EDUKACJA ZAWODOWA I USTAWICZNA
nr 2/2017

Jaroslaw Pylynski

DELIBERATIVE TEACHING AND LEARNING AS POWERFUL INSTRUMENT FOR DEMOCRATIC EDUCATION IN MODERN UKRAINE

DORADCZE NAUCZANIE I WYKtADANIE JAKO POT^ZNE NARZ^DZIE EDUKACJI DEMOKRATYCZNEJ WEWSPOtCZESNEJ UKRAINIE

ДОРАДЧЕ НАВЧАННЯ і ВИКЛАДАННЯ ЯК ПОТУЖНИЙ ІНСТРУМЕНТ ДЕМОКРАТИЧНОЇ ОСВІТИ В СУЧАСНІЙ УКРАЇНІ

"The main purpose of schooling is to educate a citizen. Neither a mathematician nor a philologist, neither an athlete nor an artist, but a citizen, able to live and work for the good of a society. If so, then all the strategies and tactics of modern education and schooling should be primarily aimed to achieve this goal"[1].

For a long time Ukrainian society was educated under totalitarian control. This primarily applies to those who are over thirty now. The younger generation has also been taught obedience to the state, maybe not as intensively as :heir parents - but since the majority of teachers and educators never had other experience than totalitarian, they reproduced it in their daily educational ractice. Thus the idea of the state as a good or evil parent has been deeply ingrained by the Soviets pedagogy in many Ukrainians. So it is difficult for many citizens to realize that they have to pursue their own interests, create

Дем'янчук О. ***Політична освіта. Місток між державою та громадянським суспільством I*** О. Дем'янчук // Громадянське суспільство: проблеми теорії та практики. - К.: НаУКМА, 2008 - С. 70.

communities, control the authorities they have elected, personally improve their lives and take the responsibility for mistakes and miscalculations.

If children do not learn to read, write and count, they cannot be effective citizens and successful members of a society. This is obvious and nobody objects to it. But the current practices indicate that without proper democratic education, without thoughtful discussion of their own problems and the clarification of all the possible pros and cons, it is impossible for citizens to make qualified decisions which would be supported by the majority and perceived as their own and not imposed by the authorities.

However, the majority can also be wrong if it is insufficiently or badly informed. Since information spreads at the speed of light now, wrong decisions can turn democratic societies into plebiscite democracies, with all the possible negative consequences or worse still - into authoritarian regimes. So democratic education, and above all educating citizens to discuss thoughtfully public issues, can help them become not only active, but conscious decision makers both in their community and in their own country. As one Dutch politician aptly said: «For many of our fellow citizens democracy is something as inevitable as rain». But democracy is not a natural phenomenon, it is a result of purposeful human activity, and has to be taught. This simple truth is unfortunately not so clear for many people[2].

In this context, it is important to note that people often engage in collective actions, which are quite similar to that of so-called «anonymous flocks». This became especially obvious over the last few decades when information started to spread so quickly that this process can be compared with the visual contact[3].

Konrad Lorenz notes that people under certain conditions can become an «anonymous flock». An anonymous flock is comprised of many living creatures that stay closely together and move in the same direction. Under such circumstances individuals in the pack try to stay as close as possible to each other. Moreover, according to Lorenz, this desire of closeness can be not only innate, such as for certain types of fish and birds, but it may be the result of individual learning. Observations by scientists over many years and comparison of observations by his colleagues gave Lorenz reason to believe that instinct, which gathers groups of animals, is a fierce force. And this force of attraction to the flock which affects individuals or their small groups increases with size. Lorenz believed that in spite of the apparent drawbacks of animal existence in large packs, this lifestyle should also have some advantages that not only bal-

[2] Mathews D. *The Ecology of Democracy.* Kettering Foundation Press. 2014. - P. 5.

[3] Lorenz K. *On Aggression. Routhlege Classics,* London NY, 2002. - P. 134-145.

ance the shortcomings, but also exceed them so that long-term selection pressure brought in animals such complex mechanisms of joining in the packs.

Most sociologists believe that the original form of social association is a family, and on its basis various forms of associations that are common among mammals developed in the process of evolution. However, there is reason to believe that the first form of community - in the broadest sense of the word - is an anonymous flock, a typical example of which is a school of fish in the ocean. Within this formation there is no structure, only a large number of identical elements. They definitely influence each other, because there are different forms of . :>mmunication between creatures that are joined in such unities.

A large school of small and closely united fish shows some volatility. Occasionally some quick-witted fish form a small group that moves forward, outside of the school. But as such groups stretches up and deviate from the main group, the tension inside them rises. Usually this development ends up with the swift retreat of the enterprising groups into the depths of the school. As Dr. Lorenz .: mments: «Watching these indecisive actions one almost begins to lose faith in democracy and to see the advantage of authoritarian politics»[4].

Relevance of this worry was corroborated by a simple, but very important experiment conducted with river minnows by Erich von Hoist. He took one minnow and removed its forebrain, which is responsible for making fish joining a school. A minnow without a forebrain eats and swims normally, as any other. But it does not care if none of its «relatives» from the school follow; :hat is the only difference in its behavior. Thus it does not share the inherent indecisive behavior of a normal fish which even is whole busy pays attention to its school, whether other fish are swimming alongside, and how many such fish are about. This did not matter to the brainless fish: if it saw food, or had any other reason for doing so, it swam resolutely in a certain direction and - the whole shoal followed it. By virtue of his deficiency the brainless animal had become the dictator![5].

A crucial reason for such behavior is that this form of association is completely anonymous. Each individual is entirely satisfied with anyone's compa- ... The idea of personal friendship does not apply in such anonymous flocks. As members are practically identical, it makes no sense to stick with a particular individual. Ties that unite such anonymous flocks are quite different from the personal friendship that makes our modern communities strong and stable. But friendship and mutual understanding should not only be taught; but they

Lorenz K. *On Aggression. Routhlege Classics,* London NY, 2002. - P. 140.
Lorenz K. *On Aggression. Routhlege Classics,* London NY, 2002. - P. 141.

also need to be maintained and practiced. These skills and knowledge not only emerge and are taught but also are maintained and improved in society groups thanks to constant direct contact.

In the meantime the vast majority of Ukrainians perceive the state as something impersonal, even though, all state functions are performed by certain known people. All the government decisions are made by certain officers, and sometimes it is a small circle of only a few persons. If people are not aware of this simple fact, they do not understand the need to establish effective control over officials, their activities, decisions and income. Only if there is such control, society can overcome or at least minimize corruption and create equal possibilities for all its citizens.

Citizens could have avoided most of the problems or easily overcome them if they were sufficiently informed and could study the problem. Failures are perceived especially painfully when ignorance at society level results in the suffering of individuals, because usually it is much more difficult to correct collective errors than your own. And it's not just because of the different scale, but also because people are often convinced that the majority is always right, that collective intelligence cannot be wrong, so any different minority opinion is false. The situation is complicated by the fact that if the knowledge that mankind has accumulated in math and natural sciences can be impersonally passed to the next generation through books or various electronic information media. Social knowledge, common types of relationships and patterns of actions are mainly reproduced and passed on through live communication[6]. Thus, humanism, tolerance, kindness and mutual assistance cannot be established once and for all, and then only be increased and developed. On the contrary, every time they have to be reestablished. That is why ethical characteristics of a society and moral values of individuals are vulnerable and volatile. What is now considered an unacceptable evil tomorrow may turn into an empty superstition, and, vice versa, something that is perfectly normal today would be viewed as a violation of basic human rights tomorrow. In the meantime people are suffering. Yet their sufferings pass away with them, and next generations often bother so little that they are likely to repeat the same mistakes, condemning many more people to suffer. Can this vicious circle be broken? Unfortunately, there is no explicit answer. Once we are aware of challenge, but not trying to do so it would be a grave moral failure, even worse sin than doing evil because of ignorance.

[6] Kant I. *Idea Of A Universal History On A Cosmopolitical Plan (1784)* [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: // http://philosophyproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/02 IDEA-OF-A-UNIVERSAL-HISTORY-ON-A-COSMPOLITAN-PLAN.pdf.

Experience tells us that people successfully arrange their lives, when a viable balance between what communities should do, and what the government should do is found. In areas where people tend to obey the state expect its raternalistic care and thus exhibit passivity, a continuous development lag :s usually observed. In order to bring up active and responsible citizens, it is important to use *deliberative education*.

Deliberative education, as we understand it, is a set of tools, techniques ind methods that educate citizens and help them to become active members of society who can discuss common problems thoughtfully and find wise solutions. It is a crucial element of sustain civic education. Moreover, this education should be continuous, because it serves to educate competent and :houghtful citizenry, capable not only making wise collective qualified decisions, but also implementing them together.

Democratic education in Ukraine has a long history, as it dates back to the revolutions that began in Europe in 1848 and crated a large number of educational civic organizations in Central and Eastern Europe[7]. These civic groups and organizations voluntarily took the burden of public education in the numerous non-state nations in the region.

In terms of nineteenth century politics, it meant the transformation subordinate subjects of absolutist empires into citizens of national democracies :y means of education. In Ukraine «Prosvita» («Enlightenment»), took on this mission[8]. The proliferation of «Prosvita» chapter organizations has begun in Ukraine in the 1860s - 1870s, first in Galicia (Austro-Hungarian Empire), and then through the rest of Ukraine, and further on Kuban, and even in the Volga and Far East regions of the Russian Empire. They appeared everywhere where Ukrainians created their settlements.

The activities of these centers of cultural and civic education had prepared the emergence of the democratic Ukrainian state in 1917. However, due to the weakness of the newly formed democratic state institutions, Ukraine was unable to resist totalitarian Bolshevik Russia. Therefore after a long war | 1918 - 1921) it was conquered and became part of the communist empire. As a result, during the first half of the twentieth century, Ukraine lost about

Spring of nations. Revolution 1848-1849 in Galicia: http://www.aus-ugr.narod.ru/37.html // Kost' Levytskyi, The History of the Political Thought of the Galician Ukrainians, 1848-1914, (Lviv, 1926), P. 17-26.

Всеукраїнське товариство Просвіта (The Ukrainian association «Prosvita»): http://prosvitanews.org.ua/istor.html // Лозинський М. Сорок літ діяльності «Просвіти» (Lozinski M. *Forty years of activities of «Prosvita»):* https://archive.org/stream/sorokltdialn001ozyuoft#page/n3/mode/2up.

half of its own population *including most ethnicity-based communities* (Polish, German, Jewish, Greek, etc.). Together with the Ukrainians, they became victims of the communist and Nazi genocides[9].

Meanwhile, communists introduced well developed and sophisticated political education for all citizens in the territories where they achieved to control. Political education in Soviet Ukraine was promoted by government-run educational institutions - kindergartens, schools, vocational schools and universities, where young generations were indoctrinated with the so-called «scientific communist outlook». Thereby from the early childhood, future citizens were educated in the spirit of loyally to the existing political system, assured at the ultimate truth of communist party ideas, with uncritical attitude towards reality, with complete obedience and strong faith in the communist Utopia[10].

Another important element of civic education was the education of adults. It was continuous communist education that lasted for life. People were taught at theoretical seminars, conferences, and regular political information meetings that happened at all enterprises and institutions, in special Schools and Universities of Marxism-Leninism, at the trade union clubs of political education. In addition, all employees received an additional portion of communist education in accordance with the Soviet slogan: «Trade unions are the schools of communism» at various trade union meetings.

Another important part of political education in the USSR was in-depth training of history researchers for the Communist Party, as well as training of «ideological workers» in the field of Marxist-Leninist philosophy and scientific atheism. These courses were compulsory to all university and vocational school students. In addition we should also mention political lecturers, whose number totaled around 687,000 people in Ukraine at the end of 1970th (The total population in Ukraine at that time was slightly less than 50 million)[11].

[9] Snyder,T. *Bloodlcmds: Europe Between Hitler and Stalin.* Basic Books, 2012 p. 560 *I,* BaberowskiJörg. DerroteTerror. Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2003., S.290. // Stephane Courtois, Joachim Gauck, Ehrhart *Neubertetal, Das Schwarz buch des Kommunismus. Unterdrückung, Verbrechen und Terror. (1998) Piper* Verlag, München 2004.

[10] For example, in the typical English learning manual for the 8 grade (Ukrainian-English phrase book. - K. 1980) only four of 33 sections were not politically oriented: *My family, My working day, The United Kingdom and London.* The rest of the subjects had positive political content: *Rights and duties of the citizens of the USSR, Lenin and his Mother. Foreign Languages in the life s of V.Lenin and K.Marks, The 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union etc.*

[11] Дем'янчук О. *Політична освіта. Місток між державою та громадянським суспільством* **/** О. Демянчук // Громадянське суспільство: проблеми теорії та практики. - К.: НаУКМА, 2008. - С. 69.

However, as it was clearly demonstrated by the collapse of the Soviet Union all these efforts eventually trained people in the double think, so typical of every totalitarian society. Once under the influence of economic and social :ecline, which is inevitable for every closed society, when the Party weakened its repressive pressure on citizens, the artificial, superficial and decorative nature of communist political education became apparent. It became clear evident that the purpose of Soviet education was the protection of the interests of an essentially small group - the party leadership, which in fact did not believe in its own deceitful propaganda.

But over the years, this Soviet political education - dogmatic, uncritical and hypocritical deeply traumatized Ukrainian society. To overcome its consequences, Ukrainian society has to pave the way for the return from communist to human values, from class enmity to the «golden rule» and the moral norms of the civilized world.

It is notable that ideologists of communist political education avoided discussions, debates and deliberation in their practical work, because their goal was not to educate citizens capable of self-reflection and self-evaluation with advanced critical thinking, but obedient executors of the will of party leaders.

After the collapse of the USSR, the Soviet system of civic education ceased to exist, and during next decade, for the reasons mentioned above, any talk about any political or civic education was considered inappropriate. The first really important event in the development of civic education in Ukraine was the establishment of the Institute for Civic Education, National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy» in 1999. Almost simultaneously, a couple of NGOs such as the Centre for Civic Education «Kyiv Brotherhood», Ukrainian Association of Teachers of History and Social Sciences «New Day» appeared. These organizations began to study political and civic culture of Ukrainian society, to organize conferences and seminars that attracted a lot of participants[12]. A new generation of scholars and public activists began to develop the concept of civic education, to introduce courses (like «Civic Education Policy»), and to write :extbooks to help teachers disseminate the values of civic culture[13].

At the same time, Ukrainian civic education teachers felt the complexity of this task. After all, the object of study (democracy) and learning theory and practice has undergone significant transformations during the last ten years.

Громадянська освіта в Україні. Семінар. Київ, 2 жовтня 2001 р. 1іПр8://\¥\¥\¥. wilsoncenter.org/**8ІЇЄ8**^еґаи1йті1е8/2001_10_02.pdf.

Бакка Т.В., Ладиченко Т.В., Марголіна Л. В. - ***Шкільний курс. Громадянська освіта: основи демократії та методи його навчання. -*** К.: Основа, 2009. - С. 254.

Meantime many people not only in Ukraine, talk about crisis of democracy, and argue that it degrade and weaken their positions. Thus, teachers in such «new democracies)) as Ukraine face a set of serious methodological problems. They feel confuse not only how to teach for democracy, but also uncertainty regarding the very notion of democracy.

1. Problems of democracy and tasks for deliberative education

Even the supporters of democracy, not to mention its opponents, do not deny the saying that democracy is the worst form of government except for all the other forms. Today it is clear that the optimistic assumption that people in themselves are good, and we just have to free them from the oppression of tyrants, and then justice will prevail, unfortunately, is not viable in real life[14]. Unsuccessful development of democracy in most of the countries that used be parts of the Soviet Union finally dispelled these illusions regarding the inherent democratic instincts of citizens, and the notion, that they naturally desire to live in a just and democratic world where all social problems are be solved through competition of ideas and knowledge. Anyway this belief in people is particularly wide-spread among supporters of democracy in countries with authoritarian regimes. Despite the apparent failure in one country, the proponents of this view inevitably appear in another one. Therefore, they can truly be considered as democratic optimists.

But in countries where democracy does exist, democratic pessimists dominate because they understand that «people aren't born knowing how to be citizens in a democracy. It is something they have to learn))[15]. They do not believe in people anymore and suspect that all of them are egoists. However, democratic pessimists do believe in the magic of democratic procedures and principles. «In modern liberal societies there is greater agreement on principles that deals with procedures than on matters of substance. The General support for democracy and equality of opportunity are substantive principles on which there is general agreement, though again, only on the abstract level.

[4] Paradoxical but this intellectual tradition mostly has flourished in the middle of 19 century under the influence of Rousseau's writings in the bosom of different socialist oriented movements.

[5] Deliberative Pedagogy. *Teaching and Learning for Democratic Engagement*, Ed. by Timothy J. Shaffer, Nnicholas V. Longo, Idit Manosevitch, and Maxine S. Thomas. Michigan State University Press, 2017. - P. VIII.

Specific workings-out of these and other principles is subject to wide-spread disagreement and requires procedural resolution))[16].

Both points of view, optimistic and pessimistic have been coexisting among democrats since the XVIII century, but now at the beginning of the XXI century it is clear that the standpoint of the pessimists is also limited, despite the fact that they were apparently successful in many countries. The basic foundations of democracy: universal suffrage, multiparty system, transparency of elections, political freedom, human rights, etc. were effective drivers of social development and worked successfully for over a hundred years.

problems that represent a significant threat to the future of democracy.

The first problem is that authoritarian regimes have learned to masquerade themselves as democracy; this is what happened in the USSR and other : cialist countries. For example modern Russia also demonstrates all the attributes of a democracy, but, in fact, it remains an authoritarian state[17]. In addition, authoritarian regimes have learned to use democratic institutions in their right against democracy itself[8]. However, there have already been similar situations. For example, the Russian Empress Catherine II successfully fought for democracy and the rights of religious dissidents in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth until it was neatly divided between the three monarchies[19]. It is also worth to mention the activities of the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs during the First World War in the opponent countries[20]. Particularly :cessful was the cooperation with Vladimir Lenin and his Bolsheviks, who

Klosko G. *Democratic Procedures and Liberal Consensus,* Oxford University Press, 2000.-P. 231.

An essential condition for the development of democracy in our country is the creation of an effective legal and political system. But the development of democratic procedures could not be reached by the cost of the rule of law, neither the so hard-won stability, nor the sustainable implementation of the taken economic course. V. Putin (Message to the Country, 2005).

Friedrich Hayek, Law, Legislation and Liberty, Volume 2: The Mirage of Social Justice, University of Chicago Press, 1978, P. - 210.

Piotr Stefan Wandycz, *The Price ofFreedom: A History of East Central Europe from the Middle Ages to the Present.* Routledge; 2001, P. 345. // Norman Davies, God's Playground. *A history of Poland. Oxford University Press, 1981,P 1210;//A. Andmsiewicz, Katarzyna Wielka. Prawda i mit,* Warszawa 2012, P. 688.

Thomas Boghardt. *Spies of the Kaiser: German Covert Operations in Great Britain during the First World*'War Era. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. - P. 224.

eventually began the October Revolution, seized power and, as a result, Russia stopped military actions in World War I[21].

However, modern authoritarian regimes came to a new level of fighting democracies. Suffice it to recall the story of the German girl Lisa which was completely fabricated by Russian security services and pro-Russian media in Germany, in winter 2016[22]. And there are plenty of such examples.

The second problem is that democratic countries came to a new phase of development. As the recent elections in the US, Brexit or the migrant crisis in the EU show, now traditional democracies need to update their tools. Although the main democratic foundations were formed in the nineteenth century and stood the test of time, now they have become vulnerable to manipulations. Various authoritarian groups, both within these countries and outside, use democratic instruments (freedom of speech, human rights, rule of law, free elections) to wreck on democratic societies.

To overcome this danger it is important to spread civic education, to involve citizens in active cooperation, to help them develop critical thinking skills and encourage them to discuss and solve the problems of community and country in public forums. This should help modern liberal democratic society to develop harmoniously, excluding the scenarios when democracy is imposed 'with an iron hand' or when there are chaos and anarchy.

The third problem is most evident in the countries that are on the road from authoritarianism to democracy. In these countries we can observe different combinations of political forces.

Given the current methods of information dissemination and education via Internet, there is social demand for the latest and most advanced forms of democracy. However, in these countries both citizens and whole societies have not yet fully accepted the values that are the basis of all successful liberal democracies in the world. It becomes particularly apparent if we look at the level of political and economic corruption[23]. As we have noted previously, undeveloped democratic values and wide-spread «communist» morality prevents these societies from becoming truly democratic.

[21] Zeman Z.A.B. *Germany and the Revolution in Russia, 1915-1918:* Documents from the Archives of the German Foreign Ministry. Oxford University Press; 1958. - 180 p.

[22] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Criminal_case_of_Lisa_F. Or: http://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/ subversion-tsar-will-protect-election-from-russian-dirty-tricks-0pf2kps77.

[23] http://dyvys.info/2016/12/30/2016-ukrayina-u-svitovyh-rejtyngah/.

Today Ukrainian society faces perhaps the most obvious and urgent problem of modern democracy, namely the «quality» of its citizenry or the human factor of democracy.

Unfortunately, today in many countries there is a very real threat of ochlocracy[24]. However, we know that attempts to prevent the expansion of ochlocracy by developing meritocracy, where experts and scientists have the right for the last word. Nevertheless this way also has essential drawbacks. After all, scientists and experts were the ones who sent Giordano Bruno to the stake. Probably he was the first famous victim of intrigues in the expert community. Thus the question: «For whom democracy exists, and who is its bearer?» still remains open in these societies. If we apply the standard formula from constitutions of most modern democracies where people are announced the subject and the source of power and democracy, it excessively simplifies the answer to both of these questions. Hence modern societies have to use some kind of a mediator to solve permanently nascent social problems. This intermediary is a bureaucracy, and this causes another problem - anonymity and over-organization of modern democracy.

Over 200 years have passed since its last reincarnation and democracy transformed into an almost impersonal conveyor of decision-making and its implementation. However, this work has been increasingly slowed down although there are no apparent external causes. Thus, it becomes increasingly clear that the functioning of the bureaucracy in republics is almost identical to the bureaucracy in monarchies. In both cases, they are equally prone to corruption, slow and inefficient. Now there is a system in which problem perception, discussion and decision-making can take years and years, and the implementation is postponed because of formal reasons or takes a lot of time[25].

In Ukraine the grip of bureaucratic nomenclature weakened for a short period in the early 1990s, but since the mid-90s it has been restored, managing of public property for its own benefit as it was in the Soviet period, but this time using the framework of the market economy. It happened because private property that was separated from the state in the case of reforms remained largely under the control of bureaucracy. Now Ukrainian bureaucracy through the tax system, supervision of banks, and control over the property (especially over real estate and land) as well as using corruption, prevent private business from full scale disposing of their property. As a result all the

[24] In many democratic countries populism is growing up, and thus to power comes leaders who de facto represent not conscious citizens - the demos, but ochlos.

[25] For example, the creation in Ukraine of the state bodies intended to fight against corruption lasts more than two years.

financial resources to support political parties are concentrated in the hands of state bureaucracy.

Regular elections also do not guarantee that emerging problems will be solved, especially if they exist at the local level. At the same time, elections are certainly more expensive than the phone call to the «Emperor». In addition, one also needs to get to the «Emperor», bypassing his secretariat. We believe that this resemblance of bureaucracies in democratic republics and in authoritarian regimes makes them very similar in the eases of common citizens - its everyday consumers. That is why they become sometimes so receptive to authoritarian demagoguery.

If an authoritarian regime is «soft» or «vegetarian» and citizens do not have high expectations, democracy and authoritarianism are not perceived as totally different systems of governance. Thus **the third problem** can also be defined as *((democratic fatigue».* It manifests differently in the «old» democracies and in the states that have just recently become democratic[26]. In countries with robust democratic traditions there is a psychological problem that can be called «cloy of democracy)). Countries that recently got rid of authoritarian regimes experience «confusion because of democracy)). This psychological condition is well reflected by political polls and the low turnout in the regional elections in post-revolutionary Ukraine in 2015 and 2016.

The fact that democracy actually means pluralism and there is no sole correct and officially approved picture of the world, is a psychological shock to many citizens in post-authoritarian countries, who are accustomed to only one correct ideology or one religion. When voters have to choose a «product)) that cannot be quickly assessed, they often try to withdraw from any choice, especially because of the habit to do only the «right)) things.

Besides, democrats find themselves in a double trap of their own pluralistic methodology. They cannot and do not want to give a clear philosophical description, and hence programs, of further social development, and talks mostly about abstract values obscure for many people. At the same time democrats do not offers any short-term, scientifically based «roadmaps)), similar to those imposed by e.g. Marxists: communist industrialization, collectivization or introduction of «five-year plans)) etc.

At the same time authoritarians rigidly impose their projects, ideas and values as the only right ones, thus offering quick and easy solutions to complex problems of social development. They do not understand that in the modern world «Force... should be reserved, in terminological language, for the

[26] See the situation in Poland and Hungary or Britain and the United States.

< *forces of nature «or the «force of circumstances», that is, to indicate the* energy released by physical or social movements))[27]. As Hannah Arendt stated in one of her latest works: «Violence can always destroy power. Out of the barrel of a gun grows the most effective command, resulting in the most instant and perfect obedience. What never can grow out of it [violence] is power[28]. So today there is a serious challenge before modern democracies: to work out a new theoretical agenda for the world without losing its openness and pluralism. So they have to pass both the 21st century Scylla of authoritarianism and Charybdis of chaos.

The experience of successful democracies shows that this task cannot be accomplished without involvement of citizens and their collective work. Continual thoughtful discussion of issues and solutions to community problems [itical for democracy. Only by training deliberation skills it would be pos- r.ble to educate conscious citizens who will be ready to develop democracy zether with their fellow citizens.

2. Doing deliberative teaching and learning for better society

As it was mentioned before, deliberative pedagogy is focused first, as it should be, on the classroom and on the challenge of giving students an understanding of citizenship they can use every day. But it also has the potential to spread from the classroom to the institution as a whole - and the potential to bring the institution into a more productive relationship with the public.[29] So that is why it is important especially for the new democracies to elaborate not only teaching methodology but also learning technics which should help not only to teachers to teach deliberation in schools, but also to help students to learn deliberation and to practice it consciously in their social life.

In our book we will analyze deliberative practices as they were formulated by D. Mathews in the introduction to the book Deliberative pedagogy:

1. Naming problems to reflect the things people consider valuable and hold dear.
2. Framing issues for decision-making that not only takes into account what people feel is valuable but also lays out fairly all the major options for

[27] http: //www. fsmitha. com/review/arendt.html.

[28] http://www.fsmitha.com/review/arendt.html.

[29] Deliberative Pedagogy. *Teaching and Learning for Democratic Engagement,* Ed. by Timothy J. Shaffer, Nnicholas V. Longo, Idit Manosevitch, and Maxine S. Thomas. Michigan State University Press, 2017. - P. XII.

acting - with full recognition of the tensions growing out of the advantages and disadvantages of each option.

3. Making decisions deliberatively to move opinions from first impressions to more shared and reflective judgment.
4. Identifying and committing all the resources people have, including their talents and experiences, which become more powerful when combined. These are assets that often go unrecognized and unused.
5. Organizing civic actions so they complement one another, which make the whole of people's efforts more than the sum of the parts.
6. Learning as a community all along the way to keep up civic momentum[30].

As we know, traditional teaching goals are aimed to help students learn a preset amount of knowledge. Teacher, give students organized and segmented information (knowledge), and train the skills usually approved by educational authorities[31]. The goal of the students is to learn information and skills created and developed by others. The knowledge acquired while schooling is a certain amount of information gained from a variety of disciplines; it stays in the students' minds in the form of clusters that do not always have semantic connections between themselves or with the reality around. Thus, in the process of education both teachers and students are frequently unable to link the content of one subject with the knowledge from other disciplines. Generally, in modern Ukrainian school learning is based on information that has already been acquired by someone else, so students in the evaluation process demonstrate themselves (in the broadest sense of the word), but do not search a better knowledge[32]. In such circumstances, the teacher becomes de facto a controller, and students in some sense are well (or poorly) manufactured products. When these types of teaching and learning are used, students develop tendency to paternalism and statism, especially those who later work in the field of public administration and are in charge of its intellectual support[33]. And thus they are quite skeptical about the abilities of their fellow citizens to solve problems in the public sphere at all levels[34].

Ibid. - P. IX.

See more: http://classroom.synonym.com/goals-traditional-education-8023.html.

See more: Glasser W., *The Quality School Managing Students Without Coercion.* Harper Perennial, 1992.

See more at: *Robert Nozik, Why Do Intellectuals Oppose Capitalism? // Cato Policy Report. 1998. January-February.*

David Mathews., Politics for People: Finding a Responsible Public Voice, Paperback 1999. University of Illinois Press, P. 65-79.

Deliberative teaching and learning are both interactive. First, students get some information about the world, but they acquire new knowledge and learn via interpersonal interactions. So in the class the student learns in the process of interactions with other students and the teacher how to find knowledge through individual and collective activities, how to think independently and act collectively. Instead of a mere demonstration of skills and knowledge, students experience but there is a collective and individual search for knowledge. In a sense, it is a return to the teaching and learning methods that first appeared in ancient Greece and, in fact, which helped to create this ancient democracy[35].

So, using such deliberative training the teacher creates an environment where students discover something themselves, acquire new knowledge and gain experience in various spheres, they learn to seek neither a compromise nor a consensus but the knowledge, which can never be finally defined and obtained. At the same time they learn that liberty means living with conflict. Through collective deliberation they muster that diversity and equality: each has their place in a constitution of the society which seeks to guarantee these greatest life values for all. Such is the ultimate goal of *deliberative education.*

A famous American psychologist Albert Bandura wrote that learning would be an extremely time consuming process - not to mention the fact that it would be very risky - if people were learning how to act, solely relying on the consequences of their actions. Fortunately, in most cases people learn through simulation. Based on observations of our surroundings, we form ideas about new types of behavior, and later on this coded information is used is a guide for further actions. Before implementing in practice a particular rehavior, people can learn from examples, even approximate ones, and thus they can avoid many mistakes[36].

3. The position of teacher and student in the educational process and introduction of deliberative education

Organizing the educational process, teachers in traditional schools first of all think about the content of their own activities. The syllabus usually describes only what the teacher should do. So in the classroom the teacher is the main person, who manages student's activities, shows, talks, asks, keeps the class in order and restricts the actions of students.

Jaeger Werner. Paideia: the Ideals of Greek Culture. Volume 1. Oxford University Press. 1965.

[16] Albert Bandura., Social Learning Theory, Prentice-Hall; 1976, p. 40.

These conditions determine the position of a student in the classroom - a passive listener, who is sometimes given the opportunity to demonstrate his or her knowledge. Hierarchical teacher-student relationships form authoritarian patterns, generate competition among students for the teacher's attention, stimulate competition and make collaboration in the classroom unnecessary. To some extent, society is modeled as a hierarchical patron-client system and this hinders the creation of informal horizontal connections in a society, without which cooperation and trust networks cannot appear or exist.

Changing the position of teacher and student as a result of the introduction of *deliberative education* will lead to changes in the educational process: establishing interaction between teachers and students on an equal footing. This attitude means that teachers accept opinions and active positions of students recognize their right to independence of judgment; teachers do not stick to the belief that only they have the correct view or it can only be recorded in the textbook. This is especially important in the teaching of humanities.

4. Organization of communication during learning process in deliberative education

The process of communication in a traditional education system is mainly restricted to teachers' monologue. The teacher addresses students, using ready knowledge and via a system of rewards and punishments forces them to learn this information as compulsory. The interaction between participants of the educational process, as we have noted, is usually based on the initiative of teacher, it is structured according to the beforehand prepared lesson plan. This process can be represented as a model of one-way communication. This method of communication allows the teacher in a short period of time to present a large amount of information, and the feedback is restricted to the short answers of students.

During *deliberative communication* students have the opportunity to share their thoughts, impressions and feelings about the topic, to talk about their own conclusions and get to know ideas not only of the teacher but also of their classmates.

Teachers organize the learning process; they are consultants, facilitators, who do not only pay attention mainly to their own actions. The teaching process is focused on links between students, their interaction and cooperation. The learning outcomes are achieved by mutual efforts of all the participants of the learning process, so students take on the joint responsibility for the learn-

ing outcomes and it means that in the future they will become responsible for their own life and its constant improvement.

Treating the class as a community means respecting diversity and navigating inevitable conflict. The classroom often consists of people with different socioeconomic backgrounds and political perspectives. Discussing controversial topics can be particularly interesting, albeit challenging, when students are encouraged to speak from the basis of their lived experiences. It's important to allow differences to surface. And while professors should not appear biased or politically motivated, it may be unrealistic to expect them to hide their personal views. This poses an ethical dilemma, which professors can address by backing arguments with evidence, respecting opposing and diverse views, and encouraging students to evaluate the reasonableness of all views presented, including their own[37]. That isn't to say that professors should always be transparent about their political opinions, but doing so can be a powerful pedagogical tool[38].

5. Teaching methods in deliberative education

It is possible to see the benefits and effectiveness of *deliberative education* only when it is directly implemented in educational activities. Further we will offer several proven methods of deliberative training that enable to implement it effectively.

Using deliberation in education, it is important to organize the activity of students as well as to create an adequate learning environment in school. In addition, during the learning process it is important to organize forums involving students, as future citizens, to solve local problems. Therefore it is extremely important to organize *deliberative forums,* both at class and school level to teach students how to conduct them, and to mould the habit to solve community problems together after in-depth discussion. Students should learn that thanks to such public events it often becomes clear that a personal problem is in fact a common one and it could bother a lot of people. During such discussions these problems can be identified and students learn to search for best ways to solve them. Also these discussions help young people to learn how to use democratic procedures in practice and teach them democracy and tolerance.

[37] Hess, D. E., & McAvoy, P. (2015). *The political classroom: Evidence and ethics in democratic education.* New York: Routledge.

[38] Deliberative Pedagogy. *Teaching and Learning for Democratic Engagement,* Ed. by Timothy J. Shaffer, Nnicholas V. Longo, Idit Manosevitch, and Maxine S. Thomas. Michigan State University Press, 2017. - P. 218

In the future students will not only participate but also organize such meetings in their communities themselves. Thanks to the formation of strong relationships inside the class and school and uniting efforts, duplication of efforts could be avoided, and thus, effective synergy could be achieved. Students will be able to create an effective plan for future work and decide what useful things can be done for the community, as well as to learn how to seek and to reach consensus and determine priorities. Usually during these discussions new leaders and volunteers who take responsibility for the plans developed by the community emerge[39].

Democracy is constantly challenged by different internal and external threats, but in solving these problems and neutralizing threats, society reinvents itself and is constantly updated. This process requires close attention and participation of all society members, as restrictions in participation limit democracy, transforming it eventually in to the power of groups - the oligarchy, or the power of an individual leader - dictatorship.

6. Conclusions

The pernicious forces that are destroying democracy in Ukraine can be divided into four main groups: corruption; increasing influence of advertising specialists and PR advisers on election campaigns; separation of freedom and law, and finally - the indifference of citizens towards community issues, and a reduction of participation in public life, including elections.

This last issue, in our opinion, deserves special attention because in a way it is the foundation of all the other issues. In today's world citizens have very little influence on the political realm. Common people can easily be kept away from political life and they also very often willingly relinquish control by themselves. But this is a general problem of democracy, because its efficacy, legitimacy and vibrancy depend on the political participation and competition of citizens.

Even if citizens express desire to influence public life, it is quite difficult for them to make informed decisions collectively. In most cases, they act in a hurry and mostly take into account only their current interests. They do not think about the broader context, or about future prospects. Even when citizens do make informed decisions collectively, it is still difficult for them to move towards a common goal, because people often do not really know how to coordinate their work in the public sphere.

See more at: Lukas Carol, Hoskins Linda, *Conducting Community Forums.* Wilder Publishing Center, 2003. P. X, P. 4.

However, research shows that if issues appear very important for citizens, they are willing to work together in order to solve them. Reasoning how to solve the problem, people overcome their differences, and make informed decisions, and thus essentially assert themselves as citizens. Thus, citizens' deliberation is an important instrument for creating democracy, an attentive and careful search of ways how to solve the problem becomes the base for furthering a democratic environment. Also, when citizens begin to consult each other about important issues, they show ability to make decisions, and further, to work together, overcoming difficulties.

Deliberative education is designed to give citizens instruments and knowledge to improve their lives by combining their knowledge and efforts.

Abstract: If children do not leam to read, write and count, they can never be normal citizens and successful members of a society. This is obvious and nobody objects to it. But the current practice of information dissemination and the way of involving citizens **m** governance indicates that without proper democratic education, without thoughtful discussion of their own problems and the clarification of all the possible pros and cons, **it is** impossible for citizens to make a qualified decision which would be supported by the majority and perceived as their own and not imposed by the authorities. Thus, citizens' deliberation is an important instrument for creating democracy, attentive and careful search of ways how to solve the problem became a base for further creation of democratic environment. Also, when citizens begin to consult each other about important issues, they show not only the ability to make decisions, but to work together, : ercoming difficulties. Deliberative pedagogy is designed to give citizens instruments and knowledge to improve their lives by combining their knowledge and efforts.

Keywords: civic education, adult education, deliberative teaching, learning environment, deliberative communication, educational process, knowledge

Анотація: Якщо діти не навчаються читати, писати і рахувати, то вони ніколи не зможуть стати нормальними громадянами і успішними членами суспільства. Це очевидно, і ніхто це не заперечує. Але нинішня практика поширення інформації і шлях залучення громадян до управління свідчить, що без належної демократичної освіти, без вдумливого обговорення їхніх проблем і з>ясування всіх можливих плюсів і мінусів, громадяни не в змозі прийняти компетентне рішення, що буде підтримане більшістю і сприйматиметься як своє власне, а не нав>язане з боку злади. Таким чином, дорадництво є важливим інструментом для створення демократії, уважного і ретельного пошуку способів вирішення проблем, основою *щая* подальшого розвитку демократичного середовища. Крім того, коли громадяни починають консультуватися один з одним з важливих питань, вони показують не тільки здатність приймати рішення, але працювати разом, долаючи труднощі.

Дорадча педагогіка покликана дати громадянам інструменти і знання, щоб поліпшити своє життя, об'єднавши знання і зусилля.

Ключові слова: громадянська освіта, освіта для дорослих, дорадче навчання, навчальне середовище, дорадча комунікація, навчальний процес, знання

Bibliography

Andrusiewicz A., *Katarzyna Wielka. Prawda i mit,* Warszawa 2012.

Baberowski Jörg., DerroteTerror. Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2003.

Bandura Albert., *Social Learning Theory,* Prentice-Hall; 1976.

Boghardt Thomas., *Spies of the Kaiser: German Covert Operations in Great Britain during the First World War Era.* Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.-224 pages.

Courtois S., Gauck J., Neubertetal E. *Das Schwarz buch des Kommunismus. Unterdrückung, Verbrechen und Terror.* (1998) Piper Verlag, München, 2004.

Deliberative Pedagogy. Teaching and Learning for Democratic Engagement, Ed. by Timothy J. Shaffer, Nnicholas V Longo, Idit Manosevitch, and Maxine S. Thomas. Michigan State University Press, 2017.

Glasser W. *The Quality School. Managing Students Without Coercion.* Harper Perennial, 1992.

Hayek F. *Law, Legislation and Liberty,* Volume 2: The Mirage of Social Justice, University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Hess D. E., McAvoy P. *The political classroom: Evidence and ethics in democratic education.* New York: Routledge. *2015.*

Jaeger W. *Paideia: the Ideals of Greek Culture.* Volume 1. Oxford University Press. 1965.

Kant, I. *Ldea Of A Universal History On A Cosmopolitical Plan* (1784) http://philosophyproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/IDEA-OF-A-UNIVERSAL-HISTORY-ON-A-COSMPOLITAN-PLAN.pdf.

Klosko G. *Democratic Procedures and Liberal Consensus,* Oxford University Press, 2000.

Lorenz K. *On Aggression. Routhlege Classics,* London NY, 2002.

Mathews D. *The Ecology of Democracy.* Kettering Foundation Press, 2014.

Mathews D. *Politics for People: Finding a Responsible Public Voice.* Paperback University of Illinois Press. - 1999.

Norman D. *Gods Playground. A history of Poland.* Oxford University Press, 1981.

\ozik R. *Why Do Intellectuals Oppose Capitalism?* // Cato Policy Report. 1998. January-February.

SnyderT. *Bloodlands: Europe Between Hitler and Stalin.* Basic Books, 2012.

Wandycz P.S. *The Price of Freedom: A History of East Central Europe from the Middle Ages to the Present.* Routledge, 2001.

Zeman Z.A.B. *Germany and the Revolution in Russia, 1915 - 1918: Documents from the Archives of the German Foreign Ministry.* Oxford University Press; 1958.- 180 p.

Бакка Т. В., Ладиченко Т. В., Марголіна Л. В. *Шкільний курс Громадянська освіта: основи демократії та методи його навчання* // Основа. - 2009. - С. 254 // Інститут громадянської освіти НаУКМА [Електронний ресурс]. - Режим доступу: http://www.ippo.edu.te.ua/files/gromad_osvita/resursy/3 O_polit_osvita_v_ukr.pdf.

Дем'янчук О. *Політична освіта. Місток між державою та громадянським суспільством* / О. Демянчук // Громадянське суспільство: проблеми теорії та практики. - К.: НаУКМА 2008.

Громадянська освіта в Україні. Семінар. Київ, 2 жовтня 2001 р. https://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/2001_10_02.pdf.

Лозинський М. *Сорок літ діяльності «Просвіти»* (Lozinski M. Forty years of activities of «Prosvita»). - Режим доступу: https://archive.org/stream/sorokltdialn001ozyuoft#page/n3/mode/2up.