

**THROUGH ALICE'S LOOKING GLASS: INTEREST, EXPERIENCE AND
DEMOCRACY IN JOHN DEWEY'S PEDAGOGICAL IDEAS**

***ATRAVÉS DO ESPELHO DE ALICE: INTERESSE, EXPERIÊNCIA E DEMOCRACIA
NAS IDEIAS PEDAGÓGICAS DE JOHN DEWEY***

***A TRAVÉS DEL ESPEJO DE ALICIA: INTERÉS, EXPERIENCIA Y DEMOCRACIA
EN LAS IDEAS PEDAGÓGICAS DE JOHN DEWEY***

Roberto Freire do NASCIMENTO JÚNIOR¹

ABSTRACT: The purpose of this article is to produce a critical review of the selected texts from the work of the American philosopher and professor John Dewey (1859 - 1952). Dividing the text into themes, the analysis focuses on three main points: the inclusion of “interest” in the educational process, the objective experience as a guide for the act of educating and the structuring of an education for democracy. The author's argumentative structure is briefly reconstructed based on the bibliographic and critical review made by Robert B. Westbrook (2010) and on an interview by Cristiane Trindade (2019). The methodology used in this article is based on the interpretation of the author's main ideas which is the base of our comprehension on how Dewey imagined and practiced his pedagogy. Finally, we aim to present two critical comments on the author's thought, as well as to touch on the actuality of his theoretical heritage, building a parallel between such ideas and the conflicts we are currently facing, especially regarding the defense of democracy.

KEYWORDS: Pedagogy. Interest. Experience. Democracy.

RESUMO: O objetivo deste artigo é produzir uma resenha crítica de textos selecionados da obra do filósofo e pedagogo estadunidense John Dewey (1859 - 1952). Dividindo o texto em temas, a análise concentra-se em três pontos principais: a inclusão do “interesse” no processo educativo, a experiência objetiva como guia do ato de educar e a estruturação de uma educação para a democracia. Reconstroi-se brevemente a estrutura argumentativa do autor, baseando-se na revisitação bibliográfica e crítica feita por Robert B. Westbrook (2010) e em uma entrevista de Cristiane Trindade (2019). O método de análise aqui empregado é baseado na interpretação das ideias-chave do autor, visando apreender de que maneira Dewey imaginou e praticou sua pedagogia. Por fim, objetiva-se passar em vista duas críticas ao pensamento do autor, bem como tocar na atualidade de sua herança teórica, construindo um paralelo entre tais ideias e os conflitos que vivemos atualmente, principalmente no que tange a defesa da democracia.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Pedagogia. Interesse. Experiência. Democracia.

¹ University of São Paulo (USP), São Paulo – SP – Brazil. Master in Letters from the Department of Linguistic and Literary Studies in English. E-mail: roberto.freire.nascimento@usp.br

RESUMEN: *El propósito de este artículo es producir una revisión crítica de textos seleccionados de la obra del filósofo y pedagogo estadounidense John Dewey (1859 - 1952). Dividiendo el texto en temas, el análisis se centra en tres puntos principales: la inclusión del “interés” en el proceso educativo, la experiencia objetiva como guía para el acto de educar y la estructuración de una educación para la democracia. Se reconstruye brevemente la estructura argumentativa del autor, a partir de la revisión bibliográfica y crítica realizada por Robert B. Westbrook (2010) y de una entrevista a Cristiane Trindade (2019). El método de análisis utilizado aquí se basa en la interpretación de las ideas clave del autor, con el objetivo de comprender cómo Dewey imaginó y practicó su pedagogía. Finalmente, en la conclusión, se propone presentar dos críticas al pensamiento del autor, así como tocar la actualidad de su acervo teórico, construyendo un paralelismo entre tales ideas y los conflictos que vivimos actualmente, especialmente en lo que se refiere a la defensa de la democracia.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *pedagogía. Interés. Experiencia. Democracia.*

Introduction

Like Alice, the teacher has to go with the children through the mirror and see, with the lens of the imagination, all things, without leaving the limits of her experience, but, in case of need, she has to recover her corrected vision and provide, with the realistic point of view of the adult, the guidance of knowledge and the instruments of the method (MAYHEW; EDWARDS apud WESTBROOK, 2010, p.19, our translation).

The American philosopher and pedagogue John Dewey (1859 - 1952) is considered one of the most important thinkers of education in the first half of the 20th century. His work permeates and is influenced by different historical processes that shook the world, such as the two Great World Wars, the subsequent Cold War, the cultural disputes of a politically bipartite world, the massive intensification of urbanization, among other events. Although he has extended his influence around the globe, his thinking is focused on American society and the development of its postwar liberal democracy. Situated between a theoretical-pedagogical dispute that is also bipartite, Dewey seeks, by harmonizing the theories of traditional thinkers with those of the so-called New School, to articulate the need for philosophy with the act of educating and the involvement of student psychology in teaching with the need pragmatics of educational objectives. I open the article with a reference to the character of Lewis Carroll, because the practical imagination of the young Alice will be, as we will discuss later, the touchstone for the pedagogue interested in building an education for democracy.

Born in Vermont, USA, the son of a merchant, Dewey received a doctorate in philosophy and, in a short time, assumed the position of director of the Department of Philosophy at the University of Michigan, in 1889. Five years later, he decided to accept the invitation of the president of the newly inaugurated University of Chicago, William Harper, to

the position of director of the Department of Pedagogy. However, Dewey made it clear that he would only accept the proposal on one condition: that the University create an Experimental School through which he and the Department's professors could test their theories in practice (WESTBROOK, 2010, p. 12-13, our translation). It is from the experience and reports of this Experimental School (which will later also be called “Dewey's school”) that we can observe the philosopher's ideas in practice, reorienting theories through the pragmatism of everyday pedagogy, as we will see below.

Starting from the notes made before, my objective in this article is to briefly discuss some main aspects of Dewey's pedagogical theory, relating them to some examples collected from reports of the “experimental school” from selected texts. To do so, I will divide the text into three themes, based on three categories that I believe are essential for Deweyan theory, namely: interest, experience and democracy. First, I would like to define what interests Dewey based on his comparative analysis between the “school world” and the “child's world”: why are the interests of these two worlds opposed? Is there any way to harmonize them? How can the act of educating interfere at this point? Secondly, I investigate the meaning of experience for the author based on his pragmatism: how does one define a goal? What are the goals of education? How can the school provide the objective educational experience for children? Thirdly, I would like to comment on the meaning of democracy for Dewey based on his perception of the relationship between the individual and his social environment. My focus in this part will be on school-oriented democracy: what is an education for democracy? How can the school provide a democratic experience? Can the school intervene in society or just reproduce it? Finally, I will briefly discuss some criticisms of the Experimental School, as well as intend to recover Dewey's theoretical heritage for our current moment.

Harmonizing interests: between the child's desire and the school curriculum

Before studying the educational process from a general perspective, Dewey (2010, p. 69) prefers to start with what he calls “fundamental elements”, that is, the child, on the one hand, and the adult, on the other. The gradually expanded development of constitutive elements for an overall view will be, as we will see, a constant narrative technique in the construction of his ideas. When dealing with these two fundamental elements, the author separates the child as an immature being and devoid of certain values and experiences, from the adult as a mature being and bearer of experiences arising from everyday practices. Such a separation has nothing to do with the demerit of the ideas and sensations of one or the other, as could be deduced at

first sight, on the contrary: the educational process must be based on the adequacy of the “interaction between these two elements” (DEWEY, 2010, p. 69, our translation). Another essential narrative movement in Dewey can be perceived in advance: the focus does not fall on either side of the process (teacher x student), but on the educational process itself. Educating, for Dewey, is the communion between theory and act, as I will discuss later.

With this separation, Dewey dialogues with what was then a fierce division in pedagogical theories: on the one hand, the “traditionalists” whose theoretical weight rests on the school curriculum and on the teacher as the center of the educational process; on the other, the so-called representatives of the “New School” whose attention was focused on the student as a core element of the process that, thus, should be organized around their “natural tendencies”:

“Direction and control” are magic words of a [traditional] school; “freedom and initiative”, those of the other [the “New School”]. Law and order are proclaimed on the foundation of one; spontaneity is what is sought in the other. The affections are turned here to what is old, to the conservation of what the past conquered with effort and labor; novelty, change, and progress overcome all affections there. Inertia and routine on the one hand, chaos and anarchy on the other, are mutual damning accusations. The school that makes the child the center of everything is accused of disregarding the sacred authority of duty; in turn, it attacks its opponent's suppression of individuality by tyrannical despotism (DEWEY, 2010, p. 72, our translation).

This mutual criticism of both strands shows that Dewey flees from extremism, seeking a productive point of contact between the two theories. Moreover, the author realizes that, in the practice of everyday school life, such extremisms are illogical and unfeasible, as what is seen in schools is a “confused and inconsistent eclecticism” (DEWEY, 2010, p. 72, our translation).

Turning his attention, therefore, to school practice and seeking harmony between these two plans, the author includes the notion of interest in his theory. In its pedagogy, the interest unfolds in the natural inflections of the child and in the structuring of the school program. The child's world is populated by primary sensations and contacts. Although a certain degree of abstraction and imagination are not absent, what usually arouses the child's interest is related to everything that orbits around him or around his family. His will is attracted by immediate objects of satisfaction in which there is a predominance of the empirical contact of affect and the visible marks of events. “Everything” in the children's world “is affection and sympathy” (DEWEY, 2010, p. 70, our translation). Although such a perception of the world is by no means reprehensible, it is noted that there is no room, at least immediately, for a scientific abstraction

that involves an overall view of a given process, given that, for this point to be reached, it would be a break in pleasurable immediacy through work is necessary.

On the other hand, the school program, structured in a tradition of Western philosophy of separation between reason and emotion, exposes the child to a world that is very different from his own. A world fragmented into impersonal “materials” and where knowledge is presented under the sign of a “general principle” that, a priori, does not dialogue with the immediacy of childhood perceptions. Nothing is further from the child's experience, in which “only the vital ties of affection and those of his own activity bind and unite the variety of his social experiences” (DEWEY, 2010, p. 71, our translation). However, according to Dewey (2010), objective interest and a reasonable developed analytical capacity willing to observe certain elements impersonally are common to the adult mind. Maturity also requires the development of certain intellectual habits of investigation that are not directly related to immediate ties and, therefore, require a certain degree of abstraction. Therefore, it is the duty of the school to also assist in this process.

Indeed, Dewey does not intend to abolish discipline from the school curriculum, but to adapt the educational act in order to create a bridge between the interest of the teacher (school) and the student. This means including the empirical interests manifested by children's natural tendencies in a pedagogical methodology that, like all methods, involves routine, classification, organization, intellectualization, process and abstraction. Thus, it is up to the educator to provide a necessary stimulus environment for the child to follow his own learning path. Below we will see some practical examples of such an environment applied in the “Dewey school”, but, for now, it is worth commenting on the prevalence of the idea of freedom in the educational context.

Experience as a guide: the structure of the educational process

The articulation between the child's interest and the structure of the school curriculum involves a pragmatic definition of school objectives. Here Dewey introduces a category of thought that is tributary to evolutionary biology and pragmatism. As a thinker extremely engaged in the educational act, the philosopher tried to eliminate the opposition between body and mind, making thought a mediating function between reason and sensitivity. This is the basis of his theory of knowledge (WESTBROOK, 2010, p. 14). Relating to the concept of interest that I presented earlier, it is clear that the inclusion of psychology in the educational process

has a lot to gain when we leave the generalizing theoretical framework and observe closely how the fundamental elements of the process work:

It makes no sense to speak of an educational objective when, most of the time, each act of a student is established by the teacher, when the only order in the sequence of his acts is that which comes from the attribution of lessons and the impositions of other people. It is equally fatal to a goal to allow capricious or discontinuous action in the name of spontaneous self-expression (DEWEY, 2010, p. 74, our translation).

For Dewey, a goal is like “a foreseen end” (DEWEY, 2010, p. 75), in this sense, it starts from the initial empirical observation (characteristic of the world of children) to a sequencing and organization of possible activities (characteristics of the adult world) and, finally, to an adequate choice among all the possibilities. The initial observation aims to start from the conditions of possibilities in a specific context, thus avoiding a generalizing framework that crushes individualities. It is noticed that Dewey's “prevision” has nothing to do with a “general principle”, but rather with the articulation between imagination and intelligence so that both can plan an activity from the given conditions. Then, a method must be sequenced, through trial and error, so that the techniques used to achieve the objective are improved and efficient. Finally, the possibility of choosing between the different methods allows for the permanence of freedom in the educational process and, at the same time, suggests a kind of “retrospective view”, so that the process does not escape memory, but is itself an example of the path taken.

Predicting the completion of an action means having a base from which to observe, select and order objects and capabilities. Doing these things means having a mind – for the mind is purposeful, purposeful activity controlled by the perception of facts and their interrelationships (DEWEY, 2010, p. 76, our translation).

In Dewey, knowledge is defined not only as an abstract category, but also as an ability to intervene in the world. Therefore, Trindade (2019) states that the author seeks the “coincidence between method and content”. Thus, experience, as empirical sensations, is balanced by its capacity for abstraction: body and mind are a unit, the act of seeing, looking and feeling works in communion with conceptualization or, conversely, intellectualization is part of the objective empirical problems.

As a thinker whose attention is always focused on practice, Dewey is concerned with determining some criteria for selecting good goals. The first one refers directly to the pragmatism of the context: “the established objective has to be a natural consequence of the existing conditions” (DEWEY, 2010, p. 77, our translation). This criterion instructs that the

objectives must come from within the problem and not exposed from the outside. Here, Dewey refers to a constant practice in the educational process of trying to mold objectives and activities from generalizing standards, imposing principles that do not coincide with the existing context and, thus, making use of methods and means that are completely foreign to the students. These, in turn, end up finding the context and the analysis tools strange, making the educational process a kind of “foreign body”, an invader in their reality.

The second criterion refers to the flexibility of objectives: “an objective must, therefore, be flexible; it has to be susceptible to change to suit circumstances” (DEWEY, 2010, p. 78, our translation). As previously exposed, to “keep in mind”, in Dewey's grammar, it is necessary to anticipate the process from the natural conditions of the situation. However, the prediction of a given situation does not always happen without conflicts, on the contrary, it is the vision that must be molded to the context, modifying itself, if necessary, and altering its means. In this sense, the author does not exclude the error from the act, nor does he punish it as a failure, but welcomes it as an essential part of the process. Given that the primary objective is nothing but a hypothesis, its truth test takes place in practice. Therefore, the flexibility of the method is essential when dealing with a varied context.

Finally, “the objective must always represent a release of activities” (DEWEY, 2010, p. 79). This last term concerns a cohesion between ends and means, that is, it means seeing the educational process as coherent among its parts and in its interrelationship with the context. Each activity carried out is an end sought by the experience and, at the same time, it is a means that aspires to one more link in continued development. Each part of the process, therefore, has a value in itself and a value as a whole.

Every means is a temporary end until achieved. Every end becomes a means to further activity once it is attained. The end signals the future direction of an activity in which we are engaged; the middle, the current direction. The rupture between end and means depreciates the importance of the activity and tends to reduce it to drudgery, which the individual would avoid if he could (DEWEY, 2010, p. 80, our translation)

But how to work such criteria in pedagogical practice? The transposition of the criteria of observation, flexibility and release of activities to the educational context is also based on three points. The first of them maintains the focus on the student: “an educational objective must be based on the activities and intrinsic needs (including natural instincts and acquired habits) of a certain individual to be educated” (DEWEY, 2010, p. 82, our translation). One should take into account the concrete activities of the students and not impose expectations, since, as has already been said, the world of children and the world of adults have different

perspectives and expectations. Obviously, like every objective, you must have a result in mind, but such a result must arise from concrete problems. The second criterion states that “an objective must be capable of being translated into a method of cooperation with the activities of those receiving instruction. It should suggest the kind of environment needed to release and organize their [students'] skills” (DEWEY, 2010, p. 83, our translation). The educational method is only valuable when applied to correct and propose solutions based on specific everyday problems and student tendencies. In these terms, it is the problem that suggests a method of analysis and not the other way around. The third and final criterion refers to teachers: “Educators must guard against purposes that are said to be general and ultimate. Each activity, however specific it may be, is general in its various connections, as it leads indefinitely to other things” (DEWEY, 2010, p. 84, our translation). The term “general” has two different meanings: one of them is the one that Dewey advocates against, that is, the abstraction detached from the context, which imposes strange methods and alienates teachers and students from the process. However, the generalization of the process does not need to be discarded, it can and should be the summit of the educational act. Each activity suggests a new solution and a new problem. There will always be a range of possibilities for each path to follow, so it is up to the educator to foresee the correct path for a given problem and, at the end of the process, analyze the other possibilities and provide new tools. It is the educator's duty to illustrate this "panoramic view" of the educational process in the interrelation of the school curriculum and its different subjects: "it is not possible to climb several mountains at the same time, however, when several mountains have been climbed, the views complement each other: they do not establish incompatible, rival worlds” (DEWEY, 2010, p. 85, our translation).

Taking as an example the practices developed by the Experimental School of the University of Chicago, we perceive how everyday experience and work with the environment become a true guide for the educational process. All traditional subjects, such as physics, mathematics, grammar, biology etc., were taught from the moment the child realized the need for them to solve a specific problem. For example, working with activities that are useful at home, some students decided to build a farm in the school yard. When developing the model, the first abstraction and language problems arose:

When they built the farm, they had to divide it into several fields to sow wheat, corn and oats; and also think about where they would install the house and the storeroom. For this, the children used a one-foot ruler as a unit of measurement and began to understand what 'a quarter' and 'a half' meant. Although the divisions were not exact, they were enough to allow the farm to be delimited. As they discovered the half foot, the quarter foot, the inch, their work became

more precise... When they built the house, they needed four posts for the corners and six or seven slats of the same height. Children could make mistakes when measuring the slats, so the measurements had to be redone two or three times before they were accurate. What had been done on one side of the house had to be repeated on the other. Naturally, the work gained speed and precision the second time (MAYHEW; EDWARDS apud WESTBROOK, 2010, p. 25, our translation).

Reports like this one provide an excellent example of the “liberation of activities” in Dewey's proposal, offering students concrete problems and stimulating a free mind to solve them.

Education for democracy

When dealing with the liberation of the mind, consequently we touch on the concept of freedom which, for Dewey, is not disconnected from the idea of democracy. The author is aware of the harm caused by the external imposition of programs and theories in the pedagogical context, both for teachers and students:

The addiction to externally imposed ends has deep roots. Teachers receive them from higher authorities; they accept them according to current trends in the community. Teachers impose them on children. As a first consequence, the teacher's intelligence is not free; it restricts itself to receiving the objectives established from above. Rarely does a teacher get rid of the dictatorship of authoritarian supervision, method handouts, prescribed study plans etc., to the point of letting his mind get closer to the students' minds and content. The lack of confidence in the teacher's experience is reflected in the lack of confidence in the students' response. These receive their goals through a double or triple imposition from outside and are constantly disoriented because of the conflict between goals that are natural in their present experiences and those they are urged to obey. Until the *democratic criterion* of the intrinsic meaning of each experience in development is recognized, the requirement of adaptation to external objectives will leave us intellectually confused (DEWEY, 2010, p. 83-84, author's emphasis, our translation).

Following the same logical-argumentative practice to define democracy, Dewey turns his attention to the core constitutive part of society, the individual. Again, interest emerges as an essential category. For the author, it cannot be said that despotic or totalitarian societies do not unite their members through interest. However, what qualifies the interest of democratic societies is the coalition of individual wills with the interrelationship of the social context. For the author, “the subject is unique and also social” (TRINDADE, 2019), therefore, democratic society is the guarantee of free game of individual wishes and the constant encouragement of its members to actively participate in politics. However, the guarantee of such a society is not enough, it is necessary to educate individuals for democracy, so that each one feels part of the

social construction, of the selection of its rulers through popular suffrage and the repudiation of external authority. Although extensive, it is worth quoting a beautiful passage in which Dewey (2010, p. 90-91, our translation) exposes the harmful effects of the instrumentalization of man by man:

[slavery] exists whenever a man engages in an activity whose social utility he does not understand, and which does not contain any personal interest for him. Much has been said about the scientific organization of work. But a limited view restricts the field of science to ensure the efficiency of action through correct muscular or physical movements. The main opportunity for the effectiveness of science will be the discovery of man's relationships with his work - including relationships with others who take part in it - so that the worker puts his intelligent interest in what he is doing. Efficiency in production often requires the division of labor. But this will be reduced to a mechanical routine if the worker does not see the technical, intellectual and social relations enclosed in what he is doing, in relation to the other parts of the work, and if he does not dedicate himself to his work for this understanding. The tendency to reduce such things as the efficiency of activity and the scientific organization of work to purely external techniques is proof of the one-sided point of view held by those who direct industry – those who determine its ends. Alienated from broad and well-balanced social interests, they do not have enough intellectual stimulus to turn to the human factors and relations involved in industrial activity. The ideas in this regard are restricted to elements referring to the technical production and commercialization of products. There is no doubt that within these narrow limits there can be great development, but the circumstance of not considering important social factors ceases to mean a great gap in spiritual collaboration, with a corresponding damage to the emotional life of those who work.

In this sense, an education for democracy is also a democratic education insofar as it proposes the community experience of group work, the free game of individual interests and the communication of experiences. Freed subjects are those who fight to maintain freedom, and this is at the heart of the educational process:

A society is democratic to the extent that it prepares all its members to equally share in its benefits and to the extent that it ensures the malleable readjustment of its institutions through the interaction of the various forms of associated life. Such a society must adopt a type of education which will give individuals a personal interest in social relations and direction, and habits of mind which will permit social changes without the occasion of disorder (DEWEY, 2010, p. 108, our translation).

Final considerations

I could not end this article without briefly addressing some of the criticisms made against John Dewey's pedagogical theory. The first of these refers to the alienation of the Experimental School's experiences from the American social context. Although Dewey tried to incorporate occupations and work methods from the social world, it was not the cooperative and free-choice environment of individual wills that children would find when they left school. On the contrary, the US embraced a new wave of competitiveness that, driven by the Cold War, would chart new directions for the social structure. By separating the real relations of production of capitalist society and its contradictions from the educational experience, critics pointed out that Dewey's "democratic experience" would only succeed in an idyllic environment and away from real relations (WESTBROOK, 2010, p. 27-28).

Although Dewey changed the direction of his criticism towards the end of his life, including the school environment as part of the hegemonic dispute in society, his concept of free play of associations at work, as shown above, seems to collide precisely with the pragmatism of labor relations. The massive adoption of Fordism in the 1930s and 1950s in the USA as a scientific method of organizing work contradicted its definition of work at all points and effectively affected the routine of education professionals. In addition, the principles of freedom and free expression, essential in democracy according to the author, were constantly violated by the McCarthyist persecution that, between the 40s and 50s, became a "witch hunt", as attested by pieces by Edward Albee, Tennessee Williams and Arthur Miller, and the films of Elia Kazan. Several artists and educators were arrested, deported, tortured and/or forced to testify in the Committee of Un-American Activities, as, for example, was the case of the German playwright and professor Bertolt Brecht. Curious as an author who was so concerned with the pragmatism of social relations, he overlooked this violent and, in his own grammar, anti-democratic context. It seems that US liberal democracy was not free of contradictions.

Still, Dewey's heritage is now seen in, I believe, two main points. The first concerns his view of the individual as a singular and social being at the same time. It is common to witness in Social Sciences theories that are, on the one hand, over-generalizing, crushing the individuality of fundamental elements or, on the other hand, perspectives extremely concerned with an increasingly fragmented individuality whose social markers of difference, such as gender or race, end up being transformed into exclusivist principles. The inclusion of heterogeneity, especially in the classroom, must be done considering the difference between

authority and authoritarianism and between freedom and anarchy, in such a way that there is unity in the difference.

The second point refers to the coalition of interests in the educational process. This principle transforms the school into a favorable environment for both teachers and students. At a time when we are experiencing the increasingly alarming imposition of certain quantitative demands on education, it is important to bear this in mind so that the work of education does not also lose its grace, brilliance and inventiveness. Teachers are an agent of transformation of the objective and subjective conditions of existence. It is worth remembering a passage by Lewis Carroll, in “Through the Looking Glass and What Alice Found There” (2000, p. 122, our translation):

And here I would like to be able to tell you half of the things Alice used to say from her favorite expression: "Let's pretend". She had had a rather lengthy argument with her sister just the day before, all because it started with "Let's pretend we're kings and queens"; and her sister, who liked to be very precise, had retorted that that wasn't possible as there were only two of them, until Alice was finally forced to say, "Well, you can be just one of them, I'll be all the others". And once she had really frightened her old housekeeper, by suddenly shouting in her ear: "Let's pretend I'm a hungry hyena and you're a carcass!".

As stated in the excerpt that opens this article as an epigraph, the “mirror of Alice” is the make-believe of the real world. It is, in the pedagogical context, the educator's ability to use his "children's imagination", turn everything inside out, enter the child's world and participate in it. At the same time, it is also the mirror of the real world, capable of reflecting (in both senses of the word) on the conditions of existence in and of the world. The “inside out world” is a reflection of himself, but also what he could be. Education for intervention, as proposed by Dewey, must be not only a reflection of society, but also an action to transform it.

REFERENCES

CARROLL, L. **As Aventuras de Alice no País das Maravilhas & Através do Espelho**. Trad. Maria Luiza X. de A. Borges. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2000.

DEWEY, J. “Textos Seleccionados”. In: WESTBROOK, R. B. *et al.* (org.). **John Dewey**. Recife: Massangana, 2010. p. 69-129.

TRINDADE, C. C. **Pensadores na Educação: John Dewey e a educação para a democracia**. Instituto Claro. 17 jan. 2019. 1 Vídeo (11min). Available: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JSh5-bgZjdA&t=3s&ab_channel=InstitutoClaro. Access: 22 June 2021.

WESTBROOK, R. B. "John Dewey" (1859-1952). *In*: WESTBROOK, R. B. *et al.* (org.). **John Dewey**. Recife: Massangana, 2010. p. 11-33.

How to reference this article

NASCIMENTO JÚNIOR, R. F. Through Alice's looking glass: Interest, experience and democracy in John Dewey's pedagogical ideas. **Rev. Sem Aspas**, Araraquara, v. 11, n. 00, e022012, 2022. e-ISSN: 2358-4238. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29373/sas.v11i00.16538>

Submitted: 10/07/2022

Required revisions: 05/08/2022

Approved: 20/11/2022

Published: 30/12/2022

Processing and editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação.
Correction, formatting, normalization and translation.

