

# FIGURE / GROUND

ISSN 2292-0811

[Home](#)[About](#)[eJournal](#)[Archive](#)[Awards](#)

## INTERVIEW WITH PETAR JANDRIĆ

Posted by Laureano Ralón | Nov 4, 2019 | Interviews, J | O 🗨️

| ★★★★★

© Petar Jandrić and *Figure/Ground*

Dr. Jandrić was interviewed by Julia Mañero. November 4th, 2019.

Petar Jandrić is an educator, researcher, and editor. Petar's background is in physics, education, and information science. His research interests are situated at the intersections between technology, critical pedagogy and the society, and research methodologies of his choice are inter-, trans-, and anti-disciplinarity. Petar worked at Croatian Academic and Research Network, University of Edinburgh, Glasgow School of Art, and University of East London. At present he works as Professor at the Zagreb University of Applied Sciences. Petar's current academic activities are focused to collaborative research and editing. His recent books are *Learning in the Age of Digital Reason* (Jandrić 2017), *The Digital University: A Dialogue and Manifesto* (Peters and Jandrić 2018), and *Education and Technological Unemployment* (Peters, Jandrić and Means 2019). His forthcoming books include *Postdigital Dialogues on Critical Pedagogy, Liberation Theology and Information*

### POPULAR POSTS

Interview with Catherine Malabou

posted on July 26, 2017

A Conversation with C Bangs

posted on September 10, 2016

Interview with Robert D. Stolorow

posted on June 13, 2011

Interview with Tristan Garcia

posted on September 29, 2014

Interview with Petar Jandrić

posted on November 4, 2019

Conversation with Annie Lapin

posted on January 21, 2018

### RECENT POSTS

*Technology* (McLaren and Jandrić forthcoming 2020a), *Politics, Agency and Data in Networked Learning* (Dohn, de Laat, Jandrić and Ryberg forthcoming 2020) and *Knowledge Socialism. The Rise of Peer Production: Collegiality, Collaboration, and Collective Intelligence* (Peters, Besley, Jandrić and Zhu forthcoming 2020). He is Editor-in-Chief of *Postdigital Science and Education* journal and book series.

Your background is in physics, education, and information sciences. What inspired you to explore relationships between critical pedagogy, technology, and society?

I have always been fascinated by nature. Why are the skies and the seas blue? What makes skin so effective in protecting human organs from outer conditions yet so sensitive to sharp objects? What is this universe that we all live in: how did it start, how does it work, how will it end? Why cannot we fly, teleport ourselves, stop the clock, or live forever? So many questions, so little answers... At the end of high school I realized that these questions can be approached in various ways, and my two favourite approaches were physics and philosophy. In Zagreb, Croatia, these two subjects could not be studied together at an undergraduate level so I decided to study physics. But I never stopped reading philosophy, and I approached my studies of physics through its Aristotelian understanding as philosophy of nature. I must also say that, as a student, I did a lot of arts: mostly music and theatre. In humanity's current organization of knowledge work (universities, schools, funding bodies...) arts are completely separate from sciences and philosophy, yet I have always felt that artistic insights are just as deep and important as scientific insights. So I went to study physics to learn about the world, but I intuitively never separated physics from philosophy and arts. Many years later, this intuition has translated into my long-term research interest in postdisciplinarity.

When I got my first computer in 5th grade, this simple Commodore 64 immediately became my favourite toy. I started with hacking computer games in Assembler (usually to get to higher levels 'without' effort), and when I got bored of playing games, I started writing my first programs in BASIC. When I enrolled physics in mid-1990s computers had just been entering the university, and I used my childhood experiences to simplify long calculations and

Conversation with  
Ruth Marten  
Apr 5, 2020 | M

Conversation with  
Max Presneill  
Feb 13, 2020 |  
Interviews, P

Interview with  
Norm  
Rosenberger  
Dec 27, 2019 |  
Interviews, R

Conversation with  
Betty Tompkins  
Nov 19, 2019 |  
Interviews, T

Interview with  
Petar Jandrić  
Nov 4, 2019 |  
Interviews, J

Conversation with  
Elliott Green  
Oct 17, 2019 | G,  
Interviews

ARCHIVE

April 2020 (1)

February 2020 (1)

December  
2019 (1)

November  
2019 (2)

October 2019 (1)

September  
2019 (1)

impress my teachers with nice-looking papers. Here I learned UNIX, Latex, a bit of Pascal and Fortran, and tinkered with several other computer languages. Toward the end of my studies, while I was working on my thesis in philosophy of physics, I started to feel the dialectic between technology and epistemology and I also developed a strong interest in education. After graduation I took up few short jobs in physics. Here I learned a bit of C++ and dBase, and also made my first websites. But the call of education was becoming stronger and stronger, and I took a job at Croatian Academic and Research Network's education centre. Here I developed a series of national e-learning projects which led me to MSc in Education in at the University of Edinburgh.

In Edinburgh I started to learn about social sciences and realized that the epistemic mashup of my academic and non-academic interests could potentially offer a fresh viewpoint to academic research. In Edinburgh I also got introduced to critical pedagogy, which has to this day shaped the way I think and feel about the world. Following these interests, I embarked on a PhD in information science in Zagreb. From location to department, this choice was purely strategic – back in the day PhD studies in Croatia were still free of charge, and Zagreb University's department of information and communication sciences has welcomed my research interests. To this day I don't feel like a physicist, or an educator, or a social scientist, or a philosopher – and I am definitely not an information scientist. Or, vice versa, I'm perhaps all of that at the same time. I have multiple professional identities, like a cat who simultaneously lives with two or three families. I research the world in my own, radically postdisciplinary way; academic labels and departments are just necessary evils needed to maintain an academic position which allows enough time and resources for my research. Yet, I do believe that traditional disciplines are very important. Transdisciplinarity must sit on strong disciplinary grounds, and I am extremely thankful to all disciplinary traditions which enabled me to become who I am.

In 2018 you founded the scientific journal *Postdigital Sciences and Education*, which also has its associated book series. What is your idea behind this project?

June 2019 (1)

May 2019 (1)

April 2019 (1)

March 2019 (1)

January 2019 (1)

November  
2018 (1)

October 2018 (1)

June 2018 (1)

March 2018 (1)

February 2018 (2)

January 2018 (2)

December 2017 (1)

October 2017 (2)

August 2017 (1)

July 2017 (2)

May 2017 (1)

March 2017 (2)

January 2017 (1)

December  
2016 (2)November  
2016 (1)

I started tinkering with computers as a kid in late 1980s – not really at the beginning of the computer revolution, but definitely before the era of widespread Internet. In the 1990s I wrote and sold a few computer programs – one of these programs, made for management of a neighbourhood movie rental store, had been in use for almost two decades. In the 2000s I was involved in Croatian Academic and Research Network's large-scale projects of 'introducing' computers and e-learning to Croatian primary and secondary schools. To this day, I continue to consult on practical applications of educational technology and engage in practical (usually EU-funded) projects. The latest areas of my practical work are algorithms, big data, and gamification, which I find fascinating.

In the 2010s I slowly reduced these practical engagements and embarked on a more typical academic career. Over time I noticed an interesting shift – we used to speak of 'introducing' the computer into schools and offices, now we speak of 'digitally mature' schools and offices; my university used to have a masters in 'e-business', now we speak of 'digital business'; and my favourite example, that of e-learning, has almost completely blended into traditional educational systems. In the process of diffusion into our society (to use the term by Everett Rogers) (see Jandrić 2012), digital technology has become inseparable from our analog existence. This is the starting point for the idea that we now live in a postdigital world, in which human nature is dialectically intertwined with digital technologies.

Considering breath-taking speed of these developments, it is hardly a surprise that a lot of academic research still maintains the distinction between e- and learning, e- and government, e- and knowledge. This distinction has been tackled by philosophical approaches such as science and technology studies, then various sociomaterialist and posthumanist theories, also some educational theories such as networked learning, then some new 'fields' such as digital humanities, and in many other ways. Yet the first communities that explicitly focused to the concept of the postdigital have been artists and the Silicon Valley tech-community. When I stumbled across the concept, almost by accident, I realized that it has a lot to offer. In 2018 I started the ecosystem of *Postdigital Science and Education*

October 2016 (1)

September  
2016 (2)

July 2016 (3)

June 2016 (1)

May 2016 (2)

April 2016 (1)

March 2016 (2)

February 2016 (2)

January 2016 (1)

December  
2015 (1)November  
2015 (1)

October 2015 (1)

September  
2015 (2)

August 2015 (1)

July 2015 (1)

June 2015 (1)

May 2015 (2)

April 2015 (3)

March 2015 (2)

February 2015 (2)

journal and book series which offers a place, and a space, where people from various disciplines can engage in radically postdisciplinary explorations of our postdigital condition.

Why do we need the concept of the postdigital?

Human existence in 2020 is inseparable from digital and digitally enabled technologies. While we still eat, defecate, have sex, sleep, and walk, our eating is now regulated by a diet app, we can take a picture of our feces and diagnose illness, we receive (usually unsolicited) sex advice almost any time we access the web, and our phones measure duration of our sleep and number of our steps. Theoretically, it is possible to reject these devices and decide to live a pre-digital life. In practice, however, Jeremy Knox shows that “to be on the ‘worse end’ of the ‘digital divide’ does not mean that you live an entirely ‘analogue’ life, unaffected by the encroachments of digitisation. Rather, it means that you have less agency in the digital era and that you are undoubtedly impacted to a greater extent by a technology infused global capitalism.” (Knox in Jandrić et al. 2019: 166) That brings us to a very simple (and very Freirean) conclusion. In order to live free and fulfilled lives, we need to understand and actively shape our lived reality – and our lived reality is the postdigital condition.

What are the main implications of the postdigital condition?

Digital technology is at its very beginning, really just in its infancy, and it is hard to predict what for instance algorithms and artificial intelligences will bring about in the near future. Therefore, the postdigital condition carries many known implications and even more unknown implications. Speaking of epistemology, we need to transcend disciplinary borders between various type of knowledge and embrace new opportunities for being and working together. Speaking of theory and practice, we need to accept some kind of posthumanist symmetry between human beings and technology. Speaking of education, community building, copyright, whatever – we need to build new theories and strategies on the shoulders of old ones. Sometimes we can just continue building on what we’ve already got, and sometimes we need to burn down

January 2015 (1)

December 2014 (1)

November 2014 (3)

October 2014 (3)

September 2014 (4)

August 2014 (3)

July 2014 (2)

June 2014 (1)

May 2014 (2)

April 2014 (1)

March 2014 (2)

February 2014 (3)

January 2014 (2)

December 2013 (5)

November 2013 (4)

October 2013 (4)

September 2013 (1)

June 2013 (4)

May 2013 (5)

existing structures and rebuild them from scratch. This is in the very nature of the postdigital condition, which “is hard to define; messy; unpredictable; digital and analog; technological and non-technological; biological and informational. The postdigital is both a rupture in our existing theories and their continuation.” (Jandrić et al. 2018: 895)

Right now, *Postdigital Science and Education* community is in early stages of development. In the first year, many people have focused on philosophy behind the concept of the postdigital, especially as it relates to education. From this body of research we learned that “the prefix post(-) signals that we have something to talk about” (Sinclair and Hayes 2019: 129), that “concepts like ‘digital education’ can be useful insofar as they

encourage people to look closer at the design and practice of teaching and learning” yet “they become problematic when used to close down ideas or attribute essential properties to technology” (Fawns 2019: 132), and that we need a critical philosophy of the postdigital which “must be able to understand the processes of quantum computing, complexity science, and deep learning as they constitute the emerging techno-science global system and its place within a capitalist system that itself is transformed by these developments” (Peters and Besley 2019: 40). While exploration of the concept of the postdigital will probably never end, we now also publish a lot of research on diverse subjects such as postdigital arts, digital platforms, post-truth, religion, digital immortality... you name it, it’s there. I’m extremely happy with current development of the *Postdigital Science and Education* community: diversity of themes, quality of research, and above all, warm and appreciative attitude towards each other and our research.

**Being an educator, researcher, and editor in critical pedagogies implies an ethical commitment. What is yours?**

That’s simple – I am a humanist. I love when people are fulfilled and happy, I hate injustice which makes people unfulfilled and unhappy. As a male, white, able-bodied university professor living and working in a First World country I am privileged in so many ways, and I think it is my

April 2013 (7)

March 2013 (7)

February 2013 (8)

January 2013 (6)

December 2012 (6)

November 2012 (12)

October 2012 (7)

September 2012 (4)

August 2012 (3)

July 2012 (4)

June 2012 (1)

March 2012 (2)

February 2012 (1)

January 2012 (1)

August 2011 (1)

July 2011 (2)

June 2011 (3)

May 2011 (3)

April 2011 (1)

March 2011 (1)

duty to act with those less fortunate than I am. (There is, as Freire (1972) teaches us, an important difference between acting *for* someone, which is patronizing and maintains power relationships, and acting *with* someone, in solidarity, friendship, and equality.) My obligation is moral, but also practical – *homo sapiens*, being collective species, can only be fulfilled and happy *together* with others. Working for emancipation and justice I have an altruistic goal to bring about a better world for everyone, which to an extent (and with many practical tensions) overlaps with my own selfish goal to create a better world for myself and my family.

While there are many ways of working towards these goals, I subscribe to the Freirean tradition of critical emancipatory praxis. This means that my theory is guided by practice, my practice is guided by theory, and they come together in praxeological struggle for a better society. It took me a while to accept that, in today’s world, the struggle for a better society inevitably translates to the struggle against capitalism. Our social arrangements are not mere subjects of study – they are battlefields for our individual and collective futures. Therefore, I live by the words which have inspired so many radical movements: the personal is political. While we study the world and fight against injustice, we also need to love the world and each other, and we need to enjoy every day we are blessed with spending on this wonderful planet. To use words attributed to the famous anarchist Emma Goldman and repeated in films such as *V for Vendetta*: “A revolution without dancing is a revolution not worth having”.

**Why do you think that the struggle for a better society inevitably translates to the struggle against capitalism?**

This question can be answered from so many perspectives, and each of these perspectives arrives at the same conclusion. Instead of delving deeply into any one perspective, I will merely list a few. First, capitalism is based on economic growth. However, as the environmentalists like to say, unlimited growth cannot be sustained on a limited planet. We will either give up capitalism or we will give up survival of human species. Strangely enough, capitalism seems to be winning the battle. The second perspective may explain, at least in part, why capitalism appears to be more important than human survival. Living

February 2011 (1)

January 2011 (1)

December 2010 (3)

October 2010 (3)

September 2010 (1)

August 2010 (7)

July 2010 (1)

June 2010 (1)

January 2010 (1)

September 2009 (4)

SEARCH ...

in capitalism, we have all internalized its logic – summarized in the phrase attributed to Frederic Jameson and often used by Slavoj Žižek, “it is easier to imagine an end to the world than an end to capitalism” (Fisher 2010). Third, capitalism is based on exploitation – and exploitation is bad in its own right. Fourth, while we exploit nature, human labour, and other resources such as information, we care only about certain aspects of their value. For instance, at my workplace, my value as an academic is assessed through metrics which have nothing to do with the essence of my research. Last but not least, as Peter McLaren once said, capitalism is the “juggernaut of cruelty that would profit from the tears of the poor if it knew how to market them effectively” (McLaren and Jandrić forthcoming 2020a: 90) – and more of such cruelty, or a different type of cruelty, surely won’t amount to a better society.

For better or worse, the end of capitalism will inevitably bring the beginning of something new. These days, McKenzie Wark tours the world asking “What if this is not capitalism but something worse?” (Wark 2017) I respect Wark’s question – as an ex-physicist, I’m in love with thought experiments. Yet I believe that we should be concerned with different type of questions – based on past and present, I think we should more actively experiment with the future. For instance, we all know that democracy sucks, but we accept its in-built and often catastrophic aberrations such as fascism or Brexit because we perceive autocracy as even worse. We all know that US capitalism sucks, but those who survived gulags will tell you that US capitalism is a walk in the park in comparison to Soviet communism. Examples are all around us – we, the human race, settle far too quickly for lesser evils and then comfortably sit on them for far too long. While I appreciate this pragmatic approach, I want more. In our struggle against capitalism, therefore, I think we should spend less time and effort asking what is and put more time and effort into working on the question what might be. While we imagine our individual and collective future we should definitely pay much more attention to neglected historical responses such as anarchism, and we should dare to develop completely new and yet un-named alternatives. So while I respect Wark’s question about today, my question looks into tomorrow: How do we organize our society beyond capitalism?



## What is the role of critical pedagogy in answering your question?

My worldview, research, and attempts at answering this question are deeply rooted in the tradition of critical pedagogy – from early predecessors, such as Friedrich Hegel, Karl Marx, Frantz Fanon, Antonio Gramsci, and others, through probably the biggest milestone which is Paulo Freire, then sweeping wide across the Frankfurt School of Social Science, to the Northern American tradition of critical pedagogy shaped by people such as Peter McLaren, Henry Giroux, and others. I must emphasize the field of critical philosophy of technology and theorists such as Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer, Herbert Marcuse, Martin Heidegger, Andrew Feenberg, Michael Peters, Bernard Stiegler, Christian Fuchs, and others. Furthermore, it is crucial to acknowledge the importance of South American, African, and other non-Western traditions. During the past few years, I also find it extremely relevant to look into the Christian tradition of liberation theology and similar traditions in other religions. There are many more influences to my work, arriving from fields such as social studies of technology and others, but you asked about critical pedagogy so I'll stop here.

I have been privileged to work with many of these people, and I have tremendous respect for their contributions to world's knowledge. Having said that, respect does not mean compliance. As Peter and I recently wrote for a forthcoming article:

In our age where worldwide political elites churn out curious combinations of truth, semi-truth, lies, and bullshit (MacKenzie and Bhatt, 2019; Peters et al., 2018); where anti-vaccination movements have lowered population protection rates to the point of resurrecting long-forgotten illnesses (Paumgarten, 2019); where anti-intellectualism and climate change denialism flourish under the mantra that 'my ignorance is as good as your knowledge' (Giroux, 2019a); and where the very foundations of democracy are in deep crisis (Giroux, 2019b); we strongly agree with Derek Ford's statement "that critical pedagogy is at a dead-end. This is not to say that it offers nothing valuable, but rather that it is been stagnant for some time (I would say at least since the beginning of the 21st century)" (2017: 2). We

equally strongly reject right-wing triumphalists who proclaim that critical pedagogy is dead, and those unfortunate members of the critical pedagogy movement who live on past glory, cloister themselves in small, exclusive cliques, and, as Raoul Vaneigem once said, have “a corpse in their mouth” (1975) [1967]. At this moment in history, we believe, critical pedagogy is ripe for reinvention. (McLaren and Jandrić forthcoming 2020b)

My question, since my very beginnings in critical pedagogy, has always been the same: How do we go about his reinvention?

You mention a somewhat surprising influence: liberation theology. Your forthcoming book, *Postdigital Dialogues on Critical Pedagogy, Liberation Theology and Information Technology* (McLaren and Jandrić forthcoming 2020a), and a series of articles co-authored with Peter McLaren, are all about the relationships described in book's title. How did you acquire an interest in liberation theology?

In my family religion has always been a part of culture. My mother would send me to church, but I would spend the majority of my ‘church time’ in a pub across the road. I don't think anyone in my closer family has taken the idea that God might exist seriously; it's all been about tradition, culture, and custom. In this way, I learned about Christianity without being inculcated into religious belief. Yet, in 1990s post-communist Croatia, the Catholic church has acquired a much more active social role and has sided with the right. From its support of nationalism, through its active struggle against basic human rights (anti-abortion movement, anti-LGBT movement, etc.), to its prominent negative role in state education, Croatian church has become a classroom example of a Christian fundamentalist organization. Although I like to think of myself as a man of the world, this specific local political context has strongly shaped my early attitude towards religion.

Then, sometime in 2015, my conversations with Peter McLaren have started to delve deeper and deeper into religion. I did not like this turn, but decided to give Peter's ideas a chance and learn more about religion before I complain. As I learned about liberation theology, I realized that there are different traditions and interpretations of

Christianity. Looking at political economy, Croatian Catholic church is probably the richest corporation in the country; in many places in South America, the Catholic church has decidedly sided with the poor. Looking at theory, Peter and I explored convergences between teachings of Jesus Christ, Karl Marx, and Paulo Freire; we compared the Christian eschaton of Kingdom of God with Marx's eschaton of the socialist society; we explored mutual influences between liberation theology and critical pedagogy; and so on. This work offered me a more nuanced insight into religious dogmas, developed my understanding of important distinctions between Catholic faith and Catholic institutions, and much more. Above all, this work helped me realize the importance of myth, religion, and belief. Put simply, I realized that studies of the postdigital condition cannot be complete without engagement with these powerful social forces.

Please allow me to describe the development of my attitude toward liberation theology with a quote from *Postdigital Dialogues on Critical Pedagogy, Liberation Theology and Information Technology* (McLaren and Jandrić forthcoming 2020a):

Being a proud atheist, anarchist, and iconoclast, I inadvertently succumbed to the academic sin of thinking about the world through the lens of my own worldview and trapped myself into my own little epistemic cocoon, which firmly excluded myth, belief, and religion. Near the end of preparing this book's manuscript, however, I finally woke up from this self-indulgent dream. I realized, paraphrasing the Poet, that there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in my philosophy—whether I like it or not, the postdigital condition cannot be thought of without myth, belief, and religion. (McLaren and Jandrić forthcoming 2020a: 255)

I am still a proud atheist, anarchist, and iconoclast — probably even more so than ever. However, I do believe that myth, religion, and belief are powerful social forces, and that we do need to take them seriously.

**A lot of your research is about dialogue and collectivity. Why?**

Collectivity is bread and butter of human society, and our postdigital condition has opened up new opportunities for collective behaviour. Just take your pick. Contemporary social transformations – from proverbial ‘unprecedented’ changes in ways we can communicate with friends and family, through various transformations of labour such as precarization to platformization, to new opportunities for knowledge making and dissemination enabled by approaches such as the digital humanities – are all about new ways of working together. And now, we can collaborate with various non-human actors such as artificial intelligences towards this goal. Thus, the French philosopher Pierre Levy, describes the contemporary project of collective intelligence as follows:

It is a scientific, technical and political project that aims to make people smarter with computers, instead of trying to make computers smarter than people. So, collective intelligence is neither the opposite of collective stupidity nor the opposite of individual intelligence. It is the opposite of artificial intelligence. It is a way to grow a renewed human/cultural cognitive system by exploiting our increasing computing power and our ubiquitous memory. (Peters 2015: 261)

As I already mentioned, the postdigital condition is both a rupture and continuation of human development. Ancient traditions, such as simple one-to-one dialogue, still carry enormous value – I explored some aspects of its postdigital transformation in my book *Learning in the Age of Digital Reason* (Jandrić 2017). Then there are newer opportunities, such as those described by Levy, which I explored with Michael Peters in a series of articles culminating with our book *The Digital University: A Dialogue and Manifesto* (Peters and Jandrić 2018). My work with Michael moves on: after publishing an edited book *Education and Technological Unemployment* (Peters, Jandrić and Means 2019), an even larger team of us now works on the forthcoming edited book *Knowledge Socialism. The Rise of Peer Production: Collegiality, Collaboration, and Collective Intelligence* (Peters, Besley, Jandrić, and Zhu forthcoming 2020). And the forthcoming book I referred to in previous questions, *Postdigital Dialogues on Critical Pedagogy, Liberation Theology and Information Technology* (McLaren and Jandrić forthcoming 2020a), brings these insights into conversation

with revolutionary critical pedagogy and liberation theology. It will be interesting to see what will come up next!

**And what about practical aspects of collectivity? How does your theory reflect to your work in *Postdigital Science and Education* journal and book series?**

Inasmuch I enjoy theory, collectivity is always praxis. My work in e-learning, digital learning, technology enhanced learning, networked learning, or whatever you want to call this curious blend of human learning and the computer, has started from practice – it is only after some years of working in the field that I started to engage with theory. With academic publishing it was the other way around. Working with Michael Peters, I first developed a theoretical interest. Then I started to guest edit special issues in Michael's journals and encyclopaedias, and after acquiring enough theoretical and practical experience I founded *Postdigital Science and Education* journal and book series. Unsurprisingly, my practice gives a lot to my theory and vice versa – in Freirean language, this work can be described as critical praxis. In my limited experience, good collective projects always start from community development, and that implies development of feelings for other human beings. This is why I make no difference between sciences, arts, myth, religion, and belief – they are all equally important on our collective path towards the future.

Obviously, my work has always been collective – education and research, by definition, are collective enterprises. In my work as academic researcher and editor, I try to reach beyond acknowledgement of this collective nature and actively experiment with new forms of collectivity. In 2016 Michael Peters has started the Editors' Collective, which is "a small New Zealand-based organisation comprised of editors and reviewers of academic journals mostly in the fields of education and philosophy" (Peters and Jandrić 2018: 165). In the collective we experiment with so-called 'collective articles' written by 10, 20, or more authors, and some of these articles are indeed very different from anything else you can read in traditional philosophy and education journals. I brought these experiments to *Postdigital Science and Education* journal and book series, where the community continues to develop them in the postdigital context.

Based on ethos of critical pedagogy, I decided to develop *Postdigital Science and Education* journal and book series as an antithesis to the dog-eat-dog approach which is so prevalent in contemporary academia. Each and every article receives a lot of attention; reviewers are required to ditch the accept-or-reject game and genuinely try and improve authors' work. I do not play the 'academic superstar' game and take delight in publishing papers written by unknown PhD students shoulder to shoulder with papers written by some of the most prominent academics of today. I try to forge personal connections with each and every person who submits to the journal and the book series; through long email exchanges, and whenever possible in person. I open up and support discussions and insist on publishing a large number of in-depth book reviews. I especially enjoy publishing so-called Commentaries – short articles which do not conform to academic conventions and which offer a place and space for provocations and free(r), sometimes artistic interventions. In these ways, *Postdigital Science and Education* journal and book series disrupts traditional academic publishing and brings radically different forms of research and expression to mainstream outlets such as journal databases.

**Another prominent theme in your work is the notion of the public intellectual. Why is it so important; what are the main features of a postdigital public intellectual?**

Traditional public intellectuals had been those who speak truth to power and fearlessly challenge dominant ways of thinking. They did this through books and articles, public appearances, and various other forms of engagement with popular culture. Many public intellectuals have seriously clashed with powers-that-be, and our textbooks are packed with public intellectuals who served jail and had been tortured and murdered because of their work. We tend to recognize public intellectuals with long temporal delays; in many cases, recognition arrives only after they die. Many aspects of this 'definition' are still valid today, yet the postdigital condition has radically transformed ways we live in the world and interact with the world. Public intellectuals are collective beings – as our sense of collectivity changes, public intellectuals need to change along.

The tradition of critical pedagogy still provides indispensable theoretical background for contemporary public intellectuals. Continuous reimagination and reinvention of our theories and practices, and their joining together in the concept of critical praxis, is a critical pedagogue's starting point for responding to postdigital challenges of today and tomorrow. In a recent article, Derek Ford and I wrote that being a postdigital intellectual is

less about intellectual exercises and more about social and political struggle. In the age of post-truth, it is simply not enough to produce new knowledge. It is (at least) equally important to struggle for recognition of existing knowledge, and that pushes the postdigital public intellectual towards social movements. Acting within social movements, we need to recognize the importance of digital technologies in the broadest sense. Instead of merely looking at technological affordances, or seeking easy theoretical exits through subscribing to one or another philosophical determinism, we need to understand the complexity and nuance of the postdigital reality. We need to learn how to produce digital media, develop alternative public spheres, and create spaces where people can be truly equal in inequality. We need to look beyond microchips and into the biological challenge, or what Michael Peters and Tina Besley (2019) call bio-informational capitalism. We need to build networks. While we acknowledge that a certain balance between theory and action has always been a part of the public intellectuals' life, it is fair to say that traditional public intellectuals have predominantly been beings of critique. The postdigital public intellectual is predominantly a being of organization. (Ford and Jandrić 2019: 104)

On that basis, we concluded, "we welcome the birth of the postdigital public intellectual into our world who, it should be clear by now, is always already a *collective* assemblage whose educational logics run along the lines of collective postdigital study, and not traditional teaching and learning" (Ford and Jandrić 2019: 105, italics from the original).

Can you say something about your future plans? To paraphrase Nikolai Chernyshevsky (1989) [1863], *What is to be done?*

Thank you very much, Julia, for this remarkable set of questions. For better or for worse, I cannot lay out a path for anyone else but perhaps – and only perhaps – for myself. In the foreseeable future, I will continue to develop the postdigital community and the postdigital approach. In a longer run, I will try to keep fragile balance between theory and practice in my work. And for as long as I can breathe, I will write and speak out against oppression and for freedom and love. Yet depending on circumstances, my strategies might change. If successful, *Postdigital Science and Education* will eventually become a fully collectively-led project – when that happens, I will happily step down from leadership position. At a more personal note, I can see myself getting tired of practical struggles in and against capitalism, and I don't think we are ready to reach beyond – so some day, I might escape to pure theory. But then, things can turn into an exactly opposite direction – if I will ever feel a real chance to make a social change, I will immediately ditch theory and dip into practice. At the moment I don't believe I will ever take a gun or become religious – but I firmly refuse to say never. I do dream of selling all my earthly possessions, buying a boat, and sailing into the sunset... and then I wake up, with a profound feeling of loneliness, and I start all over again.

“What is to be done?” is an eternal question asked in many writings including Nikolai Chernyshevsky's *What Is to Be Done?* (1899) [1863], Vladimir Ilyich Lenin's *What Is to Be Done?* (1902) [1901] and Paulo Freire's and Adriano Nogueira's *Que Fazer. Teoria e Prática Em Educação Popular* (*What Is to Be Done: Theory and Practice in Popular Education*) (1989). Answers to this question are individual and collective, eternal and contextual, based on reason and emotion. While there are no primers and one-size-fits-all solutions, I would like to share something I learned from physics. We should never say never – and we should always allow ourselves some space for surprise. While we fight against dogmas from capitalism through religious fundamentalism to anti-intellectualism, it is so easy to fall into our own dogma of (leftist) righteousness. We question other people's beliefs and convictions, but too often fail to seriously examine our own. If reality seems to be against our beliefs and convictions, we are much too prone to insist on our dogmas at the expense of reality. We need to strongly reject any dogmas, especially our own, and we



need to be more open to changing our beliefs, convictions, strategies, and practices. Social change always starts from conscientization – while we conscientize the world, we should never forget to conscientize ourselves.

## References

Chernyshevsky, N. (1989) [1863]. *What is to be done?* New York: Cornell University Press.

Dohn, N.B., de Laat, M., Jandrić, P. & Ryberg, T. (Eds.). (forthcoming 2020). *Politics, Agency and Data in Networked Learning*. Singapore: Springer.

Fawns, T. (2019). Postdigital education in design and practice. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 1(1), 132–145. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-018-0021-8>.

Fisher, M. (2010). *Capitalist Realism: Is There No Alternative?*. Winchester: Zero Books.

Ford, D. R. & Jandrić, P. (2019). The public intellectual is dead, long live the public intellectual! The postdigital rebirth of public pedagogy. *Critical Questions in Education*, 10(2), 92–106.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Education Specials.

Freire, P., & Nogueira, A. (1989). *Que fazer. Teoria e prática em educação popular*. Brazil: Vozes.

Jandrić, P. (2012). The diffusionist-evolutionist model of e-learning development. *Journal of Baltic Science Education*, 11(1), 67–77.

Jandrić, P. (2017). *Learning in the Age of Digital Reason*. Rotterdam: Sense.

Jandrić, P., Ryberg, T., Knox, J., Lacković, N., Hayes, S., Suoranta, J., Smith, M., Steketee, A., Peters, M. A., McLaren, P., Ford, D. R., Asher, G., McGregor, C., Stewart, G., Williamson, B., & Gibbons, A. (2019). Postdigital Dialogue. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 1(1), 163–189. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-018-0011-x>.

Lenin, V. I. (1999) [1901]. *What is to be done? Burning questions of our movement*. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1901/witbd/>. Accessed 2 November 2019.

McLaren, P. & Jandrić, P. (forthcoming 2020). *Postdigital Dialogues on Critical Pedagogy, Liberation Theology and Information Technology*. London: Bloomsbury.

McLaren, P., & Jandrić, P. (forthcoming 2020b). Postdigital Cross Border Reflections on Critical Utopia. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*.

Peters, M. A. & Jandrić, P. (2018). *The Digital University: A Dialogue and Manifesto*. New York: Peter Lang.

Peters, M. A. (2015). Interview with Pierre A. Lévy, French philosopher of collective intelligence. *Open Review of Educational Research*, 2(1), 259–266. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23265507.2015.1084477>.

Peters, M. A., & Besley, T. (2019). Critical philosophy of the postdigital. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 1(1), 29–42. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-018-0004-9>.

Peters, M. A., Besley, T., Jandrić, P., & Zhu, X. (forthcoming 2020). *Knowledge Socialism. The Rise of Peer Production: Collegiality, Collaboration, and Collective Intelligence*. Singapore: Springer.

Peters, M. A.; Jandrić, P.; & Means, A. J. (Eds.). (2019). *Education and Technological Unemployment*. Singapore: Springer.

Sinclair, C., & Hayes, S. (2019). Between the post and the com-post: examining the postdigital 'work' of a prefix. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 1(1), 119–131. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-018-0017-4>.

Wark, M. (2017). What if this is not Capitalism Any More, but Something Worse? NPS Plenary Lecture, APSA 2015, Philadelphia, PA. *New Political Science*, 39(1), 58–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07393148.2017.1278846>

© Excerpts and links may be used, provided that full and clear credit is given to Petar Jandrić and *Figure/Ground* with appropriate and specific direction to the original content.

Suggested citation:

Mañero, J. (2019). "Interview with Petar Jandrić," *Figure/Ground*. October 15th.  
< <http://figureground.org/interview-with-petar-jandric/> >

Questions? Contact Laureano Ralón  
at [ralonlaureano@gmail.com](mailto:ralonlaureano@gmail.com)

SHARE:



RATE:

< Previous

Next >

Conversation with Elliott Green

Conversation with Betty Tompkins

## ABOUT US



Figure/Ground by Laureano Ralon is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

## AUTHORS

## FOLLOW US:



Laureano Ralón – Founder & Editor-in-Chief

Copyright 2018 All rights reserved | Developed by [edrweb](#)