised by coldness, seasonal extremes of daylight and, importantly, rapid changes due to climate change.

I will focus on the last point – Arctic nature – and the human relation to this environment, which is rapidly changing, to deepen the sketching of an Arctic Pedagogy. In focusing on Arctic nature, I inevitably decentre the other two features: the Arctic's rurality and Indigenous Peoples. This is regrettable, but inevitable selection has to occur in a small piece of writing such as this. The focus on Arctic nature is due to several reasons, not least because of the immediacy of the climate crisis, in which the rate of warming in the Arctic is up to three times faster than the global average (Trenbreth et al., 2007). Moreover, these effects are felt not just in the Arctic itself but worldwide, and are therefore of broader interest beyond the Arctic. As permafrost in the Arctic rapidly warms and thaws, its nearly 1,700 billion metric tonnes of carbon are released at an accelerating rate (Miner et al., 2022). Thawing permafrost changes the appearance of the local environment, with birch forest being replaced by fens and bogs (Jorgenson et al., 2001). However, the effects of this melting permafrost are of course felt everywhere, most profoundly by "communities who have historically contributed the least to current climate change [and] are disproportionately affected with devastating effects" (IPCC, 2023, p.5).

Moreover, the point about the relation to nature in the Arctic is important when considering the relational nature of education, as will be expanded on later in the paper. To illuminate this connection, I turn the focus to pedagogy in the next section.

### **What is pedagogy? According to whom?**

Pedagogy is also a contested term and, importantly, how it is defined depends on what tradition it is being constructed in. To orient readers in these different understandings, Biesta (2011) provides a comparative reconstruction of the field of education studies/ pedagogy using what he terms the 'Anglo-American' and the 'Continental' traditions. Biesta (2011) argues that such a comparison of these different traditions raises important questions about the study of education and pedagogy that are still pertinent for educationalists today.

The Anglo-American tradition of education studies is characterised by three main features: 1) its interdisciplinarity; 2) its context in the professional preparation of teachers; and 3) until the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, its neglect of theory in favour of more practical approaches to teaching. First, it is interdisciplinary in that it is understood in terms of the four 'contributing' or 'fundamental' disciplines: psychology, sociology, history and philosophy, of which psychology has had the strongest influence. In other words, education studies is an amalgamation of these four disciplines, as opposed to being seen as an independent discipline in its own right. This means that educational claims are based not on pedagogical criteria, but instead on psychological or philosophical criteria, for example. As Hirst (1966), cited in Biesta (2011) puts it: "the validity of the principles for educational action 'turns on nothing "educational" beyond these [reasons]'" (p.182). For Hirst, pedagogy cannot generate a unique insight into education over and above those provided by the contributing disciplines. According to this argument, since education lacks theoretical structure of its own, it cannot be conceived of as an autonomous discipline. If education studies is thought of in this way, it means that there can be no

distinctly educational or pedagogical way of thinking. One can have psychological or philosophical thoughts about education, but not educational thoughts about education. The second and third points are interrelated: pedagogy is understood in the realm of teacher preparation and has historically neglected theoretical perspectives. As such, this narrowing of pedagogy to ‘how to teach’ has meant that, for many in the Anglo-American tradition, pedagogy has come to be viewed as “methods and practices of teaching” (Adams, 2022, p.114). A problem with this reduction of pedagogy to such a pragmatic definition with an emphasis on method is that it assumes a prior conception of education, i.e., we all know what education is; we just need to focus on *how* to do it *better*.

In comparison, Biesta (2011) outlines the Continental tradition of pedagogy, first addressing the challenge of language/ translation, noting that “to assume that within the Continental construction there is such a thing as ‘the field of educational studies’ is in a sense already a misrepresentation” (p.183). To use an example from German: both *Erziehung* and *Bildung* can be translated as ‘education’, and both *Pädagogik* and *Didaktik* are used to refer to the study of *Erziehung* and *Bildung*. Drawing on the German traditions of *Erziehung* and *Pädagogik*, Biesta (2011) notes how Continental Pedagogy: 1) conceives of education studies as a discipline with its own structure and set of theories, as opposed to being constituted by other disciplines such as psychology; 2) is not explicitly or exclusively connected to questions of teaching and school education but has a much wider remit which focuses first and foremost on questions of *Menschwerdung* – the process of human becoming; and 3) as in the Anglo-American construct, sees pedagogy as fundamentally connected to practice, but with an emphasis on the *aims* of education and justification of those aims instead of the Anglo-American focus on *method*.

This paper will expand on the Continental construction of pedagogy to deepen the discussion of an Arctic Pedagogy. The reasons for this selection over an Anglo-American construction are worth justifying. First, Continental Pedagogy has its own disciplinary structure, which allows one to identify instances of education. In contrast, the Anglo-American construction presupposes a shared understanding of education – ideas of which in reality may well differ – and then proceeds to focus on method. Second, this focus on method assumes pre-defined aims or at least glosses over discussion of what these aims could or should be. Accordingly, Anglo-American Pedagogy is reduced to how to most effectively realise these aims (often termed ‘learning objectives’), guided by ‘best practice’ and ‘what works’. Third, acknowledging the relational structure of education as posited by Continental Pedagogy gives scope to deepen reflections on each aspect of education such as the educator, student, or content, in a way that the Anglo-American construction avoids, given that there is no systematic definition of education to start with. Since my intention here is to provide an educationalist perspective to the consideration of Arctic Pedagogy, the subsequent discussion will be situated in the Continental tradition. Next, to deepen this discussion of pedagogy, I will elaborate on one particular construction of Continental Pedagogy, as offered by Friedrich Schleiermacher.

### **Schleiermacher’s Continental Pedagogy**

Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher (1768 – 1834), along with Johann Friedrich Herbart is seen as one of the founders of pedagogy as a field of academic study within the Continental tradition (Friesen

and Kenklies, 2022). I focus on Schleiermacher not only because of this pivotal role in shaping the discipline of pedagogy but also because of the relative novelty of Anglophone research on his pedagogical thinking – he is better known for his contributions to theology, hermeneutics, and the formation of the first modern German university in Berlin (Friesen and Kenklies, 2023). Schleiermacher's contributions to pedagogy are all but unknown in the Anglophone world because, until recently, there has been a lack of available translations (Friesen and Kenklies, 2023). But with Friesen and Kenklies' (2023) first English translation of his 1826 lectures on education, Schleiermacher looks set to also be recognised for his contributions to pedagogy.

Schleiermacher's lectures on pedagogy, published under the title *Outlines of the Art of Education*, should be seen as “epochal [...] of fundamental importance for pedagogy, both from a disciplinary and professional point of view” (Winkler, 2023, p 89). Moreover, far from being just of historical interest, the lectures can be seen as a *way of thinking* about pedagogy that holds validity today, since the questions Schleiermacher poses still offer insight relevant for educationalists (Winkler, 2023). The answers to those questions may have changed – and, indeed, will always be subject to change and debate – but the questions are still valid. As Winkler (2023) puts it:

“Schleiermacher *does not* provide pedagogy with a system in the *long term* by giving it a *permanent discursive form*, but provides a permanent *stimulus to thinking*, with neither completion nor conclusion, but nevertheless with a particular *certainty in reflection*.” [emphasis in original] (p.92).

The ‘stimulus to thinking’ suggested by Schleiermacher constructs pedagogy as its own discipline that therefore provides its own way of thinking distinct from other disciplinary lenses, e.g., psychological or philosophical. Schleiermacher follows Herbart (1802/ 2022) in this regard to construct pedagogy as the disciplinary lens for educational practice (noting the different emphasis in Herbart, who conceived of pedagogical techniques determined by psychology, whereas for Schleiermacher pedagogy should be seen as an interdependent discipline, coordinated alongside psychology and other disciplines, but not derived from them). For Schleiermacher, pedagogy has a formal scientific structure which, as a way of thinking provides form to the art of educational practice. ‘Science’ is used here as a translation of the German *Wissenschaft*, which Friesen and Kenklies (2023, p.23) note does not have the same connotation of ‘natural sciences’, which the term has in English, but instead designates any rigorous academic pursuit. Herbart's (1802/ 2022) distinction between *science* and *art* is helpful here: *science* is “an orderly combination of propositions, logically constituting a whole”; whereas *art* is “the sum of skills and abilities which are combined to arrive at a given purpose” (p.30). *Science* thus requires philosophical thinking to determine propositions on their logical grounds, whereas *art* concerns action in keeping with those scientific propositions. The *science* of pedagogy is the disciplinary lens comprised of a complete set of propositions, whereas the *art* of education is the practical manifestation of that lens in a particular moment. So, to prepare for the *art* of education, one should first understand the *science* of pedagogy. The benefit of conceiving of pedagogy in this way – as a scientific discipline in its own right and as the theoretical lens for educational practice – is that it allows educators to act with a reflective awareness, meaning that they consider the full complexity of the task at hand, and not just immediate consideration in the moment. Schleiermacher notes the important role of pedagogical theory



“to gauge rules for practice” (p.29). In other words, pedagogy makes educational practice more conscious.

For Schleiermacher, the pedagogical realm is marked by the responsibility of the older generation for the younger and the intention to improve them. By constructing pedagogy in such manner – as a discipline framed in terms of intergenerational influence – pedagogy is not the exclusive concern of teaching in formal settings such as schools but has a much wider remit that starts with parents (p.21) and extends beyond both family and school. Therefore, a key question any theory of pedagogy needs to ask is: “What does the older generation actually want with the younger?” (p.24). The relations between the older and the younger (or one could broaden this to any educator – student relation) form the basis of Schleiermacher’s construction of pedagogy.

Schleiermacher then turns to address the aims, possibilities and limits of pedagogical theory and educational practice when he poses the questions: “What *should* be accomplished through education? What *can* be accomplished through it?” [emphasis added] (p.29). The first question is a question of the aim(s) of education, which I will return to shortly, whereas the second question acknowledges the limits of education. Schleiermacher does not answer whether he sees education as omnipotent or weak, but instead acknowledges that education has both a *counteracting* and *supporting* role: to *counteract* what is bad and *support* what is good. The discussion of education’s relative omnipotence/ weakness needs to be situated in terms of the uniqueness of every person: “every person is characterised by a different interrelationship of their attributes. Pedagogy is consequently restricted by this interrelationship [of attributes]” (p.36). Thus, because pedagogy is concerned with educational practice that involves individuals, who are all different, it can never provide full insight into the uniqueness of the particular case of education. This puts an important limit on the role of theory: *theory* cannot stipulate a specific course of action to follow in *practice*; pedagogical *theory* cannot tell the educator exactly what to do in their *practice* of education.

Returning to the first question – “What should be accomplished through education?” – readers will know that there is no shortage of suggested answers to this question of the aims of education. Schleiermacher enters the discussion from an angle contemporary commentators might do well to heed. Instead of posing an assured answer to this question of aims of education such as ‘development of knowledge and skills’ or ‘optimised learning’, Schleiermacher suggests the basis for which an answer to the question of aims can be found. For Schleiermacher, this basis for pedagogy must be ethics. If it were instead founded on empiricism, pedagogy would be constantly changing. If that were the case, then nothing in pedagogical theory would have any scientific validity (since it would be out of date as soon as it were established as theory). Thus, “even though many ingenious and perceptive [empirical] observations can be made [...] pedagogy must be founded on a speculative basis because the question of how people should be educated cannot be answered but through reference to the idea of the Good” (p.38) – which is determined at the societal level. In other words, the foundations of pedagogical theory should be derived from ethics and rely on a notion of ‘the idea of the Good’, thereby emphasising “the relation between the life of the individual and the community” (p.40).

This notion of 'the Good' asserts the ethical importance of educational acts. Schleiermacher makes this point when he notes that "every pedagogical influence presents itself as the sacrifice of a present moment for a future one; and it raises the question whether we are justified in making this sacrifice" (p.66). An important question follows: "Is one permitted to sacrifice one moment of life as a mere means to the end of another moment of life?" (p.66). At this point, it is important to address the term 'sacrifice', since I do not wish to advocate an instrumental understanding of pedagogy which is *solely* future-oriented, i.e., education that follows the logic of 'in order to' achieve something else. Compelling arguments are made by Biesta (2022) and Korsgaard (2024) for an education for the present (education as an end in and of itself) and not *just* for the future. Nevertheless, Schleiermacher's questioning is helpful in underscoring the ethical importance of the educator's activities. In any pedagogical situation, the certain present is, *to an extent*, sacrificed for an uncertain future. In the moment where the educator attempts to educate the student, the student suspends other actions to enter the pedagogical relation. But pedagogical relations are characterised by uncertainty, as there is always the possibility that the intended change that the educator wishes to bring about in the student is not realised. That does not leave us with a notion of education as *solely* oriented to the future, but instead acknowledges that there is inevitably a *degree* of future-orientation to educational acts, and this orientation asserts the ethical importance of educational acts.

This little exposition of Schleiermacher's Continental Pedagogy is of course too brief to do justice to such a foundational text in education studies, but it will suffice to build the subsequent argument. In summary, Schleiermacher's pedagogy: 1) opposes dogmatic methods of teaching and prefers to set in motion thinking itself, with pedagogy seen as a discipline in own right, complete with its own set of theories and disciplinary lens; 2) constructs education as a relational practice involving the intentional influence of the older generation on the younger; 3) should be structured by theoretical principles, but remains open to the uncertainty of educational practice; and 4) poses important ethical questions related to the relational structure of education that are still relevant for educationalists today. These questions are normative in that they ask for the development of ideas about *right* ways to think pedagogically and act in particular educational situations. Examples of these questions include: *What does the older generation want with the younger? What should be accomplished through education? Is one allowed to sacrifice one moment for another?* In the next section, I will take up these questions as the basis for mapping the contours of an 'Arctic Pedagogy'.

## **Towards an Arctic Pedagogy**

In advancing the discussion towards an 'Arctic Pedagogy', let us briefly reflect on UArctic's definition, that "Arctic pedagogy is a comprehensive *method of teaching and learning*" [emphasis added] (p.5). How does this sit alongside Schleiermacher's Continental Pedagogy, which constructs pedagogy as a mode of reflection that is not solely concerned with teaching or methods thereof but instead has a remit of *Menschwerdung* – the process of human becoming? In short, it seems incongruous, if not antithetical. So, what should instead be the questions that an Arctic Pedagogy needs to respond to, i.e., what are the distinctive features of the Arctic that in some way(s) affect the responses to questions raised by pedagogy?

It is first important to preface the discussion with a note on the challenge of using 'Arctic Pedagogy' as a compound noun. On the one hand, to adopt and advance the notion of an 'Arctic Pedagogy' – as with any prefixed form of pedagogy, e.g., 'Critical Pedagogy', 'Queer Pedagogy', etc. – is, in a sense, oxymoronic. If pedagogy is conceived of as a discipline, as a mode of thinking and reflecting about education, why would this structure change according to the context it is being used in? After all, the questions that pedagogy poses remain the same, even though the answers to those questions might change. On the other hand, Biesta (2011) notes that pedagogy *has been* conceived of differently, and therefore reflects that it *can be* constructed differently going forward. In other words, if we acknowledge that pedagogy is in fact constructed and that this construct is context- dependent, then it is always subject to change. But if we take this argument too far, we are left with such a fleeting conception of pedagogy, continually changing, that there would be a lack of shared understanding of what the term means, and any proposed construction would be out-of-date as soon as it were accepted. I situate the following discussion of an Arctic Pedagogy between these two extremes – at one end, pedagogy as immutable, unchanging, and universally agreed upon since the time of Schleiermacher; at the other end, pedagogy as changing in the blow of the wind, constructed differently depending on each individual moment and place. Therefore, the 'Arctic Pedagogy' proposed here does not suggest a fundamental rewiring of pedagogy, but a 'retuning': I propose that certain aspects of pedagogy and the direction of answers to fundamental pedagogical questions, come to the fore more than others when understood in the context of the Arctic, rather than a complete structural overhaul. To guide the discussion, I take up the questions posed at the end of the section on Schleiermacher's pedagogy and relate them to the suggested understanding of the Arctic.

### **What does the older generation want with the younger?**

This question highlights the relational nature of education (between generations in Schleiermacher but, more broadly, between educators and students) and is an important pedagogical question when posed in the context of the Arctic. For Schleiermacher, how educators influence students shapes "the essence of the idea of community – or to take it to a higher level, the idea of a world" (p.25). Pedagogy – as the scientific lens for the art of education – therefore concerns the relation of the educator to the world and importantly, their relation to the student's relation to the world. Education has a dual task in this regard: of both *conserving* and *improving* the world (p.49). Let us first consider the role of education in *conservation*. In an Arctic Pedagogy, distinctive Arctic nature comes to the fore as a part of the world that education is oriented toward conserving. In the Arctic, one is forced to relate to nature, be that through clearing snow in winter, living through accelerated changes in daylight that mean one does not see the sun set for two months of the year in summer, nor see it rise for two months in winter, or more pertinently, in the present times of the climate crisis leading to rapid and pronounced changes in the Arctic environment (Trenberth et al., 2007). Arctic Pedagogy thus sees the educator's responsibility toward nature as critical, since nature is a part of the world to which education is trying to conserve. This responsibility can be seen through the theoretical lens of pedagogy, but is ultimately enacted in individual instances of education, which manifest as educators' influence on students' relation to the world.

### **What should be accomplished through education?**

Schleiermacher's next stimulus to pedagogical thinking instigates reflection on education's orientation towards the future, also asking a central question for Arctic Pedagogy to consider. This question of *aims* of education should be caveated by the question that follows it immediately: "What *can* be accomplished through it?" (p.29). Just by asking this question about limits of education, we are implored to have more modest hopes for what education can achieve. And when we consider the aims of education, it helps to return to the dual role education plays: education is not just about *conservation* but also *improvement*. This means that Arctic Pedagogy needs to engage with questions of the future, specifically, to be able to "envisage something that is better but not yet achieved" (p.80). That means educators need to imagine possibilities for a better future. In the Arctic, 'the future' is often at the centre of discussions about the region's distinctive environment, and one whose future impacts the rest of the world, such as through the speed of melting permafrost, or through oil extraction in newly passable waters. For Schleiermacher, it is important that the future envisioned by educators should align with 'the Good'. Schleiermacher does not define what 'the Good' actually is and it is not my objective here is not to lay out precisely what 'the Good' is to which education should be directed toward, rather to highlight that the question is one that comes particularly to the fore in Arctic Pedagogy. Furthermore, for Schleiermacher, *conservation* and *improvement* should be "in the greatest possible harmony – so that youth can enter into what already exists, and also energetically engage with those improvements that present themselves" (pp.49 – 50). Arctic Pedagogy thus emphasises the need for educators to not only conserve the world that exists, but also envision a better future for the world that will be.

### **Is one allowed to sacrifice one moment for another?**

Last, Arctic Pedagogy has to respond to the key ethical question posed by Schleiermacher concerning the sacrificing of the present for the future and whether such a sacrifice is justifiable. As before, first identifying the relational nature of education is necessary to be able to consider this question. And so, by acknowledging that educational influence entails some sacrificing of the present for the future, we are then faced by the ethical question as to what extent this sacrifice is justifiable. This ethical obligation is particularly pressing in education, as Lewin (2023) notes, it is not just that we are sacrificing our own present, but education imposes from the educator a sacrifice to the student's present. In the Arctic, the future is more uncertain than ever in the current ecological crisis, not to mention geopolitical challenges, placing an even greater emphasis on consideration of this question for an Arctic Pedagogy. And whilst an Arctic Pedagogy can and must guide educators through ethical considerations, ultimately, in line with Schleiermacher, it will be through educational practice that this question is answered. How the future to which students' present is sacrificed through education must therefore be a guiding question for an Arctic Pedagogy to respond to.

### **Conclusion**

In this article I have mapped the contours of what Arctic Pedagogy could mean going forward by raising some important questions it needs to respond to, and indicating a direction these answers might tend toward based on distinctive features of the Arctic. To do this, I first noted the Arctic's distinctive environment/ nature as a key feature. I then situated my discussion of pedagogy within Continental

Pedagogy, in contrast to the Anglo-American tradition. To deepen the discussion of pedagogy, I focused on one conception offered by Friedrich Schleiermacher. Last, I brought Schleiermacher's pedagogy together with the Arctic to move towards an Arctic Pedagogy. Here, I suggested that key questions for Arctic Pedagogy to respond to are: *What does the older generation want with the younger?*; *What should be accomplished through education?*; and *Is one allowed to sacrifice one moment for another?* Furthermore, I proposed a direction to the answers Arctic Pedagogy can provide to these questions by drawing on the distinctive Arctic nature. Arctic Pedagogy sees the educator's responsibility toward nature as critical, since nature is a part of the world to which education is trying to conserve; Arctic Pedagogy emphasises the need for educators to not only conserve the world that exists, but also envision a better future for the world that will be; and Arctic Pedagogy should consider the ethical question of whether or to what extent the future to which students' present is sacrificed through education can be justified.

### **Acknowledgements**

I am grateful to UiT's Philosophy of Education research group for their feedback and suggestions on this article, as well as to both peer reviewers at EitN for their constructive comments.

## References

- ADAMS, P., (2022). Scotland and pedagogy: Moving from the anglophone towards the continental? *Nordic Studies in Education*, 42(1), pp.105–121. <https://doi.org/10.23865/nse.v42.3770>.
- ADAMS, P., (2023). Scottish education: Between the UK and the Nordic. *Nordic Studies in Education*, 43(1), pp.43–59.
- AHDR, (2004). *Arctic Human Development Report*. Stefansson Arctic Institut.
- ARCTIC CENTRE, (n.d.). *The Arctic Region*. Available at:<https://www.arcticcentre.org/EN/arcticregion>
- BARENTSWATCH, (2015). *What is the Arctic?* Available at:  
<https://www.barentswatch.no/en/articles/Hva-er-Arktis/>
- BIESTA, G., (2011). Disciplines and theory in the academic study of education: A comparative analysis of the Anglo-American and Continental construction of the field, *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 19(2), pp.175–192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2011.582255>
- BIESTA, G., (2022). *World-centred education: A view for the present*. New York: Routledge.
- FRIESEN, N., and KENKLIES, K., (2022). Continental pedagogy & curriculum. In: R. TIERNEY, F. RISVI, and K. ERCIKAN, eds., *International Encyclopedia of Education* (4th ed.) Elsevier. pp.245–255.
- FRIESEN, N., and KENKLIES, K., (2023). Introduction. In: N. FRIESEN and K. KENKLIES, eds., F.D.E. *Schleiermacher's Outlines of the Art of Education: A Translation & Discussion*. Peter Lang. pp.1–20.
- HERBART, J.F., (2022). Introductory lecture to students in pedagogy. In: N. FRIESEN, ed., *Tact & the Pedagogical Relation: An Introduction*. Peter Lang. (Original published 1802).
- HIRST, P.H., (1966). Educational theory. In: J.W. TIBBLE, ed., *The study of education*. Routledge and Kegan Paul. pp.29–58.
- IPCC, (2023). Summary for Policymakers. In: CORE WRITING TEAM, H. LEE and J. ROMERO, eds., *Climate Change 2023: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. IPCC. pp.1-34.  
<https://doi.org/10.59327/IPCC/AR6-9789291691647.001>
- JORGENSON, M.T., RACINE, C.H., WALTERS, J.C. and OSTERKAMP, T.E., (2001) Permafrost degradation and ecological changes associated with a warming climate in central, *AlaskaClim. Change*, 48, pp.551–79.
- KESKITALO, P., MÄÄTTÄ, K., and UUSIAUTTI, S., (2013). *Sámi education*. Peter Lang.

KORSGAARD, M.T., (2024). *Retuning education: Bildung and exemplarity beyond the logic of progress*. [Manuscript submitted for publication]. Department of Childhood, Education and Society, Malmö University.

LEWIN, D., (2023). The educational awareness of the future. In: N. FRIESEN and K. KENKLIES, eds., *F.D.E. Schleiermacher's Outlines of the Art of Education: A Translation & Discussion*. Peter Lang. pp.119–137

LIDELL, H.G., and SCOTT, R., (1940). A Greek-English Lexicon, ἀρκτικός. Available at: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0057%3Aentry%3D%2315193&redirect=true>

MÄÄTTÄ, K., and UUSIAUTTI, S., (2015). The basics of arctic pedagogy. *Global Journal of Human-Social Science: G Linguistics & Education*, 15(4), pp.28–34.

MÄÄTTÄ, K., and UUSIAUTTI, S., (2019). Arctic education in the future. *Human migration in the Arctic: the past, present, and future*, pp.213–238.

MINER, K.R., TURETSKY, M.R., MALINA, E., BARTSCH, A., TAMMINEN, J., MCGUIRE, A.D., ... and MILLER, C.E., (2022). Permafrost carbon emissions in a changing Arctic. *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment*, 3(1), pp.55–67.

SCHLEIERMACHER, F., (2023). *F.D.E. Schleiermacher's Outlines of the Art of Education: A Translation & Discussion*. Peter Lang. (Original published 1826).

SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT, (2019). *Arctic Connections: Scotland's Arctic policy framework*. Available at <https://www.gov.scot/publications/arctic-connections-scotlands-arctic-policy-framework/documents/>

STONEHOUSE, B., (1989). *Polar ecology*. Blackie.

TRENBERTH, K.E., JONES, P.D., et al., (2007) Observations: Surface and atmospheric climate change. In: S. SOLOMON et al., eds., *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press.

UARCTIC, (2017). *Position statement on Arctic Pedagogy*. Available at: [https://68d6b65eac.clvaw-cdnwnd.com/0864e685b4bb69d24559774bdc786a0e/200000187-681e8681ea/statement\\_A4\\_web.pdf?ph=68d6b65eac](https://68d6b65eac.clvaw-cdnwnd.com/0864e685b4bb69d24559774bdc786a0e/200000187-681e8681ea/statement_A4_web.pdf?ph=68d6b65eac)

UARCTIC, (2022). *Successful funding decision for a new project called “New Northern Pedagogies: Conversations across the Arctic”*. Available at: <https://www.uarctic.org/news/2022/11/successful-funding-decision-for-a-new-project-called-new-northern-pedagogies-conversations-across-the-arctic/>

WINKLER, M., (2023). Schleiermacher's pedagogy: A thematic commentary. In: N. FRIESEN and K. KENKLIES, eds., *F.D.E. Schleiermacher's Outlines of the Art of Education: A Translation & Discussion*. Peter Lang. pp.89–117.