



Ecopedagogy and radical pedagogy: Post-critical transgressions in environmental and geography education

Phillip G. Payne

To cite this article: Phillip G. Payne (2017) Ecopedagogy and radical pedagogy: Post-critical transgressions in environmental and geography education, The Journal of Environmental Education, 48:2, 130-138, DOI: [10.1080/00958964.2016.1237462](https://doi.org/10.1080/00958964.2016.1237462)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00958964.2016.1237462>



Published online: 13 Feb 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 123



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

BOOK REVIEW ESSAY

Ecopedagogy and radical pedagogy: Post-critical transgressions in environmental and geography education

Phillip G. Payne

Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

ABSTRACT

This critical essay/review of *The Radicalization of Pedagogy: Anarchism, Geography, and the Spirit of Revolt*, edited by Simon Springer, Marcelo Lopes de Souza, and Richard J. White, is a genealogically oriented “conversation” of the discourse of critical environmental education, in particular critical pedagogy and ecopedagogy, and anarchic geography education, in particular deschooling. The purpose is to restore a critical materialist and symbolic frame of “post-critical” inquiry and praxis in EE and EER (environmental education research).

KEYWORDS

ecopedagogy; radical pedagogy; deschooling; postcritical; critical materialism

The Radicalization of Pedagogy: Anarchism, Geography, and the Spirit of Revolt, edited by Simon Springer, Marcelo Lopes de Souza, and Richard J. White. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016, 290 pp., \$41.95 (soft cover), ISBN: 978-1-78348-670-0.

Geographers made a significant contribution to the cross/multidisciplinary formalization of environmental education (EE) following the 1970s series of IUCN forums and UNESCO Conferences (Palmer, 1998), as did the innovative emergence of the closely allied field of interdisciplinary environmental studies (Tanner, 1974). In particular, Huckle (1983) and Fien (1993a, 1993b) were key geographical education (GE) theorists of what became known in the early 1990s as the “socially critical” perspective of EE and, later, education for sustainability (EfS). For the purpose of this *critical* review essay of Simon Springer, Marcelo Lopes de Souza, and Richard White’s (2016) co-edited trilogy of books about *Anarchism, Geography, and the Spirit of Revolt*, I focus on the first in that series: *The Radicalization of Pedagogy*. Fien’s (1993a) elaboration of a “critical pedagogy” of EE assertively drew attention to the (hidden) “politics” of education, and the underlying assumptions and ideological interests of knowledge production that, through curriculum policies and their developments, and associated determinations of pedagogical practices, “reproduced” various environmental problems and associated social issues. If social and ecological injustices were being reconstituted, critical pedagogy in/of/for EE aimed to “contest” the overt and covert mechanisms of cultural-political institutions like Education. Springer et al.’s text shifts Fien’s priority but supports the need for contestation. Their radicalization of pedagogy focuses mainly on the geographies of knowledge production associated with “deschooling” those formal institutions of education and their organization. Deschooling provides the key “anarchic” means of their alternative human and social geography for “transgressive” knowledge productions.

Within Springer et al.’s deschooled geography, however, there is limited mention of the environmental antecedents and ecological consequences of how schooling reconstitutes the broader geographical issues that might be of concern to GE, as well as EE. Fien’s (1993a, b) and Huckle’s (1983) versions of the socially critical drew on a range of intellectual resources of that transitional “time” and “space”

of the 1980s/1990s that “positioned” their theorizations of EE (and by implication EER). This included the nascent critical theory of education, inspired then by the “modern” critical theory of the Frankfurt School (through Habermas, Marcuse, Gramsci, and others such as Bernstein, Kemmis, Giroux) and green political/environmental movements theory (O’Riordan, Pepper, and others). Since Fien (1993a, b; and, indeed, before), there are numerous examples in EE and EER of the intellectual resources, both conceptual and empirically based, that elaborate critical (eco)/pedagogies, participatory action research methods, and, not coincidentally, “contradictions” in the purposes and practices of schooling and environmental education (Stevenson, 1987/2007) in the always evolving literature, discourse, and official narrative of the field (for example, Robottom, 1987) and its research (EER) (for example, Robottom & Hart, 1993).

For the specific theory-building purposes pursued here in dialogically engaging the political histories of EE and GE (and my “up front” positioning supported by referencing empirically qualified theorizations and praxis), Springer et al.’s foray into anarchic pedagogy is particularly relevant to the persistent need in EER to reconstruct a critical (rather than linear) genealogy of EE. Hence, this “conversation” of EE, GE, and EER. Narrative “weavings” of overlapping histories and disparate “assemblages” of discourses are needed to ferment a persuasive story (or compelling account) of the ebbs and flows, and currents and their morphologies of EE. Such weavings help legitimize its textualized representations in various public forums (and personal inquiry/research) concerned about the future of “sustainability” in academic settings, schooling, NGOs, social policy, United Nations initiatives, and so on (Payne, 2016). Histories and memories are, therefore, essential aspects of that task, including how EE and GE can share their memorializations of important and significant conceptualizations and constructions. “Anarchy” and “deschooling” and their “geographies” are, potentially, vital ingredients. The discourse of EE, and EER, has historically privileged critical, interdisciplinary, democratic, and existential expectations for education by “ecologizing” and “excavating” the different “territories” and “contours” of the “environment” and “nature” “mapped” into the social sciences, humanities, sciences, and arts. For example, in pre-service teacher education, a key intergenerational medium and mode of socio-cultural reproduction, with all its institutionally driven pedagogical constraints and methodological preferences, there is “movement.” The once static boundaries of a still dominant science education in EE “learning” are slowly shifting to “post-positivist” (constrained) constructivist epistemologies in both learning/teaching theory (and pedagogical practices— more on this later) and associated qualitative or “mixed methods” perspectives of interpretive research. Elsewhere, in the “new” (more later) environmental humanities and eco arts, we witness the rise and affects/effects in EE and EER of environmental criticism developed in literary/cultural studies, and eco/art/ographies morphing in the visual and performing arts. Environmental ethics and the philosophy of nature, including the culture-nature “relation,” remain “dormant” in EE but are now influencing EER.

At the same time as these traditional/disciplinary/intellectual borders, or silos, and their traditional pedagogical and methodological preferences are being crossed, various “insiders” in EE have lamented how the ongoing quest for various “real” justices (social and environmental) have “delivered,” or not (in educative praxis), the historical rationale of/for EE through its (eco)pedagogical practices, policy formulations, and methodological experimentations (or lack of). We ask if these “foundational” ideals and aims of EE have “tired,” been silenced, stagnated, or been obscured by the popularization of the concepts and practices of “sustainability” and various educations for its “development” (for example, Payne, 2016). Importantly, Springer et al.’s text expresses a similar nostalgia, or critique of the loss of memory. Their text is a strongly expressed rationale for a radical and critical reawakening, rememorying, and revitalization of GE. Time and the temporalities of discourse, over changing intellectual spaces, in different geographical-cultural locations of knowledge, are central to the genealogical method underpinning this critical review.

Over a decade ago, I expressed specific concern in this journal about the demise of curriculum theory (Payne, 2006). So, when Springer et al.’s book appeared, my curiosity was piqued about its claims on a radical anarchic criticality and how those claims might be “represented” in a conventional “text.” My curiosity honed in on the questions of how, when and where, and why the discourse of EE moves in particular ways, at particular times, and their “places,” and in what academic disciplines, intellectual

spacings, and critical openings? “After” (sic) Fien (1993a, b) and Huckle (1983), what happened to GE in terms of its potential to shape EE? How does Springer et al.’s text help the concepts, causes, and praxis of criticality, or not? Texts, however, cannot be read in isolation. More generally, (scholarly) shifts in “thinking” (and problem setting/solving) are an anticipated and/or expected consequence of everyday, existentially lived practical problems, such as the realities of anthropogenic global heating or/and toxications of water/land, and/or . . . (the list goes on). Climate destabilization/disruption, now conversationally “casualized” by the public as “change,” and sometimes denied, has attracted widespread “global” attention, including in EE, but increasingly to the “local” exclusion of myriad environmental problems and associated social, educational, and political issues. These inter/cross-generational issues (Payne, 2010) routinely influence, for example, children’s lives and, if so, the geographically-demographically “schooling” need for “field/experiential” excursions and eco/pedagogical investigations into the “immediacy” (proximal-temporal) sources of environmental “events” and social issues they witness, like fish dying in the bay in which they play, swim, and boat (Payne, 2015). Even when geosocial notions of “sustainability” and “place” are borrowed from other discourses, and popularized in education, those promising alternatives are too often uncritically rehearsed in theory and discourse, and simplified/reduced in practice, and, inevitably, hollowed/emptied out of personal meaning, social relevance, and environmental/ecological value. For example, in various accounts of place pedagogy in education, there is a persistent silence about the various *displacements* of place such as “non place” (Auge, 1995) and “unplace” (Trigg, 2012), notwithstanding that such “splaces” have dark underbellies that pedagogically are also ignored (for example, Nakagawa & Payne, 2017, in press).

And so it also goes with the concepts and practices of “critical” (for example, Johnson, 2013; Noys, 2014). “Materially” in partial response to the geologically epochal post-Holocene rise of the Anthropocene, “new” critical theory such as “speculative realisms,” “new materialisms,” “post” or ecophenomenology, and, for the purposes here of reviewing GE, geophilosophy (Woodard, 2013) have emerged over the past decade in the wake of the many devastating consequences and implications of the Anthropocene. Or, critical (in these various “news”) is understood intellectually as a reflexive critique of earlier theory, such as the excesses and/or idealisms of poststructuralism’s deconstructive method whose inscribing textualisms are now viewed ontologically as materially, politically, practically, and agentially wanting (for example, Archer, 2000; Grosz, 2004). EE and EER have not been immune to those two contrasting “shapings” and “forces” on the “critical” in its pedagogies and methodologies while, interestingly, this review finds Springer et al.’s text rarely cites the “usual suspects” of reflexivities often employed in (critical-Anglo) education discourse, such as Deleuze and Guattari, Derrida, Haraway, and, lately, Barad. We might therefore wonder about how, and in what ways the *politics of ontology-epistemology (and methodology)* are pre-arranged, assembled, privileged, or gain authority as representations in certain texts, theorizations, foci, and discourses, whereas others are marginalized and delegitimized through the operations and “materializations” of published knowledge (journals, edited volumes, conference presentations, PhD supervisions, etc.). “New” theory, of course, also undergoes a further round of reflexive critique (for example, Johnson, 2013; Wolfendale, 2014) but, it must be said, critical “justices” in these texts are often elusive or evasive. Nevertheless, discursive, disciplined, and institutionalized power is created and “controlled” through the varying processes and products of knowledge production (and their geo-epistemologies, or locations of knowledge, Canaparo, 2009). These concerns about the status and representation of “critical” are vexing; searching questions must be posed (and answered?) about what we think and practice “historically in the present” in positioning and (re)framing “for the imagined future” (or not) about the discourse “exchange” and “relations” in EE, EER, and/with/against GE, and others “outside.”

Some “critical” attention warrants elaboration. As indicated, there is barely a mention of any of this “new” theory (or its key protagonists), and reflexivities about it, in Springer et al.’s text. This is significant for a text in geography (and pedagogical contribution to knowledge) because much of this new “movement of thought” and its “turns” in theorizations is deconstructively anarchical in that it promotes ontologically different/other versions and epistemologically (and methodologically) derived “othered” representations of non-anthropocentrism, non-human, affect including the spatialities and geographies of “feeling” (Thrift, 2008), and associated agential relations of a bodied/material/real type.

Springer et al.'s anarchical pedagogy touches lightly on the non-anthropocentric but where it does there is value and potential for transferability to EE and EER.

Conversely, in EER, “post-critical inquiry” (Hart, 2005) anticipates many of these new “moves” in thought about the (eco)politics (and aesthetics, ethics) of the triad of ontology-epistemology-methodology and “turns” in theory (relevant to critical praxis, pedagogy, policy, research). However, after a decade, this post-critical version of inquiry and praxis in EE pedagogical and curriculum development, and EER methodological deliberation, has gained little traction in the broader discourse/narrative of the field. There has been no “revolution” or “anarchy” in EE and EER despite its/their historical claim of generating an alternative in education, when needed, as is now the case with the deafening mantra of the Anthropocene, at least. Again, the “new” struggles, while only certain aspects of the “past” are selectively remembered in a “history of a field,” while others are discarded (see Habermas’s (1992) delineation of various conservatism—old, new, young). Not coincidentally, a key purpose of Springer et al.’s text is to “reclaim” a critical orientation, disposition, commitment, and associated reflexivities in GE, a largely epistemological/pedagogical sentiment also stressed as one part of post-critical EER, a point I make in concluding this review.

Springer et al.’s contribution to a critical “restorying” of GE proceeds via 11 chapters. The 14 authors represent an eclectic geographical perspective (human, social, and cultural, not physical) grounded conceptually and theoretically in the anarchic deschooling logics of Freire and Illich. Such an eclectically driven, but focused representation of anarchic GE helps us see again (but with a different language/grammar) the shifting discursive understandings and purposes in EE and EER—comparatively and, potentially for environmental educators and researchers, ecologically *and* geographically, or holistically/socioecologically. To inject a dose of the critically material, lurking beneath the various “knowledge” bases contributing to EE and GE, despite their eclecticism, is the common globalizing denominator of the postmodern context of knowledge production and intellectual exchange that visibly (and invisibly by neoliberal stealth) saturates all discourse/practices while erasing the politics and ethics (and aesthetics) of histories, identities, differences, and othernesses. Therefore, the times and spaces of the discourses of EE and GE are increasingly mobilized in enigmatic and contradictory fluid/liquid ways, now “produced” (or manufactured, mainly by academic entrepreneurs/corporate publishers) through centralizing mediated globalizing, abstracted/digitalized and “extended” academic/intellectual “relations” (for example, Payne, 2003, 2005). Terms such as “cognitive capitalism” and “digital colonialism” help characterize the political-economic imperatives of the neoliberalization of education discourses and their technopedagogies (witness in academia the acceleration and intensification of local (spatial) online learning “flexibilities” (now in the temporal present) within the globally (spatially extended) oriented MOOCs (massive open online courses) marketed by the elite and entrepreneurial universities aiming to capture (temporal-spatialized) the lucrative international student market; impact factors for “outputs”; and rankings of individual and collective performances of staff, departments, journals, institutions). Of immediate material relevance to EE and EER is how the geographies of the earth’s crust and ecological health are becoming “environmental wastelands” through the dumping/trashing of laptops, tablets, smartphones, and e-readers. This geological toxification of the crust is a major contributor to what Parikka (2015) aptly (re)names the *Anthrobscene*.

The bodied, spatial, temporal geography(ies) of “extended” and “intensified” knowledge production, and the time spaces they represent, a key concern of the text under review, are undergoing an accelerated intellectual “climate” (sic) change in a globally intensified academic “environment.” Although Springer et al.’s commitment to anarchy is attractive and important, little is said directly in their deschooling agenda about the multi-tiered/layered (and centered/hierarchical) geography of the instrumentalized technological turbo charging of the dominant mode/mediums of digitalized knowledge production, including the politics of the artifact/things, and, more generally but subsequently, the everyday technopedagogical experiences of the existential lifeworld. Inference is needed.

Reviewing Springer et al.’s proposed anarchic pedagogy, critically and dialogically, via a longer and comparative genealogical history of the “development” of the discourse of EE and EER, as an evolving “(radical) history of the (uncritical) present” within the “stealth” of neoliberalism (Brown, 2015) and, by osmotic porosity, in EE and EER (Hursh, Henderson, & Greenwood, 2015) is, therefore, approached

with great interest, and a degree of critical caution and embellishment. To reiterate, the aim here is to advance a mutually constructive conversation between EE and GE, at least. Hence, my review emphasis on the critical confluences of ecopedagogy and radical pedagogy (and “against” technopedagogy).

Springer et al.’s pursuit of an anarchist pedagogy is informed historically from the 1970s by Ivan Illich’s “deschooling society” and Paolo Freire’s “pedagogy of the oppressed.” Why? Despite the potted history of anarchist geography I outline following, Springer et al. offer two main reasons why anarchist geography’s “long” tradition has had little engagement with pedagogical concerns and practices. First, despite the openly declared anarchist preoccupation with resistance, the issue of pedagogy has, it seems, never been prioritized in their collective (writing and practice) efforts. Second, there has been a lack of understanding about how “education” (broadly conceived) is central to the production of geographical knowledge, in particular critical geographies that are concerned with various freedoms, justices, and their constitutions of resistance and transgression of the status quo, the dominant/hegemonic, and the conservative conventional. The problematic status of “justice” (or lack of, or loss) is invariably reproduced, or reconstituted historically (even in various contemporary but uncritical “imaginaries”) via both neoclassical/conservative and liberal/progressive perspectives of education, and their blurring or mashing in the neoliberal postmodern “condition” (with their privileged pedagogies/epistemologies as we witness now in academia’s preoccupations with technopedagogies and their symbolic and material performativities in “teaching,” “networking,” researching, and publishing). Illich and Freire fill this gap for Springer et al.’s explorations of anarchism. Both of Freire and Illich’s “Latin” South radicalizations of pedagogy were, not coincidentally for the historicizing of this narrative of the present/future, published in the early 1970s, at about the same time EE was being formalized and anarchic GE was taking shape.

Springer et al. observe that in 1978, and again in 2012, a landmark special issue on anarchist geographies was published in *Antipode: A Radical Journal of Geography*. Significantly, for even the casual historian of (eco)critical pedagogies in EE, Springer et al. are quick to differentiate such anarchist geographies, historically rooted in the late 19th/early 20th “thinking” (i.e., texts) of Peter Kropotkin and Elisee Reclus and, more recently, David Harvey’s Marxist-inspired critical geographies and prolific contributions to geography in the 1970s. I was surprised that the “eco” anarchist and social ecologist Murray Bookchin received scant attention, particularly his partially (Spanish) anarchist-inspired *The Ecology of Freedom* published in 1982, given Springer et al.’s deschooling commitment to freedoms. In “education,” however, Illich and Freire have attracted some interest only in the “Anglo” North with Richard Kahn’s (2009) *Critical Pedagogy, Ecological Literacy, & Planetary Crisis* providing the most comprehensive synthesis in (environmental) education theory. Anthony Weston’s (1996) philosophically inspired “deschooling of environmental education” drew from Illich and John Holt, another well-known radical educator writing from the Anglo North in the 1970s. Among a range of eco-inspired concerns, Weston argued that the popular goal in “schooling” of “ecological literacy” (now also uncritically popularized) was deeply flawed because its technicist assumptions constructed a schooling pedagogy disconnected from the broader, animated “more-than-human world.” Food for thought for those in EE interested in, or concerned about “literacy” (and how that notion/practice is represented conceptually and textually) see Orr, 1992, in particular his chapter questioning the oxymoronic nature of environmental education. Not coincidentally for the purposes here, Weston’s chapter is followed by one of the early “versions” in EE of ecopedagogy (not named as such) developed by David Jardine (1996). Jardine’s ecopoeisis uses an existential/phenomenological and poetic “method” of inquiry as descriptive/evocative “non”-analytical representation (see also, Affifi, 2014, on the use in EE of analogies and anthropomorphization).

There are numerous reasons why we need to speculate about the relative “non inclusion” of Illich and Freire (and Holt) in the discourse of EE, noting the non-presence of GE over the past decade plus. Environmental educators, and researchers, are rightly preoccupied with the various epistemological “practices” of teaching and learning (and their “outcomes”). “Theory” and “theorization” are of less concern for various reasons (Payne, 2006). Second, “pedagogy” as an everyday practice (and, not coincidentally, performative/evaluative concern/motivation of/for teaching, learning, and schooling) in education is used by Springer et al., it seems to me, in a different way. Their “frame” is akin to a broader sub-cultural “form” of “system-like,” generalized social structure and practice, not unlike the

way the “postmodern” notion of discourse is deployed, often in abstraction from the “real/material” grounds of everyday, face-to-face practices of teaching and learning. If this important differentiation in the discursive/textual conception and production of “pedagogy” is even part way correct, in another review essay of Kahn’s formulation of a radical ecopedagogy (Reid & Payne, 2011), we recommended that Kahn’s (and by implication Springer et al.’s) otherwise important theorization(s) of radical and anarchic pedagogies can be enhanced by selectively and thematically incorporating more circumstantially and contextually driven, empirically based insights about ecopedagogy (less/non anthropocentric) and pedagogy (anthropocentric) be extracted from the 40-yearlong environmental education (and research) literature. I try to avoid that here through self-referencing to “establish” my positioning in this review. Environmental educators and researchers have had a longtime interest in closing the gap between theory and practice, rhetoric and reality, and grounds and abstraction. To be sure, this concern for praxis is shared by Springer et al. and needs to be pursued.

For this review, four chapters are of more immediate, or direct, relevance to the practical/professional issue of pedagogy and/or ecopedagogy, as those notions are commonly understood in the discourse/practice of EE (and EER). Most of the 11 chapters in the book assume or presume the logic/practice of deschooling and, as it is commonly named in EE, “informal education” (to differentiate the formal institutional mediums/modes of schools, universities, centers). Joe Curnow is one of the few contributors “housed” in a Faculty, or School, or Institute of Education. Her chapter focuses on learning theory and how it can be radicalized. Curnow asks how do people become politicized and what is the process of “transformation” (individual and collective)—a concern already well documented and critiqued from a wide range of perspectives in EE and EER, but not conclusively given the ongoing politics and dynamics in the field about its purposes, and processes—particularly about methodology in research. Curnow surveys “learning in action (and participation)” through praxis and “situated learning” that, in turn, draw on sociocultural theories (of learning), including Vygotsky. John Dewey’s experiential learning and experiential education are not mentioned, possibly because he might be associated more with formal education (but also service education). Curnow’s theorizing of radical learning coalesces around how the “prefiguration” of praxis can be arranged or anticipated, and catalyzes or scaffolds, the “political” learning social movements and communities might live/embody in and through her version of an anarchist/resistance pedagogy. Environmental movements are not considered, but might be assumed, reiterating her urban geography perspective.

Curnow’s chapter is the first in the book, and rightly so, because it loosely informs the remainder of the book, including the following chapters I selectively highlight. Erik Taje’s “destroy the school and create a free school” focuses on children (like Springer’s own final chapter) and their geographies of spaces, places, and environments (see also, Skelton, Nairn, & Kraftl, 2016) and the subsequent need to *redesign* (emphasis mine, Payne, 2015) the educational “landscape” of “free schools” in ways that avoid the unfreedoms of dominant institutions and their hierarchical social forms and power/normative relations (from a different anthropological and culturally-geographically comparative vantage point about children’s “enclosures” in schooling, see Jay Griffiths’ *Kith*, 2013; from a historical perspective in education about the priority of “environmental *design*” in curriculum *design*, over “learning,” see Huebner, 1967/1987). Francisco Toro’s naming of “ecopedagogy” and “earth consciousness,” potentially, tilts the readers’ thinking to a less or non-anthropocentric framing of a geographically anarchic pedagogy. He is one of the few contributors in this book who references names better known in Anglo-North EE and EER—Simmons, Gruenwald, Huckle, Robottom, Sanera, Stevenson, and Wals. Toro’s historicized formulation of an ecopedagogy, via Kropotkin and Reclus, centers on Gadotti’s (2000) 10-point “chart” of ecopedagogy, following the later Freire. Notably, Toro’s consideration of the ontological confrontation of human-nature relations is an important inclusion given the many in EE and EER who remain preoccupied via a Cartesian ontology with epistemological (and methodological) “solutions.” Toro’s “shift” to a different ontology (and epistemology) is somewhat consistent with the emergence in EER of “post-critical” inquiry/critique (for example, Hart, 2005) and a “critical ecological ontology” (Payne, 1999). Like Springer and Kahn, Toro’s chapter is light on empirically qualified “ecocentric” theorizations of ecopedagogical practices, pointing to the mainly speculative nature of an otherwise important account of the possibility of anarchic pedagogies sympathetic, in this instance, to “deep ecology” and

its phenomenological/ontological underpinnings, via Kropotkin and Reclus. Ferdinand Stenglein and Simon Mader's "cycling diaries: moving toward an anarchist field trip pedagogy" usefully extends Toro's ecopedagogically oriented inclusion of ontology, but backpedals into an anthropocentric framing and storying of certain experiences. Their field trip pedagogy of machinic cycling (as distinct from walking, for example, see Lorimer, 2013) is, in education discourse, an example of Dewey's "experiential learning" and, perhaps, the "situated learning" outlined anthropocentrically in Curnow's "prefiguration." But Stenglein and Mader's unannounced ontological "foregrounding" of movement, the body, affect, and the de/centering of "contentious spatializations" through field trips as an alternative pedagogy, potentially ecopedagogical, is promising. Stenglein and Mader are also methodologically inclined in the empirical sense, unlike the majority of contributors to this text. Their anarchic geography of field trips demands ethnographically driven contrasts/comparisons of the different sites "moved" through bodily in the timespaces of cycling. The moving and relational "body" they invoke conceptually and methodologically acts as a medium of what Sarah Pink (2009) called "sensuous ethnography" (including the movement/mobility mode of walking), notwithstanding its lurking anthropocentrism of the human/researcher can extend (eco)affectively/aesthetically to the non/more-than human researched/probed by Toro.

The other chapters in the book are interesting and useful. They cover different geographical/anarchy ground, mainly theoretical and conceptual, with varying degrees of empirical support. One chapter is an historical account of GE's origins, noting the increasingly ahistorical nature of much EER "scholarship"; one culturally comparative (Zapatismo and the Western neoliberal university); one about urban geography expeditions in Detroit and East Lansing and another about gangs; another about the transgressive act of writing and the pedagogy of the text; and another about the geographies of children. Deschooling is the constant articulation of the anarchic of a radicalized pedagogy.

This short (and limited) review essay and genealogical effort at storying the productions of knowledge/discourses presumes there is a compelling need for historicized theorizations and comparative analyses within and across disciplinary boundaries of the purposes and means of EE, GE, and others. More than 20 years after Fien and Huckle's (still) important and relevant work in "translating" geographical concerns into education (and numerous others up to the present), the alternative sentiments expressed by the contributors to *The Radicalization of Pedagogy: Anarchism, Geography, and the Spirit of Revolt* about transgressing certain geographical and educational frontiers through the radicalization of pedagogy and, potentially, ecopedagogy, are welcome, and overdue. They are welcome for a number of reasons. First, the need in EE for "outside" views that revitalize and reanimate the "internal" conceptual base and interdisciplinary/experiential aspiration of/for EE; second, to emphasize the post-critical need for greater congruence between the purposes of EE, its pedagogical means, and "case" for methodological extensions and experimentations to legitimize the "ends-in-view" of EE.

A third major reason addresses some of the misunderstandings about the role of "experiential education" (possibly Curnow's situated learning and Stenglein's cycling field trips) in formal education, despite experience-based pedagogies having great historical importance in the discourse of EE, as well as in outdoor education, notwithstanding the "field trip" capacities and potentialities of geography, health, and associated social/human issues-driven curriculum formulations. Put differently, experiential education is, potentially, an outdoor deschooling "alternative" to the indoor classroom enclosures that, depending on their constructions, can be critical, deconstructive, reconstructive, and "anarchic" within the conventional settings and routines of schooling, including "wild/feral" pre-service teacher education efforts in "nomadic" environmental ethics and ecopolitics (for example, Payne, 2014), or young children's environmental inquiry/field trips culminating in democratic/inclusive "activism" (Payne, 2015). Historically, a major impulse of EE in the 1980s was to critique any form of education that reproduced various injustices. Fien (1993a, b) Huckle (1983), among many, helped advance that principle in the way I broadly outlined earlier in this review.

More precisely, for the critical purposes here, Springer et al.'s anarchic geography and radicalizations of pedagogies serve as a historical reminder of the always evolving need for critically engaged scholarship in EE (and GE). If so, such comparative "memory work" in EE and GE aims to reclaim the trajectories for justness/justice that otherwise seems to be fading away in the respective discourses,

given the neoliberalization of the academy, and technopedagogical teaching and research within that corporate/entrepreneurial globalizing culture of abstracted and commodified intellectual exchange and geographically stretched or “extended/accelerated” socioecological relations.

In temporary conclusion, that said rather pessimistically about the diminishing political status and practices of EE and EER in the academy, there remain traces or a modest “counter” momentum from a variety of perspectives in the most recent (published) discourse of EE—a concern expressed in seemingly conventional/orthodox representations of EE that *do not* necessarily invoke *critical theory(ies)*. To reiterate. *All* education (formal, informal, deschooled) and EE (and EER) is, indeed, inherently political. Its pedagogies, curricula, policy, evaluation, and research assume, or reflect, or promote a “worldview” that is then, accordingly, conceptualized, constructed, positioned, and practiced (or governed) by the educator/researcher in (disciplined) ways that very selectively make/mirror even more assumptions about the learner and his/her/their positioning in certain pedagogical “situations,” curriculum “episodes,” and educational “contexts.” This “hidden” curriculum and its “new” and “young” conservative pedagogies require deconstruction and reconstruction in terms of how knowledge and practice are produced by whom, for whom, for what interests, and for what purposes.

Undoubtedly, Springer et al.’s use of terms such as radical, anarchy, and deschooling will worry some in EE and GE for a range of self-evident reasons given the “deradicalization” imperatives of various governments. Rather than be alarmed or confused by terms like the radicalization of pedagogy, or react against them, they provide openings and options now demanded if EE is to “sustain” itself within the increasingly ecological problematic human/nonhuman condition of the Anthropocene. For example, a sampling of articles recently published in this journal speak eloquently to the ongoing need for the democratization of EE. Although not anarchic, or radical, education is viewed by some as an important informant/contributor to the “green movement” (Strife, 2010). Like this text under review, there is heightened interest in the goal of action and participation (Short, 2010), and elevated importance of environmental citizenship (Schild, 2016). The need exists for alternative conceptual/philosophical propositions driving the field’s practices (Kopnina, 2014), and, of course, ongoing ecopedagogically oriented conversations between EE and GE, and others, so as to dialogically and transgressively learn from each other.

References

- Affifi, R. (2014). Drawing analogies in environmental education. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, 19, 80–93.
- Archer, M. (2000). *Being human: The problem of agency*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Auge, M. (1995). *Non-places: An introduction to supermodernity*. London, England: Verso.
- Bookchin, M. (1982). *The ecology of freedom: The emergence and dissolution of hierarchy*. Palo Alto, CA: Cheshire Books.
- Brown, W. (2015). *Undoing the demos: Neoliberalism’s stealth revolution*. New York, NY: Zone Books.
- Canaparo, C. (2009). *Geo-epistemology: Latin America and the location of knowledge*. Oxford, UK: Peter Lang.
- Fien, J. (1993a). *Education for the environment: Critical curriculum theorizing and environmental education*. Geelong, Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- Fien, J. (Ed.). (1993b). *Environmental education: A pathway to sustainability*. Geelong, Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- Gadotti, M. (2000). *Pedagogia da terra*. Sao Paulo, Brazil: Peiropolis.
- Griffiths, J. (2013). *Kith: The riddle of the childscape*. London, England: Hamish Hamilton.
- Grosz, E. (2004). *The nick of time: Politics, evolution, and the untimely*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1992). *The new conservatism: Cultural criticism and the historians’ debate*. Cambridge, UK: The MIT Press.
- Hart, P. (Ed.). (2005). Special issue: Transitions in thought and practice: Links, divergences and contradictions in post-critical inquiry. *Environmental Education Research*, 11(4), 391–400.
- Huckle, J. (Ed.). (1983). *Geographical education: Reflection and action*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Huebner, D. (1967/1987). Curriculum as concern for man’s temporality. *Theory into Practice*, 26, 324–331.
- Hursh, D., Henderson, J., & Greenwood, D. (Eds.) (2015). Special issue: Environmental education in the neoliberal climate. *Environmental Education Research*, 21(3), 299–505.
- Jardine, D. (1996). “Under the tough old stars”; Meditations on pedagogical hyperactivity and the mood of environmental education. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, 1, 47–55.
- Johnson, J. (Ed.). (2013). *Dark trajectories: Politics of the outside*. New York, NY: [NAME] Publications.
- Kahn, R. (2009). *Critical pedagogy, ecoliteracy, & planetary crisis*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Kopnina, H. (2014). Future scenarios and environmental education. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 45(4), 217–231.

- Lorimer, H. (2013). Walking: New forms and spaces for studies of walking. In T. Cresswell & P. Merriman (Eds.), *Geographies of mobilities: Practices, spaces, subjects* (pp. 19–34). Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
- Nakagawa, Y., & Payne, P. (In press). Educational experiences of post-critical non place. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*.
- Noys, B. (2014). *Malign velocities: Accelerationism and capitalism*. Winchester, UK: Zero Books.
- Orr, D. (1992). *Ecological literacy: Education and the transition to a postmodern world*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Palmer, J. (1998). *Environmental education in the 21st century: Theory, practice, progress and promise*. London, England: Routledge.
- Parikka, J. (2015). *The anthroscene*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Payne, P. (1999). Postmodern challenges and modern horizons: Education “for being for the environment.” *Environmental Education Research*, 5(1), 5–34.
- Payne, P. (2003). The technics of environmental education. *Environmental Education Research*, 9(4), 525–541.
- Payne, P. (2005). Lifeworld and textualism: Reassembling the researcher/ed and “others.” *Environmental Education Research*, 11(4), 413–431.
- Payne, P. (2006). Environmental education and curriculum theory. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 37(2), 25–36.
- Payne, P. (2010). Moral spaces, the struggle for an intergenerational environmental ethics and the social ecology of families: An ‘other’ form of environmental education. *Environmental Education Research*, 16(2), 209–232.
- Payne, P. (2014). Vagabonding slowly: Ecopedagogy, metaphors, figurations, and nomadic ethics. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, 19, 47–69.
- Payne, P. (2015). Critical curriculum theory and slow ecopedagogical activism. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 31(2), 165–193.
- Payne, P. (Ed.). (2016). Special issue: On the politics of policy for education for sustainable development. *Journal of Environmental Education*, 47(2), 69–178.
- Pink, S. (2009). *Doing sensory ethnography*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Reid, A., & Payne, P. (2011). Review essay: Producing knowledge and (de)constructing identities: a critical commentary on environmental education and its research. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 32(1), 155–165.
- Robottom, I. (Ed.). (1987). *Environmental education: Practice and possibility*. Geelong, Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- Robottom, I., & Hart, P. (1993). *Research in environmental education: Engaging the debate*. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- Schild, R. (2016). Environmental citizenship: What can political theory contribute to environmental education practice? *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 47(1), 19–34.
- Short, P. (2010). Responsible environmental action: Its role and status in environmental education and environmental quality. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 41(1), 7–21.
- Skelton, T., Nairn, K., & Kraftl, P. (Eds.) (2016). *Space, place, and environment*. Singapore: Springer.
- Stevenson, R. (Ed.). (1987/2007). Special issue: Revisiting schooling and environmental education: Contradictions in purpose and practice. *Environmental Education Research*, 13(2), 129–285.
- Strife, S. (2010). Reflecting on environmental education: Where is our place in the green movement? *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 41(3), 179–191.
- Tanner, T. (1974). *Ecology, environment, and education*. Lincoln, NE: Professional Educators Publications, Inc.
- Thrift, N. (2008). *Non-representational theory: Space/politics/affect*. London, England: Routledge.
- Trigg, D. (2012). *The memory of place: A phenomenology of the uncanny*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.
- Weston, A. (1996). Deschooling environmental education. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, 1, 35–46.
- Wolfendale, P. (2014). *Object-oriented philosophy: The noumenon’s new clothes*. Falmouth, England: Urbanonic.
- Woodard, B. (2013). *On an ungrounded earth: Towards a new geophilosophy*. Brooklyn, NY: Punctum Books.