

Critical Futures Study: A Dimension of Educational Work

Richard A Slaughter

Educational institutions are already in the futures business. They participate in a much wider enterprise often without knowing it, without reflecting on the processes whereby aspects of past cultures are brought into the present and used as raw materials in the construction of futures.

No architect, engineer or business executive could proceed for long on the basis of worn-out designs and purposes. But as sheltered, monopolistic institutions schools are approaching the twenty first century long before they have come to terms with the twentieth and, moreover, they still retain an unwieldy amount of baggage from earlier times. This is not to attack schools, nor to take a crude anti-historical view. What I want to emphasise is that the whole business of curriculum development, innovation and change is bedevilled by the continuing immersion of educational institutions in the past - not the past that actually occurred in unrecorded complexity and richness, but the past that survives in reconstructed bits and fragments replete with official myths, simplifications and endless omissions.

Schools, colleges and universities tend to behave as if the past were authoritative and the future a mere abstraction. Neither view holds water and competent historians will readily admit that their enterprise is much more provisional and open than is commonly believed. But few teachers, teacher educators or lecturers make a point of exploring the ways that education inherently refers forward to ends and processes which absolutely *require* a future. When I answer the question about 'what do I do' I'm no longer surprised by the raised eyebrows, the incomprehension. Futures? What does that mean? What does it have to do with education?

I want to offer three opening comments. First, in lacking a futures dimension, education takes on a repressive character. That is, it elevates a concern for the maintenance of knowledge (and therefore power) structures over human concerns. To render the future invisible, not worthy of discussion or study, is to strip away much of human significance in the present. For teaching and learning do not take place simply as a result of the pressure of the past. Statements of aims and objectives usually refer to purposes, goals and intentions which necessarily refer *forward* in time. So there is a contradiction in disregarding futures since they are already present, already there in present-day teaching and learning. Futures concerns are so deeply involved in creating the present that it is doubtful if we could act at all without them.

Like all other human activities educational work is embedded in time and it is axiomatic that such work cannot materially affect what has gone before. Whatever the precise purposes embodied in any particular educational offering they necessarily refer forward to future ends. While it is true that some activities are held to be worth doing for their own sake, and while it is earnestly to be hoped that good teaching and productive learning have immediate benefits, every lesson, exercise, tutorial, assignment and the like derive meaning both from what has gone before and what is hoped for in the longer term. Qualifications, the development of abilities and skills, vocational training and preparation for life are not short-term concerns. They range out beyond the 'here and now' of immediate sensory perception to wider spans of space and time. They are true futures concerns.

Few teachers would undertake the rigours of training if it were not related to personal and professional goals. Few students would remain at their desks if they were not persuaded of the benefit. It is not really possible to begin to discuss careers, personal development or social change without reference to the world of the future in which all of this is supposed to happen.

A second comment is that education for whole persons needs a futures dimension. For persons require a future to guide them in the present. The implicit model of personhood which we have inherited from the industrial era overlooks this and much else besides. It recognises some of the mental and physical attributes of persons but deals scantily, if at all, with their emotional and spiritual aspects. By 'spiritual' I do not mean religious. There is plenty of religiosity around. But few recognise the inner person and its higher needs. That has not been a part of recent Western culture in the past and it is therefore not seen as important now or in the future. Yet little can be more important than to have a developed view of human growth and human potential which includes notions of peacefulness, caring and stewardship. This is part of the human basis for resisting the arrogance of technological overkill.

The industrial model needs replacing with one which gives due attention to the layered quality of persons and the world in which they live, to the way in which we are all grounded in the physical world but also range upward through emotional and mental states to levels of functioning which can only be called spiritual (Schumacher 1977). A world view based on Cartesian logic and Newtonian paradigms of enquiry simply cannot cope with that. But the fact of the matter is that as we proceed from lower to higher levels we discover *emergent qualities*. Just as a watch is more than the sum of its parts and a living cell is much more than the sum of its chemical constituents, so the highest levels of human consciousness do in fact reach the transcendent.

A worldview or curriculum which misses this is actually missing one of the most humanly significant features of our world. For higher levels of awareness tend to be inclusive rather than exclusive. They reach out to embrace broad spans of space and time and have therefore become essential in healing our planet, creating peace and moving toward new stages of civilised life.

The third comment is that as they are currently constituted, educational curricula tend not to offer a critical purchase on the underlying causes of the present world problematique. They actually contribute to the problem when they unthinkingly reproduce an obsolete world view. For the sources of most world problems lie in the character of paradigms and systems of valuation and thought which support the Western way of life (Berman 1981). The practical power of our technology and organisational ability has been purchased at an enormous price: pollution, conflict, alienation, social decay, ecological breakdown and nuclear stalemate. Those features of the world are often glossed over. Yet any map which omits areas of danger is not worth having. So ways are needed of coming to grips with the underlying belief systems and approaches to knowledge which have brought our civilisation to this dangerous and unstable condition. While some groups find this essential and constructive work threatening or even subversive (perhaps because of entrenched interests or dated knowledge) it cannot be overstressed that understanding the breakdown is an essential precursor to real cultural innovation and recovery. I'll return to this later.

Futures in education is therefore most centrally concerned with negotiating and exploring new and renewed understandings about our present cultural transition beyond the industrial era. It has a role to play in defining and creating a more just,

peaceful and sustainable world. Visions and views of desirable futures always come before their realisation. Yet today positive visions are in very short supply.

To think ahead is still dismissed as being 'speculative' despite the fact that human civilisation has created dynamic processes of change which could alter, or eliminate, sentient life upon the earth. Such is the power of obsolete world views. Empiricists will even ask how one can study something which does not exist. But I have come to realise that the future (or futures) represents a principle of present action and present being. Without it there would be no plans, purposes, goals, intentions, meanings ... or curricula. A present without any future component would be too sparse, too narrow, too arid for the exercise of human intentionality. Indeed, a little reflection will reveal that futures are constitutive of human consciousness. To the extent that futures are ignored, repressed or predetermined human agency itself is under threat. It is characteristic of our species that, while the body may be time-bound through biological necessity, the mind and imagination are not. In this view there's an organic quality to futures: they are very much connected with everyday life and the wider implications thereof.

A less liberating interest in futures arises from the attempts of powerful groups to secure their own ends. Jovenel (1967) called this 'colonising the future.' He was referring to the organised attempt to impose some certainty or some structure upon that which lies ahead. Planning has certainly become unavoidable and such efforts are entirely reasonable when motivated by some notion of the public good. Yet it remains a fact that much of the expertise of futurists, planners and forecasters is monopolised by purely commercial, bureaucratic and strategic military concerns. This certainly remains the case in the USA and Europe (Miles 1979, Slaughter 1984). So on the one hand there is a widely-shared but diffuse interest in futures and on the other a diverse group of experts committed to a range of enterprises and ends. But this sketch leaves out two important items. One is the existence of a multi-faceted international futures movement which acts as a kind of counterbalance to professionalised futures research. The other is the development of critical views which draw upon and reinterpret material from the whole spectrum.

My own view is 'critical' in at least three senses. First, it developed from a critique of the shortcomings of dominant American approaches which were in some respects superficial, misleading and ideologically naive. Second, I drew explicitly upon the critical theory of Jurgen Habermas and his associates of the Frankfurt school. Third, the perspective attempts to be open and self-critical (reflexive) about assumptions, values and meanings. In this view there is little interest in attempting to forecast future events. Rather, the available material (including forecasts, scenarios, arguments, images, etc.) is deployed in processes of *interpretive negotiation*. As I have noted elsewhere, transformations of meaning occupy a central place in this perspective. The ideological content of futures problems is recognised, as is the crucial role of language and presupposition in mediating all attempts at communication (Peters 1974).

Critical futures study is not value-free, nor does it aspire to be so. Rather, it is openly committed to what Habermas calls the 'emancipatory interest' (Habermas 1971, 1972). That is, the fundamental human concern for freedom from oppression, mystification, repressive power relations and ideologically distorted communication. In practice, that translates into concern for human development, well-being, and the articulation of convivial and sustainable futures. That seems to me to be an eminently productive basis for educational work. By drawing broadly upon the futures field as such and on traditions of enquiry that have not been widely associated with it, critical futures study proposes a mode of discourse which can be widely applied in a variety of fields.

The futures field as an educational resource

When people ask how one can study something which 'does not exist' they are implying three things. First, they are implicitly referring to empiricist traditions of enquiry which tend to value only the tangible and the measurable. Second, they have not given much thought to values and meanings which are not diminished by their non-material status. And third, they've not looked seriously at the futures field. If they had, they would know that powerful groups such as governments, trans-nationals and the military spend a great deal of money on the kinds of futures work of benefit to them. Why educational systems have not yet done the same on any wide scale is an interesting question. In fact futures have been taught now for over twenty years. While some of the ideas may seem new they are not untested in practice. How, then, does one begin?

The first thing to note is that there is indeed a broad field of study, research and practice involving futures. The subject matter of the field has sometimes given rise to quite spurious dismissals of futures. But if one looks through any of the journals, magazines or books associated with it, the subject matter is very clear. It ranges from forecasts, plans, surveys of various kinds, through careful analyses of particular issues to explicitly partisan statements about hoped-for or intended futures. Nor should we leave out of this sketch the branch of speculative writing which has used the future as an imaginative backdrop. For it is often within the context of stories that the human significance of futures can be most productively explored.

There are many implications for educational studies and development. One is that underlying notions of temporality subtly condition the way we understand and approach pedagogic tasks. Another is that negotiations of meaning are centrally involved in processes of cultural continuity and change. In the former instance it is worth noting that western linear time, while having undoubted practical benefits, also has a number of drawbacks. It reifies and separates past, present and future (though they are in fact richly interconnected). It is anthropocentric and scientifically inaccurate in presupposing a simple one-way flow (Capra 1975). But its biggest drawback is that it tends to make the present vanish. That is to say, the present has been 'chopped up' by progressively more exacting measurements so that it has seemed to disappear beneath perceptual thresholds (Fraser 1978). This minimal present corresponding to the 'here and now' of Western linear time is something of a disaster. In an interconnected and interdependent world the last thing we need is an alienating present which maintains an illusion of separateness and isolation from the universal process in which we are immersed (Dossey 1982, Wilber 1979). Of immensely greater benefit is the notion that reconnects us with the wider pattern - an extended present. There are major interpretive choices to be made here. I've taken up Elise Boulding's idea of a two-hundred year present stretching about 100 years in each 'direction' (Boulding 1978, Slaughter 1984). In educational terms that is just about right for it embraces the living context we have inherited and are now creating. Here, then, is one category of meanings to be reinterpreted and renegotiated. There are many others.

Educational institutions have often been accused of being inward-looking, isolated and incapable of change. That is not really surprising given their history. Nor would it matter if the wider context were static. In that case history would indeed reign supreme. But in the early 1990s such a stance has little credibility. The proper business of education is neither to uncritically purvey reified aspects of the past nor to try to predict the future. Rather, it is to mediate past and future in the continuing reconstruction of the present. What does this mean?

In the first place, it implies that there needs to be a much more even-handed concern with past and future, a more productive *temporal balance*. The forward-looking aspects of existing courses can be debated and explored. Opportunities exist on every side to open up moribund subjects by permitting futures issues and problems to enter. A number of tools and techniques from the futures field have been adapted for educational use and many of these can be deployed across the curriculum.

In developing a critical approach to futures I have moved freely from one research front to another on a variety of fields. Among them are hermeneutics, critical linguistics, post-structuralist literary criticism, transpersonal psychology and speculative fiction. Each contributes to what I have called an *interpretive perspective*. The latter has numerous implications for educational work and underlines the central importance of negotiations of meaning in that context. In this view, teachers, lecturers and writers have a lot in common. They are each in the business of producing texts or discourses which appear to be authoritative. The author is in charge of the text, the teacher of the classroom. Both types of work are grounded in conventions about power, knowledge, truth and so on which tend to be taken for granted. Naturalistic writing and authoritarian teaching both invite us to see the world in this particular way and to close off other interpretive choices. Clearly, some degree of authority is useful and unavoidable, but if it suppresses the interpretive autonomy of the reader or student it is fundamentally unproductive and humanly repressive.

Debates about the extent to which texts (or curricula) are essentially open structures continue (Belsey 1980, Waugh 1984). Some argue that texts are structures from which readers can generate a wide range of meanings while others believe that the range of plausible meanings is rather limited. In fact, I doubt if the question can be resolved at such a general level. What I will suggest is that since each reader/student brings a unique set of capacities, understandings and potentials to bear upon a text/curriculum there is latitude for some degree of interpretation. It is profoundly important that individuals are not trapped by unregarded conventions and practices into simply decoding discrete and finished structures of meaning. In educational terms there is much to be gained by regarding people as co-authors who, given the chance, are fully capable of calling forth meaning, purpose and intention from a range of sources. The distinction between passive decoding and active interpretation is crucial. It is the difference between object and subject. One approach forces individuals back to inferior and dependent states while the other opens up options for development and participation. Thus, to be involved in the continuing reconstruction of the present attracts a number of core meanings. It suggests that students be encouraged to interpret in both 'directions' away from the present rather than be presented with sequences of givens which merely require passive conformity. Since any liveable notion of the present embraces aspects of past and future, this amounts to a continuing process of interpretive reconstruction.

One of the central themes of the futures field is that underlying all human differences are certain commonalities of interest. These include food, shelter, companionship, a healthy environment, peace and justice. Whatever one's position or viewpoint, these underlying interests provide a basic framework for enquiry and for curriculum development. The all-too-obvious differences that arise are arguably less important than the shared fact of a common underlying agenda. But what the analyst, protester and teacher have in common goes beyond this. For each, in his or her own way, and with greater or lesser clarity and awareness, attempts to plot a course through a changing

world. This involves reading signals from the environment, interpreting them, making decisions and acting.

Negotiating change – a cycle of transformation

It is regrettable that pundits, commentators, children's books and most media productions involving futures tend to misdirect students and to focus on the external construction of the future by technology. For underlying the surface of technical change there are important human processes. These have to do *with transformations of meaning*. We can distinguish at least four stages. To begin to be aware of them is to open up whole new areas of enquiry and action. In so doing we penetrate to the core of critical futures work.

Teachers and lecturers are more aware than many that uncertainty, depression, frustration and fear often appear to be the dominant emotions of our times. Third world populations have seen the material cornucopia of the West and yet, broadly speaking, it is denied to them. On the other hand, the rich, and relatively rich, populations of the industrialised world have many of the material goods but have lost a coherent view of where they are going or why. The nuclear sword hangs over us all. A large number of the values and beliefs which sustained the social landscape and gave it coherence have fallen, or are falling, apart. Work, leisure, defence, gender, progress, health and so on have lost much of their earlier significance. We are, in other words, living through a *breakdown of inherited meanings*. This is the first stage of a 'transformative cycle', or T-cycle for short. The point is this: whereas unreflective immersion in the breakdowns of unemployment, racism, crime, poverty and meaninglessness is certainly a cause for depression and anger, it is of enormous value to see that the breakdown is often structural. It is not *merely* the result of individual failure or bad luck. However well-off we may be, we are all affected. So, first, we can recognise a society-wide process which affects everyone and for which we are all responsible. Second, we can begin to move out of the sense of guilt and/or depression which results because, having brought the breakdown to full consciousness, we are now open to new choices and possibilities.

The recognition of the breakdown is a kind of ground-clearing exercise (though in fact it is also continuous and parallels the other stages). It alerts us to search the cultural environment for anything which might be helpful in resolving the problem. Here we reach a second stage. For a highly significant part of the futures field is engaged in evolving proposals, suggestions, practices which explicitly address the breakdown.

Many people who put forward these *reconceptualisations* (or new proposals) would not, perhaps, think of themselves as involved in futures. Yet that is just what they are involved in. For in elaborating possible solutions they are setting up possibilities which invite individual and social responses. This occurs in almost every conceivable area. The difficulty is that much of this solution-oriented work never makes it into the mass media which are dedicated to relatively trivial ends such as marketing and reality-avoidance (Postman 1985). Most proposals simply fall by the wayside and are lost. Some fail because they are inappropriate or impractical. In any event, this takes us on to the third stage.

Since far more proposals are fielded than can ever be taken up, some kind of winnowing process is needed. At present the process is obscured by power politics, lack of knowledge and lack of appropriate forums. New proposals often reach the stage of *negotiations and conflicts* without ever having had the benefit of wide public discussion. If you think of the sheer effort and cost of mounting opposition to the siting of nuclear

power stations or cruise missiles, it is immediately obvious why many other possibilities seem to disappear without trace.

Conflicts occur because the new impacts upon the old and someone always has interests bound up in the way things were (Schon 1971). The crucial capacity here is to be able to move from a position of open conflict to one of negotiation. That involves organisation, support, commitment, a suitable arena and the equalisation of power relations (if only for the purposes of discussion). To the extent that this occurs there is a chance for innovations to be taken up and legitimated. This is, in fact, the final stage of the cycle. *Selective legitimation* refers to innovations and proposals which are taken up and incorporated in the new pattern. Examples would be the emancipation of women, preventative health measures, smoke-free restaurants and nuclear-free zones. However, we cannot assume that under present conditions the solutions which are accepted are the right ones or the best available. Often they are not. Nevertheless this outline of the cycle does place in context many activities which hitherto may have been considered in isolation. As a workshop method, teaching tool and research approach the T-cycle has a variety of uses.

An underlying assumption of the cycle is that meanings, values, commitments and understandings have become less certain, more fluid and dynamic than perhaps they once were. Changes which once may have spanned centuries are now taking place in a few years. Since few schools were established with the express purpose of mediating change it is not surprising that they find it hard to cope. Nor is it surprising that individuals exhibit symptoms of uncertainty, stress and fear as they regress to the minimal present. However, longer-term views are attainable provided that the interpretive capacities involved are encouraged and developed. That, perhaps, is the central concern of critical futures study as a dimension of educational work. From within the extended present the processes of continuity and change look less threatening. Moreover, *individuals who know that they stand at the centre of their own history as agents rather than spectators are well placed to negotiate conceptions and images of futures worth living in.* The extension of concern beyond the alienation and narcissism of the 'here and now' represents a movement toward maturity which contrasts strongly with the regressions I have come to associate with naturalistic writing and authoritarian teaching.

In practice I have not found that the adoption of an interpretive perspective leads to any crisis of authority. Rather it is that the nature of authority has changed. In a futures context I am generally less interested in the ontological status of interpretations than in their fruitfulness; I expect plurality to emerge. I do not necessarily want a reader or listener to agree with me. I hope that others will contribute their own insights and negotiate their own meanings. It is not necessary to 'win' because the battleground metaphor is not applicable. The result is a much more relaxed and open style of teaching and learning. It is a participatory style which fully recognises the open-endedness of futures and the provisionality of knowledge.

Many popular books on futures tend to skate over important questions about language, meaning, power and fundamentally conflicting interests (Toffler 1970, Ferguson 1980). In so doing they lose credibility and assume dependent readers who have been described as being 'shocked' by change (an external force which tends to be understood by the author but not by those he/she is addressing). By contrast, a critical approach provides access to meanings, commitments and understandings which tend to remain hidden precisely because they frame our world. The implicit content of official discourse may, for this reason, be more interesting than the explicit content. However, it is

becoming increasingly clear that futures worth inhabiting spring less from the think-tanks and convocations of professional futurists than from the vision and determination of those who have learned to resist the hard sell and bland reassurances from above. Thus, to the extent that educators view students as makers of meaning and interpreters of culture there is a direct connection between education and the elaboration of sustainable futures. Even where this connection is absent, even in the case of the most hide-bound and ideologically regressive curriculum, there must be forward-looking assumptions. Hence, from where I stand, some notion of futures study is a *sine qua non* of curriculum work.

Practical objectives

The primary attitude objective of futures study in education is to help students develop a genuine sense of optimism and empowerment about their ability to determine their own life prospects. This results from possessing adequate information about their society and world, from an awareness of their own inner vocation (which is very different to a narrow vocationalism) or sense of purpose, and the opportunity to develop the skills of self-mastery. I suspect that this can only take place fully where students are regarded as agents (not spectators) and given the chance to develop autonomy through decision-making and choice. The imposition of knowledge structures in the form of stereotyped subjects works against the development of optimism and empowerment because it confronts students with pre-givens requiring accommodation and acceptance, not reconceptualisation and creativity. Futures is one of a number of inter-disciplinary foci which hold out more nourishing options.

Careful person-centred futures work encourages students to be more confident about their own abilities. With this confidence, and with developing insight, they can be encouraged to refuse many of the artificial boundaries which our culture has read upon a seamless and indivisible world (Wilber 1979). Two consequences follow. First, the removal and reinterpretation of boundaries eliminates the causes of many conflicts. (The latter tend to look foolish when we perceive our common immersion in the same 'ground of being'). Second, they can explore their own immersion in wider processes involving energy, food, relationships and meanings (Dossey 1982). As this sense of inextricable *involvement* develops it provides the basis for a deeply-felt stewardship ethic. Many now believe this to be a crucial aspect of any liveable future.

A related attitude is the willingness to join with others in defining and working toward shared goals and purposes. It's all too easy to drift passively toward protest. But beyond protest lies the essential task of defining in positive terms just what is wanted and needed. Futures study provides tools and contexts for developing visions and views of futures worth living in.

Students need to develop images of how they would like to be in the future. This 'future-focused role image', as it's been called, is not just a piece of wishful thinking, or need not be. The views people create for themselves deeply condition what they believed to be worth attempting in the present. Many existing curricula function to obscure this important process, but it can be made explicit through stories, time-lines, values clarification and many other futures exercises (Slaughter 1988).

Inherent in all of this are many different types of skills: self-knowledge and empathy with others; reflexivity (the ability to stand back from one's immersion in social process and to critically reflect upon our debt to particular traditions and forms of knowledge); clarity about values, meanings and purposes; a broad or holistic understanding of global

processes; the ability to understand and critique the images and plans of futures as they are represented (brought into the present) by powerful groups; understanding the differences between possible, probable and preferable futures.

It's worth emphasising here that the purpose of futures study is not to predict, not to say what will happen. That is the task of forecasters. The major concern is to *understand alternatives*. In so doing we introduce into the present a wide range of choices, e.g. in relation to energy, transport, lifestyle, relationships, etc. The exercise of considered choice is what leads us toward one future and away from another. So the term *possible futures* covers a very wide range indeed. Many things are possible, not all of which we will want to support. Fewer are *probable* and it is here that we will draw on forecasts, projections, scenarios and stories to grasp the range of what is currently considered likely. (Note that many issues seem to rise and fall with media coverage. Hence the latter is not a true guide to their importance). *Preferable futures* are those which we positively hope for and work to create. Some of the criteria we can use in constructing our images of preferable futures are closely related to the commonalities of human experience noted above: sustainability, health, peace, justice and so on. With appropriate help and support students of all ages and abilities find it relatively easy to engage in this process. The worries and fears which arise can be acknowledged, focused and directed toward constructive and creative ends. (See Macy 1983).

Implementation

It is common for those involved in curriculum innovation and course development to refer to the lack of space on timetables and the competition between subjects. But is futures study a subject? I'd suggest that at the tertiary level it is certainly a coherent focus of enquiry and it can be treated as a subject in schools. But, on the whole, it is probably best regarded as a cross-curricular dimension. This means that problems of space and competition virtually disappear. What tends to happen is that once people have grasped the significance of futures, they simply change what they already do in small but significant ways. It is certainly no harder to teach futures than it is to teach anything else. 90% of the perceived difficulties are basically questions of familiarity. With a little background it is relatively easy to design and teach whole new modules incorporating futures ideas or simply incorporate futures materials, tools, ideas in existing programmes.

One of the most consistent findings of research is that students tend to find futures work exciting and rewarding. Neither threats nor persuasion are needed. Most already have natural interests in the unfolding of their lives and the context in which that process will take place.

Conclusion

I've taught a range of futures modules and courses at secondary, undergraduate and post-graduate level and it is very clear that, given time to acquire a working knowledge of the area, most people find this perspective personally stimulating and professionally indispensable. A Masters student (Lancaster, UK) described it as 'a personal and professional lifeline'.

Those who remain immersed in obsolete ways of knowing and teaching will continue to doubt how, or even whether, futures can be studied. But others are finding the past of lesser interest than the range of alternative futures now confronting us. For, historically speaking, we have never been here before. Historical parallels relevant to the present

global situation are tenuous at best. Nor does it require extensive study and research to take up the available tools and join with others to negotiate and explore futures worth living in.

With other curriculum initiatives which focus on the needs and aspirations of real people, futures studies can contribute toward the deeper shifts which could change the nature of schools and education. That shift has less to do with passing on a declining culture than about grasping the new and renewed sources of cultural vitality which have been suppressed during the industrial era (Berman, 1981). It is less about studying futures as a dry academic activity than about creating them through the choices we make in our daily lives and work. That is something which a dependent, wasteful and short-sighted society should think about. For the mere extension of present trends leads to a world few would wish to live in or hand on to their children.

If we want a peaceful, sustainable, convivial future, we will have to begin it now. In that process we will want to integrate futures into every aspect of teaching, learning and research.

References

- Belsey, C. *Critical Practice*, London: Methuen, 1980.
- Berman, M. *The Re-enchantment of the World*, Hartford, Conn.: Cornell University Press, 1981.
- Boulding, E. The dynamics of imaging futures, *World Future Society Bulletin*, 12, 5, 1978, pp. 1-8, Washington D.C.
- Capra, F. *The Tao of Physics*, Wildwood House, London, 1975.
- Dossey, L. *Space, Time and Medicine*, Colorado, Shambhala, 1982.
- Ferguson, M. *The Aquarian Conspiracy*, Tarcher, Los Angeles, 1980.
- Fitch, R. & Svengalis, C, Futures Unlimited: Teaching About Worlds to Come, *National Council for the Social Studies Bulletin*, 59, Washington, D.C. 1979.
- Fraser, J.T. *Time as Conflict*, Basle, Birkhauser Verlag, 1978.
- Gough, N. *Project IF and Other Stories*, Victoria College, Melbourne. Gould League of Victoria, Melbourne, 1985.
- Gough, N. Futures thinking and curriculum work, *Curriculum Concerns*, 3, 1, 1986, pp. 19-20.
- Habermas, J. *Towards a Rational Society*, London: Heinemann, 1971.
- Habermas, J. *Knowledge and Human Interests*, London: Heinemann, 1972.
- Holden, C. Teaching about the future with younger children: more than spaceships and battlestars, in Hicks and Slaughter (eds), *World Studies Journal*, 6, 1, 1985, pp 6-9.
- Hubbard, B. *The Evolutionary Journey*, Evolutionary Press, San Francisco, 1982.
- Jouvenel, B. de *The Art of Conjecture*, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, London, 1967.
- Kauffman, D. *Teaching the Future*, ETC Publications, Palm Springs, California, 1976.
- Miles, I, The development of forecasting: towards a history of the future, in Whiston, T. (ed.), *The Uses and Abuses of Forecasting*, Macmillan, London, pp. 5-41.
- Peters, T. The nature and role of presuppositions: an inquiry into contemporary hermeneutics, *International Philosophical Quarterly*, 14, 1, 1974, pp. 209-222.
- Postman, N. *Amusing Ourselves to Death*, Heinemann, London, 1985.
- Schon, D. *Beyond the Stable State*, Temple Smith, London 1971.
- Schumacher, E.F. *Guide for the Perplexed*, London: Jonathon Cape, 1977.
- Slaughter, R. Towards a critical futurism, *World Future Society Bulletin*, 18, 4, 1984, pp. 19-25 and 18, 5, 1984, pp. 11-21.
- Slaughter, R. Futures study in the curriculum, in Skilbeck, M. (ed.) *Readings in School Based Curriculum Development*, London, Harper & Row, 1984, pp. 290-304.

- Slaughter, R. Metafiction, transcendence and the extended present, *Foundation* 35, 1986, pp. 52-65.
- Slaughter, R. *Futures Tools and Techniques*, Dept. of Educational Research, Lancaster, 1987; revised, Melbourne: Futures Study Centre, 1998.
- Slaughter, R. The transformative cycle, *Educational Change and Development*, 8, 1987b, pp. 11-16.
- Slaughter, R. *Futures Tools and Techniques*, Melbourne: Futures Study Centre, 1987c.
- Slaughter, R. *Recovering the Future*, Graduate School of Environmental Science, Monash University, 1988.
- Toffler, A. *Future Shock*, Random House, New York, 1970.
- Waugh, P. *Metafiction: the Theory and Practice of Self-Conscious Fiction*, Methuen, London, 1984.
- Wilber, K. *No Boundary: Eastern and Western Approaches to Personal Growth*, Shambhala, Colorado, 1979.

Note

An early version of this paper was published in *Curriculum Perspectives* 6, 2, 1986, pp. 64-68. A revised version was published in Slaughter, R. *Recovering the Future*, GSES, Monash University, 1988, chapter 10, pp. 142-153.