

cR

Centro
de Referência
Paulo Freire

**Este documento faz parte do acervo
do Centro de Referência Paulo Freire**

acervo.paulofreire.org



InstitutoPauloFreire

Education, Dialogue and Intervention: revisiting the Freirean project

PETER ROBERTS

Education Studies Department, University of Waikato, Private Bag, Hamilton, New Zealand

SUMMARY In the past two decades Paulo Freire's philosophy of education has been the subject of much discussion by academics, school teachers and adult educators in a variety of formal and informal settings. While Freire initially gained recognition for his work with adult illiterates in Brazil and Chile, since the early 1970s his ideas have found increasing application in Britain, the USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. This article reconsiders the literacy methods through which Freire initially attracted international attention. Freire's approach to literacy education in Brazil is outlined and brief reference is made to the other major adult education programmes with which Freire has been involved since 1964. A number of serious criticisms of Freirean pedagogy are identified, all of which deal in some way with what might be termed the problem of 'imposition' in Freire's work. Critiques from Berger, Bowers and Walker suggest that the Freirean project entails the imposition of a particular world-view and mode of social practice on adult illiterates. According to these critics, Freire assumes that he knows better than the oppressed the nature of, and the best solution to, their oppression. The author argues that the Freirean system is indeed non-dialogical and impositional in certain respects, but concludes that Freire's literacy efforts were ultimately worthwhile.

The pedagogy of Paulo Freire has influenced thousands of scholars and practitioners over the past 20 years. Freire's philosophy has been studied and applied not only by educationists, but also by sociologists, psychologists, counsellors, political activists and theologians. This paper returns to the literacy methods through which Freire first attracted international attention. Freire's approach to adult literacy education in Brazil is reconsidered in light of allegations of élitism, imperialism and anti-dialogue in his pedagogy. While these charges render pivotal aspects of Freirean theory and practice problematic, the present paper concludes that Freire's practical literacy endeavours were nevertheless (on balance) worthwhile.

Freirean Literacy Education

Freire describes his literacy work with Brazilian adults in some detail in his *Education: the practice of freedom* [1]. His appointment in 1963 as Director of the National Literacy Programme was preceded by more than 15 years' experience in the field of adult education, in both urban and rural areas. He recalls that while he experimented with many different pedagogical methods and means of communication during this formative period, his one overriding conviction remained the same: '... only by working with the people could I achieve anything authentic on their behalf' [2]. The sponsorship by Miguel Arraes of an adult literacy programme in Recife in 1962 provided Freire with the platform to launch his now-famous 'culture circles' [3]. In the culture circles illiterate adults were invited to participate in a process of critical reflection on the social conditions in which they found themselves. Freire abandoned many of the traditional teaching methods in the project, replacing lectures with dialogue, the teacher with a co-ordinator, and the term 'pupils' with 'group participants' [4]. Encouraged by Freire's achievements in the Recife programme, President Joao Goulart appointed Freire Director of the National Literacy Programme, and plans were put in place for a nation-wide effort to overcome illiteracy using Freirean methods. The military *coup d'état* in 1964 brought the campaign to an abrupt halt and Freire was detained in jail for 75 days. However, the methods adopted in the culture circles and the philosophy that undergirded the national campaign are well documented, and have been reworked and applied by Freire and others in a number of Third World literacy campaigns since 1964 [5].

Freire's literacy work in Brazil comprised three related stages:

- (i) an investigation of the social situation of the adult illiterates, and the preparation of materials and agendas;
- (ii) an introduction to the concept of culture through the analysis of a series of pictorial representations of aspects of Brazilian life; and
- (iii) the utilisation of a small number of 'generative' words for assisting in the process of reading and writing [6].

(i) *Investigative and Preparatory Work*

Freire identifies five phases in this stage of the programme. In Phase One, literacy workers researched the vocabulary of the people with whom they were working. From informal interviews, lists of 'charged' words were built up. Investigators, Freire comments, were to search for words which were infused with emotion and meaning for the adult illiterates: the words were chosen on the basis of their centrality in the daily lives of those in the community, and were laden with 'longings, frustrations, disbeliefs, hopes, and an impetus to participate' [7]. Freire is careful to point out that the words selected in this early phase emerged from the adult illiterates themselves, and did not merely reflect the

literacy workers' predispositions about what was important as far as a reading vocabulary was concerned [8].

Once the process of informal interviewing and investigation had been completed, 15–18 'generative' words were selected for each area covered by the campaign. This was the second phase of the preliminary work. Words were generative in two senses. First, they were imbued with existential meaning—i.e. they corresponded to the most fundamental concerns, ideas and practices of the adult illiterates' lives—and were thus pregnant with possibilities for discussion of daily life in political, social and cultural contexts. In this sense, then, the words that were selected generated reflection on lived, everyday reality, and offered the potential for a deeper, more critical understanding of that reality. Words were also selected on the basis of their phonemic richness; specifically, an effort was made to find words which could be broken down into syllables, combined with vowels, and re-formed to generate new words. Freire also stipulated that 'the words chosen should correspond to the phonetic difficulties of the language, [and should be] placed in a sequence moving gradually from words of less to those of greater difficulty' [9].

Phase Three was the creation of 'codifications'. These were pictorial representations of generative words. Frequently, the pictures would encapsulate situations from the daily lives of the adult illiterates. Generative words were embedded in the codifications, and graduated in terms of their phonetic complexity. A generative word might embrace the entire situation depicted in the picture, or it might be relevant to only one aspect of the situation [10].

The fourth and fifth phases of the investigative and preliminary stage of the programme consisted in the explication of 'agendas' (i.e. the style, methods and content of the programme) for culture circle co-ordinators, and the production of discovery cards with the breakdown of generative words into phonemic families [11]. Freire observes that as far as informing co-ordinators of the nature of the programme was concerned, the difficulty lay not with instruction in the technical aspects of the method employed for teaching reading and writing, but with the inculcation of a particular orientation toward the learning process. Co-ordinators were called to abandon traditional, narrative, 'banking' methods of education in favour of a pedagogical system based upon the principle of dialogue [12].

(ii) *An Introduction to the Concept of Culture*

After all of the initial preparations had been put in place—the existential situation of the participants explored, generative words selected, posters or slides of codifications made, and co-ordinators given their agendas—the next stage in the programme could commence. In Brazil, this second stage—an exploration of ideas about nature, culture, work, and human relationships—occupied up to eight sessions of the overall programme [13]. The conditions which prompted the introduction of this dimension to the programme are neatly captured by Bee:

The task of motivating the Brazilian people was a difficult one. They were apathetic, downtrodden, and fatalistic in their attitudes. In order to change this demoralising situation into something more positive and responsive Freire and his team needed to convince the people of their own worth, to show them that no matter how denuded of dignity they considered themselves to be, they were in fact makers of culture, of history, and subjects in life, not merely objects of manipulation. [14]

Toward this end, Freire commissioned the services of the Brazilian artist Francisco Brenand in putting together a series of pictures designed to introduce the notion of 'culture'. The pictures were made into slides and projected on to the walls of houses where culture circles met [15]. There were 10 pictures in the original sequence [16], each intended to initiate dialogue based around a particular theme. These visual representations were deliberately ordered, such that later pictures and their respective themes built on ideas discussed in earlier pictures.

The first picture, for example, showed a peasant man standing beside a well and a tree, holding a hoe and book, with a pig in the foreground and a house in the background. All aspects of the picture (with the possible exception of the book) were familiar to those participating in the programme. Co-ordinators were instructed to begin by asking, 'What do you see in the picture?' Once the various aspects of the scene had been identified, participants were asked such questions as these: 'Who made the well?'; 'What materials did he use?'; 'Who made the tree?'; 'How is the tree different from the well?'; etc. [17]. From this problematisation of the reality depicted in the picture, adults in the programme began to distinguish between nature and culture, between objects which exist in the natural world and those which are created by human beings.

As participants moved through the sequence of codifications, discussion progressed from topics pertaining to the differences between humans and animals, the possibilities for dialogue between human beings, and the transformation of nature through human activity, to freedom, education, literate culture, technology and tradition [18]. In the tenth and final situation, members of the group saw themselves portrayed in visual form. The picture showed a group of peasants assembled in a culture circle, with the co-ordinator at the front of the room pointing to one of the earlier pictures. This was an important moment in the process of self-reflection, and the first step along the road to critical consciousness [19].

The process through which Freire hoped adults would move toward critical consciousness has become known as 'conscientisation'. The movement for illiterates, as Freire conceived of it, was from either 'magical' (semi-intransitive) consciousness or 'naïve' consciousness [20]. Freire talks of magical consciousness as typical of 'closed' (predominantly peasant) communities. Such groups were cut off from the political decision-making process in Brazil in the early 1960s: many peasants in rural areas could not read and write, and illiterates were not permitted to vote. People in these communities tended to

attribute the harsh conditions they endured (exploitation by landowning élites, malnutrition, high rates of disease and infant mortality, etc.) to a power greater than themselves—as something beyond human control: hence, the term ‘magical’ consciousness. Freire tells us:

Men of semi-intransitive consciousness cannot apprehend problems situated outside their sphere of biological necessity. Their interests centre almost totally around survival, and they lack a sense of life on a more historic plane ... semi-intransitivity represents a near disengagement between men and their existence. [21]

Naïve consciousness, which Freire associates with urban centres in Brazil, is characterised by ‘... an over-simplification of problems; by a nostalgia for the past; ... by the practice of polemics rather than dialogue’ [22]. The shift from magical or naïve modes of thought and action to critical consciousness implies a deepening analysis and critique of social reality, a reliance upon dialogue rather than monological or polemical methods, and increasing responsibility for transforming conditions of oppression [23].

By the time the second stage of the programme had been completed, Freire attests that participants were highly motivated to continue learning; they were also beginning to see their potential for understanding and changing the world. Freire summarises his thoughts on the significance of this part of the literacy process as follows:

Literacy makes sense only in these terms, as the consequence of men’s beginning to reflect about their own capacity for reflection, about the world, about their position in the world, about the encounter of consciousness—about literacy itself, which thereby ceases to be something external and becomes a part of them, comes as a creation from within them. [24]

(iii) *Syllabic Combinations through Generative Words*

Up to this stage, there had been no attempt to teach participants how to read and write in the traditional sense (i.e. to form letters, words and sentences): the programme thus far had been devoted to discovering as much as possible about the world of the illiterates, and to fostering discussion of anthropological, social and political issues. It was not until these tasks had been completed that the more conventional expectations of a literacy programme were addressed. Even at this point, the learning of syllabic combinations was preceded by discussion of a pictorial representation in which the generative word from which the combinations were derived was embedded.

After a group had exhausted analysis of the codified situation encapsulating the first generative word, the word itself was introduced. Participants were encouraged to visualise (but not to memorise) the word, and, with the aid of the codification, to establish the semantic link between the generative word and its object of reference [25]. The word was then displayed without the accompany-

ing codification and broken down into its component syllables. The syllables of the word, once recognised by the members of the group, could be paired up with vowels and re-combined with other syllables to make new words. This technique, as Sanders notes, was greatly aided by the fact that Portuguese is a syllabic language, with 'little variation in vocalic sounds and a minimum of consonantal combinations' [26]. Different generative words were chosen for each area covered by the programme, but the first word was always trisyllabic, with each of the three syllables consisting of one consonant and one vowel [27]. The purpose of beginning this way is made apparent in Freire's often-cited example of the generative word, '*tijolo*'. This word—which in English means 'brick'—was the first generative word used in a culture circle in Cajueiro Seco, a slum area in Recife [28].

After the word had been thoroughly discussed in its codified setting, it was introduced on its own and its syllables 'ti', 'jo' and 'lo' were read aloud by the co-ordinator of the group. The first syllable was then presented in a sequence of consonant-vowel combinations, in the following manner: 'ta-te-ti-to-tu'. Although participants recognised only 'ti' in the first instance, they quickly moved to the observation that 'while all the syllables begin the same, they end differently' [29]. In this way, the basic vowel sounds were rapidly grasped, and the co-ordinator could proceed with the introduction of the other two syllables in the generative word, building up this sort of pattern on the discovery card [30]:

ta-te-ti-to-tu

ja-je-ji-jo-ju

la-le-li-lo-lu

After sounding out each of the syllables, participants were then given the opportunity to form new words from the 'pieces' depicted on the discovery card. Hence, the possibility emerges of illiterates creating words such as '*tatu*' (armadillo), '*luta*' (struggle), '*loja*' (store), '*juta*' (jute), and '*lote*' (lot) [31]. Freire was not concerned if participants formed combinations of syllables which were not actual words; it was the discovery of the mechanism of phonemic combination that was important. More important still, though, was the discussion which surrounded the introduction of each generative word. In the case of the word '*tijolo*', the theme of urban reform became the subject of debate; with the generative word '*favela*' (slum), groups deliberated on problems relating to housing, health, food and education; '*terreno*', the Portuguese word for 'land', stimulated discussion around such subjects as irrigation, natural resources and economic domination [32].

The object of this dialogue was not only that adults would critically reflect on their social circumstances but that they would be inspired to act to change oppressive conditions. The ultimate end to which Freire's literacy efforts were directed was humanisation (or becoming more fully human) through praxis: 'reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it' [33]. Freire's

methods were highly effective in allowing the rapid acquisition of basic skills: 15–18 carefully selected generative words for each culture circle were sufficient to bring formerly illiterate adults to the point where they were ‘reading newspapers, writing notes and simple letters, and discussing problems of local and national interest’ in 6 weeks to 2 months [34]. It was hoped that this achievement could be consolidated, and political transformation intensified, with a post-literacy stage [35], but plans for the establishment of 20,000 culture circles across Brazil in 1964 were crushed by the military coup, and Freire was forced to extend his literacy methods elsewhere [36].

Freire’s Involvement in Other Literacy Programmes

While a comprehensive account of Freire’s post-1964 literacy endeavours is beyond the scope of this paper, it is important, I think, to mention some of the major adult literacy programmes with which he has been involved, and to note some of the similarities and differences between these programmes and the Brazilian campaign.

After a short stay in Bolivia following the Brazilian coup, Freire spent 5 years working in Chile. His involvement with the Chilean Agrarian Reform Corporation, while not without resistance from sections within the Frei government of the time [37], was extensive and Freire was able to deepen considerably both his theory and practice of adult literacy education. There were some differences, though, between Freire’s Brazilian programme and his work in Chile. Llyod notes that while many of the co-ordinators in Brazilian culture circles were students, the programme in Chile had to rely on paid co-ordinators, many of whom were primary school teachers who experienced some difficulties in changing from traditional (monological) teaching methods to a dialogical approach to education: ‘Despite training in dialogue and the Freirean method, paternalistic attitudes and patterns persist[ed]’ [38]. After overcoming the political and pedagogical hurdles, Freire’s system became an official programme of the Government, and Chile was recognised by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) as one of the five nations most effective in overcoming illiteracy [39]. Freire incorporated discussion of the concept of culture into the ‘generative words’ stage of the programme in Chile, instead of devoting a series of separate sessions to this task. This was because ‘... the Chilean, unlike the Brazilian who liked discussion about himself as a creative, cultural being, tended to lose interest if he did not begin to learn immediately’ [40]. The generative words and codifications, of course, were different in the Brazilian and Chilean campaigns, but the fundamental techniques for learning how to form words (through syllabic combination) were the same.

Freire was briefly involved with adult education work in Tanzania in the early 1970s, but his chief commitments in the decade following his departure from Chile were to literacy programmes in São Tomé and Príncipe, and Guinea-Bissau. Both of these programmes have attracted a measure of criticism

as well as favourable evaluation; Freire's work in Guinea-Bissau, in particular, was fraught with operational difficulties.

The major problem that emerged was a difference in opinion between Freire and the Government of Guinea-Bissau (for whom he was working) over the issue of the Portuguese language. Freire felt that the country could never lift the yoke of colonial oppression completely until it abandoned the language of the colonisers (the Portuguese) and adopted the native creole dialect. The Government insisted that Portuguese remain the official language of Guinea-Bissau, and an impasse was reached. In Freire's own appraisal of his achievements in Guinea-Bissau, he concedes that the degree of technical competence with print that was attained in the adult literacy work was not high, but argues that emergence of a new form of political awareness amongst the people who participated in the programme outweighed this [41]. He attributes the 'failure' of the campaign (to promote an adequate command over the alphabet for those who took part) to the persistence of the authorities in wanting to uphold the Portuguese language [42].

In São Tomé and Príncipe, Freire made a significant break from earlier practices in supporting the use of a primer for literacy learning. From his earliest experiences with adult illiteracy in Brazil, Freire had steered clear of primers, basing his mistrust on the belief that they 'set up a certain grouping of graphic signs as a gift and cast the illiterate in the role of the *object* rather than the *Subject* of his learning' [43]. Adult education efforts in São Tomé and Príncipe were organised around books called 'Popular Culture Notebooks'. The first primer in the series—*Practice to Learn*—was employed in the literacy phase. Additional material was introduced in the post-literacy stage [44]. *Practice to Learn* was a workbook with sets of words and sentences for illiterates to tackle, coupled with codifications and themes for discussion. The primary notion presented in the early part of the book was the idea that people learn through (social) practice [45]. As learners worked their way through the book they were introduced to progressively more complex themes and ideas relating to national independence, work, knowledge, exploitation and colonialism. Learners were given opportunities to write words and sentences of their own in each part of the workbook. The programme was, in Freire's terms, successful, though not without its difficulties. Most of these were tied to wider problems in the overall process of national reconstruction following the country's independence in 1975. Freire mentions obstacles such as the following: international fluctuations in the price for cacao (the main product of São Tomé and Príncipe); a lack of 'national cadres' able to deal with the tasks of post-colonial rebuilding of the country; and a shortage of trained personnel and material resources for adult literacy work [46]. Lately, the programme in São Tomé and Príncipe has been criticised, notably by Gee, for the contradictions it embraced between, on the one hand, wanting to encourage people to become independent thinkers and yet, on the other hand, telling them what it means to 'think correctly' [47]. All in all, though, Freire's work in São Tomé and Príncipe has not been marked by the same controversy which accompanied the programme in Guinea-Bissau, perhaps largely because,

as Freire himself points out, he and his wife Elza found themselves absolutely at one with the Government in its articulation of national goals [48].

Evaluating the Freirean Project

Freire's literacy work has been undeniably influential and widely praised [49], but it has by no means been free from criticism. The avenues for critique range from concerns over the 'technical' aspects of Freirean literacy programmes to rejection of the entire paradigm within which Freire's pedagogy operates. In the discussion that follows I make only brief reference to 'technical' criticisms, before moving on to what I shall call the 'imposition problem' inherent in the Freirean project. This issue has been addressed in varying ways over the past two decades, with different theorists focusing on such themes as conscientisation, 'cultural invasion', and dialogue [50]. While the force of these criticisms is indisputable, I argue that they do not constitute sufficient grounds for dismissing Freire's approach to adult literacy education as worthless or harmful.

Given the distinctive methods he employed in the Brazilian programme, the technical features of Freire's work might have been expected to have generated considerable discussion. Reading psychologists, for example, might argue for or against the technique of breaking key ('generative') words down into their syllabic parts and combining them with vowels to allow new words to be created. Freire's system (as far as I can tell) embraced aspects of both 'phonics' and 'whole language' approaches to reading [51]. His method, then, is perhaps unlikely to please vigorous advocates of either approach, though he may find favour with those who suggest that people best learn to read through a combination of phonics and whole language strategies. Somewhat surprisingly, there has been little extended debate over such issues. This can be explained in part, perhaps, by Freire's explicit broadening of the boundaries of what counts as literacy.

To become too caught up in debates over phonics and the like is to miss the point of Freire's literacy work. Freire would claim that *whatever* techniques are used, we would not want to say that a person had become literate unless he or she had learned something more than simply how to read (or write) symbols on a piece of paper. Indeed, in recent publications Freire has argued that the mechanical repetition of words, with no attempt to understand them or place them in some form of social context, does not constitute 'real' reading at all. In such instances, it might be said that there is something going on which *appears* to be reading, but which in Freirean terms does not get to the heart of what reading involves. If someone is *really* reading, then he or she will, according to Freire, be reading critically [52]. Strictly speaking, we could not call a system for teaching people basic skills with print a 'literacy', or even a 'reading', programme at all unless the learning of these skills was coupled with the development of some sort of critical reflection.

Features other than the technical aspects of the Brazilian programme have not escaped criticism so easily. In 1974, for example, prominent sociologist

Peter Berger offered a stinging critique of conscientisation [53]. Berger, like many other opponents (and supporters) of Freire, construes conscientisation as a process of 'consciousness raising' [54]. He suggests that programmes adopting consciousness raising as a guiding principle assume that:

... lower-class people do not understand their own situation, that they are in need of enlightenment on the matter, and that this service can be provided by selected higher-class individuals. [55]

Freirean literacy programmes set up a dichotomy between an intellectual vanguard and 'the masses', the former taking it for granted that they possess the knowledge and the means necessary to liberate the latter [56]. Berger argues against a hierarchical view of consciousness, noting that knowledges are *different* rather than superior or inferior, and concludes that the idea of raising someone's consciousness is not only arrogant and benevolent but empirically impossible [57].

Freire has also come under fire for the allegedly dominating and intervening effect of what Bowers calls his 'Western mind set' [58]. The Freirean approach to adult literacy education privileges notions of agency, change, critical thought and progress over traditional, integrative, non-questioning and non-intervening cultural beliefs [59]. Under the Freirean framework, premised as it is on the idea that one group 'possesses a truth that must be shared with, and even imposed on, others in order to save them' [60], intervention in situations which are judged to be oppressive becomes morally imperative. In Bowers's opinion, Freire's work is underpinned by a modernising mode of consciousness, appropriate perhaps for adults operating within Western linguistic and cultural codes, but invasive for other cultural groups [61].

Further problems are identified by Walker, who contends that 'Freire's praxis does not have the liberating potential it aspires to' [62]. In pointing to a number of contradictions in Freire's theory, Walker argues that Freirean approaches to adult education are likely to be anti-dialogical. Walker sees a tension in Freire's pedagogy between two influences: existentialist Christianity on the one hand, and Marxist/socialist national liberation theory on the other. Of the two, Walker claims that the former is more fundamental for Freire's practice [63]. This creates difficulties for Freire in dealing with the concrete realities of structured oppression and class conflict. Abandoning the Marxist notion of workers rising against the capitalist class of their own accord, Freire adopts the concept of 'class suicide' whereby members of the *petit bourgeoisie* renounce their class origins and join with the oppressed as organisers and leaders of the resistance [64]. Where for Marx the struggle between dominator and dominated is to be played out dialectically (with the inevitable contradiction between the two groups eventually being negated through revolution), for Freire the answer lies in dialogue between leaders (formerly from the dominating class) and the oppressed [65]. Freire's faith in dialogue as a means for addressing class conflict is, in Walker's view, misplaced. Dialogue is initiated by the leaders, not the oppressed, through a process in which 'the enlightened reach out to the

unenlightened' [66]. Walker acknowledges the (educational and ethical) worth of dialogue, but suggests that the genuine political equality necessary for its effective functioning is absent in Freire's pedagogical theory [67].

Each of these critiques, though differing in the dimensions of Freirean theory and practice they target, point to a deep-seated problem in Freire's work: Freire, in one way or another, assumes that (a) he knows better than the oppressed the nature of their difficulties; (b) he is better placed than 'the people' themselves to organise their struggle; and (c) the imposition of a particular conception of the world and a specific mode of educational practice on the oppressed is (given the first two premises) justified. Adult literacy programmes based on these assumptions have been variously seen as élitist and arrogant, imperialist and anti-dialogical [68]. Two questions will frame the remainder of the discussion in this paper:

- (i) In what ways might Freirean adult literacy education be accurately described as 'impositional'?
- (ii) If Freire's approach can be seen as impositional in certain senses, to what extent does this detract from the overriding worth of his efforts in the Brazilian programme?

Walker notes that the Freirean project relies on the idea of a genuine dialogue between the organisers of a literacy programme and the illiterate adults to justify the involvement of the *petit bourgeoisie* in the lives of the oppressed. A dialogical approach was supposed to underpin every aspect of the Brazilian programme, including the selection of generative words, the discussion of experiences and political reality, and the formulation of transformative alternatives to existing structures. On closer examination, however, it appears as though there was at best only a partial, selective form of dialogue in the Brazilian programme. (Arguably, the non-dialogical aspects of Freire's work were, if anything, more pronounced in other campaigns [69]; I shall confine my comments here, though, to Freire's efforts in Brazil.)

The concept of choosing the initial words for a literacy programme on the basis (at least in part) of what mattered to participants was a relatively novel one in the early 1960s. Sylvia Ashton-Warner pioneered a similar approach with her organic vocabularies and key words in working with Maori children in New Zealand, and the Cuban literacy crusade of 1961 was built around themes and words tied to revolution and national reconstruction [70]. But the dominant approach to literacy work, exemplified in both school classrooms and programmes of adult education, was unquestionably 'top-down' in emphasis: the words and themes of school journals and adult literacy primers were separated from those to whom they were directed. It was the 'experts'—curriculum planners, government policy-makers, occasionally academic researchers—who were considered best placed to decide the content of reading programmes. Frequently the major words, story lines, and themes bore little relation to the lived reality of those learning to read. This philosophy resulted in some

memorable failures in adult literacy schemes, chief among them a number of highly visible and comparatively expensive UNESCO campaigns [71].

The Freirean approach was without doubt a giant step away from this tradition. Freire did, of course, have to satisfy certain linguistic criteria in his selection of generative word lists in order for the 'technical' features of the programme to be realised. In this sense, the selection process was a negotiation between the 'technical' requirements and the need for words to be intimately connected to participants' lives. With this, there can surely be little complaint. The success of the Freirean programme depended on both of these requirements being met. After this initial selection process, however, the waters become a little murkier.

First, and ironically, Freire's insistence that co-ordinators replace the monological methods of old with a dialogical form of pedagogy appeared in itself to be rather non-dialogical [72]. We see little evidence of *negotiation* over this issue. While Freire cautions that the elaboration of agendas 'should serve as mere aids to the co-ordinators, never as rigid schedules to be obeyed' [73], the commitment to a dialogical approach was unflinching: '... co-ordinators must be *converted* to dialogue' [74]. For this to occur, pedagogical instructions '... must be followed by dialogical supervision, to avoid the temptation of anti-dialogue on the part of the co-ordinators' [75]. Freire says nothing about the possibility of different co-ordinators using alternative teaching practices with different groups of adult illiterates: dialogue, and a particular type of dialogue at that, was to be *the* method across the whole campaign. Yet, for *some* groups, the older style of pedagogy, or a mixture of the old and the new, may have been more effective than the single form of dialogue instituted by Freire. We cannot know if this was the case, as Freire never considers the possibility of employing other (or mixed) pedagogical styles [76].

Of greater interest than this, though, was the next stage of the programme: the introduction to the concept of culture. Ostensibly an open exploration of themes arising from the codifications (which depicted aspects of the illiterates' world, not the co-ordinators'), it is important to note that it was a *particular* notion of 'culture' that was under investigation. Indeed, it was a specific theory of human beings and the world that illiterates were encouraged to consider. The ideas covered in discussions of the codifications, if we are to take Freire's description of these in *Education: the practice of freedom* as representative of the programme generally, were essentially a reproduction of the Freirean ontology, ethic and epistemology. The distinctions between humans and animals, the notion of transforming nature through work, the idea of human beings relating to each other: these themes, at the heart of the discussions of codifications, are also central to Freire's philosophy. The second stage of the programme, then, far from being an open invitation to discuss *any* themes associated with the pictorial representations, was more an induction into a given way of understanding the world. This is where Bowers's critique takes hold: Freire's adult literacy work ultimately entailed the imposition of a particular world-view upon participants. To be sure, dialogue was fostered; but the framework for that dialogue

was already presupposed. It was dialogue *within* given parameters that was promoted, rather than dialogue which might lead to a rejection of those parameters altogether.

Now, while we might accept that the Freirean programme was impositional in the ways indicated above, this does not mean that Freire's approach to adult literacy education must be judged unacceptable. For a start, Freire has never claimed that dialogue means open discussion of whatever themes happen to be of interest to participants. To the contrary, he has always stressed the structured and purposeful nature of dialogue in his educational scheme [77]. Freire would be quite happy to admit, I think, that he *did* have a 'set' agenda in his work with adult illiterates. For him, there was an identifiable form of oppression operating in Brazil at the time; dialogue was directed at overcoming that oppression. The locating of discussion around themes such as reflective transformation, then, was no accident: in Freire's view, it was precisely in coming to see the world this way—i.e. in coming to realise their own capacity for changing the world—that Freire saw hope for the people with whom he was working.

In Freire's defence, it is difficult to imagine how a literacy programme could avoid being 'impositional' and 'non-dialogical' in certain respects. Any educational endeavour where one group has the responsibility of assisting others in learning something (be it reading and writing, or anything else) necessarily involves the imposing of certain assumptions, structures and processes on participants. A baseline objective in almost all literacy programmes is that learners will either acquire certain skills, or learn how to engage in a specific set of social practices. This implies some sort of movement from one state of understanding or form of social practice to another. Co-ordinators of literacy programmes are held responsible for facilitating this change—through whatever methods they deem appropriate [78]. Even if the methods used are developed through discussion with participants, this assumes that negotiated pedagogical forms are better than those which are decided in advance. To have a programme at all, some system or other must be imposed. More than this though, a literacy campaign always rests (even if only implicitly) upon a particular ethical ideal. It is expected that something *good* will come of a literacy programme, whether this is defined in terms of a deepening critical consciousness of conditions of oppression, or other goals such as the enhancement of logical thought, social mobility, or economic development [79]. The ends organisers and co-ordinators have in mind (whether they state them or not) cannot but influence the way a literacy programme is structured.

It is also crucial to remember that Freire's theory was informed by his practice. The correspondence between the codification themes and pivotal theoretical principles in Freire's written work is hardly surprising. Freire has consistently underscored the importance of linking theory and practice [80]. He has likewise always insisted that the teaching-learning relationship is a reciprocal one, with teachers and co-ordinators not only teaching but also learning from other participants (whether they are students in a school classroom or adult illiterates) in the educative process [81]. It is quite possible, therefore, that

Freire's theoretical statements on the differences between humans and animals, the nature of culture and work, and the transformation of reality through critical reflection and action, were influenced as much by his involvement in adult literacy programmes as his reading of Marx, Hegel and other theorists.

The analysis thus far still leaves open the question of whether Freire should have intervened *at all* in the lives of adult illiterates in Brazil. Bowers seems to object to the idea of an educationist imposing any programmatic framework on others, unless the system for learning and the assumptions and ideals that go along with this comply with the world-view of the participants. This surely raises enormous theoretical and practical difficulties. Are we to say that the imposition of a different way of looking at the world on others is never justified? *Not* intervening in some situations can allow what appears to be overt oppression and exploitation of large numbers of people to continue. It could be argued, of course, that Freire's concept of oppression is contingent upon certain Western, modernist assumptions, and that under other theoretical frameworks Brazilian illiterates might not have been considered oppressed. Freire, I suspect, would find it hard to conceive of the conditions he observed (for illiterates) at the time as anything other than oppressive, under any reasonable definition of 'oppression'. If Bowers's argument is taken to its logical limit, existing forms of experience, consciousness and practice can only be affirmed, or, at most, modified along lines that do not threaten the overall world-view of the people involved. For Freire, neither participants' interpretations of their experiences nor their current modes of thinking and acting should be uncritically accepted or necessarily supported.

In reply to Berger's objections about the depiction of different levels of consciousness, Freire would doubtless say that for the specific situation with which he was dealing, the categories of 'magical', 'naïve' and 'critical' forms of consciousness were appropriate. A 'magical' way of viewing the world *was* inferior to a critical apprehension of reality, *if* the ideal of identifying and transforming oppressive structures was accepted as a worthwhile goal under the circumstances. For Freire, this is not to denigrate those who see the world in magical terms; rather, it is to signal the existence of social structures, policies and practices which discourage people from viewing the world in any other way.

Freire's hope that his literacy efforts would allow adults to move from magical or naïve consciousness to critical consciousness, an aim so strongly criticised by Berger and Bowers, embraced—through the very nature of the ideal he was espousing—the possibility of illiterates rejecting Freire's view of the world if they so wished. Freire tells us that critical consciousness is characterised by:

... depth in the interpretation of problems; ... by openness to revision; by the attempt to avoid distortion when perceiving problems and to avoid preconceived notions when analyzing them; ... by rejecting passive positions; ... by receptivity to the new for reasons beyond mere

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. [82]

If these were the qualities Freire was attempting to promote in his practical work with Brazilian adults (and if we take Freire at his word, we must assume that they were), the means for criticising and, if necessary, repudiating any or all aspects of the Freirean programme were built into the inner logic of Freire's ideal. Theoretically, then, taking Freire's advice to heart, a peasant might decide to continue viewing the world in 'magical' terms if he or she saw some validity in this. Similarly, Freire provides an open invitation for adults to revise his depiction of nature, culture, work, humans and animals, etc., and to find fault with his framing of political issues. Unfortunately, he supplies few details on the success of the programme in 'shifting' consciousness; it is not clear how many adults significantly changed their way of thinking about the world, or in what ways these changes were manifested [83].

In practical terms, there are at least two problems with the line of argument presented above. First, given the limited time available, it seems unlikely that adults could have developed the analytical sophistication necessary for engaging in what amounts to a meta-critique of the Freirean project in the literacy phase of the Brazilian programme. Such a level of analysis—where the critical capacities promoted in the campaign are in effect turned back upon the programme itself—might be a more realistic possibility in the post-literacy phase of a Freirean adult education programme. In Brazil, of course, this potential was thwarted by the military coup. More than this, though, the very act of critically analysing the Freirean philosophy in the ways indicated above represents more an endorsement than a dismissal of Freire's ideal. So long as people display the qualities outlined by Freire as typical of critically conscious, dialogical and praxical individuals—even if in so doing they criticise the notion of critical, dialogical reflection and action for transformation—the Freirean ideal is being met. Rejection of Freirean assumptions through Freirean approaches, then, does not overcome the concerns expressed by Bowers: to the contrary, this form of disavowal would, for Bowers, confirm the impositional character of Freirean literacy campaigns.

Once a framework for understanding and acting upon the world has been 'imposed' on a group of people through an educational programme, the more successful this programme is, the less likely participants are to return to their former ways of making sense of the world. Indeed, it is difficult to see how someone could ever be the same again after experiencing a Freirean-style literacy education. Education, by almost any definition, implies some sort of change within those being educated. If this point is accepted as valid, the best defence of Freirean pedagogy is not to deny that the Brazilian programme was at the very least interventionist, but rather to demonstrate that such intervention could be justified.

It is worth pointing out that an interventionist stance, for Freire, is not the same as an impositional approach:

... the educator does not have the right to be silent just because he or she has to respect the culture. If he or she does not have the right to impose his or her voice on the people, he does not have the right to be silent. It has to do precisely with the duty of intervening, which the educator has to assume without becoming afraid. There is no reason for an educator to be ashamed of this.[84]

Elsewhere, Freire proclaims:

... I have never begun from the authoritarian conviction that I have a truth to impose, the indisputable truth. On the other hand, I have never said, or even suggested, that not having a truth to impose implies that you don't have anything to propose, no ideas to put forward. If we have nothing to put forward, or if we simply refuse to do it, we really have nothing to do with the practice of education. [85]

From Freire's point of view, an educator has a duty to 'take a stand': he or she can never be neutral. Freire's methods in Brazil were not impositional in the strong sense of *forcing* others to comply with his view of the world; but he did *encourage* and challenge the adults in the programme to think and act in new ways. Walker's doubts about the dialogical nature of elements in Freirean pedagogy are, I believe, well founded. Freire's literacy efforts were, at best, only partially dialogical in character. They were, nevertheless, worthwhile. The most telling question of all is, ultimately, this: were the lives of the Brazilian illiterates with whom Freire worked better or worse as a result of his intervention?

The success of the programme in technical terms was undeniable: Freire developed a literacy method which enabled adults to gain a basic competence with reading and writing in a very short period of time. Even one of Freire's harshest critics has admitted that 'Freire's method has shown itself to be very successful ...' [86]. That the programme was stopped short by the military coup before these relatively rudimentary abilities could be translated into more sophisticated forms of reading and writing was tragic, but hardly Freire's fault. It could be suggested, perhaps, that in encouraging adult illiterates to see their world in a new light—in a demonstrably more critical way—Freire's programme was a source of frustration rather than liberation. A critical consciousness is no use, a critic might say, if the social situation does not allow one to act upon one's reflections to change the world. While he would defend the intrinsic worth of a critical perspective on the world, I am sure that, at the end of the day, Freire would agree with the sentiment of this criticism: transformation of oppressive structures through critical reflection and action is the supreme objective. In retrospect, Freire has attained a very clear picture of the conditions necessary for a truly successful literacy programme:

... programs of adult literacy have been efficient in societies in which suffering and change created a special motivation in the people for reading and writing. [87]

In *Literacy: reading the word and the world*, Freire speaks of the success of the Nicaraguan literacy crusade in these terms:

Literacy in the case of Nicaragua started to take place as soon as the people took their history into their own hands ... Anyone who takes history into his or her own hands can easily take up the alphabet ... In Nicaragua the people rewrote their society before reading the word.
[88]

There is, Freire asserts, a very direct correspondence between the revolutionary transformation of a society and success in adult literacy work [89]. Literacy must be understood in its social, political and cultural context. Where groups of people in a given society have struggled against concrete forms of oppression, in a critical and dialogical way, they have already engaged in humanising praxis. To introduce the learning of reading and writing in the context of revolutionary national change is to build on this praxis, and in so doing create a liberating (and, hence, humanising) form of literacy practice. The key to the success of literacy programmes in revolutionary societies is that people have already reached a certain state of consciousness before embarking on the programme, and have already become praxical subjects, taking (increasing) control of their own destinies. The themes that have been introduced in literacy campaigns which have followed national revolutions have invariably been based on issues addressed during the revolutionary process itself (including such subjects as oppression, colonialism, freedom, the revolutionary leadership, health, education, etc.) [90]. People are strongly motivated to learn to read and write because they can see (and have seen) definite changes in the way they live, and understand, their daily lives.

The Brazilian programme provided for *some* improvement in the lives of formerly illiterate adults. Elementary forms of reading and writing became possible, and a heightened awareness of conditions of oppression ensued. Unlike Nicaragua, however, political circumstances in Brazil favoured transformation of oppressive social structures for only a very brief period. Praxis—the synthesis of critical reflection with action—lies at the heart of the Freirean ethical ideal. But Freire would be quick to point out that we do not always achieve the desired goal in our actions. Social transformation inevitably takes place under political constraints. It is in the very struggle to overcome these political impediments, in the search for a better way of life for all (be it through literacy or other means), that the Freirean ideal of liberation is realised. In so far as the Freirean programme explicitly fostered this struggle, and to the extent that adult illiterates were able to engage in certain modes of critical thinking and acting, Freire's literacy efforts in Brazil were worthwhile.

NOTES

- [1] See Freire, P. (1976) *Education: the practice of freedom*, pp. 41–84 (London, Writers & Readers).
- [2] *Ibid.*, p. 41.

- [3] Mackie, R. (Ed.) (1980) 'Introduction', in: *Literacy and Revolution: the pedagogy of Paulo Freire*, p. 4 (London, Pluto Press).
- [4] Freire (1976) op. cit., p. 42 (see Note [1]).
- [5] In outlining key features of Freire's Brazilian work, I shall draw principally on *ibid.*, pp. 41–84, and Brown, C. (1974) Literacy in 30 hours: Paulo Freire's process in northeast Brazil, *Social Policy*, 5(2), pp. 25–32. For further discussion of the Freirean approach to literacy, see Freire, P. (1972a) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, pp. 81–95 (London, Penguin); (1972b) *Cultural Action for Freedom*, pp. 29–47 (London, Penguin); (1978) *Pedagogy in Process: the letters to Guinea-Bissau* (London, Writers & Readers); (1981) The people speak their word: learning to read and write in São Tomé and Príncipe, *Harvard Educational Review*, 51, pp. 27–30; (1985) *The Politics of Education*, pp. 7–18, 21–27 (London, Macmillan); Freire, P. & Macedo, D. (1987) *Literacy: reading the word and the world*, Chapters 4 and 5 (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul); Horton, M. & Freire, P. (1990), in: B. Bell, J. Gaventa & J. Peters (Eds) *We Make the Road by Walking: conversations on education and social change*, pp. 83–95 (Philadelphia, PA, Temple University Press); Sanders, T.G. (1972) The Paulo Freire method: literacy training and conscientization, in: T. J. La Belle (Ed.) *Education and Development: Latin America and the Caribbean* (Los Angeles, CA, Latin American Centre); Bee, B. (1980) The politics of literacy, in: R. Mackie (Ed.) *Literacy and Revolution: the pedagogy of Paulo Freire* (London, Pluto Press); Llyod, A.S. (1972) Freire, conscientization, and adult education, *Adult Education*, 23, pp. 3–20.
- [6] It is tempting to call this the 'actual literacy training' (see Sanders op. cit., p. 593, Note [5]), because it was only at this stage that participants learned the 'mechanics' of reading and writing—i.e. the formation of words and sentences. But giving in to this temptation represents a serious mistake, for 'literacy', as it is conceived by Freire, consists in much more than simply the mastering of the medium of print: the preceding or co-existing analyses of nature, culture, work, human relationships, etc. and the attendant posing of problems pertaining to local and national politics are as much a part of what it means to become 'literate' in Freirean terms as the learning of letters and words.
- [7] Freire (1976) op. cit., p. 49 (see Note [1]).
- [8] *Ibid.*, p. 50.
- [9] *Ibid.*, p. 51.
- [10] *Ibid.*, pp. 51–52.
- [11] *Ibid.*, pp. 52–53.
- [12] See *ibid.*, pp. 45–46, 52; Freire (1972a) op. cit., ch. 2 (Note [5]). Some interesting light is shed on the background and processes governing the selection of co-ordinators in Freire's Brazilian literacy work in a little-known interview conducted with Freire while he was visiting India in the early 1970s. Freire notes that 600 teachers were requested and more than 30,000 applications were received (!) A two-page test was administered in a football stadium, and co-ordinators were selected on the basis of their answers to questions such as these: 'Brazil is largely a marginal society. How shall we get out of this situation?'; 'What do you think of the condition of education in Brazil at the present moment?'; 'Why did you decide to apply for this job?' See Foncesca, C. (1973) Paulo Freire in Bombay, *New Frontiers in Education*, 3(2), p. 95.
- [13] Literacy groups met for 1 hour each week-night for a period of up to 8 weeks. See Brown op. cit., p. 32 (Note [5]).
- [14] Bee op. cit., p. 40 (Note [5]).
- [15] Where it was not possible to use the wall of a house, the reverse side of a blackboard was utilised.
- [16] Freire informs us that the originals were taken from him. The pictorial situations published in *Education: the practice of freedom* were produced by another Brazilian artist, Vincente de Abreu. See Freire (1976) op. cit., p. 61 (Note [1]). Cynthia Brown was able to obtain eight of the original sequence of 10 pictures, all (eight) of which are reproduced in her article, Literacy in 30 hours: Paulo Freire's process in northeast Brazil (op. cit., Note [5]). Figures

- 5 and 8 in the collection shown by Brown are from the de Abreu set. See Brown op. cit., pp. 27–28, (Note [5]).
- [17] Brown *ibid.*, p. 26.
- [18] See *ibid.* pp. 26–29; Freire (1976) op. cit., pp. 65–81 (Note [1]).
- [19] Brown op. cit., p. 29 (Note [5]).
- [20] See Freire (1976) op. cit., pp. 17–20 (Note [1]).
- [21] *Ibid.*, p. 17.
- [22] *Ibid.*, p. 18.
- [23] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 18–20.
- [24] *Ibid.*, p. 81.
- [25] *Ibid.*, pp. 52–53.
- [26] Sanders op. cit., p. 591 (Note [5]).
- [27] Brown op. cit., p. 30 (Note [5]).
- [28] *Ibid.*, p. 31.
- [29] Freire (1976) op. cit., p. 54 (Note [1]).
- [30] See *ibid.*
- [31] *Ibid.*
- [32] *Ibid.*, pp. 82–84.
- [33] Freire (1972a) op. cit., p. 28 (Note [5]).
- [34] Freire (1976) op. cit., p. 53 (Note [1]).
- [35] Freire regards the post-literacy phase as crucial in any programme of education and national reconstruction. While the literacy work concentrates on generative *words*, a key element in the post-literacy stage is generative *themes*. The themes that form the focus of post-literacy dialogical education are drawn from the problems, issues, struggles, conflicts, and politics of national, regional and local life. Through critical exploration of themes, the limit-situations confronting participants are identified and (when necessary and where possible) negated with limit-acts. Full details on this process are given in Freire (1972a) op. cit., ch. 3 (Note [5]).
- [36] The attitude of the Brazilian government toward Freire after his forced exile is clearly (if implicitly) revealed in an article by Arlindo Lopes-Correa in the mid-1970s, MOBREAL: participation-reading in Brazil, *Journal of Reading*, 19(7), 1976. Then-president of MOBREAL (the Brazilian Literacy Movement), Lopes-Correa outlines the methods used by the Brazilian government to overcome functional adult illiteracy. In a remarkable act of plagiarism, Lopes-Correa runs through a literacy process involving generative words, syllabic families, discovery tables and pictorial codifications, with not a single mention of Freire either in the text of the article or in the bibliography. References to conscientisation and praxis have been removed, and Freire's call for literacy to be a means through which illiterates attain a deepening political awareness is replaced by the expressed hope that 'pupils'—a term Freire avoided as far as possible—develop 'an interest in continued self-learning through reading' (p. 534). The 'technical' aspects of Freire's literacy method have been appropriated almost to the letter (with their source of origin left unacknowledged), but the radical, critical force of Freire's work has been conveniently placed to one side. Further evidence of the treatment afforded Freire by Brazilian authorities more than a decade after the military coup can be gleaned from comments made in one of a series of conversations at the University of Massachusetts and Harvard University in the 1980s. Freire reveals that the well-known (1976) Declaration of Persepolis (published in L. B. Bataille (Ed.) *A Turning Point for Literacy* (Oxford, Pergamon Press)—a concise statement of aims for adult literacy work formed at the conclusion of a conference with representatives from across the globe—was signed by all participating countries *except* Brazil. The Brazilian delegates protested Freire's presence and left the meeting. See Bruss, N. & Macedo, D. (1985) Toward a pedagogy of the question: conversations with Paulo Freire, *Journal of Education*, 167(2), p. 14.
- [37] Mackie op. cit., p. 5 (Note [5]).

- [38] Llyod op. cit., p. 12 (Note [5]).
- [39] Ibid., p. 11.
- [40] Sanders op. cit., p. 593 (Note [5]).
- [41] Freire & Macedo op. cit., pp. 114–115 (Note [5]).
- [42] Ibid., p. 114.
- [43] Freire (1976) op. cit., p. 49 (Note [1]).
- [44] Freire & Macedo op. cit., pp. 64–65 (Note [5]).
- [45] Ibid., p. 69.
- [46] Freire (1981) op. cit., p. 30 (Note [5]).
- [47] Gee, J.P. (1988) The legacies of literacy: from Plato to Freire through Harvey Graff, *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(2), pp. 207–208.
- [48] See Freire & Macedo op. cit., p. 64 (Note [5]).
- [49] The regard in which Freire is held can perhaps be measured by the fact that in 1990 (International Literacy Year), a group of North American educationists proposed that he be nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize.
- [50] In recent years, post-modernist critics have brought a new set of critical categories to bear on Freire's work. Unfortunately, space does not permit consideration of such perspectives here. For informative discussion of some of the pertinent issues raised by post-structuralist and post-modernist writers, see Weiler, K. (1991) Freire and a feminist pedagogy of difference, *Harvard Educational Review*, 61(4); McLaren, P. & Silva, T.T. da (1993) Decentering pedagogy: critical literacy, resistance and the politics of memory, in: P. McLaren & P. Leonard, (Eds) *Paulo Freire: a critical encounter* (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul).
- [51] According to Chall, 'word recognition and decoding are vital aspects of the Freire program, along with political consciousness and motivation. This contrasts with many of our [US] reading programs for adult beginners which assume that interesting and vital content will lead naturally to word recognition and skill in the use of the alphabetic principle'. See Chall, J.S. (1987) Reading development in adults, *Annals of Dyslexia*, 37, p. 245.
- [52] Freire, P. & Shor, I. (1987) *A Pedagogy for Liberation*, p. 10 (London, Macmillan).
- [53] Berger, P. (1974) 'Consciousness raising' and the vicissitudes of policy, in: P. Berger *Pyramids of Sacrifice: political ethics and social change* (New York, Basic Books).
- [54] Elsewhere, it has been argued that the equating of conscientisation with 'consciousness raising' is extremely problematic. See Roberts, P. R. (1988) Understanding Paulo Freire's notion of conscientisation, unpublished MA thesis, University of Auckland, ch. 5.
- [55] Berger op. cit., p. 113 (Note [53]).
- [56] See *ibid.*
- [57] See *ibid.*, pp. 113–118.
- [58] Bowers, C.A. (1983) Linguistic roots of cultural invasion in Paulo Freire's pedagogy, *Teachers College Record*, 84(4), p. 936.
- [59] See *ibid.*, pp. 936–942.
- [60] *Ibid.*, p. 942.
- [61] *Ibid.*, pp. 935, 943 and 952.
- [62] Walker, J. (1980) The end of dialogue: Paulo Freire on politics and education, in: R. Mackie (Ed.) *Literacy and Revolution: the pedagogy of Paulo Freire*, p. 150 (London, Pluto Press).
- [63] *Ibid.*
- [64] *Ibid.*, p. 134.
- [65] *Ibid.*, p. 137.
- [66] *Ibid.*, p. 140.
- [67] See *ibid.*, p. 146.
- [68] By Berger, Bowers and Walker respectively.
- [69] Consider, for instance, Gee's critique of Freire's approach to adult education in São Tomé and Príncipe, op. cit. (Note [47]).