

---

## COLLOQUIA

---

**Paula Guerra**

*University of Porto*

*Faculty of Arts and Humanities*

ORCID: 0000-0003-2377-8045

**Piotr Zańko**

*Uniwersytet Warszawski*

*Wydział Pedagogiczny*

ORCID: 0000-0003-3931-2928

### **Educational contexts of cultural resistance in Poland and Portugal. An introduction to research**

Where there is power there is resistance

Michel Foucault

#### **Summary**

The goal of this article is to present the main theoretical and methodological assumptions of an international research project on the educational contexts of cultural resistance in Poland and Portugal. In this article, we will first analyse, in a resumed way, the various lines of thought related to cultural resistance, radical democracy critical pedagogy; then we will present an example of a critical pedagogy, the punk pedagogy, in order to demonstrate that the reality we describe is not only present at the abstract level; then, and finally, we proceed with the research methodology that we intend to trigger in order to analyse the educational contexts of cultural resistance in Portugal and Poland. In this article we are talking about two countries with very dissonant stories. Even today, in the context of membership of the European Union, the course of both countries seems to diverge. However, we argue that the comparison between these two distant and different countries may open new perspectives on the contexts of cultural resistance and critical pedagogy. Like the example of punk, these practices of cultural resistance can serve as a way to empower active civic and political participation, going beyond the simple act of voting every four years and promoting a radical democracy.

**Key words:** cultural resistance, critical pedagogy, punk pedagogy, radical democracy, Poland and Portugal

The goal of this article is to present the main theoretical and methodological assumptions of an international research project on the educational contexts of cultural resistance in Poland and Portugal. In this article, we will first analyse, in a resumed way, the various lines of thought related to cultural resistance, radical democracy and critical pedagogy; then we will present an example of a critical pedagogy, the punk pedagogy, in order to demonstrate that the reality we describe is not only present at the abstract level; then, and finally, we proceed with the research methodology that we intend to trigger in order to analyse the educational contexts of cultural resistance in Portugal and Poland.

### **Cultural resistance and radical democracy**

What does “cultural resistance” actually mean? Let us begin with the fact that the second element of this term is – as Gibson Burrell (1984) and Peter Fleming (2005) correctly pointed out – a metaphor originating from the natural sciences, in particular from Newtonian physics and the *Third Law of Motion*: “for every action, there is an equal and opposite reaction”. This metaphor of resistance allows us to imagine a political and cultural action, which is distinguished by: “friction, opposition and negation” (Fleming 2005: 48).

In the cultural and political context, cultural resistance can be defined as conscious or unconscious, effective or ineffective practices, actions undertaken by subordinate, discriminated, oppressed and minority groups; against dominant cultural, political and economic discourses and structures (Duncombe 2002; Guerra 2018; Kuligowski 2018; Zańko 2019).

According to Stephen Duncombe, the practice of cultural resistance can take on various forms and meanings:

- it can create a sort of “free space” for the development of ideas and practices (in the area of ideology, it shall be the space to create a new language, new meanings and visions of the future, while in the area of matter, a place to build community and develop organisational models);
- it can be the first step towards political activity providing the language, the practice and the community;
- it can be understood as political or equivalent resistance;
- it can also be perceived as “a haven in a heartless world”, a way to escape politics and problems, to release discontent which could be expressed differently through political activity (Duncombe 2002: 5–8).

In our research project we will focus primarily on the ideological (political) dimension of cultural resistance, although its aesthetic context will also be taken into account. At the theoretical level, we will refer to the heritage of The Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies in Birmingham. In the aforementioned tradition, cultural resistance was analysed mainly in the context of the conflict: the culture of the oppressed *versus* the dominant culture (Hall & Jefferson 1976; Hoggart 1976; Hebdige 1979). Of course, we realise that the division into cultural resistance and dominant culture is not so obvious in postmodern culture. Many researchers pointed out that all forms of cultural resistance, sooner or later, become forms of dominant (consumer) culture (Hebdige 1979; Heath & Potter 2004; Holt 2002; Frank 1997). Some researchers, like Stephen Duncombe (2002), cited already, suggest even that the discussion of cultural resistance should take into account the statement that resistance does not exist in reality and cannot exist, because the complementary hegemony of the dominant system in the areas of ideology and matter is stronger than any form of cultural expression.

Initially, we put forward the thesis that the practices and texts of cultural resistance in Poland and Portugal are actually manifestations of committed citizenship and cultural, radical democracy. We agree with Tony Judt (2010) that an inclination to discord and protest is the nerve of the open society; and that we need people, who turn contestation into virtue, because democracy built on permanent concord cannot remain democracy for long. We also agree with Cornelius Castoriadis (1997), who argued that “there is no democratic society without democratic *paideia*” (p. 10). Paraphrasing this thought, we would like to add, that there is no democratic society without cultural resistance – and referring to the educational context – without “pedagogies of resistance” – “atypical, unconventional spaces of teaching and learning, which function outside the institutional educational discourse, and have a counter-hegemonic potential” (Zańko 2018: 207–208; see also: Sandlin, Schultz & Burdick 2010). As they point out, Joe L. Kincheloe and Peter McLaren (2011) thanks to the existence of these opposition ideologies, the “hegemony is never total or complete; it is always porous” (p. 315). As we will show in a moment, this counter-hegemonic potential of public pedagogy is of fundamental importance for radical democracy.

Although the concept of radical democracy is associated primarily with Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, and their famous book *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy. Towards A Radical Democratic Politics* (1985 [2001]), its sources can be found in the thought of the philosophers of the Enlightenment, in particular

Jean-Jacques Rousseau. This Genevan philosopher, among other things, drew attention to the repressiveness of social and cultural institutions and the issue of social inequalities (see: Rousseau 1750, 1755 [1969]), later developed by Karl Marx, another important theoretician for radical democrats. The youth revolution of the 1960s also influenced the development of radical democratic thought. Let us remind ourselves, that the counter-cultural project of remodelling the social world (based on the grassroots activity of rebellious citizens) was a negation of the adult world – with their repressive, technocratic, materialistic culture, turning citizens into passive consumers (Roszak 1969; Reich 1970).

As a result of the youth revolution, new social movements, among other things, have appeared. In contrast to the “old”, hierarchical social movements, these new social movements were focused not on creating a single, large project of changing the social world and gaining power (in the political sense) but on practising – quoting Anthony Giddens (1991) – “life politics” (see also Melucci 1980). These new social movements placed at the centre of their interest the following issues: pacifism, ecology, women’s rights, sexual minorities rights, consumer right and animal rights. In other words, the practices of the new social movements were focused on the issues of identity and life style. Thus, thanks to these new social movements, what had previously belonged to the private sphere has currently become “public”. As Alberto Melucci explains: “sexuality and the body, leisure, consumer goods, one’s relationship to nature – these are no longer the loci of private rewards but areas of collective resistance, of demands for expression and pleasure which are raised in opposition to the instrumental rationality of the apparatuses of order” (Melucci 1980: 219). The legacy of Rousseau, Marx, the counter-culture of the 1960s and new social movements also influenced poststructuralist thinking about democracy. As Lincoln Dalhberg points out, “poststructuralist radical democracy involves not only the extension of liberty and equality but the institutionalisation of contingency, which means the institutionalisation of contestation” (Dalhberg 2012: 6). Moreover, the author, after Oliver Marchart, states that: “democracy has to accept contingency, that is, the absence of an ultimate foundation for society, as a necessary precondition. Otherwise it cannot legitimately be called democracy in a strong sense” (Marchart 2007: 158).

The category of contingency and contestation is also a foundation for the radical democracy project of Laclau and Mouffe. This post-Marxist concept is actually a critique of the dominant western deliberative democracy, which

focuses on constructing *consensus*, and does not take into account class, gender, or racial differences existing in society (Laclau & Mouffe 2001). Thus, the deliberative paradigm is not the basis for democratic relations, which is based on rationality and *consensus* – but the base for democracy is the agonistic paradigm. In this model of democracy, the central category is the category of conflict, disagreement with the existing social reality (Mouffe 2000). This disagreement can be a vehicle that transports rebellious citizens into democratic spaces; common spaces free from asymmetrical power relations. In the agonistic model of democracy, we do not treat the *Other* as an *enemy* but only as an *opponent*, who has the right to express his point of view (Mouffe 2000). In turn, referring to the thoughts of Jacques Rancière (2010), one can conclude that the basis of (radical) democratic relations is not *consensus* but *dissensus*. In other words, the foundation of democracy is a conflict, a difference, and a questioning of the existing *status quo*.

In conclusion – closely related to the category of contestation, resistance, disagreement, and conflict – radical democracy exposes the hierarchical and oppressive relations of power that occur in postmodern, neoliberal society. Activities in the field of radical democracy are aimed at making these relations visible. As a result, these deconstructive practices of power relations lead to social change.

### Critical pedagogy: a state of the art

It may seem like a cliché, but a new world is in the making. The impacts felt nowadays are occurring deeper and faster. In the last decades we have observed the collapse of institutions and the reformulation of the Western cultural world. This sense of crisis is growing and turning into a dehumanising process, giving shape to an individualistic, selfish, and narcissistic society (Lasch 1979; Apple 1995; Zerzan 2012). The pillars of stability are affected by global uncertainty and by concomitant political changes that bring back the worst of humanity: the fear of the *Other*, the re-emergence of the political extreme-right, the collapse of the value of science and knowledge.

The school plays a pivotal role in all of this. In order for the inequality of this system to persist, it is enough for the school to ignore cultural imbalance between individuals from different social contexts (Bourdieu 2007) at curriculum, assessment methods and criteria. Tiago Teles Santos and Paula Guerra (2017),

referring to the Portuguese reality, notes the existence of multiple intelligences. The problem is that the school only recognises a very limited range, namely those associated with the middle/upper classes. This internal structure of inequality is not an unconscious 'error'. It is an integral part of the ideology that has gained prominence and authority in Western societies.

The most famous contribution regarding critical pedagogy is that of Paulo Freire. Freire (2005: 72) is occupied with the concept of 'banking', which is prevalent in education today. This is the process of depositing (or dumping) information in students in a noncommunicative relationship. For Freire this could not stand further from what education really is. In this process, the students are nothing more than information repositories, and, moreover, they lose the sense of humanity that only emerges with 'creativity, transformation and knowledge'. As mentioned above, it is a conscious process that serves the interests of the oppressors, who do not care if the world is revealed or transformed. They find that the best way to achieve their purpose is to nullify the creative power of the students.

This Brazilian philosopher advances with some key principles that guide critical pedagogy, and that will be important for future perspectives. First, education is a horizontal relationship between students and teachers. A conversation in which both posit problems and seek to solve them together; second, education must broaden students' perception of reality. They must see the world in a different way and, above all, must be motivated and enabled to act in it; third, education must be empowering and must imply an awareness. That is, knowledge must go beyond simply remembering the information received. Students should be able to understand information and act upon it; fourth, education must be transformative. It only earns the name of education when students and teachers feel that their worldview has changed; finally, education is political. Power structures influence what is taught, how it is taught and to whom it is intended. Thus, schools and classrooms are permeated by power structures. Critical pedagogy must place constraints on these forms of power. One way is to subvert the emphasis on hidden curricula, that is, to tell students that all of their knowledge, the multiple intelligences will be valued.

Given the key principles, let us turn to the results that, for Paulo Freire, critical pedagogy must have. First, there must be a connection between interpreting the world and interpreting the word. If any teaching does not serve to alter the student's perception of reality, the teaching has failed. The teaching must continually create new spaces of possibilities. Second, it should

raise awareness, which occurs when the students acknowledge more strongly what they already knew. Third, not only must the perception of the students' world change, but also that of their teachers. There must be a double transformation. This is the only way to achieve meaningful learning. Since Paulo Freire's innovative approach, the overall teaching situation has not yet improved. Let us look at the educational model postulated by neoliberal ideology. Apple (2013, 2016) describes four interlinked movements that postulate the neoliberal educational model:

1. neoliberalism and its pressure to establish a link between education and business models;
2. neoconservatism, which requires the application in schools of a common and consensual culture;
3. the new managerialism, which is guided by a culture of evaluation, with highly restricted models of evaluation and accountability;
4. religious and populist movements, which assume and proclaim ultraconservative positions in the educational system.

This new model of school, which can be found to some degree throughout the Western world, seeks to create a new type of student and citizen: malleable and flexible rather than based on determined principles (Soudien, Apple & Slaughter 2013: 455). John Dewey (1916) draws a distinction between schooling and education. The latter, which should be valued most, would involve a reconstruction of experience and thereby the possibility of altering the course of subsequent experiences. The problem for this author was the inability of modern societies to stimulate this form of education. More serious than that, he argued that schools in modern societies miseducated rather than educated. They stimulated competition and discord over harmony and diversity. All this would be the result of the values of the recent consumer society, or as the author termed it, the acquisitive society.

Another author who followed this line of thought was Ivan Illich (1971). This philosopher considered that schools had abandoned their *progressist* precepts becoming merely a transmission belt of oppressive institutions, as the state, the church and the upper classes. For Illich, the only way to overcome this problem was radical: the deschooling of society. With this process, the author intended that societies could create new forms and networks of learning that were not dependent on the oppressive forces he pointed out. We now come to the more recent notion of critical public pedagogy, postulated by Henry Giroux (2003) as a set of moral and political meanings. Its main objective is to achieve a radical,

participatory and inclusive democracy. This can only be achieved through progressive social and political changes. As we have already mentioned above, critical pedagogy opposes what Giroux (2004) called “corporate public pedagogy” of neoliberalism, which is the dominant ideological standard of the 21st century.

The corporate public pedagogy aims to develop, in McLaren’s (1998: 6) opinion, a “free market democracy” or, in other words, a hollow democracy that values a reduced and uncritical civic participation. Central to this argument is the idea that with the advancement of neoliberalism, public spaces are progressively being replaced by commercial spheres, which ultimately leads to a situation where “the substance of critical democracy is emptied out and replaced by a democracy of goods available to those with purchasing power” (Giroux 2004: 74). On the other hand, Patrick A. Roberts & David J. Steiner (2010) consider that a radical democracy is necessarily a plural democracy and is marked by differences of opinion. These differences are supported by an inclusive act of making and thus critical public pedagogy is characterised by the emphasis on a critical social agency, that is, people’s ability to act and change the prevailing social conditions and create new democratic relationships, new institutions and identities.

Again, school is the main battleground. This is where the fight is won or lost. A critical role is assigned to teachers. The problem is that in many cases teachers, as highlighted by Freire, only pass information to students uncritically. In addition, the relationships are anchored in an asymmetric and hierarchical model. That is why Roberts and Steiner (2010) speak of the need for teachers to also be pedagogues, which literally means “boy leader” and from which the word pedagogy is etymologically derived.

The role of these pedagogues is to “speak the truth” (Said 1994) and is a source of social and political criticism. Above all, for Roberts and Steiner (2010: 26), in performing the role of *paidagogos*, the critical pedagogue has two key tasks:

1. “To critique through her role as enabler/disabler the political parameters of democratic authority as these are established, of necessity, to maximise participation and inclusion in the public deliberation of normative values”;
2. “To promote through her role as servant-leader subjective re-articulation (...) in the interest of developing critical social agency oriented to the public good”.

## Punk pedagogy

Why punk? According to Kevin C. Dunn (2008), the attractiveness of punk as a form of political and personal expression resides in the offer of resources for agency and empowerment through disalienation, a DIY ethos and an anti-status-quo disposition, a disposition that according to David James (2009) is a deliberately rude infraction of the aesthetic and social norms. Punk is, then, a space *of* and *for* resistance. According to Michel Foucault (1997), the act of resisting is not detached from power; there is no exteriority, no absolute exterior to power. In this way, power relations depend on a multiplicity of points of resistance that fulfil the role of the adversary, the place of the target.

For Simon J. Charlesworth (2000: 17), “the world is a particular world, come to be known in a particular way: a way that makes possible the realisation of life projects”. This ‘particular world’ is based on the being-in-the-world and on a set of non-cognitive attitudes that refer to what Maurice Merleau-Ponty (2004) defines as the world of perception, or, in other words, the world that is revealed to us by our senses in our daily lives. This world of perception, despite being referred to as an illusion by Merleau-Ponty (2004), is the one that we know, the one upon which we act and from which we receive information. It is this world that forms and transforms our lives, and upon which existence is defined. In this context, space is social and is a central element in the definition of the universe of possibilities – the limits of the thinkable (Castoriadis 2007).

At this point we propose punk as a shelter that enables individuals to take the present into their own hands, to change the course of their lives at their own will, while reclaiming *no future*<sup>1</sup>, instead of creating and enacting a different future (Santos 2012; Guerra & Bennett 2015). In this way, punk offers opportunities for people to recognise collective cultural and political desires as their own (Thompson 2004). This operates in contrast to the identity crisis facing contemporary society, which, according to Erich Fromm (2013), reflects the crisis produced by its members becoming instruments without individual personalities, whose identities are reliant on their participation in corporations. One of punk’s structuring characteristics, one that makes it a stronghold for hope, is its perpetual refusal to stop imagining the world as other than it is (Thompson 2004). Neoliberalism is neither natural nor necessary – this is

---

<sup>1</sup> No future was one of most significant banners in punk’s emergence, one immortalised by the Sex Pistols’ homonymous song.

a guiding principle for many punks who cannot fully imagine how a better world might be, but who refuse to accept that this one cannot change (Thompson 2004).

Punk is also informed by points of view, experiences, trajectories, ideals, expectations and contexts, orbiting around one another to form collective and shared experiences. In a society in crisis, that is shattering at both the social and personal levels, one can share a culture of opposition, a culture that can either exist only at the level of discourse or can be actualised. Punk thus becomes a space able to guarantee a shelter, and to be a support base for those who, for one reason or another, feel different or displaced (Santos 2012). Punk was here long before it acquired its name. Despite some of its elements being appropriated by the mainstream and commodified, as aesthetics and music were, punk *ethos* resists. It resists and exists as long as societies produce inequalities and these lead to feelings of inadequacy, isolation and lack of fit. It will exist and resist as long as such conditions prevail (Santos & Guerra 2017).

Decentralised, anti-hierarchical, mobile and invisible, punk spread far and wide, guaranteeing its propagation by sublimation. We aim to present punk as a specific kind of space which serves as habitat for a different kind of pedagogy. Foucault (1986, 2002) presents heterotopias as peculiar spaces that at once relate to and deviate from everyday life. For Foucault, heterotopias (unlike utopias) are disturbing because they secretly undermine language and disable the possibility of discourse (Foucault 1986, 2002). In this sense, to look at punk as place, as a safe haven or a shelter, makes it, a kind of symbolic heterotopia – existing in the world, disturbing the *status quo* through means of resistance based on a shattering of signifiers and a (re)appropriation of signs.

After exploring education's transformations and a small introduction to punk, we now have the basis to discuss the prospect of a critical punk pedagogy. As we have shown, punk "can function as a space where individuals can experiment, create and interrogate" (Dines 2015: 24). This creative process is at the core of what Freire (2005) poses as concern for humanisation; attained only by what he defines as "true generosity" (Freire 2005: 45). For Freire, the radical – the *punk* – is an individual who is fully committed to grasping and transforming reality. It is this attitude that characterises the emergence of punk pedagogies.

According to Mike Dines (2015), punk pedagogy, despite being a notion capable of raising eyebrows, finds its own space among two particular possibilities: it can be seen as a form of pedagogy inspired by the critical pedagogy school, the DIY ethos, and the oppositional attitude of punk; or as a pedagogy based on punk as a subject matter, as a part of a curriculum. Both

discourses and punk lyrics can be considered subject matters in a curriculum focused on punk. Nonetheless, our goal is to use them to illustrate punks' ideology of opposition, their radicalism (using Freire's expression) in embracing a form of pedagogy that breaks free from the constraints of the schooling system and that emerges, in turn, as a free space, as a symbolic heterotopia (Guerra 2014, 2016; Santos & Guerra 2017).

Guerra and Silva's study about Portuguese punk texts analysed the lyrics of 264 punk songs, gathered from interviewees. From the 130 most cited songs, 41.5% vented sentiments of "denounce, protest, demarcation", 20% of "anger, revolt", 11.5% of "rage, hatred", and 10% of both "evasion (fun, pleasure, experimentation)" and "friendship, brotherhood" (Silva & Guerra 2015: 122). Education only succeeds as a relationship that overcomes authoritarianism and intellectualism through the becoming of both the teachers and the students as subjects of the educational process, and through the use of dialogical action focused on cooperation, unity, organisation, and cultural synthesis (Freire 2005: 86).

In this way, how can this be achieved in the scope of a punk pedagogy? We agree with Woods' assertion that the critical pedagogues' "aim [is] to empower students through emancipating them from ideologies and discriminatory practices" (Woods in Dines 2015: 28). The DIY *ethos* is of the utmost importance in this regard. It is through this that punk's emancipatory power enables punk to thrive and survive as a pedagogical pillar based on the teachings of Paulo Freire, one that "reinstates personal responsibility instead of relying upon the dominant ideology of teacher as transmitter" (Dines 2015: 24).

In summary, a punk pedagogy should be liberating. The outsider positionality and capabilities of punk enable the development of an educational process that can both happen *inside* of punk and draw from it to the *outside*. A punk pedagogy is not, in this sense, for the punks. It is an educational process that uses their attributes, diversity and ethos to create a collective, more real, radical and educational alternative to the individualistic schooling hegemony (Santos & Guerra 2017).

## Research methodology

The research will be of interdisciplinary character. Due to the experience of members of the research team, we will base our work on methodology

assumptions developed on the basis of culture studies, sociology of culture and, in particular, interpretative anthropology. We believe that cultural resistance is a thoroughly polysemous area. For its description (interpretation) it makes sense to apply the “method” of thick description, developed by Clifford Geertz (1973), where – as rightly noted by Mariusz Czubaj (2007: 19), “the meanings overlap, cross and rather shed light on each other than reduce each other to clean-cut responses”. The main research techniques employed in our ethnography of cultural resistance shall include: narrative interviews, participant observation and interpretative analysis of cultural texts (McKee 2003).

Analysing selected practices and texts of the cultural resistance, we are interested in their content, forms and methods of production. In other words, we want to find out what elements of the social world artists, *artists* and activists criticise; what alternative visions of the world they propose, and how they do it. We also want to find out what are the differences and similarities between cultural resistance in Portugal and in Poland as well. *Last but not least*, we want to find out what is the relationship between cultural resistance and committed citizenship and radical democracy. The planned analysis will contain practices and texts of cultural resistance created after 2000. Although the historical context of cultural resistance in Poland and Portugal will also be taken into account at the theoretical and analytical level.

We plan to conduct 100 narrative interviews with artists, *artists* and activists tied to cultural resistance, that is, rock musicians, street artists, culture jammers, performers and *happeners*, directors at theatres and of alternative films, writers, creators of zines and crafts, activists running squats and manufacturing bicycles with the Do It Yourself (DIY) method, the people behind the “Warsaw Critical Mass”, environmentalists building alternative rural communities, organisers of the “ZdaErzenia” festival of alternative culture. The interviews would be conducted both in large cities (Warszawa, Gdańsk, Lublin, Gliwice, Kraków, Wrocław, Szczecin, Poznań, Łódź) and in rural communities (Dąbrówka, Wolimierz, Moszczaniec). Similarly, we will adopt the same approach in Portugal: in the two large metropolitan areas of Porto and Lisbon; in coastal areas and “medium cities” such as Viana do Castelo, Aveiro, Coimbra, Leiria; in interior areas and developing cities like Braga and Castelo Branco; in tourist areas such as Faro in Algarve; in rural areas of the interior of Alentejo or in more interior and border zones in the north of Portugal.

In order to capture the widest possible spectrum for the research issue – following the lead of Michael Patton – we shall select our interlocutors in a purposeful manner, taking into account the maximum of variability and variety

of the discourses of cultural resistance that they generate (Patton 2002, quoted from Flick 2007). The cultural texts and practices of cultural resistance shall be selected in the same manner, including those that we intend to observe (including the festival *Rock na Bagnie – Rock in the Swamp*, punk rock and hardcore concerts and other events tied to cultural resistance, organised at the ADA – Active Alternative House in Warsaw, the neo-hippie “Rainbow Family” meetings in Moszczaniec).

We believe that the triangulation (of the applied research techniques) ensures better reliability and quality of the research. Our analyses, in line with suggestions of proponents of grounded theory, shall be conducted up until the achievement of theoretical saturation of the field of cultural resistance. As explained by Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss (2006), “the criterion for judging when to stop sampling the different groups pertinent to a category is the category’s theoretical saturation. Saturation means that no additional data are being found, whereby the sociologist can develop properties of the category. [...] One reaches theoretical saturation by joint collection and analysis of data. [...] When one category is saturated, nothing remains but to go on to new groups for data on other categories and attempt to saturate these new categories also” (p. 61).

The qualitative analysis of the discourse of cultural resistance in Poland and Portugal shall cover:

1. Selected texts of cultural resistance created in the years 2000–2020: texts of rock and hip hop songs (including those on sexual minorities); products of socially engaged street art (template graffiti, murals, stickers etc.) and visual artefacts of cultural jamming; zines and other magazines tied to cultural resistance; independent, off-cinema documentaries and feature films; literary works; comics and author illustrations.
2. Selected practices of cultural resistance from the years 2000–2020: alternative theatre and performance; squatting; bicycle counter-culture, including the activity of the Warsaw Critical Mass and the activity of the Porto Critical Mass; alternative rural communities (eco-villages) in Wolimierz and Dąbrówka near Lublin and alternative rural communities (eco-villages) in Alentejo in the south of Portugal; guerrilla gardening; festivals: including *Rock na Bagnie (Rock in the Swamp)* (Goniądz); *Primavera Sound* (Porto), *Boom Festival* (Idanha-a-Nova); *O Semibreve Festival – Electronic music and digital arts festival* (Braga); *o OUT.FEST – Barreiro International Music Exploratory Festival* (Barreiro); *Alternative Culture*

Festival ZdaErzenia (ClaEshes) (Lublin); various forms of cultural resistance (including punk rock and hardcore concerts, independent cinema reviews etc.) organised by the Active Alternative House (ADA) in Warsaw; Neo-hippie meetings “Rainbow Family” in Moszczaniec; alternative lifestyles linked to new therapies and unconventional medicines; various forms of cultural resistance (including punk rock and hardcore concerts, independent cinema reviews etc.) organised by the OUT.RA, Cultural Association.

Analysis of practices and texts of cultural resistance in Poland and Portugal will focus on their meaning and shall be conducted according to the scheme: coding meaning – condensation of meaning – interpretation of meaning (Charmaz 2009; Kvale 2007). Precisely speaking, at the first stage of analysis the collected material shall be coded with pre-defined, general categories (“upfront coding”). Next, these categories shall be developed, defined in more detail (interpreted). To ensure the reliability and aptness of research, the narrative interviews and other texts tied to cultural resistance shall be analysed (coded) by a group comprising the main project executors. This will ensure that all differences resulting from analysis of the research material would be discussed on an ongoing basis during seminars in Poland and in Portugal. As we foresee the volume of research material to be large, for the purpose of analysis we shall use an advanced computer application *Atlas.ti 8*, which supports the analysis of qualitative data. It enables, among others, the coding (creation of analytical categories) within various types of data (not only the transcription of interviews, but also – what is very important for us – visual materials, including video), comparison of cases and drafting theoretical memos.

The project execution will be supported by “ethnographers of cultural resistance” – a group of young researchers, doctoral students from Poland and Portugal, who before commencing field research shall be informed of the main principles for conducting narrative interviews and observations (with particular attention devoted to ethical aspects) (Kvale 2007). They shall also be trained on the use of the *F4* computer application which supports the process of interview transcription.

### **A final point as a starting point**

Comparisons should be made with objects that can be compared. But can Portugal and Poland be compared? We are talking about two countries with

very dissonant stories. Even today, in the context of membership of the European Union, the course of both countries seems to diverge. However, we consider that the comparison between these two distant and different countries may open new perspectives on the contexts of cultural resistance and critical pedagogy.

How are these processed in the two countries? Are the differences more significant than the similarities? Are there cross-cutting influences, particularly those from the Anglo-Saxon countries? How are these practices of cultural resistance perceived by society and by public institutions? As we said, at a time when everything seems ephemeral and changing, it is important to objectify and study what has been done at the level of cultural resistance. Like the example of punk, these practices can serve as a way to empower active civic and political participation, going beyond the simple act of voting every four years and promoting a radical democracy. Similarly, in a time of de-structuring, those resistance cultures can stand as forms of ontological security for agents. In short, there is a whole world to be discovered and allowed to advance with the state of the art on cultural resistance, which, like many other topics, is overrepresented by Anglo-Saxon reality.

## References

- Apple M.W. 1995. *Education and power*, Routledge, London.
- Apple M.W. 2013. *Between traditions: Stephen Ball and the critical sociology of education*, "London Review of Education", 11 (3), pp. 206–17.
- Apple M.W. 2016. *Introduction to "The politics of educational reforms"*, "The Educational Forum", 80 (2), pp. 127–36.
- Bourdieu P. 2007. *Escritos de educação* [Writings about Education], Vozes, Rio de Janeiro.
- Burrell G. 1984. *Sex and organizational analysis*, "Organizations Studies", nr 5, pp. 97–118.
- Castoriadis C. 1997. *Democracy as procedure and democracy as regime*, "Constellations", nr 4 (1), pp. 1–18.
- Castoriadis C. 2007. *Figures of the thinkable*, Stanford University Press, Palo Alto.
- Charlesworth S.J. 2000. *A phenomenology of working class experience*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Charmaz K. 2000. *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.
- Charmaz K. 2006. *Constructing grounded theory. A practical guide through qualitative analysis*, Sage, London – Thousand Oaks – New Delhi.

- Czubaj M. 2007. *Biodra Elvisa Presleya. Od paleoherosów do neofanów*, Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne, Warszawa.
- Dalhberg L. 2012. *Radical democracy*, available at: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287857221\\_Radical\\_democracy](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287857221_Radical_democracy) (opened on April 23, 2019).
- Dewey J. 1916. *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*, Macmillan, New York.
- Dines M. 2015. Learning through resistance: Contextualisation, creation and incorporation of a 'punk pedagogy', "Journal of Pedagogic Development", no. 5 (3), pp. 20–31.
- Duncombe S. (ed.) 2002. *Cultural resistance reader*, Verso, New York.
- Dunn K.C. 2008. Never Mind the bollocks: the punk rock politics of global communication, "Review of International Studies", no. 34 (51), pp. 193–210.
- Fleming P. 2005. Metaphors of resistance, "Management Communication Quarterly", no. 19 (1), pp. 45–66.
- Flick U. 2007. *Designing qualitative research*, Sage, London.
- Foucault M. 1986. Of other spaces: Utopias and heterotopias, "Diacritics", no. 16, pp. 22–27.
- Foucault M. 1997. *Ethics, subjectivity and truth. The essential works of Michel Foucault 1954–1984*, vol. 1, The New Press, New York.
- Foucault M. 2002. *The order of things: An archeology of the human sciences*, Routledge, London – New York.
- Frank T. 1997. *The conquest of cool: Business culture, counterculture, and the rise of hip consumerism*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Freire P. 2005. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*, Continuum, New York – London.
- Fromm E. 2013. *To have or to be?* Bloomsbury Academic, London – New York.
- Geertz C. 1973. *The interpretation of cultures*, Basic Books, New York.
- Giddens A. 1991. *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Giroux H.A. 2003. Neoliberalism and the disappearance of the social in Ghost World, "Third Text", no. 17 (2), pp. 151–161.
- Giroux H.A. 2004. *The terror of neoliberalism: Authoritarianism and the eclipse of democracy*, Paradigm Publishers, Boulder.
- Glaser B.G. & Strauss A.L. 2006. *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*, Aldine Transaction, New Brunswick – London.
- Guerra P. & Bennett A. 2015. Never mind the Pistols? The legacy and authenticity of the Sex Pistols in Portugal, "Popular Music and Society", no. 38 (4), pp. 500–521.
- Guerra P. & Silva A.S. 2015. Music and more than music: The approach to difference and identity in the Portuguese punk, "European Journal of Cultural Studies", no. 18 (2), pp. 207–223.
- Guerra P. 2014. Punk, expectations, breaches and metamorphoses: Portugal, 1977–2012, "Critical Arts: South-North Cultural and Media Studies", no. 28 (1), pp. 111–122.
- Guerra P. 2016. Keep it rocking: The social space of Portuguese alternative rock (1980–2010), "Journal of Sociology", no. 52 (4), pp. 615–630.

- Guerra P. 2018. Raw power: punk, DIY and underground cultures as spaces of resistance in contemporary Portugal, "Cultural Sociology", no. 12 (2), pp. 241–259.
- Hall S. & Jefferson T. (eds.). 1976. *Resistance through rituals: Youth subcultures in post-war Britain*, Routledge, London.
- Heath J. & Potter A. 2004. *The rebel sell. Why the culture can't be jammed*, Harper Collins, Toronto.
- Hebdige D. 1979. *Subculture: The meaning of style*, Routledge, London.
- Holt D.B. 2010. Why do brands cause trouble? A dialectical theory of consumer culture and branding, "Journal of Consumer Research", no. 29 (1), pp. 70–90.
- Illich I. 1971. *Deschooling society*, Harper & Row, New York.
- James D. 2009. *Art, myth and society in Hegel's aesthetics*, Continuum, London – New York.
- Judt T. 2010. *Ill fares the land*, Penguin Press, London.
- Kincheloe J.L. & McLaren P. 2011. *Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research*, [in:] K. Hayes, Sh.R. Steinberg, K. Tobin (eds.), *Key Work in Critical Pedagogy*, Sense Publisher, Rotterdam, pp. 285–326.
- Kuligowski W. 2018. *Wprowadzenie do praktyk oporu kulturowego*, [in:] W. Kuligowski (ed.), *Miejsca oporu. O kontrkulturach kultury polskiej*, Stowarzyszenie Czasu Kultury, Poznań, pp. 7–24.
- Kvale S. 2007. *Doing interviews*, Sage, London – Thousand Oaks – New Delhi.
- Laclau E., Mouffe Ch. 2001. *Hegemony and socialist strategy. Towards a radical democratic politics*, Verso, London – New York.
- Lasch Ch. 1979. *The culture of narcissism: American life in an age of diminishing expectations*, W.W. Norton & Company, New York.
- Marchart O. 2007. *Post-foundational political thought. Political difference in Nancy, Lefort, Badiou and Laclau*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- McKee A. 2003. *Textual analysis: A beginner's guide*, Sage Publications, London – Thousand Oaks – New Delhi.
- McLaren P. 1998. *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*, Longman, New York.
- Melucci A. 1980. The new social movements: A theoretical approach. "Social Science Information", no. 19 (2), pp. 199–226.
- Merleau-Ponty M. 2004. *The world of perception*, Routledge, London.
- Mouffe Ch. 2000. *The democratic paradox*, Verso Books, London – New York.
- Patton M.Q. 2002. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*, Sage, London.
- Rancière J. 2010. *Dissensus: On politics and aesthetics*, A&C Black, London.
- Reich Ch.A. 1970. *The greening of America*, Random House, New York.
- Roberts P.A. & Steiner D.J. 2010. *Critical public pedagogy and the paidagogos: Exploring the normative and political challenges of radical democracy*, [in:] Jennifer A. Sandlin, Brian D. Schultz, Jake Burdick (eds.), *Handbook of public pedagogy: education and learning beyond schooling*, Routledge, New York – London, pp. 20–27.
- Roszak T. 1969. *The making of a counter culture*, University of California Press, Oakland.

- Rousseau J.-J. 1750, 1755 [1969]. *The first and second discourses*, Bedford/St. Martin's, New York.
- Said E.W. 1993. *Culture and imperialism*, Vintage Books, New York.
- Sandlin J., Schultz B.D. & Burdick J. 2010. *Understanding, mapping, and exploring the terrain of public pedagogy*, [in:] J.A. Sandlin, B.D. Schultz, J. Burdick (eds.), *Handbook of public pedagogy. Education and learning beyond schooling*, Routledge, New York–London, pp. 1–6.
- Santos T.T. & Guerra P. 2017. *From punk ethics to the pedagogy of the bad kids: Core values and social liberation*, [in:] G.D. Smith, M. Dines, T. Parkinson (eds.), *Punk pedagogies: Music, culture and learning*, Routledge, London, pp. 210–224.
- Santos T.T. 2012. *Bad Kids. Para uma compreensão dos universos simbólicos e materiais de existência: referências punk na cidade do Porto* [Bad Kids. Towards an understanding of material and symbolical universes of existence: punk references in Porto]. MA dissertation in Sociology, University of Porto, Porto.
- Soudien C., Apple M.W. & Slaughter S. 2013. Global education Inc: new policy networks and the neo-liberal imaginary, "British Journal of Sociology of Education", no. 34 (3), pp. 453–466.
- Thompson S. 2004. *Punk productions. Unfinished business*, State University of New York Press, Albany.
- Woods P. 1996, *Critical Students: Breakthroughs in Learning*, [in:] P. Woods (ed.), *Contemporary issues in teaching and learning*, Routledge, London, pp. 127–143.
- Zańko P. 2018. *Pedagogie patriotyzmu* [Pedagogies of patriotism], "Kwartalnik Pedagogiczny", nr 4, pp. 190–211.
- Zańko P. 2019. *Pedagogie oporu* [Pedagogies of resistance], Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa (in print).
- Zerzan J. 2012. *Future primitive*, Feral House, Port Townsend.