and Educational Demands

PAULO FREIRE

Special Consultant, Office of Education, World Council of Churches, Geneva.

Discussing development and its relationships with educational demands implies some previous considerations. First of all, I think that it is necessary to recognise two main different ways of economic transformation which societies can suffer, according to the point of decision of the transformation itself. On the one hand, we have changes in which the point of decision is outside the society; on the other hand, changes whose point of decision is within the society. In the first case, the society is the mere object of other or others; it is in Hegelian language, a "being for other"; in the second hypothesis, the society acts as a subject or a "being for himself". Modernisation and development name, respectively, both of these different processes of change. So, the concept of development is linked to the process of liberation of the dependent societies, while the modernising action characterizes the concrete situation of dependency. Hence, it is impossible for us to understand the phenomenon of underdevelopment without the critical perception of the category of dependency. Underdevelopment does not in fact have its "reason" in itself; on the contrary, its "reason" is in development.

In this way, the fundamental task of the underdeveloped countries - the historical commitment of their peoples - is to overcome their "limit situation" of dependent societies, in order to become "beings for themselves". Without this overcoming, those societies will stay experiencing themselves in the "culture of silence".* *which, in resulting from the structures of dependency, reinforces these structures. So, there is a necessary relationship between dependency and* "culture of silence". *Being silent is not to have an authentic voice; it is to follow the prescriptions of those who speak and impose their words. By this, concretizing the state of "beings for themselves" constitutes for the underdeveloped societies what I call* "untested feasibility".** *The limit situation in which they find themselves, at the same time challenges them and makes it possible for them better and better to perceive the real causes of their dependence. But, the more the limit situation becomes unveiled and the* "untested feasibility" *appears as a historical demand, the more their* "untested feasibility" *becomes a limit situation for those who prescribe their voices. So, development as liberation is, on the one hand, the* "untested

* *A propos of* "culture of silence", *see FREIRE, Paulo :* Cultural Action for Freedom. *Center for the Study of Development and Social Change.*

***See FREIRE, Paulo :* Pedagogy of the Oppressed. Herder and Herder, New York, 1970.

feasibility" of the dependent societies, and, on the other hand, the limit situation of the Director societies; in this way, modernisation, which stimulates only the mere appearance of voice in the dependent societies, does not go beyond the pure reforms of the structures. As a process which starts from outside, it preserves the state of dependency of the societies, which can have, however, the illusion of becoming subjects of their decisions. Because of this, modernisation implies "cultural invasion", whose process deforms the being of the invaded society, which becomes a kind of caricature of itself. The invaded society is profiled by the invading one, which establishes its truth as the only truth, its cultural patterns as the best ones.

For this reason, education for development must be education for freedom, in whose process science and technology will be at the service of the humanisation of men. So, precisely because there is not a neutral education, the answers which both of these processes give to the educational demands are necessarily different. If both these processes, for instance, need to emphasise technological education, scientific research, professional specialisation, their approach concerning all of this will be distinct, if their agents are really coherent. So, the normal tendency of the modernisation process is to increase a kind of training in which the social reality appears as if it were a "given fact", which cannot be discussed. Such an orientation obviously responds to the main objective of modernisation, which is to modernise the structures without changing them essentially.

In this way, in the process of modernisation, education becomes an indoctrination, a mere training, a kind of "domestication", through which men are alienated in their capacity of transforming beings. Such a kind of action obviously improves the naive consciousness concerning the very reality which needs to be transformed. Hence, the so much proclaimed neutrality of science, of technology, of education . . . Specialisation becomes "specialism"; rationality, "irrationality"; technique, "technicism"; the technicians, "technicists" : men are almost reduced to machines. So, in the modernisation process, men are trained for the "specialisms", in which, submerging themselves in the "focalist" vision of reality, they lose the global one, which the speciality can offer them. Technology tends to become a myth, a new divinity to which men enslave themselves.

On the contrary, the fundamental educational demand of development is the creative activity of people who must assume the role of real subjects of the process of transformation of their society.

Development must be made with people and never for them, without them, which is a form of being against them.

"Thus in supporting the development effort, the churches will be true to one of the most basic commands of the Christian faith: 'to love thy neighbour as thyself'. And they will also be playing their proper part in the long, arduous task of building a more stable international order of well-being and peace for the whole human family."

(Taken from "World Development - Challenge to the Churches" - the report of the conference on World Co-operation for Development April 1968)