1. Ancient Indian Education System:
   a. Right to Education for all is totally absent but only to the upper caste.
   b. Education is vertical particularly Hindu Scripture based
   c. Memorization is Method of learning
   d. Paternalistic and Guru is as if God and therefore the student is totally Dependent on him.

2. British Education though opens education for all but it is highly institutionalised meant for clerical work in their office but it is race oriented.

3. There is a transition from ancient Indian education system to contemporary education system. However there is development in system itself but still it experiences the following traumas.
   It alienates the student from the Indian reality
   1. It kills our critical faculty and curbs creativity
   2. It glories an a-political attitude – a kind of noble neutrality
   3. It is heavily loaded with a status-quo philosophy and its value system
   4. Education system becomes Education Industry. Student becomes not a subject of learning but object. Education turns into corporatization.

CHAPTER 3

PAULO FREIRE: PRINCIPLES OF A PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

3.0. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to systematically trace the principles that construct the philosophy of education according to Paulo Freire worked out from his primary writings. To this task the chapter is divided into three parts -the first part deals
with the idea of power as shared empowerment addressing the social context as the
‘text’ to be decoded, the second part outlines foundational principles of education for
liberation in terms of banking education vs. dialogical education, the role of the
teacher student and student teacher, and the third part deals with the notion of
inseparability of theory and practices grounded in the idea of praxis leading to
cultural revolution.

3.1. Philosophical Traditions in Education

Freire was influenced by three major philosophical traditions in education. They are Anarchist tradition, Marxist-Socialist tradition and Freudian Left. The Anarchist opposed national systems of education because of their conviction that education in the hands of the state would serve the political interests of those in control. They advocated the promotion of personal freedom and autonomy of the learner by removing education from state control. The Marxist-Socialist tradition in education advocated a revolutionary change from a capitalistic political economy to a socialist form of government and economy in order to produce a free and autonomous person. The Freudian Leftists addressed the problem inherent in the Marxist-Socialist assumption that once people become aware of what they view as evil structures, they will be able to bring about the necessary changes. The persons are prevented from acting in their own self interests because of man’s development. They, therefore, advocated sexual freedom, changes and family organization, and libertarian methods of child-rearing and education as the solutions to this structure of authoritarianism.

3.2. Philosophical Concepts
Philosophical views such as phenomenology, existentialism and Christian Personalism are quite significant influences, seen in his work. Phenomenological ideas of Freire have been shared from Buber, Sartre and Jaspers. It is thus how that the stress on inter-personal relations and dialogue has incorporated in his thought. His concern with conscious and the way people construe the world influenced by existential-phenomenological views. “Reality is never just simply the objective datum, the concrete fact, but it is also man’s perception of it.”

His discussion of inter-subjectivity, intentionality, authenticity and cultural action for freedom can be traced to his existential phenomenological concerns.

According to Jean-Paul Sartre, existentialism is human existence. “Everything is indeed permitted if God does not exist, and humans (men) are in consequence forlorn, for they cannot find anything to depend upon either within or outside their self”. Sartre states that there is no determinism, only freedom. Humans are free, thus human equals freedom. In existentialism God does not determine the fate of human beings, only humans can determine their fate, by changing and influencing their reality or existence. The existentialist assumptions of Jean-Paul Sartre are reflected in Freire’s narratives. To encapsulate Sartre’s ideas, existentialism is based on existence preceding essence. From this perspective, Freire argues that humans have the potential and capacity to develop higher-level thinking and social relations.

Personalism requires an affirmation of the value of the human person. Although Christianity is seldom mentioned directly in his writings, it is highly important part of his philosophy. De Chardin, Mounier, Nebuhr and generally the liberation theological thinkers who have influenced him. For him, Christian faith
essentially means a commitment to social action against exploitation and oppression for a humanized world. His Christianity is one which has entered into a creative dialogue with Marxism unlike the anti-communist Christianity. Liberation theologians like Gutiérrez and revolutionaries like Camilo Torres have influenced Freire. The role of church must be the role of liberation, the humanization.

3.3. Thinkers of Educational Philosophy

Freire was inspired by many different educational philosophers. There are few influential philosophers who are apparent in Freire’s works.

3.3.1. Paulo Freire – Socrates

Socrates’ basic principle is to know thyself. Knowledge is virtue, has universal validity. His method of education is called elenctic, the process of obtaining an idea or concept inductively by conversation on moral and philosophical problems. His privileged place as a teacher consists only in and in so far as, he had been in the self-examination exercise longer and more systematically than most people. His method is purely elenctic, drawing out the confusions and contradiction in student’s thinking. Moral progress is facilitated through this method because truth is already there in the student. When all the muddled and contradictory ideas are elicited and refuted through elenctic argument, the right one will be retained and the erroneous will be thrown away. Simultaneously, the student sheds his unbalanced pride and overconfidence, and becomes more receptive to listen to others, to reflect and to engage in genuine deliberation.

For Socrates, knowledge is obtained objectively by conversation and subjectively by reflection. Knowledge has a universal value of morality. The power of
thought is immediate objective of education, not the imparting of knowledge. Socrates believed in different kinds of knowledge, important and trivial. Knowledge of craftsmanship is regarded as ‘trivial’ and ‘how best to live’ becomes the important knowledge. Through his method of questioning, he seeks to guide the students to discover the subject matter rather than simply telling them what they need to know. The goals of education are to know what one can, importantly, to know what one does not know. Ordinary and higher are two types of knowledge.

Socrates does not believe that any one person or any one school of thought is authoritative or has the wisdom to teach ‘things’. The Socratic Method is a technique for engaging others and empowering the conversator to openly dialogue. It was a dialectical method that employs critical inquiry to undermine the plausibility of widely-held doctrine. Socrates' main focus throughout his public teaching is the acquiring by the individual of self-knowledge. He believes that goodness and truth, positive essences and pure ethical and moral instincts are placed there divinely in the soul.

The method of estrangement is an enriched form of the Socratic dialogue, in which the method of assertion and critical counter-assertion or denial develops a new affirmation, expressing the question, and the tentative answer, more clearly than before. But all counter-assertion, negation, occurs within the perimeters of the Divine Idea, and a sophisticated consciousness is won through contemplation.

3.3.2. Paulo Freire - Aristotle

Aristotelian ethics forms a central component in Freire’s idea of humanization. In *The Nichomachean Ethics* Aristotle (1985) argues that the characteristics
distinguishing humans from all other entities, or their ‘excellence,’ is their ability to reason. I extend this to mean that humans have the capacity to think critically which is discussed in detail later. Freire adopts and expands this idea by arguing that denying humans the opportunity to reason is a prima facie violation of their basic humanity.

Aristotle believed that justice and well being must be initiated by education. Education would teach people to solve their problems verbally instead of physically thereby creating a non-violent social structure. Education is what makes a human truly human. It is the cultivation of individuals with their own realities must cultivate a specific pedagogy of education in order for it to be purposeful. It is only realistic when it derives its reality from its connection with life. Aristotle felt education provided structure for the individual. Thus, he constantly presented the possibility of remoulding people who had debased themselves by focusing on lower values and never having the opportunity to develop a true concept of the good for man. It may be determined by the individual’s own experiences and reflections. Once a person has lost touch with her own life and is unable to foresee any other path, the individual may debase herself by limiting her goals and rights to what is perceivable. Once a person has fallen into this cycle of bad habits and attitudes, it is difficult to change them. Moreover, re-teaching good values and good habits in place of bad values or habits is a very challenging task as it must seek to re-shape the individual’s view of herself.

3.3.3. Paulo Freire - Louis Althusser

French Marxist Louis Althusser states that “the ideological state apparatus or the subtle means by which ruling groups maintain their power" which has been
installed in the dominant position in mature capitalist social formations is the educational ideological apparatus. The significance, according to Althusser, is "All ideological State apparatuses contribute to the same result of the reproduction of the relations of production, i.e. of capitalist relations of exploitation", the educational ideological apparatus is even more sinister because "it is so silent!" He identifies the educational system as the societal institution which is most responsible and most effective in maintaining the status quo, particularly because few citizens question what education: drums into them, whether it uses new or old methods, a certain amount of 'know-how' wrapped in the ruling ideology ([language arts], arithmetic, natural history, the sciences, literature) or simply the ruling ideology in its pure state (ethics, civic instruction, philosophy). Power of pedagogy is enhanced by its unobtrusive qualities, which are the "traditionally unmentionable, 'external' social and economic peculiarities and their super structural implications". Thus, Althusser identifies the political quality of education as inherently dangerous because hardly anyone: teachers, administrators, students, or parents-recognizes the ideological positionality embedded in a particular educational system or pedagogy.

Influenced by Althusser's theories of the educational ideological apparatus, Paulo Freire emphasizes that there is no such thing as a neutral educational process. Education either functions as an instrument that is used to facilitate the integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity to it, or it becomes the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world. Similar to Althusser, Freire’s conceptualization of education is that it either
reproduces the status quo, or education becomes a process by which human beings critically intervene in the realities of their own existence. More specifically, in Freire's context of Brazil, this reinforced status quo involved the economic, social, and political oppression of peasants.

### 3.3.4. Paulo Freire-Antonio Gramsci

In 1932, the Communist intellectual Antonio Gramsci detected the paradoxical consequences of the new ‘democratic’ education that stressed naturalistic approaches over hard work and the transmission of knowledge. Writing from jail, where he had been imprisoned by Mussolini, he observed that it was a serious error to discredit learning methods like phonics and memorization of the multiplication table as outdated or conservative.

Like Gramsci, Freire rejected traditional subject matter and derided the banking theory of schooling whereby the teacher provides the child with a lot of ‘rote-learned’ information. This conservative approach, according to Freire, numbs the critical faculties of students and preserves the oppressor class. He called for a change of both content and methods. Teachers should present new content that would celebrate the culture of the oppressed, and they should also instruct in new methods that would encourage intellectual resistance. In short, Freire linked political and educational progressivism.

Gramsci held that political progressivism demanded educational traditionalism. The oppressed class should be taught to master the tools of power and authority, the ability to read, write, and communicate, and should gain enough traditional knowledge to understand the worlds of nature and culture surrounding them. Children should not
be encouraged to follow ‘natural’ inclinations which would only keep them ignorant
and make them slaves of emotion. They should learn the value of hard work, gain the
knowledge that leads to understanding and master the traditional culture in order to
command its rhetoric.

History has proved Gramsci a better prophet than Freire. Modern nations that
have followed Gramscian principles have improved the condition and heightened the
political, social, and economic power of their lower classes. In contrast, nations that
have adopted the principles of Freire (including our own) have failed to elevate the
economic and social status of their most underprivileged citizens. Gramsci was not the
only observer to predict the inegalitarian consequences of the educational methods
variously described as naturalistic, project-oriented, critical-thinking and democratic.
Freire focus on Gramsci as a revered theorist of the Left in order to make a strategic
point. Ideological polarizations on educational issues tend to be facile and premature.
Not only is there a practical separation between educational conservatism and political
conservatism, but there is an inverse relation between educational liberalism and
social liberalism. Educational liberalism is a sure means for preserving the social
status quo, whereas the best practices of educational conservatism are the only means
whereby children from disadvantaged homes can secure the knowledge and skills that
will enable them to improve their condition. Unfortunately, many of today’s American
educators paint traditional education as the arch-enemy of ‘humane’ modern
education. Even everyday classroom language unfairly pits the two alternatives
against one another.
Regarding ideology Gramsci saw ideas reflecting dominant material relationships as residing in ‘common sense’ contains elements of ‘good sense’ but is a distorted and fragmentary view of the world. Freire is of the view that popular consciousness full of ideology. And Freire earlier work points out different levels of consciousness ranging from naïve to critical consciousness. As regards resources of hope both refuse evolutionary economic determinist theories of social change. As regards Freire that codification as praxis whereas philosophy of Praxis in Gramsci. Exile is as praxis in Freire. Action-reflection-transformative action and dialectical relations are between the above. Regarding authority and freedom Freire sees as distinction between ‘authority and freedom’. It echoes Gramsci’s in interplay between “spontaneita` e direzione consapevole” (spontaneity and conscious direction). Education in its broadest context Gramsci saw Hegemony as education, Education across ‘civil society’ and Historical bloc whereas Freire exhorted educators and other cultural workers to ‘be tactically inside and strategically outside’ the system and social movements and Party.

3.3.5. Paulo Freire- Ivan Illich

Unhappy over the present situation Paulo Freire- Ivan Illich denounces the oppression that characterizes the life of the most persons as dependent since the condition of human beings resulting from their domination by oppressive forces and structures. They see human beings as less than inanimate, remaining in silence, still, dehumanized.

They disagree in analysis of oppression and identification of the enemy. For Illich the problem stems from the advanced institutionalization of modern industrial
society, technocratically organized, planned and ritualized to the degree that people are conditioned to need institutionalized services in order to cope with their own lives. The oppressive forces make them dependent that they cannot even conceive of transforming the conditions in which they live. Unless radical change occurs, he foresees either extinction or some sort of "compulsory survival in a planned and engineered hell". But For Freire the enemy takes form in the political and economic structures. His experience with military governments, in prison, and in forced exile, gives a reality to his discussion of oppression that focuses it on visible and concrete human instrumentalities. Also life in northeast Brazil, dominated by national politics and its effect in his local situation and personal life, colours his analysis of oppression, and hence shapes his hopes for change.

For Illich, the oppressed human being looks like a consumer, passively getting and taking rather than doing or being, trained to use up the earth's resources where he criticizes both capitalist and socialist nations for perpetuating that goal for humankind. Even the values of social justice based consumption, emphasizing equal distribution of resources to people. For Freire the oppressed human beings look most like slaves, docile, meek, doing what they are told to do or ‘assisted’ to do by various persons or projects designed elsewhere for their benefit. They are therefore bound in a culture of silence, unable to say their word and participate in the transformation of the world as they should. The assistentialism of modern development programmes therefore perpetuates and intensifies their dehumanization. Hierarchical societies or practices within societies contribute also to the continuation of their oppressed condition. Hence he criticizes most sharply the capitalistic nations which breed competition among
people and create larger and larger gaps between ‘haves’ and ‘have-nots’ and foster separation among other groups. For him they are more oppressive than governments that try to build on communal or socialist principles, where people participate more directly and share more fully and equitably in the transforming action of their societies.

Both agree that Modern education systems contribute to the oppression of human being. It is their institutionalization of education that makes them dangerous, because they have come to provide packaged and institutionalized services for the dependent. Freire’s Freire's criticism of extension education in Extension of Communication and of banking education in Pedagogy of the Oppressed also accuses traditional education of perpetuating dependency and oppression. But both differ in their way of analyzing education. For Illich education is not a dependent variable of other structures, but a significant system on its own. Deschooling must be part of any revolutionary political programme. Fundamental social change must begin with a change of consciousness about institution. For Freire education is clearly a subsystem dependent upon political and economic structures. Thus it serves the powers controlling those structures, and can be changed fundamentally only when those structures change.

### 3.3.6. Paulo Freire- Martin Buber

For Buber, “human reason is to be understood only in connection with human non-reason”. In his book, *Between Man and Man*, he declares, "real existence, that is, real man [human beings] in his relation to his being is comprehensible only in connection with the nature of the being to which he stands in relation." In other
words, without relations, there is no humanity. It leads Buber to a profound discussion of the two primary attitudes and relations of human beings, I-Thou and I-It relationships. Skills and knowledge are, according to Buber, acquired through dialogue. Relationships provide context for dialogue. In dialogue, communication is central and thus language becomes a powerful means during the meaning-making processes. In the teaching-learning process, Buber exalted the teacher-learner relationship and dialogue. Buber uses two images to characterize the nature of teaching. He first compared teaching with the image of birth-giving. He wrote in *Teaching and Deed*, "He who teaches the tradition to his fellowmen is regarded as though he has formed him and made him and brought him into the world."\(^{cxxix}\)

Buber speaks of the teacher as a filter and a selector. The teacher as a filter takes the task of refining the diverse messages arriving from the surrounding. As a selector the teacher must "stand in contradiction to the old education characterized by a passive acceptance of tradition poured from above (symbolized by a funnel), as well as the new education (represented by a pump) which pictures education as drawing forth the static powers of the self.

Upon examination, the relationship between the teacher and students is hierarchical. And though the teacher-student relationship is hierarchic, the pedagogical realm is entirely dialogical. A teacher can apprehend his students, but his students are incapable of comprehending their teacher. Therefore, the teacher must stand simultaneously at the two poles of the education scene: his own and the student’s. Dialogue undoubtedly stands out as one major method of teaching. Buber
constantly encourages teachers to use music and art side by side with literature in dialogic reciprocity.

Society is constructed of inter-relationship. His vision of a global, dialogical community of communities emphasizes the quality of social relations that cannot be institutionalized. The substance for interactions between separate spheres of being is found in the notion of the interpersonal. The responsibility of individuals who have to maintain conscious effort to create the quality of their social space, that is to have an appropriate attitude to being and relationships so that the I-Thou could be formed and transformed. Evidently, Buber does not believe in the static nature of relation and being; the I of the I-Thou relation moved forward into relation by changing continually his state of being. The I-Thou dialogic points out: "Just as the intimacy of interpersonal relation is rooted in the essential mutuality and reciprocation of the I-Thou, so the true spirit of community life is traced in his work to the dynamic plurality of I-We. The plurality of this reciprocation, based on the genuine address of the I and the genuine response evoked in the Thou, reflects the quality of the community spirit. The concept of dialogue that I-thou or I-it or I-we influenced him to build up his dialogical pedagogy and anti-dialogical pedagogy to maintain banking concept of education and Problem-posing education. Constructive both holds either the oppressor oppresses or the oppressed class is oppressed.

3.3.7. Paulo Freire- Karl Marx

Freiean humanism has been deeply influenced by humanist Marxist, Freire’s emphasis on praxis and the need for a utopian vision to negate the existing capitalist society and concepts such as praxis, alienation and dialectics have been contributed by
the humanist Marxists like Petrovic and Kalakowski. The core of Freirean humanism is in the belief that as people realize their ability to change reality and become active subjects of history, instead of remaining passive objects, there is liberation.

In the dialectical social conflict Freire identifies between the oppressors and the oppressed is directly indebted to Marx’s (1933) theory of dialectical materialism. The achievement of Conscientization, the telos of Freirean pedagogy, mirrors an escape from the Marxist condition of false consciousness. This project relies on Marx’s assumptions that the psychological state of mind of members of society is dominated by ideology. Freire however avoids the deterministic implications of Marxism by emphasizing the existential capacity of humans to influence their circumstances.

3.3.8. Paulo Freire – Hegel

Critique’s intent is not to prove or disprove an argument or simply to prove right from wrong. In fact, a critique values its opposing argument for its ‘rightness’ but looks more specifically at identifying the hidden or underlying social interests or implications. In other words, critique is a process of human thoughtfulness in order to uncover dominant relationships. In many respects, Freire’s concept of humanization and dehumanization emerge from the critique process. More importantly, critique is a characteristic solely embraced by humans. Hegel employed the concepts of being, nothingness and becoming.

From the two antithetical perspectives, being and nothingness arose becoming. This dialectic led Hegel to argue that human development fosters the development and
redevelopment of ideas. Much like Freire’s argument, if indeed we are dominated, then we must therefore dominate others.

Freire wrote, “If what characterizes the oppressed is their subordination to the consciousness of the master, as Hegel affirms true solidarity with the oppressed means fighting at their side to transform the objective reality which has made them these beings for another”. To expand Freire’s argument, Marx’s concept of false consciousness gains currency through the assertion that society is dominated by ideology. In order to be truly liberated, humans must be aware of the ideologies that are imposed upon them. Until humans are aware of forces that shape their existence, they are subjected to the deterministic life described by Marx. To move beyond this cognitive passivity, people must look closely at the socio-historical ideology that shapes their consciousness.

3.3.9. Paulo Freire – Frantz Fanon

Psychiatrist, humanist, revolutionary, Frantz Fanon was one of the greatest political analysts of our time. Organic intellectuals are particular strata of intellectual that are connected to the dominant social class and acts as both an organizer of society and its diverse organisms, and as its thinking element, leading the ideas of their class. The organic intellectual is set apart from the traditional intellectual, those who are "men of letters" and believe themselves, falsely, to be independent of the dominant social group.

In order to break the ideological bond of hegemony that permeates all of society and works to support the status quo Gramsci theorized that what was needed was counter-hegemony. In order to produce this counter-hegemony the working class
would need its own organic intellectuals. These organic intellectuals would come from within the working class and stay within the working class working towards a counter-hegemony by actively engaging and leading in social relations. The role of the organic intellectual is a merging of theory and praxis that s what Freire adapted in to his dialogical education.

3.4. Socio-Historical Context during Paulo Freire Period

Paulo Freire, in describing his admiration for Gramsci, says, "For him, the philosophy of practical action was history". He says that to understand something one must "become soaked in the cultural and historical waters of those individuals involved in the experience." Freire describes how it is that history is the method for analyzing the specificities of an area and of a man. Freire is a radical, a founding member of the Workers Party of Brazil and supporter of other Marxist options, who chooses education and literacy as the nucleus of his decidedly political work on the side of the oppressed. On his own terms, he is a fair subject for a historical and political examination.

3.4.1. Feudalism and Capital

Brazil is the third in-land mass to the United States. With more than 150 million people, it is steadily increasing rates of population growth for the last century, a factor encouraged by government policies. Brazil in the seventies determined to press forward in both economic and population growth. It is geographically the largest country in Latin America and has historically had the largest gross national product. Brazilian citizens share an imperial but pervasive language, Portuguese, as well as the choice of dual Portuguese citizenship. The industrial work force increased remarkably
since 1960 to more than 20 percent. Labor unions have a long and active Brazilian history. The Brazilian auto industry quadrupled production from 1968 and 1974. VW, General Motors, Mercedes Benz and Ford are all heavily invested in Brazil, relying on a historically friendly state to boost profits. The country is divided into five distinct regions: the North and the Amazon basin, the Northeast, the East, the South and the Center-West. The economy in North is built around rubber, fishing and some cattle breeding, in the Northeast around sugar, cattle breeding and cotton, in the East around coffee, cocoa and industry, the south around industry and the Center-west around cattle.

As a whole, the top 20% of the country's earners control 63.3% of the total national income, the lowest 40% control just 9.8%. Brazil suffers from a rather elaborate code of racism, ranging along a scale of power from European Caucasian to African to Mestizo to Indian. People self-identify themselves in surveys, probably skewing the results somewhat. Even so, self-identified white people live longer than non-whites.

Of the past 150 years, Brazil has lived under fascist or feudal governments for about 120. From 1891 to 1930, Brazil lived as a republic for those in the middle and upper classes. Vargas offered a velvet glove of company unionism based on a state-sponsored form of paternalism surrounding an iron fist of anti-communist, anti-socialist laws and practices. In 1950, Vargas came back to power through an election and remained in office only until 1954, when he committed suicide. He was succeeded by Juscelino Kubitschek, a centrist who drew support from liberals, the Soviet-backed Brazilian Communist Party, and fascists, simultaneously. Kubitschek's ambition,
necessarily requiring huge expenditures to develop transportation and energy was, coupled with massive inflation. This, linked to the restiveness of Brazilian labor which gained strength as it was organized by the expansion of industry, resulted in Kubitscek's electoral loss to Janio Quadros. Goulart quickly moved toward Vargas' populist/fascist tactics but could do nothing about a 100% inflation rate, labor unrest, and hints of a growing leftist movement coalescing beyond the reach of the usual liberal/leftist/Christian coalitions. He was driven from office by a lightning strike of the military on 1 April 1964. Freire was jailed and exiled. Six successive generals then held office under similar Vargas-style populist/fascist programs until 1984 when open elections were held. Paulo Freire returned to the country in the midst of a general amnesty.

First, the industrialization of Brazil coupled to its deep ties to world imperialism makes it clear that this is not, as some would have it, a semi-feudal country. Even though traces of feudalism remain, like remnants of property relations on plantations or mystical beliefs as organized into movements by churches, Brazil is an advanced capitalist nation and it is capitalist production, capitalist markets, the development of raw materials and the concentration of labor, the rising inequalities rooted in class and race and sex described above, that penetrates every aspect of Brazilian life. Secondly, Brazil has a long history of corporatist (fascist) schemes which propose to unite all social classes for the purpose of national economic development. The military and the U.S. have long dominated Brazilian history which is rife with conflict and inequality. Racism in Brazil has its roots in the particular history of Brazilian slavery. People did fight back, though they were unsuccessful in
gaining state power or even most of their modest reform goals. I now turn to an examination of the Freire's birthplace, Brazil's northeast, city of key parts of the resistance, and then to the background of slavery in Brazil, and to the organized resistance itself, the Brazilian left.

### 3.4.2. The Northeast

Da Cunha's book gets little attention in the discourse around Freire and predates by about 3/4 of a century, his conceptual investigatory framework of nature, man, history and culture in its chapter headings. Da Cunha follows his own beautifully put advice. It is Da Cunha's project to demonstrate the historical and political roots of a rebellion in the Northeast, to create an epic of rebellion and its material causes--and its people and their ideas. In describing the Rebellion in the Backlands, Da Cunha predates Freire's multiple themes of struggle, oppression, literacy, consciousness, and resistance in culture and war. Szulc was referring to a situation made possible, in part, by the introduction of reforms to the Northeast through an organization known as SUDENE (the Superintendency for the Development of the Northeast) implemented by the Brazilian congress in 1958.

Celso Furtado, scholarly author of a report which gave SUDENE its impetus, was named director of SUDENE, responsible immediately to the President of Brazil, Kubitschek. The report had described the severe inequities of life in the Northeast, pointed out that much of Brazil had been established on a base of Northeastern labor and agriculture, and suggested that a national effort, headquartered in the key northeastern city of Recife, be enacted to stimulate regional economic growth by striking at the base of the problems which held it back: education and
industrialization. The SUDENE report was supported by industrialists eager to minimize the growing rebellions in the Northeast and by the powerful Catholic Church whose Rio Archbishop, Dom Halder Camara, strongly supported the struggle against underdevelopment in the Northeast. The purpose of SUDENE was economic development, to integrate the Northeast with the rest of Brazil. "Within that framework, humanization or the maximization of human resources was subordinated to modernization or the maximization of physical and natural resources of the region".cxliv A division of education was established under Furtado, and it was here that Paulo Freire initiated his work as an education activist.

3.4.3. Human Ownership: Master – Slave Ownership

It must be noted however that slavery was an integral part of the world imperialist system, that while it was unique in some ways in Brazil, slavery never-the-less was the prop on which both that nation and the world capitalist system was built. Brazilian sugar and slavery are which made capital available. Slavery is treated separately here because of its bearing on Freire's views on oppression (master-slave relationships), literacy, consciousness, production, and resistance.cxlv For example, "Seven-tenths of the goods used by Brazil for slave purchases were British manufactured...was Brazilian sugar necessary. Several factors militated against slave resistance. The slaves were hard to unite. Separated geographically over vast plains, held under the tight watch of overseer, slaves were also divided by their multiple African backgrounds, cultures and languages as well as by task and skill factors in Brazil. While it was often the skilled slaves who took leadership in resistance, obtaining a better job was also a factor in compromising slaves. Moreover, the
transition away from the Portuguese crown in Brazil required no republican revolt on
which the slaves could tie their own fortunes. Slaves found it difficult to play on
divisions between elites. Slavery, in Blackburn's history, is buttressed by religion. Lay Catholics and their ‘brotherhoods’, associations, struggled hard to recruit slaves and freed people of color. Eventually, black associations built their own Catholic chapels. This augmented the need for slaves in a period when many other countries were industrializing, a process mitigating toward paid labor. For the most part, slaves learned to read on their own, by watching others. Slave owners who needed slaves capable of performing complex tasks taught their own slaves to read.

The record is clear that slave literacy and slave rebellion had nothing necessarily in common. For example, a rebellion of slaves in the Bahai region was organized purely by word of mouth. Slave owners feared the content of print; not the print itself or the ability to read it. In the U.S., they made modest efforts to retard literacy among slaves but fought in Congress to silence specific publications. To the contrary, Hilary Beckles argues that literacy enhanced slaves "socials status and allowed them to move into occupations such as artisan or overseer".

Blackburn offers an interesting theoretical and historical turn on the conquest of Latin American slavery. He refers to the failure of "Hegel's well-known thesis on the master-slave, as Sartre pointed out in "Critique of Dialectical Reason", to take into account the dialectic between one master and another. The dialectic of the subject also fails to address the problem of how inter-subjectivity could develop between slaves in differing situations and of different extraction; and likewise it fails to consider the role played by such 'third' groups as free people of color or non-slaveholding whites.
Blackburn illuminates the pattern of the struggle for freedom by identifying "three factors favourable to such an outcome... i) a political crisis marginalizing slaveholders and giving birth to a new type of state, ii) the actuality or possibility of slave resistance or rebellion, and iii) social mobilizations encouraging the partisans of reform or revolution to rally popular sentiment with anti-slavery acts." The end of formal slavery came to Brazil by decree, as noted earlier, in 1888, twenty three years after the bitter end to slavery through Civil War in the United States.

3.4.4. Religious and Communist Background

Reporter Ted Szulc visited Brazil in the early 1960's and sounded the communist alarm. Szulc knew that Brazil had a long history of radicalism, imbedded with communist representations. The Nobel poet, Pablo Neruda, was a communist. Its leading architect, Niemeyer, was a communist. Novelist Jorge Amado was a communist. When the tide receded, the people hurried into the muck to collect the river crabs scrambling for life under their homes. Szulc called the city a communist stronghold and identified the mayor as a communist sympathizer. This, not surprisingly, was one of the reasons the Peasant League's earliest work was centered on literacy campaigns -as were the efforts of the Catholic base communities.

The Brazilian Communist movement "is a peculiar one". The Brazilian Communist Party (CP), from its inception, was so imbued respect for the Comintern, it didn't need much direction. This contradiction, Soviet interests versus the revolutionary impulse of the poor and working people of the world, is widely recognized as the achilles heel of communist revolutions in the twentieth century--though it is but one of many. Initially organized on the heels of the Russian
Revolution in 1921, the Brazilian CP made the appropriate turns at the right times, moving from the "Third Period" line of the late twenties and early thirties which denounced social democrats as social-fascists, to the "Popular Front" era following the Seventh Congress of the Comintern which identified the source of fascism as evil forces within the world's ruling classes and urged alliances with the progressive bourgeoisie, through the Hitler-Stalin pact, into WWII and a period of support for the neo-fascist Vargas regime. Like other communist parties throughout the world, the Brazilian CP did take leadership in the fight against racism, in the development and activation of trade unions (Vargas' populist-fascism tolerated labor unions within narrowly drawn labor codes--and the CP often fell in line, and the organizing of peasants. In given periods, it had a huge popular base. Indeed, the CP's Francisco Juliao is identified as having taken the initiative in organizing Peasant Leagues in the early 1960's which the Catholic Church later duplicated in its peasant circles. To Hitler's gas ovens. The party was crushed. What is important here is the central role of the Communist Party in the development of the Brazilian left and the mobilization of masses of people in struggles for liberation back and gave the people a sense of hope that they could win.

Peritore, Carr, Welder, Maria Helena Moreira Alves, and Freire point to a party which they believe is different, a party beyond the errors of the past in which the masses of people can stake their hopes for the future: the Partido dos Trabalhadores (Workers Party) which was active in the seventies strike wave. This claim is worth examination, particular since Peritore identifies Freire as the catalyst which holds together the Worker's Party coalition of the Church and the left. "The PT and
liberation Church share similar commitments to participatory democracy because of the strong influence of Paulo Freire's theories of cultural revolution. The Workers Party, which claims "about 350,000 militants", was formally organized in 1979. Interestingly, one of the groups within the coalition-like party is "Em Tempo (In These Times)". "The fact that such a party could arise in Brazil indicates the penetration of Freire's thought ... Freire has only codified the revolutionary practice of the church and various parties in Latin America into a sophisticated political theory which blends the best of European Marxism, Latin American Catholicism, and liberating popular action".

PT's social democratic view, its particular position on the development of social change, is not thoroughly examined in Freire or Peritore, either in the sense of the experience of the U.S. Students for a Democratic Society, or, what appears more apropos, the early Russian Bolsheviks or the Mensheviks. Closer to the Brazilian home is Freire's praise for Allende's Chile, a paragon of the Socialist International, so easily smashed--at the cost of hundreds of thousands of lives. Efforts to achieve socialism through the ballot, pluralist socialist parties, both have a long and unenviable history. There is exemplary history closer to hand, in Freire's work in Grenada and Guineau-Bissau, as we shall see. But first we shall turn to the Catholic left, the other half of Freire's Christian Marxism, and then we will create a chronology of Freire's work, and then lay the theoretical framework which buttresses the special conception of literacy-consciousness-production--and social justice.

3.5. Principles of a Philosophy of Education for Liberation
Human beings, different from animals, should not simply 'live' by adapting themselves to the world; human beings, to fulfill their roles as such, have to historically, culturally and socially 'exist' in and with the world, which implies to be in a permanent 'process of becoming'. From this point of view, to exist humanly is to exist in transforming, interfering in the world; consequently, history and our social reality are products of our intervention in the world.

In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire distinguishes 'men' and 'animals' in defining animals as being "ahistorical", therefore, "fundamentally 'beings in themselves'". It basically means that animals are "unable to objectify either themselves or their activity living 'submerged' in a world to which they can give no meaning, lacking a 'tomorrow' and a 'today' because they exist in an overwhelming present". On the other hand, 'men', different from animals, "exist in a world which they are constantly recreating and transforming because they are conscious beings they can separate themselves from the world, which they objectify, as they separate themselves from their own activity, as they locate the seat of their decisions in themselves and in their relations with the world and others, men overcome the situations which limit them: the 'limit-situations'". Moreover, because they are conscious beings, they are able to be conscious of their own 'unfinishedness'.

The Freire, based on the same principles, improved this proposition with more precision and dearth: "The ability to reflect, to evaluate, to program, to investigate and to transform is unique to human beings in the world and with the world. Life becomes existence and life support becomes world when the conscience about the world, which also implies a conscience of the self, emerges and establishes a
dialectical relationship with the world. Human beings as the ones who do not just adapt to the world but who are involved in the world are in a "continual state of searching and investigating, curious about everything and everyone, and therefore historic, always preoccupied with tomorrow".

History then, being the result of our interference with the world, cannot be something predetermined but it is a "possibility"; it is constructed according to our everyday decisions. Consequently, future is not preset, it is problematic. The early Freire as well as the late Freire is precise in defining the role of "past" and "future", in which the past exists to be analyzed for the construction of a better future. As the early Freire states: "it affirms men as beings who transcend themselves for whom looking at the past must only be a means of understanding more dearly what and who they are so that they can more wisely build the future." Despite the late Freire's understanding of 'past' and 'future' being fundamentally the same, he improves the proposition by making dear the role of the present, which, similarly to future, is under construction: "It is in the concrete, dynamic, and contradictory present that the battle is waged from which the future emerges. Only the past while lived time and available for our analysis and comprehension, cannot be transformed. It is not possible for us to intervene in it, but by understanding its contradictory movements, it is possible to perform better in the present. The present and the future are times under construction, transitioning into the past.

Considering history as being the result of our actions, it is also valid to affirm that it is "a process of being limited and conditioned by the knowledge that we produce. Nothing that we engender, live, thinks, and make explicit takes place outside
Thus, here lies the root for Freire's refusal to accept a fatalistic way of thinking. The early Freire placed fatalism as a usual phenomenon among the 'exploited', the 'oppressed people', as a result of lack of critical reflection upon reality: fatalism is "the fruit of an historical and sociological situation, not an essential characteristic of a people's behaviour. Under the sway of magic myth, the oppressed see their suffering, the fruit of exploitation, as the will of God - as if god were the creator of this 'organized disorder'. The late Freire addresses this phenomenon not only to the exploited or the ‘oppressed’ but extends it to everyone who believes their life is predetermined, who accepts the unjust wealth and food distribution in the world without any protest, who accepts millions of people dying with hunger whereas tons of food are thrown away. To accept any unjust situation as not transformative, is fatalism and there is a need to fight against this fatalistic view of life: "The affirmation that "Things are the way they are because they cannot be otherwise" is hatefully fatalistic since it decrees that happiness only belongs to those in power ... We are transformative beings and not beings for accommodation."

The new version of fatalistic discourse is often held by the reactionary neoliberals with their 'mechanistic' and authoritarian way of understanding history as well as future, proclaiming the "death of history" and of ideologies. According to them, "tomorrow is the pure repetition of today, or that tomorrow is something "predated" or as I have called it, a given datum, a 'given given'. If history is predetermined, "Social struggle would be reduced to either delaying the inexorable future or helping it to arrive". For Freire, however, there can be no human experience that takes place
outside history since history is constructed and constituted by us. Then, to proclaim "death of history" also implies our death.

In the process of making history, hope is an ontological need. In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire defined the role of 'hope' as an indispensable factor to fight against the oppressor: "Hope is rooted in men's incompleteness, from which they move out in constant search - a search which can be carried out only in communion with other men. As long as I fight, I am moved by hope; and if I fight with hope, then I can wait." The late Freire, however, emphasized the need to have hope not only to fight against the 'oppressor', but also to be able to "humanly exist" and transform the society: "Dreaming is not only a necessary political act, it is an integral part of the historic-social manner of being a person. It is part of human nature, which, within history, is in permanent process of becoming ... There is no change without dream, as there is no dream without hope."

Once we assume ourselves as 'transformative beings', it also implies the assumption of the responsibility for our own acts, since society is 'moulded' accordingly: "we recall that our awareness of our unfinishedness makes us responsible beings, hence the notion of our presence in the world as ethical." In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, although it is mentioned that human beings could be 'ethical or not', Freire does not stress the importance of each human being assuming Freire's Theory of Education from a School Education's Perspective responsibility for their own acts as much as the late Freire does.

There are no fundamental changes from the works of the early period to the late one concerning the historicity of human beings, but he definitely shifted his emphasis
towards to the need to fight against fatalism, to dream with hope, and the need for each person to be responsible for their own acts. He believed all his life that human beings, as historical beings, are capable of constructing a future founded on democratic principles. In fact, this does not apply only to countries in development but also to the developed ones, since with the society over-institutionalized, people feel powerless in their ability to 'create and re-create' history. Consequently, future is often foreseen with no space to "dream with hope" in constructing their own future. By the same token there is no need to assume responsibility for their own acts since people only follow and respect the rules. This is also immobility, a sort of fatalism which is unacceptable for Freire. We are 'transformative beings', and we have the potential to make history with our own hands, and only by transforming reality human beings fulfill their existence.

3.5.1. Human Being as Historical Beings – Paulo Freire

Freire wanted to empower illiterates, to raise their consciousness of their own fatalism, to conscientize them and to motivate them to take charge of their lives to a greater extent. Through a critical analysis of education (societal and formal), he created a philosophically principled plan for liberation, organic and indigenous, not an imposed regimen formatted to liberate. To understand Freire's educational liberative philosophy, a couple of key terms need to be defined. He calls those people marginalized, impoverished, dejected, and cheated of social justices, the "oppressed." Those in power or powerful class, who have wealth and legal protection, are the "oppressors." While not all oppressors have direct contact in the mistreatment and dehumanization of the oppressed, they are gears within the social, economic, and
governmental machine, which structures and perpetuates a system of domination and abuse. "An act is oppressive only when it prevents men from being more fully human." Societies based on poverty, cheap exploited labour, discrimination, unequal education, and unequal health care rely on some people (men and women) being treated as partly human and, thus, are oppressive. It is this oppression that Freire hopes to change. Paulo Freire provides an equally eloquent solution from the opposite end of the earth. He proposes that both the oppressors and the oppressed should join in the effort to perform their “historical and ontological vocation” of becoming more fully human.

First, Freire states that oppressive societies, both the oppressors and the oppressed, are continually projecting “I-It” relationships, which treat people as objects, as opposed to the “I-thou” relationships, wherein people are treated as human beings. Freire portrays society’s skewed view of relationships with, “For the oppressors, ‘human beings’ refers only to themselves; other people are ‘things.’” This skewed perception of relationships presents an enormous obstacle for healthy dialogue. Freire poses the question, “How can I dialogue if I always project ignorance onto others and never perceive my own? How can I dialogue if I regard myself as a case apart from others mere ‘its’ in whom I cannot recognize other ‘I’s?’

Second obstacle that presents itself in oppressive societies is the oppressed fervent reflected in self-deprival which continuously affirms they are less than human. Freire identifies the source of this constant self-depreciation as: “So often do they hear that they are good for nothing, know nothing and are incapable of learning anything
that they are sick, lazy and unproductive that in the end they become convinced of their own unfitness.”

Third, social comparison acts to perpetuate oppression. In other words, oppression is the only thing people know; thus, it will be the only thing they will continue to do. Oppressors will always judge themselves superior to the oppressed, and consequently, the oppressed will always aspire to become the oppressors purely to be on the more comfortable end of the spectrum. Freire acknowledges this by explaining, “The very structure of their thought has been conditioned by the contradictions of the concrete, existential situation by which they were shaped. Their ideal is to be men; but for them, to be men is to be oppressors.”

The oppressed human, existence is not being, it is being under the oppressor. Likewise, to the oppressors, being becomes having and “having more” is solely their inalienable right. Freire explains that people entirely stop being people and become mere phases of oppression.

The objective must be the complete obliteration of the oppressive cycle, and this involves liberating both the oppressed and their oppressors on a path towards becoming more fully human. This process of liberation must not involve propaganda, management, and manipulation all of which Freire describes as “arms of domination which cannot be the instruments of dehumanization.” It must be done dialogically through education that is provided by true generosity with the intent of freedom. Thus, dialogue is never an end in itself but a means to develop a better comprehension about the object of knowledge.”

Education, he held, “the practice
of freedom, the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world.\textsuperscript{clxxxv}

Freire’s procedure for establishing his vital pedagogy is the acknowledgement that “the oppressed must be their own example in the struggle for their redemption.”\textsuperscript{clxxxvi} With this rule in mind Freire defines dual distinct phases for any liberation. First, the pedagogy must “unveil the world of oppression” around the oppressed and through “praxis” allow them to commit themselves to transforming it.\textsuperscript{clxxxvii} The second stage, he explains, occurs after the oppression has been transformed and changes from pedagogy of the oppressed to “pedagogy of all people in the process of permanent liberation.”\textsuperscript{clxxxviii} In this process people cease being objects and develop \textit{“consciousness as consciousness of consciousness.”}\textsuperscript{clxxxix} Freire states that this miracle cannot be “packaged and sold,” rather it must be achieved through “reflection and action.”\textsuperscript{cxc} We know that apart from this inquiry and these praxis humans cannot be humans; they can only be mere tools of an oppressive, banking society. However, with reflection and action the oppressed are allowed to perceive reality as a process that is not set in stone and only through communication can reality truly hold meaning.

\textbf{3.5.2. Encountering the Oppressive Situation}

To process liberation of the power of people, Paulo Freire primarily recasts the very notion of power. Social and political power in the hands of the ruling few is conceive to be individual or group centred. As against this notion, Freire arguments that political power needs to be considered as socially invested by the people. Societies based on poverty, cheap exploited labor, discrimination, unequal education,
and unequal health care rely on some people (men and women) being treated as partly inhuman and thus, are oppressive. It is this oppression that Freire hopes to change.

He conceives power ‘Le Pouvoir’ in French with significantly different meanings from those of the English term ‘power.’ “pouvoir is nominalised infinitive; the verb pouvoir from which it drives means ‘to be able to.’ ‘pouvoir, then, is the ‘power’ that defines, in a manner that is at once indissociably – enabling and constraining, the actions of an individual placed in a certain social space. Moreover, as power cannot be reified and abstracted from the relations from whom it develops, it is not the antithesis of freedom. Therefore, power is not a force that comes only from above. If one wants, he can ‘escape’ from relationships of power.

In Freire's view of education, learning to take control and achieving power are not individual objectives, as in a "boot strap" theory of empowerment. For the poor and the dispossessed people, strength is in numbers and social change and is accomplished in unity. Power is shared, not the power of a few who improve themselves at the expense of others, but the power of the many who find strength and purpose in a common vision.

Paulo Freire’s Pedagogy of the Oppressed recognizes the followings: It begins with false generosity and paternalism (as rationalized guilt): It results in the objectification of the oppressed to further warrant false generosity (“look how poor they are”); the oppressor cannot be the champion of liberation; Since liberation requires power, and the oppressed lack power, how is their liberation possible?

The two uses for education power: Systematic Education requires political power to implement educational reform. Educational Project does not require political
power for implementation of education reform. Liberation achieved by individuals at the expense of others is an act of oppression. Personal freedom and the development of individuals can only occur in mutuality with others. Social power he held that is geared through education for liberation of the oppressed. Shared power in learning is exercised in control over the curriculum, its contents and methods, and over the coordination of all learning activities. Education for liberation provides a forum open to the imaginings and free exercise of control by learners, teachers, and the community, while also providing for the development of those skills and competencies without which the exercise of power would be impossible. Empowerment is both the means and the outcome of this pedagogy which some have come to call ‘liberatory education’.

According to Freire there exist two distinct classes of people – the oppressor and the oppressed. The dialectical materialistic relation between these two propels a situation of oppression wherein an oppressor class oppresses and an oppressed class is oppressed. He calls those people marginalized, impoverished, dejected, and cheated of social justices, the ‘oppressed.’ Those in power, or the powerful class, who have wealth and legal protection, are the ‘oppressors.’ The oppressed are those who deprived of their justice (basic needs and rights), freedom (not subject of their own history-decisions made by others) and Dignity (a sense of being somebody). By this poor become voiceless and powerless. This marginalization of the poor is called oppression.

Freire’s particular concern is with the state of consciousness of the oppressed class. The oppressed class is submerged, having accepted the thing status into which
they are oppressed. The historical vocation of the oppressed class is to struggle against the oppressor and realize human worth which the oppressor denies them. Only the oppressed class can realize humanity, but they do it for all. That is the oppressed class has the role of liberating the oppressors, as well as itself, from their role as oppressors, thus resolving a contradiction in which they neither are fully human. Freire outlines in the *Pedagogy of the oppressed*, the relations which exist between oppressors and oppressed. For example: "Any situation in which 'A' objectively exploits 'B' or hinders his or her pursuit of self-affirmation as a responsible person is one of oppression". "An act is oppressive only when it prevents men from being more fully human." And he further states that one of the basic elements of the relationship between oppressors and oppressed is prescription. Every prescription represents the imposition of one individual's choice upon another, transforming the consciousness of the person prescribed into one that conforms with the prescriber's consciousness. He states that the oppressed may internalize the oppressor. The oppressed who emerge from their submergence in being-for-the-other have an attitude of adhesion to the oppressor and cannot sufficiently 'objectify' them. Freire writes: "But almost always, during the initial stage of the struggle, the oppressed, instead of striving for liberation, tend themselves to become oppressors, or 'sub-oppressors'. For example the peasant who just receives some education may express a desire to be foreman. In theory it creates the possibility that peasants who disagree with the revolutionary ideas can be dismissed as having 'internalized the oppressor'. While not all oppressors have direct contact in the mistreatment and dehumanization of the oppressed, they are gears
within the social, economic, and governmental machine, which structures and perpetuates a system of domination and abuse.

3.5.3. Power Awareness

Freire puts forth a pedagogy in which the individual learns to cultivate his own growth through situations of daily life that provide useful learning experiences. This is not pedagogy for the oppressed; it is rather pedagogy of the oppressed. The subject should build his reality from the circumstances that give rise to the daily events of his life. The texts that the individual creates permits him to reflect upon and analyze the world in which he lives - not in an effort to adapt himself to this world, but rather as part of an effort to reform it and to make it conform to the historical demands. Given to the immediate situation, the method of learning of Paulo Freire requires that students do more than simply reproduce the words that already exist. It requires that they create their own words from their own worlds, the words that allow them to become aware of reality in order to fight for their own emancipation. This is how one would become conscious of the immediate oppressive situation as to move towards critical consciousness. Without this, some people acquire a kind of naive consciousness in which they are aware of their situation but don't make any effort to change it; they take a conformist stance and consider their situation something normal, even to the point of supporting it themselves. Other individuals construct their own reality and liberate themselves from oppression, only to go to the opposite extreme and become the antithesis of what they were fighting against. The person who thinks and reflects on the given environment goes about creating himself from the inside out. He creates his consciousness of struggle by transforming reality and liberating himself
from the oppression that has been inserted by traditional pedagogy. In the same way, when he acquires a new way of thinking, his understanding of the social status that he holds changes him. It's not necessarily a materialistic understanding, but a cognitive one, whose importance is revealed in the liberation from oppression which is found in the interior of the consciousness of the individual who possesses it. Freire endeavors that the individual, through systematic study, also learn to fight for the end of oppression and for constructive criticism of the status quo. Thus we could infer that according to Freire's there two sequential moments to educate against the oppressive situation – The first involves becoming conscious of the reality that the individual lives as an oppressed being subject to the decisions that the oppressors impose. The second refers to the initiative of the oppressed to fight and emancipate themselves from the oppressors.

Freire does not believe that the lived situation consists only of a simple awareness of reality, Instead, that the individual has a historical need to fight against the status that dwells within him. The efforts of the oppressed become focused and concrete through the type of learning that school really should give them, instead of encouraging them to adapt to their reality, as the oppressors themselves do. In the relationships they establish, the oppressed appear to be the instigators of violence, even when the conditions and events that they have experienced up to that point incite them to try to modify their status. Paulo Freire developed a pedagogy of the oppressed that teaches illiterate basic reading and writing skills. It helps them develop a greater awareness of the forces that shape their lives. He contends that oppressed people are submerged in a "culture of silence" in which they have little control over their reality.
They are trapped in an exploitive, oppressive and alienating situation. Yet, by participating in a problem-posing educational process based on their existential situation (the social, political and economic realities of their existence), oppressed people are able to begin analyzing their reality. This in turn can lead them to take an active role in initiating change. Freire calls this the process Conscientization or the process through which one develops a critical awareness of the contradictions of one's world; realizes that such incongruity can be overcome; and acts on the basis of this new understanding.\textsuperscript{exciv}

Nevertheless, in the eyes of the oppressors, such fights are canonized as unnecessary violence or utopian dreams, and not as the ideas of a revolutionary who is known for the ideological commitment that he establishes with his peers, rather than for the battles he carries out. Although the reality of the oppressed is not the will of God, although He is not responsible for the oppressive situation, in a society without conscience such situations are presented as normal. These circumstances occasionally provoke a mistaken horizontal violence between the oppressed themselves in their efforts to achieve emancipation. Furthermore, the oppressors accuse those who oppose them of being disobliging, irresponsible, depraved and responsible for their own situation, despite the fact that even if these adjectives do sometimes apply, they are really a response to being oppressed and are ultimately the result of the exploitation to which these people have been subjected. The situation gets even worse when the oppressed accept this reality and adapt to it without questioning or even attempting to change it. This generates in the oppressed an emotional dependence that
seems irrevocable. It is necessary, therefore, that these individuals get to know themselves in order to begin the fight for their inexorable emancipation.

3.5.4. Social Context as the Primary Learning Text

For oppressor there exists only one right, their right to live in domination, over against the right of the oppressed. The climate creates in the oppressor a strong possessive consciousness; possessive of world and human beings. This consciousness tends to transform everything into an object of domination: world and humans. Everything is reduced to the status of objects at their disposal. Objects of purchasing power; money is the measure of all things for them ‘to be is to have’. If having is the condition for being it should necessarily be the condition for all people. This is not recognized by the oppressors. The oppressors do not see that having more dehumanizes them and oppressed, they convince themselves that their wealth is acquired through their own effort, with their ‘courage to take risks.

If others don’t have, it is because they are lazy, incompetent. They are ungrateful; envious etc. The oppressors regard the oppressed as potential enemies who must be watched. Consequently, they ‘control’ the oppressed; they change them into inanimate ‘things’ – the oppressed lose freedom’ this is sadism; reducing a person to a thing, whereby the person loses one essential quality of life: freedom. Oppressors use sconce and technology for their purpose (to oppress).

Some from the oppressor class may join the oppressed in their struggle for liberation. But though they cease to be oppressors, given their background, they bring with them the marks of their origin, namely their prejudices and lack of confidence in the people’s ability to think. They believe that they should be the educators of the
transformation. They do not trust people. Those who authentically commit themselves to the people, must have a real rebirth, have a true communion with the people, only then will they understand the ways of behaviours and action of the oppressed.

3.5.5. Oppressor’s Perception

Domination is the act by which others are forced to participate in the system that alienates them. They are compelled to perform actions contrary to their nature and their historical essence. Domination is an act of pressure and force. The servant obeys out of fear and out of habit. Domination is transformed into repression when the oppressed try to liberate themselves from the pressure they suffer. Faced with a gesture signifying the intention of fight from a situation of domination, the dominator increases the pressure; the dominator represses. Repression can be individual and psychological but it is always social. The last category of reflection is the core of the philosophy of liberation. True liberation can only be brought about by a person who has an ethical conscience not merely moral conscience. The ethos of domination is it imperialist or dependent national, revolves around the mystification, in the form of reigning customs or virtues, of what were vices in the time of oppression. The ‘virtues’ of the centre and dominating classes are alienation in the periphery and dominated classes

The oppressor adopt fatalistic attitude towards their situations. E.g., I am only a peasant what can I do? Fatalism sometimes is explained by oppressors as ‘docile’ a virtue. But it is a fruit of the historical and sociological situation. Fatalism is adopted either due to the distorted view of the God/magic. The oppressed are submerged so much so the oppressed cannot perceive clearly that they are serving the interests of the
 oppressors, chafing under restrictions, sometimes they strike their own comrades, resulting in violence. Sometimes the oppressed feel an irresistible attraction towards the oppressor and his way of life. So they want to resemble him, imitate him, follow him. (E.g. the middle class aping the West or upper castes, Indian politicians, bureaucrats who want to ape the forms of colonial masters) Self-deprecation is another characteristic of the oppressed. They internalize the opinion which the oppressor has of them. We are good for nothing, incapable of learning, sick, lazy etc. Others know ‘so they want to listen to others’. They lack confidence in themselves, hence, are reluctant to resist. This attitude is accompanied by a fear of the boss. They believe in the magical power of the oppressor. Act of opposing the boss brings guilt feelings. The boss brings guilt feelings. The dominant culture silences the oppressed through the cultural transmission of discourses in schools and other institutions that support its hegemony and through ignoring or demonizing other discourses that might challenge its authority. As a result, oppressed people learn to internalize negative images of them. Because they are not taught the tools of critical inquiry that would allow them to challenge these false representations, they remain passive and silent.

### 3.5.6. Perception of the Oppressed People

The situations of oppression are overcome through the recognition of its causes. The struggle is a struggle to transform the situation of oppression. It affects both the oppressor and the oppressed. The oppressor cannot initiate the struggle. The oppressor is dehumanized by dehumanizing the oppressed. There are two forms of oppression: False perception is the interpretation of perception as purely subjective phenomenon; It is not a denial of facts just a reinterpretation of the fact; it is an
attempt to rationalize oppression; rationalized facts lose their objective basis; the oppressor wants to propagate a state of submersion i.e. submersion as fact; it is an attempt to mask the true nature of oppressive reality.

True perception is the interpretation of perception as dialectical relationship between the subjective and objective realities. It is world and action are intimate interdependent. We must be preoccupied with the action of dialogical exchange; our praxis must be directed toward the critical intervention of those submerged in oppression; those who initially recognize this oppression develop the pedagogy of their liberation, the ‘pedagogy of humankind’; the oppressed must be their own example in the struggle for their redemption.

Sometimes the oppressed feel an irresistible attraction towards the oppressor and his way of life. So they want to resemble him, imitate him, follow him (e.g. the middle class aping the West or upper castes, Indian politicians, bureaucrats who want to ape the forms of colonial masters). Oppressed internalize the opinion which the oppressor has of them. We are good for nothing, incapable of learning, sick, lazy etc. Others know ‘so they want to listen to others’. They lack confidence in themselves, hence, are reluctant to resist. This attitude is accompanied by a fear of the boss. They believe in the magical power of the oppressor. Act of opposing the boss brings guilt feelings. The boss brings guilt feelings.

The oppressed suffer from the following duality/conflicts between ejecting oppressor within in / not ejecting him; between human solidarity/alienation; between being spectator /actors; between speaking out/being silent. One of the most important concepts of Freire's pedagogy of the oppressed is the ‘culture of silence.’ The
oppressors overwhelm the oppressed with their values and norms, which effectively silences people. In this context Freire uses the concept of "myth". By pressure from those in power, the oppressed have internalized those myths, which we can speak of here as "lies" because they have been purposefully and knowingly imposed upon the people without taking into consideration their reality. The oppressed people feel ignorant and they become dependent on the culture of the oppressors, the so-called experts, specialists in society. The needs of the oppressed and the knowledge gained from their own experience are not regarded as important; they are ignored, devalued and considered as inferior.

Solutions to oppression do not consist in reversal of roles between oppressed and oppressor. When the oppressed liberate themselves from the oppressive situation – may be in a violent way – they take away the oppressors power to dominate and suppress and thus restore humanity to the oppressor. This act of freeing the oppressor from dehumanization is love. Yet one must note that when the oppressed resolve the contradiction authentically, the former oppressors do not feel liberated, for them, any situation other than the old one of oppressing others is for them oppression. Any restriction on this behaviour (to ensure the rights of others) appears to them as violation of their rights. For them the term ‘human beings’ applies only to themselves, others are ‘things’.

3.6. Problem–Posing Model of Education

In terms of actual pedagogy, Freire is best known for his attack on what he called the "banking" concept of education, in which the student was viewed as an empty account to be filled by the teacher. He notes that "it transforms students into
receiving objects. It attempts to control thinking and action, leads men and women to adjust to the world, and inhibits their creative power. The basic critique was not new —Rousseau’s conception of the child as an active learner was already a step away from *tabula rasa* (which is basically the same as the “banking concept”). In addition, Dewey described education as a mechanism for social change, explaining that “education is a regulation of the process of coming to share in the social consciousness; and that the adjustment of individual activity on the basis of this social consciousness is the only sure method of social reconstruction.” Freire’s work, however, updated the concept and placed it in context with current theories and practices of education, laying the foundation for what is now called critical pedagogy.

### 3.6.1. Foundational Principles of Education for Liberation

- Man’s ontological vocation is to be a Subject who acts upon and transforms his world, and in so doing, moves toward ever-new possibilities of fuller and richer life individually and collectively.
- Every human being, no matter how “ignorant” or submerged in the culture of silence he or she may be, is capable of looking critically at the world in a dialogical encounter with others. Provided with proper tools for this encounter, the individual can gradually perceive personal and social reality as well as the contradictions in it, become conscious of his or her own perception of that reality, and deal critically with it, is the final of it.
- Freire's theoretical framework, reality is divided into two distinct complimentary components (i) the Objective reality consists of objects, structures, roles are external to people. (ii) Subjective reality is ideas, thoughts, values are internal to
people. These two realities interact in a dialectical process. Berger and Luckmann identify three continuous moments in this dialectical process as externalization, the process by which people project their subjective reality into the objective reality, objectification, the process through which people establish their beliefs as facts, independent of the society, and internalization, the process by which the, "objectivated social world is retrojected into consciousness, in the course of socialization." 

Friere’s theoretical framework includes that knowledge is not neutral but it is the expression of historical moments where some groups exercise dominant power over others. Oppressed groups of individuals often experience life as “objects” being acted upon rather than “subjects” of their own lives. “Objects” often lack certain critical skills essential for influencing the institutions that have control over their lives. “Subjects” not only have skills for influencing institutions, but also have the opportunity to exercise these skills. The learners are the subjects in the learning process and not the objects as they have to be subjects of their destiny. The learners and educators are equal participants in the learning process; this process is developed by a continuous dialogue between the educators and learners. Through dialogue, learners or subjects are able to focus their attention on the reality which mediates them and which posed as a problem and challenges them. The response to that challenge is the action of dialogical subjects upon reality in order to transform it. The objective of the learning process is to liberate the participants from their external and internal oppression; to facilitate learners becoming capable of changing their lives and the society they live in.
Freire’s Educational philosophy emphasis on acts of ‘cognition not only of the content, but of the why of economic, social, political, ideological, and historical facts under which we find ourselves placed. The pedagogy does not romantically celebrate the adult learner or student’s experience just for its own sake. Rather, it is based on a critically affirmative language, and advocates that educators must work constantly on both their own and the experiences of learners. This pedagogy in situations of classroom or textbook interaction requires that we democratize language teaching and break down the elitist mould or paternalistic barriers to the development of the communicative competence and ensure equality of all learners.

3.6.2. Critique of Banking Model of Education

To the world of philosophy of education, Freire introduced the concepts of ‘banking’ vis-a-vis ‘dialogue’ education in order to differentiate between dominating educational practices from liberation dialectics. Freire criticised banking educational methods that sees teacher as a source of expert knowledge and students as empty accounts to be filled with deposits of knowledge. The banking metaphor invokes the image of the teaching depositing the knowledge into the students who are mere ‘collectors’ or ‘cataloguers’, lacking any critical consciousness and analysis. “Education is’ says Freire, ‘suffering from national sickness.

In a dominating system, the teachers are considered as the holders of power, authority, and knowledge, whereas, the students are "empty vessels" to be filled with knowledge. The banking concept of education suits the oppressors. In this system the students are treated as empty vessels into which knowledge can be deposited (like deposits in a bank) by the teacher. Freire depicts what actually goes on in the world of
banking education succinctly. He writes "This relationship [teacher-student] involves a narrating Subject (the teacher) and patient, listening objects (the students). The contents, whether values or empirical dimensions of reality, tend in the process of being narrated to become lifeless and petrified…. His [the teacher's] task is to 'fill' the students with the contents of his narration- contents which are detached from reality, disconnected from the totality that engendered them and could give them significance". The students are ignorant, unable to learn without the bestowal of knowledge by the teacher. Freire calls this the "banking" system of education.

Freire sees clearly how the teacher in a banking system must assume that the students ‘know nothing’, indeed the teacher projects an ‘absolute ignorance’ onto others. Freire argues that banking education fosters passivity in students by negating the spirit of inquiry. In banking education the teacher owns the object of knowledge and prepares a lesson on it. The lesson is delivered to the students as secondary knowledge. The students never find out anything for themselves and thus are rendered passive. They are good students in as much as they can repeat the narrative about the world which they have been given.

This classroom education structure mirrors the political and social structure in which the students and teachers live. The state leaders hold the knowledge and bestow it on the citizens. Both are patriarchal, repressive structures: the students and citizens only learn the knowledge that the teacher or government wishes to confer. By structuring the education in this manner, the student is acculturated into oppressive social structure. Obedience, unquestioning acceptance, and resignation to the abusive authority and structure are learned behaviors for living in the oppressive society. The
‘social education’ begins at an early age to create docile drones partaking in the government machine.

In banking education there is an absolute dichotomy between the teacher and the student. The teacher *always* has knowledge. His knowledge is *absolute*. Linked to his absolute knowledge is his authority, not just a subject-authority but the authority of social control. The teacher chooses what is learned. The students, in their serried rows, learn by absorbing what they are told by the teacher. For Freire it is a ‘ready-to-wear’ approach to education which does everything to obviate the need for critical engagement with reality. The teacher *imposes* himself on the students. He is not *with* them.

In banking education reality is made static. The students learn about it and adapt to it. Their humanity is thus not denied. Banking education teaches fatalism; the 'world' is a given; one can but submit to it.

The banking system of education has a narrative character. The teacher narrates the content to students as if reality were static and compartmentalized. His task is to “fill” the students with contents. Students are containers/ receptors to be filled. Teacher is the depositor. There is polarization between teachers and students. The relationship involves a narrating Subject (the teacher) and patient, listening objects (the students). Narration leads the students to memorize mechanically the narrated content. The more completely he fills the receptacles, the better a teacher he is. The more meekly the receptacles permit themselves to be filled, the better students they are. Education becomes an act of depositing, in which the students are the depositaries and the teacher is the depositor.
According to the banking concept of education, knowledge becomes a gift bestowed by those who regard themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing. This projection of an absolute ignorance on others by the knowledgeable is a characteristic of ideology of oppression. The students accept their ignorance like a slave. Freire here makes an interesting point, by stating unlike the slave, they never discover that they educate the teacher. Education must begin with the solution of the teacher-student contradiction, by reconciling the poles of the contradiction so that both are simultaneous teachers and students. Following are the chief characteristic of the banking education which leads to several contradictions in the system. The banking system maintains the contradiction through the following practices.

- The teacher teaches; the students are taught.
- The teacher is omniscient; the students are dumb and ignorant.
- The teacher is omnipotent; the students are powerless.
- The teacher thinks and the students are thought about.
- The teacher talks and the students listen meekly.
- The teacher is subjects; the students are objects.
- The teacher disciplines; the student is disciplined.
- The teacher chooses and enforces his choice; the students comply.
- The teacher acts; the students have the illusion of acting through the action of the teacher.
- The teacher chooses the program content; the students adapt to it.
○ The teacher confuses the authority of knowledge with his or her own profession authority.

The banking system reduces the creative power of the students. This is in the interest of the oppressors. The oppressors, through their welfare schemes what they call “humanitarianism” preserve their superiority. The oppressed are termed as ‘marginals’, incompetent’ and ‘lazy’. The banking approach ‘dehumanizes’ the students and adults in place of ‘humanize’ them.

The banking concept of education regards men as adaptable, manageable beings. The more students work at storing the deposits entrusted to them, the less they develop the critical consciousness which would result from their intervention in the world as transformers of that world. The more completely they accept the passive role imposed on them, the more they tend simply to adapt to the world as it is and to the fragmented view of reality deposited in them.

The capability of banking education to minimize or annul the student's creative power and to stimulate their credulity serves the interests of the oppressors, who care neither to have the world revealed nor to see it transformed. The oppressors use their "humanitarianism" to preserve a profitable situation. Thus they react almost instinctively against any experiment in education which stimulates the critical faculties and is not content with a partial view of reality always seeks out the ties which link one point to another and one problem to another.

The banking concept does not admit to partnership and necessarily so. To resolve the teacher-student contradiction, to exchange the role of depositor, prescriber,
domesticator, for the role of student among students would be to undermine the power of oppression and serve the cause of liberation.

Implicit in the banking concept is the assumption of a dichotomy between human beings and the world: a person is merely in the world, not with the world or with others; the individual is spectator, not re-creator. In this view, the person is not a conscious being (corpo consciente) rather the possessor of a consciousness: an empty "mind" passively opens to the reception of deposits of reality from the world outside. This view makes no distinction between being accessible to consciousness and entering consciousness. The distinction is essential: the objects which surround me are simply accessible to my consciousness, not located within it. I am aware of them, but they are not inside me.

The banking notion of consciousness is that the educator's role is to regulate the way the world "enters into" the students. The teacher's task is to organize a process to "fill" the students by making deposits of information which he or she considers to constitute true knowledge. And since people "receive" the world as passive entities, education should make them more passive still and adapt them to the world. The educated individual is the adapted person because she or he is better 'fit' for the world. Translated into practice, this concept is well suited for the purposes of the oppressors, whose tranquility rests on how well people fit the world the oppressors have created and how little they question it.

The more completely the majority adapt to the purposes which the dominant majority prescribe for them (thereby depriving them of the right to their own purposes), the more easily the minority can continue to prescribe. The theory and
practice of banking education serve this end quite efficiently. Verbalistic lessons, reading requirements, (3) the methods for evaluating "knowledge," the distance between the teacher and the taught, the criteria for promotion: everything in this ready-to-wear approach serves to obviate thinking.

Because banking education begins with a false understanding of men and women as objects, it cannot promote the development of what Fromm calls ‘biophily’, but instead produces its opposite: ‘necrophily’. Oppression, an overwhelming control is necrophilic and nourished by love of death, not life. The banking concept of education, which serves the interests of oppression, is also necrophilic. Based on a mechanistic, static, naturalistic, spatialized view of consciousness, it transforms students into receiving objects. It attempts to control thinking and action, leads women and men to adjust to the world, and inhibits their creative power.

Freire's critique of banking education is located in his class analysis. "Education as the exercise of domination stimulates the credulity of students, with the ideological intent (often not perceived by educators) of indoctrinating them to adapt to the world of oppression". For Freire banking education alienates praxis by excluding the students from a living, critical engagement with the now (the present political and social conditions) is, without doing anything further, already indoctrinating students into acquiescence in the status quo. This accusation is not made in the naive hope that the dominant elites will thereby simply abandon the practice. Its objective is to call the attention of true humanists to the fact that they cannot use banking educational methods in the pursuit of liberation, for they would only negate that very pursuit. Nor may a revolutionary society inherit these methods from an oppressor society. The
revolutionary society which practices banking education is either misguided or mistrusting of people. In either event, it is threatened by the specter of reaction.

Unfortunately, those who espouse the cause of liberation are themselves surrounded and influenced by the climate which generates the banking concept, and often do not perceive its true significance or its dehumanizing power. Paradoxically, then, they utilize this same instrument of alienation in what they consider an effort to liberate. Indeed, some ‘revolutionaries’ brand as ‘innocents’, ‘dreamers’, or even ‘reactionaries’ those who would challenge this educational practice. But one does not liberate people by alienating them. Authentic liberation—the process of humanization—is not another deposit to be made in men. Liberation is a praxis: the action and reflection of men and women upon their world in order to transform it.

Those truly committed to liberation must reject the banking concept in its entirety, adopting instead a concept of women and men as conscious beings, and consciousness as consciousness intent upon the world. They must abandon the educational goal of deposit-making and replace it with the posing of the problems of human beings in their relations with the world. "Problem-posing" education, responding to the essence of consciousness—intentionality—rejects communiqués and embodies communication. It epitomizes the special characteristic of consciousness: being conscious of, not only as intent on objects but as turned in upon itself in a Jasperian split—consciousness as consciousness of consciousness.
3.6.3. Anti-dialogical method Vs Dialogical Method

3.6.3.1. Conquest

The first characteristic of anti-dialogical action is the necessity for conquest. The anti-dialogical person, in his relations with other people, aims at conquering them by all means. Every act of conquest implies a conqueror, and someone or something, which is conquered. Conquest first reduces human beings to the status of things. In the conquest, the oppressor attempts to destroy people and keeps them passive. Oppressor is not with the people.

3.6.3.2. Divide and Rule

The oppressors though constitute a minority group subordinates the oppressed that form a majority. Oppressor divides in order to preserve the status quo and remain in power. This minority can not tolerate the unification of the people, which would signify a serious threat to their own hegemony.

3.6.3.3. Manipulation

Manipulation is an instrument of conquest. Greater the political immaturity of the oppressor, the more easily can they be manipulated. Another means by which manipulation is achieved is through agreement between the dominant and dominated classes. This image of dialogue is only superficial as the real aim of the dominant classes is to achieve their own ends. Manipulation is also a fundamental instrument for the preservation of domination.

3.6.3.4. Cultural Invasion

Here the invaders penetrate into the cultural context of another group and by ignoring the potential of the latter; they impose their own view of the world upon
those they invade. The invaders inhibit the creativity of the invaded by curbing their expression. The invaders are successful if they convince the invaded that they are inferior. When invaded accept their inferiority they also recognize the superiority of the invaders. Cultural invasion further signifies that the ultimate seat of decision regarding the action of those who are invaded lies not with them but with the invaders. The oppressors’ approach will always reflect antidualogical characteristics such as conquest, divide and rule, manipulation and cultural invasion. On the other hand, the revolutionary leader will always adopt dialogical method such as cooperation, unity for liberation, organization and cultural synthesis.

3.6.4. Culture of Silence

According to the School of Education of the University of Miamai, "Freire's most well known work is Pedagogy of the Oppressed, well known for concepts such the "Culture of Silence in which dominated individuals lose the means by which to critically respond to the culture." At the heart of Freire’s unique view of education lies in critical consciousness or conscientization. This term means, “consciousness raising” is about understanding the social and political contradictions of the world and taking action against them in one’s own life. According to Freire, freedom will be the result of praxis or informed action when a balance between theory and practice is achieved. Understanding these contradictions is necessary especially in situations of extreme poverty, because oppressors create a culture of silence that propagates a negative self-image of the oppressed. The student needs a critical consciousness to realize that this culture of silence is created to oppress. In Cultures of Silence, Paulo Freire set forth a theory of dialogic communication and the thesis that these
cultures provide a matrix in which "dominated individuals lose the means by which to critically respond to the culture that is forced on them by a dominant culture".

The culture of silence is that social-cultural context which does not permit the voice of any who have not been accepted into the prevailing hierarchical system. It is the culture of "do what you're told, don't explain, don't complain, don't whine, and don't draw attention to yourself. After long periods of time, those who have suffered such imposition of silence come to believe that they have no voice, no control, merely to accept whatever happens to them as beyond their power to influence.

According to Freire, the system of dominant social relations creates a culture of silence that instills a negative, silenced and suppressed self-image into the oppressed. The learner must develop a critical consciousness in order to recognize that this culture of silence is created to oppress. Also, a culture of silence can cause the "dominated individuals [to] lose the means by which to critically respond to the culture that is forced on them by a dominant culture." Social domination of race and class are interleaved into the conventional educational system, through which the "culture of silence" eliminates the "paths of thought that lead to a language of critique."

Paulo Freire identifies the culture of silence as a characteristic "which Freire attributes to oppressed people in colonized countries, with significant parallels in highly developed countries. According to Heahey, Freire isolates the phenomena in the underdogs for whom so much of his works seems to advocate. "Alienated and oppressed people are not heard by the dominant members of their society. The dominant members prescribe the words to be spoken by the oppressed through control
of the schools and other institutions, thereby effectively silencing the people." He is careful to point out however that ‘silence, according to Freire, is not necessarily in accordance with the dictionary sense of total mute lack of speech. Rather, he states that "this imposed silence does not signify an absence of response, but rather a response which lacks a critical quality." Further, he discusses the effect of this suppression of speech. "Oppressed people internalize negative images of themselves (images created and imposed by the oppressor) and feel incapable of self-governance. Dialogue and self-government are impossible under such conditions." It seems that a vast cadre of social workers has echoed similar themes, based upon practical field experience.

In the *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Paulo Freire exposed our educational system as one in which: i) the teacher is the depositor, the students are the depositories; ii) the teacher issues communiqués (instead of communicating) which students passively receive, memorize, and repeat; iii) knowledge becomes a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those they consider to know nothing; iv) teachers and administrators choose the instructional program content and students adapt to it; v) The more students work at storing the deposits entrusted to them, the less they develop the critical consciousness which would result from their intervention in the world as transformers of that world. The more completely they accept the passive role impressed on them, the more they tend simply to adapt to the world as it is and to the fragmented view of reality deposited in them.

3.6.5. Student-Teacher Dualism
More challenging is Freire's strong aversion to the teacher-student dichotomy. This dichotomy is admitted by Freire comes close to insisting that it be completely abolished. This is hard to imagine in absolute terms, since there must be some enactment of the teacher-student relationship in the parent-child relationship, but what Freire suggests: A deep reciprocity be inserted into our notions of teacher and student; “Education must begin with the solution of the teacher-student contradiction, by reconciling the poles of the contradiction so that both are simultaneously students and teachers.” Freire wants us to think in terms of teacher-student and student-teacher – that is, a teacher who learns and a learner who teaches – as the basic roles of classroom participation. Freire however insists that educator and student, though sharing democratic social relations of education, are not on an equal footing, but the educator must be humble enough to be disposed to relearn that which s/he already thinks s/he knows, through interaction with the learner. The authority which the educator enjoys must not be allowed to degenerate into authoritarianism; teachers must recognize that "their fundamental objective is to fight alongside the people for the recovery of the people's stolen humanity", not to "win the people over" to their side.

3.6.6. Dialogue as a Method of Education

“Dialogue is the encounter between men, mediated by the world, in order to name the world." Dialogue cannot occur between those who want to name the world and those who do not want this naming; between those who deny other people the right to speak their word and those whose right to speak has been denied them. Dialogue with the people is radically necessary to every authentic revolution.
Revolutionary acts with no dialogue with the people are not truly revolutionary acts. In order to dominate, the dominator has no choice but to deny people the right to say their own word and think their own thoughts. The oppressed and the leaders are equally the subjects of revolutionary action. Revolution is made neither by the leader for the people, nor by the people for the leaders, but by both acting together in solidarity. Revolutionary leaders cannot think without the people, nor for the people but only with the people. They think with the people in order to understand them better.

3.6.6.1. Prerequisites for Dialogue

Dialogue can take place only when the following criterions are taken into consideration. So it is worth examining them.

3.6.6.1.1. Love

Dialogue cannot exist in the absence of a profound love for the world and for fellow beings. The naming of the world which is an act of creation and recreation is not possible if it is not infused with love. Love is the foundation of dialogue and dialogue itself. Love is an act of courage, not of fear. Love is committed to others and to the cause of liberation. It is an act of bravery. It is not sentimental, not manipulative. If one does not love world, if one does not love life, and if one does not love human beings, one cannot enter into dialogue.

3.6.6.1.2. Humility

Dialogue cannot exist without humility. Naming of the world cannot be an act of arrogance. Dialogue, as an encounter between parties is addressed to the common task of learning and acting, is broken if the parties lack humility. One cannot enter into
dialogue if one considers that naming the world is the task of an elite and the common people have no say in it. People lacking humility cannot come together and be partners in naming the world. Someone who cannot acknowledge himself/ herself as mortal as everyone else still has a long way to go before he/she can reach the point of encounter.

3.6.6.1.3. Intense Faith in Others

Dialogue requires an intense faith in human beings, faith in his/her power to make and remake, to create and re-create, faith in his/her vocation to be more fully human. The dialogical person believes in other person even before he/ she meets the other face to face. Whereas faith in others is an a priori requirement for dialogue, trust is established by dialogue. False love, false humility and feeble faith in others cannot create trust.

3.6.6.1.4. Hope

Dialogue cannot exist without hope. Hope is rooted in human incompleteness, from which they move out in constant search-- a search which can be carried out only in communion with other human beings. The dehumanization resulting from an unjust order is not a cause for despair but for hope. If the dialoguers expect nothing to come out of their efforts, their encounter will be empty sterile and bureaucratic.

3.6.6.1.5. Critical Thinking

True dialogue cannot exist unless the dialoguers engage in critical thinking. Thinking perceives reality as process, as transformation, rather than as a static entity. This thinking does not separate itself from action, but constantly immerses itself in
temporality without fear of the risks involved. Only dialogue which requires critical thinking is also capable of generating critical thinking.  

3.6.7. Analysis of Dialogical Method  

3.6.7.1. Co-operation  

In the dialogical theory of action, subjects meet in order to transform the world. Subjects meet to name the world in order to transform it. Dialogue does not impose, does not manipulate, does not domesticate etc. Dialogue does not mean, however, that the theory of dialogical action leads nowhere; nor does it mean that the dialogical person does not have a clear idea of what he wants.  

3.6.7.2. Unity for Liberation  

Dialogical theory of action requires very much the unity of the leaders with the oppressed to make liberation a reality. Liberation can take place only through praxis i.e. reflection and action. It is easy for the dominant elites to practice this praxis because they have the instrument of power. They can come together when their fundamental interests are challenged. But the revolutionary group cannot exist without the people and this can pose a difficulty for achieving the unity.  

3.6.7.3. Organization  

Organizing the oppressed is the integral aspect of creating unity. Liberation is a humble, courageous and common task. The leader makes the people aware that they are creators of history. The leader makes them aware of the historical context, the view of the world held by the people etc. Liberation can be achieved only when the oppressed begin to assert themselves which requires their total involvement.  

3.6.7.4. Cultural Synthesis
Cultural synthesis is the exact opposite of cultural invasion and aims at establishing a close rapport with the people of the locality without imposing their own ideas or world-views. In other words, the people are treated as objects in cultural invasion while in cultural synthesis, the people become co-authors of the action and the only object in this process is the reality to be transformed for the liberation of people.

3.6.8. Problem-Posing Model

In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* Freire writes: Education as the practice of freedom as opposed to education as the practice of domination denies that man is abstract, isolated, independent, and unattached to the world; it also denies that the world exists as a reality apart from people. Authentic reflection considers neither abstract man nor the world without people, but people in their relations with the world.\(^{ccxiii}\)

Problem-posing education solves the student-teacher contradiction by recognizing that knowledge is not deposited from one (the teacher) to another (the student) but is instead formulated through dialogue between the two.\(^{ccxiv}\) Freire's argument concludes that “authentic education is not carried on by “A” for “B” or by “A” about “B,” but rather by “A” with “B.”\(^{ccxv}\) The representation of knowledge rather than the imposition of it lead to liberation.

The education that Freire is proposing is oppression and its causes objects reflection by the oppressed and from that reflection will come their necessary engagement in the struggle for liberation. Paulo Freire states on education: "There is no such thing as a neutral education process. Education either functions as an instrument which is used to facilitate the integration of generations into the logic of
the present system and bring about conformity to it, or it becomes the ‘practice of freedom’, the means by which men and women deal critically with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world. nccxvi

An education can be defined as a social process by which, skills, beliefs, attitudes and ideas are learned. The achievement and development of an education can help one succeed in society. Education is one of the most important tools that a society possesses. The right use of this tool is one of the greatest ways of assuring the quality of life within a society. Therefore the liberation process must include a change in the structure of education.

Freire contrast this with dialogic education in which knowledge, experience and potential of students and teachers are honoured as central to the education process. Dialogic education unearths the silenced and subjugated voices, examining the unequal power relations in the classroom and social world around it. This can take place in two stages: 1) the oppressed become aware of their oppressed situation, and through praxis commit themselves to change this situation. Praxis cannot be purely intellectual or purely action, but a combination of both critical reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it. When reflection is sacrificed for the sake of action, it is activism. And when action is sacrificed for the sake of reflection, it is verbalism. Neither activism not verbalism can be a good path to the pedagogy of social justice. 2) When reality of oppression is transformed, this pedagogy is generalized so that it becomes pedagogy for all in the process of permanent liberation. The authentic and sustainable solution to the oppressor-oppressed condition is not a
reversal of position wherein the oppressed now become oppressors, but an order where everyone can be free without hindrance.

Problem-Posing Education approaches the teacher-student teaches the student-teacher. Here two things remain true: i) In no case will the teacher ever be guaranteed not to be able to learn from his students; ii) even in those cases where this is unlikely there is no reason why a teacher cannot still work alongside the students, as an equal, posing problems and working with them to solve them for it is obviously false to set up a situation where the teacher acts as if he has absolute knowledge. Problem-Posing model of education is politically liberating because it treats people as persons who can take their place in society as thinking beings while a banking approach is oppressive because it, as Freire says 'files them away'. Freire argues that in problem-posing education teacher and students are both subjects. In banking education the teacher alone is the subject; the students, as vessels to be filled are merely objects.

In problem-posing education the teacher does not claim to either own or know the world; teacher and student approach the problem together. Freire writes: "Problem-posing education bases itself on creativity and stimulates true reflection and action upon reality, thereby responding to the vocation of persons as beings who are authentic only when engaged in inquiry and creative transformation". 

Freire emphasizes that problem-posing education is dialogical; it involves a dialogue between student-teacher and teacher-students. He relates this especially to the classic revolutionary context and reminds the revolutionary leadership that they must dialogue with the people and not just issue communiqués. In an educational situation where communication takes place in the form of two-way dialogue there is
no back-chat. The very phrase 'back-chat' with its pejorative intonation reflects the one-way nature of the approved educational process and the way it makes bad normal human creativity and interaction.

Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* approaches to education requires a teacher who can empathize with the students, who can enter into their activity of inquiry, alongside them. It requires patience and love as Freire says. It probably can't be done very efficiently on a large-scale and its fruits cannot be measured in exams which are just regurgitating the official words. In trying to preserve their freedom the disaffected are also trying to preserve the freedom of their oppressors and to keep open the possibility of dialogue. For Freire, who believes that human destiny is to be realized in the final triumph of the proletariat in history any exclusion from social and political reality and the enforced alienation concomitant on it is specifically class oppression.

Problem-Posing education is an attempt to search for solutions. The facilitator provides a framework for participants to consider a common problem and find solutions; people are actively involved in the social construction of knowledge, naming the world, and developing and acting on solutions to the problem. “The role of the educator is to present to the people in challenging form the issues they themselves have raised in a confused form.” Students and teachers become critical co-investigators in dialogue with each other. The problem-posing method opens up the floor to any unforeseen problems and questions. Problem-posing enables the brain to function as it was meant to be. “People know themselves to be unfinished; they are
aware of their incompletion. “Problem-posing education affirms men and women as beings in the process of becoming.”

It is important to establish dialogue with a community. Since problem posing method implies the use of a language similar to that with which the individual is familiar, it is necessary to integrate oneself into the life of the individual and society. Topics for learning can be found in the reality that surrounds the individual; it's just that they are hidden by the ‘limiting situations’ that the oppressors create. These limits can disappear through the education that a problematising teacher, who moves from the particular to the general, encourages.

The dialogical approach contrasts with the anti-dialogical method, which positions the teacher as the transmitter of knowledge, a hierarchical framework that leads to domination and oppression through the silencing of students' knowledge and experiences. In problem-posing education men and women develop their power to perceive critically the way they exist in the world with which and in which they find themselves. They come to see the world not as static reality but as reality in process. Problem-posing education is a type of cultural synthesis wherein the differences between views are not denied; but rather, that criticism and conflict between the two positions is encouraged. What is abnegated is the imposition of one view over the other. Thus problem-posing or liberating education strives for the emergence of consciousness and critical intervention in reality.

Problem-posing education is prophetic, looks ahead towards the future. Banking method directly indirectly reinforces men’s fatalistic perception of their situation. Problem-posing education presents this very situation as a problem – a
historical reality that can be changed transformed that human beings are in control (if reality/situation were in control of them, they would become objects) Problem posting methods is directed towards humanizing/ pursuit of full humanity in solidarity with others.

Paulo Freire’s problem-posing education can only occur within egalitarian, respectful relations. Dialogue cannot occur between those who want to name the world and those who do not wish this naming—between those who deny other men the right to speak their word and those whose right to speak has been denied to them. Those who have been denied their primordial right to speak their word must first reclaim and prevent the continuation of this dehumanizing aggression.

Problem-posing education relies on a revolutionary, respectful relationship between teacher and student. Democratic educators replace the traditional teacher-student hierarchy with egalitarian interactions. Freire wrote: problem-posing education “cannot exist, however, in the absence of a profound love for the world and its people…. Founding itself upon love, humility, and faith, dialogue becomes a horizontal relationship of which mutual trust between the dialoguers is a logical consequence." He suggested that problem-posing education revolutionizes the teacher-student relationship: “through dialogue, the teacher of the students and the students of the teacher cease to exist and a new term emerges: teacher-student with students-teachers. The teacher is no longer merely the one who teachers, but one who is himself taught in dialogue with the students, who in their turn while being taught also teach.

3.6.9. Method of Problem-Posing
The banking type of education is designed to prevent critical thinking and perpetuate the status quo. Here the educator is the guardian of a secret. Teacher teaches and the students are taught. Problem-posing education, on the other hand, is an act of learning together, where the teacher and the learners enter into a dialogue through which they investigate the problems together. The basic assumptions are that “no one can teach anyone else”, “no one can learn alone” and that “people learn together, acting in and on their world.”

3.6.9.1. Phases in Problem Posing Education

The contents of problem-posing education are developed in a collaborative effort, involving the inhabitants of the particular areas where the programme is to be implemented. The various phases of it are the following:

**Phase 1** Investigation by the educational team and volunteers from the area into the ‘present, existential, concrete situation’ to discover the people’s thematic universe; in other words, the main issues of their situation. This phase also involves linguistic research to find significant word, typical sayings, and expressing linked to the existential situation of the people.

**Phase 2** Certain key words and themes are selected for discussion and analysis. The words are chosen based on the richness of the phonemes, degree of phonetic difficulty and degree of practical content. Words which have a concrete reference to economic, social and political problems of the area are chosen. e.g. Domination, underdevelopment and so on.

**Phase 3** This phase is a codification stage. Codifications are made of the generative themes or words. Codification could be drawings, posters, and slides, i.e.
visual representations of the existential situation. These would pose the issues for discussion. Discussions will lead to a more critical consciousness and simultaneously the learners learn to read and write. Though the codifications represent local situations, they are sufficient to open perspectives for the analysis of regional and national problems.

**Phase 4** In this phase agendas are developed as guidelines for the coordinators. The coordinators are guided through a training programme in which new attitudes are created, especially with regard to a dialogical approach.

**Phase 5** Here, various kinds of educational materials are produced. For literacy, this includes cards for each generative word with the breakdown of its phonemic families. One important factor here is that the materials in Freirean method are not illustrations or just pictures; rather they are codes of a complex and relevant social reality.

**Phase 6** Once the above steps are taken the codified situation is taken to the cultural circle for “decoding”. The participants are invited to express their opinion, objectify their problems, reflect on them and in reflecting on the problems, recognize themselves as subjects. There is no teacher-student relationship rather a subject-subject relationship. Once the generative word is introduced the semantic link between the word and the object is established. Then the word is broken into syllables and once these are recognized, the card presenting the phonemic families is shown. Using these cards, the learners form new words combining syllables. The group would decide which combination is meaningful and which are not. Combinations, which do not mean anything, are called, “words of thinking.”
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3.6.10. Distinction among Banking & Problem-Posing Education

Paulo Freire distinguishes between banking method and problem posing method of education. Banking education resists dialogue; problem-posing education regards dialogue as indispensable to the act of cognition, which unveils reality. Banking education treats students as objects of assistance; problem-posing education makes them critical thinkers. Problem-posing education bases itself on creativity and stimulates true reflection and action upon reality. In sum: banking theory and practice, fails to acknowledge human beings as historical beings; problem-posing theory and practice take human being’s historicity as their starting point. Problem-posing education affirms human beings as beings in the process of becoming as unfinished, uncompleted beings in and with a likewise unfinished reality. Indeed, in contrast to other animals who are unfinished, but not historical, human beings know themselves to be unfinished; they are aware of their incompleteness. In this incompleteness and in this awareness lie the very roots of education. The unfinished character of human beings and the transformational character of reality necessitate that education be an ongoing activity.

The banking method emphasizes permanence and becomes reactionary. Problem-posing education—which accepts neither a ‘well-behaved’ present nor a predetermined future-roots itself in the dynamic present and becomes revolutionary. Problem-posing education, points that human beings subjected to domination must fight for emancipation. To that end, problem posing education enables teachers and students to become Subjects of the educational process by overcoming authoritarianism. It also enables human beings to overcome their false perception of
reality. Problem-posing education does not and cannot serve the interests of the oppressor. No oppressive order could permit the oppressed to begin to question. In the revolutionary process, the leaders cannot utilize the banking method.\textsuperscript{ccxxv}

In \textit{Pedagogy of the Oppressed}, Freire criticizes the 'mechanic' transference of knowledge in order to 'fill' the learners with information to adjust to the world: "Based on a mechanistic, static, naturalistic, spatialized view of consciousness, it transforms students into receiving objects. It attempts to control thinking and action, leads men to adjust to the world, and inhibits their creative power."\textsuperscript{ccxxvi} The main difference with the late Freire is that in \textit{Pedagogy of the Oppressed}, to 'read the world' is to "unveil the world of oppression",\textsuperscript{ccxxvii} it is to demythologize reality in order to transform it, whereas for the late Freire, to 'read the world' is to have political knowledge in order to know 'how society functions' because only then, it is possible for every person to fulfil the duties as a citizen.

For this process to work, Freire insists that the educator-leader needs to be deeply involved in the lives and struggles of the students and citizens. The teacher needs to be open, transparent and candid with his pupils. Only such an atmosphere, according to Freire, will facilitate good teacher: “There is no more ethical or truly democratic road than one in which we reveal to learners how we think, why we think the way we do, our dreams, the dreams for which we will fight, while giving them concrete proof that we respect their opinions, even when they are opposed to our own.”\textsuperscript{ccxxviii}

In opposition to the banking model, Freire proposes a liberatory one, based on a horizontal relation between teachers and learners (co-intentionality), on critical
thinking and on social transformation. In Freire's model, the teacher becomes a facilitator, the traditional class becomes a cultural circle, the emphasis shifts from lecture to problem-posing strategies, and the content, previously removed from the learners' experience, becomes relevant to the group. For Freire, literacy implies as much the acquisition of language as a political process of citizenship, in which people take history into their hands. Hence, the departure point of any educational process is not the world of the teacher, but the world of the learner. He also suggested that a critical analysis of reality could start with a critical reading of the official curriculum. He pointed out that teachers and students alike tend to consider the curriculum as something given, a neutral content to be transmitted, without understanding that education is a political act. The more teachers and students challenge this naive perspective, the easier it becomes to engage in a critical analysis of social reality. Freire's method of consciousness raising enables people to discover and recreate one for themselves in personal and social terms.

Hence, the key for liberation, accordingly, lies in the revolutionary minded intellectual elites who must prescribe by gaining control of state ideological apparatuses, contrary to Freire, a consciousness which synthesizes not overthrow or replace, that would be undemocratic, for the intellectual must remember that the oppress is an interpolated agent of the field of knowledge and power, which “names” them the existing ideology of power, i.e., the oppressor, with liberating practices for the oppressed to the oppressed against their “semi-intransitive consciousness” so that they may recursively reproduce in the form of society a democratic form of being in the world. If left to themselves, “[t]he ordinary mass of people can think nothing,
do nothing and be nothing without the intercession of the intellectual elite. It feels, but
does not understand; it has a spontaneous character, but no consciousness; activity, but
no awareness; it comprehends through faith not reason, so that didactically the only
means of reaching it is through the endless repetition of the same message wrapped in
different coverings. Its province is the folklore of philosophy, no more than common
sense laced with religion. The mass, it would seem, has the same limited
comprehension as Aristotle’s slave, the same qualities of loyalty and discipline and
the same incapacity to function as an autonomous being.

Transforming actions in aggregate comprise a revolutionary stance which
simultaneously announces an egalitarian, participatory, and democratic social order
and denounces hierarchical, authoritarian, and alienating systems of organizations.
The content of liberator education is both critical consciousness and the development
of appropriate skills and competencies related to liberator praxis. Its process is
dialogical, affirming the mutual and coequal roles of teachers and learners. The
governance of liberator education reflects and anticipates the social order announced
by its vision.

The tasks for progressive educators in Freirian theory are: i) to unveil
opportunities for hope, regardless of the obstacles; ii) to accept the political and
directive nature of education; iii) to express respect for differences in ideas and
positions; iv) to respect the educands, never manipulating them; v) to be tolerant,
open, forthright, and critical, teaching is not simply the transmission of knowledge
concerning the object or concerning the topic; vi) to teach so that educands can learn
to learn the reason-for, the why of the object or the content; vii) to challenge educands
with a regard to their certitudes so that they seek convincing arguments in defense of the *why*; viii) to respect popular knowledge, cultural content...this is the point of "departure for the knowledge (that educands) creates of the world; ix) to understand that the "perception of the why of the facts...lead us to transcend the narrow horizons of the neighborhood or even the immediate geographical area, to gain (the) global view of reality." Freire contended that the basic importance of education lays in the "act of cognition not only of the content, but of the why of economic, social, political, ideological, and historical facts under which we find ourselves placed."

**3.7. Inseparability of Theory and Practice**

Freire’s many volumes of work are highly theoretical and some critics have charged that his ideas were devoid of practical activities and specific techniques. Freire himself agreed that there were no readymade formulas to apply the methodology in a classroom. However, he believed that each practical experience with each group of learners was different from others; the role of the educators/organizers was to develop their own activities and techniques with the people they were working with. For Freire, theory and practice were inseparable; theory is a moment of practice; from the practice is born the theory, and the theory returns to the practice to be changed and reformulated.

Freirian denunciation of the oppressive elements of the educational system helped to demystify the pedagogism. In 1960-70s, educators either attributed to education a liberating power that on its own it does not have or denied it of any value until after there is a revolution. Freire cautioned against both voluntarism, a kind of idealism that attributes to the will of the individual the power to change all things and
determinism, a sort of mechanic structuralism that underestimates the role of agents in historical processes. By doing so, he criticized both objectivism and subjectivism because each of them alone is incapable of giving account of the tension between consciousness and the world.

Education for liberation, in Freire's view, would challenge the ‘givenness’ of the world and enable learners to reflect on their experience historically, giving their immediate reality a beginning, a present, and most importantly, a future. It would awaken in adult learners the expectation of change a power which, once awakened, seeks expression in collective, transforming social action. For poor and dispossessed people, strength is in numbers and social change is accomplished in unity.

3.8. Praxis - Reflection - Action

Pedagogy of the oppressed is an instrument for the critical discovery that both the oppressed and their oppressors are dehumanized. One of the great difficulties in the achievement of liberation is that oppressive reality absorbs those within it. The only solution is praxis: A complex activity involving a cycle theory, application, evaluation, reflection, and then back to theory. Social transformation is the product of praxis at the collective level. The oppressed confront reality critically (reflection) simultaneously act upon that reality (action). Pedagogy of the oppressed cannot be developed or practiced by oppressors. It is a contradiction. They may entertain false generosity ‘certain humanitarian approach’. But they won’t show humanistic approach. They will see the situation continues and their interests are safeguarded. Praxis is reflection as well as action; it is the dialogue on which all effective
relationships and advancements rely. Without analyzing and learning from experiences and events, no learning occurs; the same mistakes will be repeated and successes cannot be duplicated. "For apart from inquiry, apart from the praxis, men cannot be truly human.

Freire emphasizes that praxis cannot be divided into stages of reflection and action; they must occur simultaneously and continuously. Constant re-evaluation enables a quick learning process and adjustments to action. The reflection is not removed from the event as it will or did occur. According to Paulo Freire, liberation is a humanizing process that includes both reflection and action. Mere activism (action) lacks the basis or the originating moment of liberation and mere verbalism (reflection) does not encompasses the practical movements of the liberation struggle. Liberation need to arise from the unique dynamism between acting and reflection. Liberation presupposes reflection, action (praxis) and active involvement of the oppressed in their struggle. They must perceive reality of their existence.

Attempting to liberate the oppressed without their reflective participation in action is to treat them like objects to be rescued from a burning building. At all stages of liberation, the oppressed must see themselves as people engaged in the ontological and historical vocation of becoming fully human. Liberation can be achieved only through reflection on their concrete historical reality, which varies in accordance with historical conditions. Action follows reflection, reflection on reality will call for action. About the relationship between the oppressor and the oppressed, Paulo Freire says ‘the great humanistic and historical task of the oppressed’ is ‘to liberate themselves and their oppressors as well’ who ‘oppress, exploit and rape by
Thus the struggle for humanization consists in breaking the cycles of injustice, exploitation and oppression. According to Freire, this makes the beginning of revolution as the first stage. i) First, the pedagogy must “unveil the world of oppression” around the oppressed and through “praxis” allow them to commit themselves to transforming it. ii) The second stage occurs after the oppression has been transformed and changes from pedagogy of the oppressed to “pedagogy of all people in the process of permanent liberation.” In this process people cease being objects and develop “consciousness as consciousness of consciousness.” Freire states that this miracle cannot be “packaged and sold,” rather it must be achieved through “reflection and action.”

Freire bases his ideology on the fundamental premise that people's "ontological and historical vocation" is to be more fully humanized, wherein people, conscious of their inherent incompleteness, strive to better themselves. In other words, persons in the process of becoming conscientized, (the process through which people attempt to critically understand their reality), establish a praxis (a dialectical interaction of action and reflection), and thereby begin to humanize themselves. This is achieved through their interaction with others in the process of "knowing" the world. Ideally the act of "knowing" is realized by people's critical analysis of their world together with such behaviour that reflects this knowledge.

In his, education, Liberation and the church, Freire says: only the ‘innocent’ could possibly think that the power elite would encourage a type of education which denounces them even more clearly that do all the contradictions of their power structures. Such naiveness also reveals a dangerous underestimation of the capacity
and audacity of the elite. They only liberating education can be only be put into practice outside of the ordinary system, and even then with great cautiousness, by those who overcome their naiveness and commit themselves to authentic liberation. cccxiv i) The individuals in a ‘culture of silence’ wonder at the world instead of merely belong to it and accepting magical explanation for events around them. ii) They distance or separate themselves as a first step to find their place in and with it. iii) They problematize the world in terms of person-nature, persons-person, and person-culture etc, categories. iv) They name their world; give literary expression to their place in time and space. They have reached the naive status of consciousness whose entire focus is on changing individual behaviour. v) They see their world in terms of the world of others and in terms of political, economic, cultural, etc. Structures, that is as a totality (totalization). They reach the critical stage in which they can see the connection between individual and system: behaviour. i) They begin- as individuals and in groups- to transform their world. The seventh is that thereby they become subjects (not objects) and contribute to the humanization of the world.

Genuine struggle would demand that the oppressed don’t become oppressors of oppressors, but restorers of humanity to both because it is a distortion of being more fully human, sooner or later being less human leads the oppressed to struggle against those who made them so. In order for this struggle to have meaning, the oppressed must not in seeking to regain their humanity (which is a way to create it), become in turn oppressors of the oppressors, but rather restorers of the humanity of both.

3.9. Dynamic Move from Intransitive to Critical Transitivity Consciousness
3.9.1. Cultural Circle for Critical Consciousness

Freire, through his educational project launched a new institution of popular culture, “a culture circle,” since school was a traditionally passive concept. In this, instead of a teacher, there is a coordinator; instead of lectures, dialogue; instead of pupils, group participants; instead of alienating syllabi, compact programs that were “broken down” and “codified” in to learning units. The content of liberatory education in such cultural circles is both critical consciousness and the development of appropriate skills and competencies related to liberatory praxis.

Conscientization is an ongoing process by which a learner moves toward critical consciousness. The process of Conscientization involves identifying contradictions in experience through dialogue and becoming a subject with other oppressed subjects--that is, becoming part of the process of changing the world. Conscientization is the process by which one learns to critically relate oneself and one’s work to nature and culture. It enables human beings to reject their status as oppressed objects and achieve their ontological vocation to be become subjects.

3.9.2. Definition of Consciousness

Consciousness is defined as ‘learning to perceive social, political and economic contradiction and to take actions against the oppressive elements of reality.” It is the process of achieving critical consciousness. Conscientization represents the development of the awakening of critical awareness.

3.9.3. False Consciousness

False Consciousness is a ‘myth’ created by cultural invasion and is imposed by means of religion, education and socialization. Myths are the base of the false
consciousness and benefit the oppressors. They are a way of keeping the oppressed silent. Such people adapt themselves defencelessly and passively to the expectations of a superior force: they are not conscious of the socio-economic contradictions within this society: they accept life for what it is and don't question injustices done to their lives. They are silent and docile.

3.9.4. Levels of Consciousness

3.9.4.1. Intransitive of Consciousness

In Brazil, the passage from predominantly intransitive consciousness to predominantly naïve transitivity paralleled the transformation of economic pattern.

3.9.4.2. Semi-intransitive Consciousness or Magical Consciousness

A semi-intransitive consciousness is found in ‘circumscribed’ and introverted communities. People ‘cannot apprehend problem situated outside of their sphere of biological necessity. Their interest centred almost totally around their survival or they lack sense of life on a more historic plane’. Semi-transitive consciousness (one’s) sphere of perception is limited. One is ‘impermeable to challenge situated outside of biological necessity. In this sense only, semi-intransitivity represents a new disengagement between (people) and their existence. In this state, discernment is difficult. People confuse their perception of their objects and challenged of their environment and fall prey their magical explanation because they cannot apprehend true causality.

3.9.4.3. Transitivity of Consciousness

As people amplify their power to perceive and respond to suggestion of questions arising in their context increase their capacity to enter into dialogue not only
with other (people) with the world, they become transitive. Their interest and concern now extend beyond simple vital sphere. Transitivity makes (true human person) permeable. It leads (one) to replace (one’s) disengagement from existence with almost total engagement. Existence is a dynamic concept, imply external dialogue because people found the world between people and creator. It is this dialogue which makes (the human being) a historical being.

Consciousness which does not challenge the world is therefore uncritical and intransitive for it does not act upon the world as an object. Total intransitivity is not a form of consciousness at all. Semi-intransitive consciousness is the state of those whose sphere of perception is limited, whose interests centre almost totally on matters of survival, and who are impermeable to challenges situated outside the demands of biological necessity. Magic consciousness, in contrast, simply apprehends facts and attributes to them a superior power by which it is controlled and to which it must therefore submit. Magic consciousness is characterized by fatalism, which leads men to fold their arms, resigned to the impossibility of resisting the power of facts.

Freire observes that when these persons amplify their power to perceive and respond to suggestions and questions arising in their context, and increase their capacity to enter into dialogue not only with others, but with their own world, their consciousness becomes "transitive" where before they reacted to particulars, to limited spheres, now they react to the general scope of a particular problem.

3.9.4.4. Naive Transitivity Consciousness

The second stage of consciousness is naive transitivity. There is, however, an initial, predominantly naïve, stage of transitive consciousness. Freire characterizes this
stage of consciousness by an over-simplification of problems; by nostalgia for the past; by an underestimation of ordinary people; by a strong tendency to gregariousness; by a lack of interest in investigation, accompanied by accentuated taste for fanciful explanations; by fragility of argument; by strongly emotional style; by the practice of polemics rather than dialogue; by magical explanation. The magical aspect of intransitivity is partially present here also. Although (people’s) horizons have expanded and they respond more openly to stimuli, their responses still have a magical quality.

Naïve transitivity is consciousness of (people) who are still almost part of a mass, in whom the developing capacity for dialogue is still fragile and capable of distortion”. If this consciousness does not progress to the stage of critical transitivity, it may be deflected by sectarian irrationality into fanaticism. Naïve transitivity is never totally and irrevocably surpassed; for all who enter the learning process, this remains a lifelong task.

3.9.4.5. Critical Transitive Consciousness

The critically transitivity consciousness is characterized by depth in the interpretation of the problems; by substitution of causal principles for magical explanations; by the testing one’s finding and by openness to revision. “….by the attempt to avoid distortion when perceiving problems and to avoid preconceived notion when analyzing them; by refusing to transfer responsibility; by rejecting passive positions; by soundness of argumentation; by true practice of dialogue rather than polemics; by receptivity to the new for reasons beyond more novelty’ and by the good sense not to reject the old just because it is old –by accepting what is valid in
both old and new’ by permeable, interrogative, restless, and dialogical forms of life." The more accurate men grasp true causality, the more critical their understanding of reality will be. Their understanding will be magical to the degree that they fail to grasp causality. Critical consciousness always submits that causality to analysis; what is true today may not be so tomorrow.

“Critical transitivity is characteristic of authentically democratic regimes and corresponds to highly permeable, interrogative, restless and dialogical”; “forms of life – in contrast to silence and inaction, in contrast to the rigid, militarily authoritarian state, prevailing in Brazil an historical retreat which the usurpers of power try to present as a reencounter with democracy.”

Conscientizaco must grow out of a critical educational effort based on favourable historical conditions. But how could this be done? The answer seemed to lie: a) in an active, dialogical and criticism-stimulating method b) in changing the program content of education c) in the use of technique, the thematic ‘breakdown’ and ‘codification’. Our method, then, was based on dialogue which is horizontal relationship between persons.

Naïve consciousness sees causality as a static, established fact, and is deceived in its perception. Critical consciousness represents “things and facts as they exist empirically, in their causal and circumstantial correlations...naive consciousness considers itself superior to facts, in control of facts, and thus free to understand them as it pleases.” Critical conscious is integrated with reality. Native consciousness superimposes itself on reality; and fanatical consciousness, whose pathological naiveté leads to the irrational, adapts to reality.
As the process of urbanization intensified (people) were thrust into more complex forms of life. As (people) entered a larger sphere of relationships and received a greater number of suggestions and challenges to their circumstances, their consciousness automatically becomes more transitive. However, the further, crucial step from naive transitivity to critical transitivity would occur automatically. Achieving this step would thus require an active dialogical educational program, concerned with social and political responsibility and prepared to avoid the danger of massification.

There is a close potential relationship between Native transitivity and massification. If a person does not move from naive transitivity to critical consciousness, instead falls into fanaticised consciousness (than person) will become even more disengaged from reality than in the semi-intransitive state. To the extent that a person acts more on the basis of emotionality than the reason, (one’s) behaviour occurs adaptively and cannot result in commitment, to committed behaviours has its roots in critical consciousness and capacity to genuine choice. The adoption and lack of engagement typical of semi-intransitivity are more prevalent still in a state of massifications. The power to perceive authentic causality is obliterated in the semi-intransitive state; hence the latter’s magical quality. In massification their power (to perceive authentic causality) is distorted, producing a mythical quality.

In the semi-transitive state, people are predominantly illogical; in fanaticized consciousness the distortion of reason makes them irrational; the possibility of dialogue diminishing markedly. People are defeated and dominated though they do not know it; they fear freedom, though they believe themselves to be free. People
follow general formulae and prescriptions as if by their own choice. They are directed; they do not direct themselves they are objects, not subjects. For people to overcome their state of massification, they must be enabled to reflect about their very condition. But since authentic reflection cannot exist apart from action, (people) must also act to transform the concrete reality which has determined their massification. In a nutshell, Critical understanding leads to critical action; magical understanding to magical response.

3.11. Education for Liberation

The Liberation Education is an approach to awaken individual consciousness in relation to the oppressive social structure thereby gaining freedom to implement social change. In advocating for the dismantling of oppression that he believes to be a “necrophilic” force that is “nourished by love of death, not life,” Freire calls for liberation education to awaken one’s social consciousness to the oppressive forces that deny basic human rights.

The process of pedagogical liberation begins when we recognize that dignity of human being has been cornered. Propaganda, management, manipulation which is dominating factors can not be the instruments of re-humanization. The only instrument is a humanizing pedagogy in which the revolutionary leader who establishes a permanent relationship of dialogue with the oppressed. It is not a teacher-student relationship in which the teacher is dominant. So, a revolutionary must accordingly practice co-intentional education in which teachers and students are both subjects, who know and recreate the knowledge of reality.
Education which is liberation encourages learners to challenge and change the world, not merely uncritically adapt themselves to it. The content and purpose of liberation education is the collective responsibility of learners, teachers and the community alike who, through dialogue, seek political, economic and personal empowerment. Liberating education cannot be developed by the oppressive classes. Liberating education demands a commitment which involves a political organization. Transformative education cannot be brought about by formal education. Hence there is a need to emphasis revolutionary transformation and political education. It is impossible to separate politics from education. Education can be either for domestication or for liberation. Both start from the same concrete reality. But the process of domestication takes them to pre-set goals, known beforehand. The process of liberation relies upon the praxis of collaboration and communication.

The educator must treat the area of action as a means for codification. That is, the area should be made into a scene of conflict. This would be the anti-thesis to the original thesis, and our decodification then gets under way. Then, through our selected generative matrices, there will arise a new codification, which will form the synthesis, and the thesis for the start of a new cycle of interpretation. By a series of such approximations, we arrive at a final decodification, which is the programme of action, the programme of liberation.

Thus, the first codification is of the concrete reality. The first decodification is its interpretation by the people. The second codification is educator’s tentative list of generative matrices. The second decodification is the joint research by the educator and the people to draw forth knowledge of words and their uses from these generative
matrices. The third codification enables the educator to pare down and purify the tally of generative matrices or themes. The last decodification is again by the people who grasp the programme of revolutionary action together with the literary tools of comprehending reality.

3.12. Conclusion

This chapter has endeavoured to demonstrate the educational philosophy of Paulo Freire after having introduced varying influences ancient as well as modern that shaped his philosophy. Brazilian milieu urged Freire to ponder over the need for discussing afresh the theories of education and suggest practical solutions for the new generation learners. His love and concern for humanizing liberation for both the oppressor and the oppressed through new vistas of education has been elaborated.

Freire's criticism towards the traditional schools yesterday as well as today is mainly towards the authoritarian relation between educators and learners, which is not more than a criticism of the authoritarian relations generated by the capitalist mode of production.

Freire criticizes the mechanic transference of knowledge (mechanic, static, naturalistic, spatialized view of consciousness) in order to 'fill' the learners with information to adjust to the world, attempts to control thinking and action, and inhibits their creative power.

Freire’s pedagogy is a utopian pedagogy engaged in the denunciation of the injustices of the society in reflecting upon it, and the 'annunciation' of a society based on 'universal human ethic', which is not more than 'humanity's ontological vocation to be more'.
Educational practice is an education to form citizen, to form people who at the same time learn contents and are able to reflect upon their social realities for gaining human rights. The greater clarity that education gives the popular classes to read the world may bring political intervention that advances the democratic learning process.

The two methods of education—Banking method and Problem-Posing method have found a fresh touch in the hands of Freire. How Freire’s portrayal of liberation through education finds Problem-Posing method and its techniques a fine tool has been highlighted. Both theory and practice in the field of education find equal stress in Freire’s discussion. The following chapter, while highlighting the practical focus of Freire, attempts to probe the precepts of Indian education scenario to present a critique of Indian education.