

Denis E. Collins, S.J.*

Conscientization and Social—Self-Realization: Paulo Freire and Theodore Brameld

Theological reflection today is credible to the extent that it addresses the future. This is not to ignore either the validity of historical investigations or accurate analyses of the present, but to underline the legitimate demands of humanity upon the theologian. God created men and women to be free and to exercise a stewardship over all the other gifts of His creation. Each one's stewardship is exercised historically, and the Church and the theologian must be so in touch with history and contemporary events as to guarantee an enhanced free use of creatures that will lead to the salvation of every person. Modern theological reflection examines the problems of contemporary humanity to discover in what ways God's speaking in history can reveal the possibilities of transformation and resolution of human problems in favor of personal and universal salvation. The fathers of Vatican II put it this way:

With the help of the Holy Spirit, it is the task of the entire People of God, especially pastors and theologians, to hear, distinguish, and interpret the many voices of our age, and to judge them in the light of the divine Word. In this way, revealed truth can always be more deeply penetrated, better understood, and set forth to greater advantage.¹

It is a truism that securing "greater advantage" for humankind is assured to possess political and educational implications. "Who should be free?" and "To what extent should humans enjoy freedom?" are political questions. Gustavo Gutierrez has pointed out that while it is incorrect to equate the liberation of Christ with political liberation, the liberation preached by Christ takes place in historical and political liberating acts, mediations that cannot be avoided.² Prerequisite to political liberation is an educational process that frees the human intellect to discover the answers to the two questions above, along with realization that God did not intend man to accept the *status quo* as an eternal given. In an open society the nexus between theological reflection, political liberation, and education is inescapable.

¹"The Church Today," in *The Documents of Vatican II*, Walter M. Abbott, S. J., ed., (New York: Herder and Herder, 1966), p. 246.

²Gustavo Gutierrez, "Freedom and Liberation," in *Liberation and Change* by Gustavo B. Gutierrez and Richard Shaull (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1977), p. 85f. Karl Rahner's essay "Christianity and the 'New Man'" in *The Sacred and the Secular*, Michael J. Taylor, S.J., ed. (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1973), pp. 84-103, is another excellent exposition of the intramundane tasks to which Christians must address themselves.

*Denis E. Collins, S.J., is Director of Education, The California Province of The Society of Jesus, Los Gatos, California.

Paulo Freire's works suggest that education, properly understood and undertaken as loving dialogical problem-posing pedagogy (conscientization), is the essential avenue toward permanent human liberation. His experiences with the unlettered and oppressed in Brazil and Chile and the United States led him to propound a Christian philosophy of education that at first reading appears to address only the tasks of the preliterate stages of human liberation. This is not the case at all, however, with Freire. Throughout his works one finds a repeated concern that those studying his ideas not accept them as complete, much less as prescriptions for educational praxis that can be uncritically applied to any culture. At the same time it is my belief that Freire's thought is a treasure in terms of his vision of humanity, the nature of authentic knowing, and the understanding of oppression as alienation of humans from one another and from their Creator. Treasures should be shared.

In this article I hope to illustrate the richness of Paulo Freire's thought by comparing and contrasting it with the educational philosophy of a North American social educator, Theodore Brameld, long prominent in this country and abroad. My purpose is not to accentuate the conflict between secularist thought and Christianity,³ but to accomplish three goals: (1) to tease out in summary fashion the most consequential ideas of Paul Freire; (2) to remind the reader that the desire to remake the world order in the name of human freedom is entirely consonant with Christian teachings; and (3) to suggest that in spite of his oversimplification of earlier philosophies and acerbic accusations about the intentions of religious educators, Theodore Brameld has throughout a long career offered positive educational proposals for the reconstruction of post-literate societies. Both men are optimists, each describes himself as a utopian thinker. While I am more comfortable with Freire's Christian humanism, I submit that Brameld's reconstructionism remains a contribution to the planning of democratic societies and world order. The remaining pages of this article report similarities and differences in the ontology, epistemology, axiology, and educational theory of the two educators.

Ontology

Similarities

Paulo Freire and Theodore Brameld both view reality as historical process, and understand it to include the world of plants and animals and men, along with men's ideals, emotions and thinking.⁴ Both men

³On this topic I refer the interested reader to the work of Charles Rodgers, S.J., *The Church and the World* (Notre Dame: Fides Publishers, Inc., 1973).

⁴Limitations of space will not allow me to present exhaustive documentation of the works of Freire and Brameld. Elsewhere I have published a detailed exposition and analysis of Freire's educational philosophy in Part Two of *Paulo Freire: His Life, Works and Thought* (New York: Paulist Press, 1977) and have therefore decided to refer the reader to citations of his works found in the notes on pp. 90-94 of that book to substantiate my account of his philosophy in this article. References to Brameld's works are provided in the notes that follow with an occasional reference to Freire when absolutely necessary.

attribute a preeminent place to man and to human culture, the product of his thought and activity. Both men prefer to speak of reality as conditioned rather than caused, and both are aware that human culture is conditioned by innumerable biological, economic, political, ideological influences, all of which are in constant interaction with one another.⁵

Both philosophers assert that men, and the culture which reflects humanity's work are unfinished and evolving. In so far as men and culture are unfinished, they point to a human future different from the past and the present.⁶ The future is therefore a problem to be addressed through study which can provide understanding of the conditioning influences of past and present cultural reality. Both men assign an important role to science (both physical and behavioral) and to philosophy in the task of analyzing reality.⁷ The work of philosophical analysis is never thought of by either man as an operation that reifies either thought or culture. Neither man is content to describe reality as an object for analysis; both insist that the unfinished character of reality present it as a problem to be solved and evoke a call to action on the part of man. Both men utilize Bergson's concept of duration to indicate that the past, present, and future are all present as a problem to be analyzed and solved by mankind.⁸

Freire and Brameld attach great importance to the social nature of man. Neither treats him as if he were an individual isolated from society, pointing out that each man has rights and responsibilities in regard to society. At the same time neither denies that individual men have individual rights.⁹

In their approach to man as a historical being both men find that the history of human culture is a struggle for human freedom. Both apparently find indication that the struggle points to a future cultural pattern of increased freedom and interdependence and hence unity for mankind.

Both men believe that the answer to the question "What is real?" bespeaks a need for radical political activity on the part of man.¹⁰

Divergencies

The view of reality as historical process found in Freire is essentially Marxist, and Freire uses classical Marxist vocabulary to illustrate his ontology. Brameld on the other hand presents his ontology as an outgrowth of progressivist thought and even though he stresses the role of

⁵Theodore Brameld, *Patterns of Educational Philosophy* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1971), pp. 360-372.

⁶Theodore Brameld, *The Use of Explosive Ideas in Education* (Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1965), pp. 163-181.

⁷Theodore Brameld, *Education for the Emerging Age* (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), pp. 71-78.

⁸Brameld, *Patterns of Educational Philosophy*, pp. 380-382.

⁹Theodore Brameld, "Causation, Goals and Methodology," *Educational Theory*, Vol. II, No. 3 (July 1952), 203-209; cf. Brameld, *The Use of Explosive Ideas in Education*, pp. 225-233.

¹⁰Brameld, *Ends and Means in Education*, pp. 57-70; also his *Patterns of Educational Philosophy*, pp. 448-450.

class conflict, group struggle, economic conditioning of group mind and group behavior, and denounces the deprivation of human freedom to the majority of mankind, has stated explicitly that he rejects Marxist metaphysics.¹¹ This is not to say he ignores Marxism as an important expression of modern thought. The *Use of Explosive Ideas in Education* and *Patterns of Educational Philosophy* stress the relevance of Marxist concepts and neo-Marxism to modern man and reconstructionist education.

Freire's accent upon man as different from animals, as the only being capable of work, as the creator and re-creator of history through authentic praxis are presented almost as Marx described man's unique difference from animals. Brameld's discussion of man is couched in terms of reaction to earlier philosophies which had attributed human existence to causes or superhuman powers other than experience and nature.¹² For Brameld human beings are products of evolution capable of directing human history through study and choice; there is no other world or life than that experienced by living men. As a professed theist Freire probably accepts some form of evolutionary creationism but never mentions it as a relevant philosophical question or problem. His primary focus is man and the possibility of authentic human existence where man becomes the agent of history and culture. He is unconcerned with any superpower(s) as cause, except when he criticizes God or gods who function in historical religions as sources of oppression. He insists the task of philosophy is to demythologize such gods.

The concept of human culture achieves central importance in the ontologies of both Freire and Brameld who find anthropology (as "philosophical anthropology" in Freire or "anthropotherapy" in Brameld)¹³ the field in which men may study the present in order to shape the future. Although Brameld criticizes behaviorism, he nevertheless espouses it,¹⁴ while Freire is reluctant to do so because it can reduce men to machines and human consciousness to an abstraction.¹⁵

Brameld and Freire believe philosophy should be orientated toward action but use different terms to define action. Freire calls it cultural action for freedom or liberating praxis; Brameld calls it reconstruction of human culture or social—self realization.¹⁶ The action desired by each man has the same intention, the liberation of mankind. It is difficult to state how their thinking diverges on the subject of action except in modes of planning. In this respect Brameld is far more detailed than Freire in the specific recommendations he puts forward concerning the kinds of action for which contemporary cultures-in-crisis should opt. Freire offers

¹¹Theodore Brameld, "The Problem of Anti-Rationalism in Educational Theory," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 2 (Spring, 1953), pp. 79-80.

¹²Brameld, *Patterns of Educational Philosophy*, p. 358f.

¹³*Ibid.*, pp. 463-466.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 366f.

¹⁵Paulo Freire, *Cultural Action for Freedom* (Cambridge: *Harvard Educational Review* and Center for the Study of Development and Social Change, 1970), p. 30.

¹⁶Brameld, *Patterns of Educational Philosophy*, pp. 420-474.

recommendations for changes in human consciousness so that men can make political and cultural revolution a reality.

The last major divergence in ontology between the two philosophies is the current of existentialism evident in Freire's writings that is almost totally absent in Brameld's writings. To be sure, Brameld has included in the revised edition of *Patterns of Educational Philosophy* statement of his awareness that existentialist concern for the personal dimensions of human existence needs to be incorporated and guaranteed in planning for a future society.¹⁷ But reconstructionist thought is far more closely aligned with progressivism than with any strain of existentialism.

Epistemology

Similarities

Freire and Brameld each attempt to answer the question "How do human beings know?" by illustrating *why* human beings want to know. For each man thinking, knowing, and truth are presented as means to achieving human goals. Both men believe in the legitimacy of abstract conceptualization and objectification of thought for the purposes of philosophical discourse. Both men are empiricists and welcome full utilization of physical and behavioral sciences as well as philosophy in the project of selecting and achieving human goals.

Both thinkers express the notion that knowing is a social activity. Individual men know and seek goals, but Freire and Brameld both speak of knowing and truth as terms that imply degrees of knowing and truth conditioned by the extent men agree on their knowledge.¹⁸ For each philosopher there are "true acts of knowing" made possible by interdependence and intersubjectivity in the work of learning. These true acts of knowing contrast with conditioned states of knowing which manifest effects of non-rational influences upon individual and collective consciousness. They also contrast with knowledge possessed only by individuals. When knowledge is shared, it can be tested by scientific means and is thus subjectivity become objectivity and hence "more true" than individual thinking and knowing.¹⁹

The criterion of truth for each philosopher is the ability of knowledge to lead to wider freedoms for human beings.²⁰ When examining factors that contribute to conditioned states of consciousness, both men lament the influences of ideologies, myths, religions, aristocratic philosophies, and educational systems which have hindered the majority of the human race from achievement and enjoyment of freedom. Both men recognize the impact these influences have made upon cultural institutions and patterns

¹⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 420f.; also p. 551.

¹⁸Although Brameld usually speaks of consensual validation as pertinent to group experience, he does not consider it entirely irrelevant even to the investigations of physical science. See his comments on consensual validation and intersubjectivity in Theodore Brameld, *The Climactic Decades* (New York: Praeger Publishing Co., 1970), pp. 110-113.

¹⁹Brameld, *Patterns of Educational Philosophy*, p. 411f.

²⁰*Ibid.*, p. 411.

and argue for a need for men to make new cultural patterns that will permit extension of freedom to all presently excluded from participation in the process of making their own culture.

Both men note the potential and actual misuse of technological and scientific knowledge.²¹ Both suggest that knowledge which leads to selection and pursuit of common cultural goals is more important (in the sense that it intends to bring human intelligence to bear on the problem of wider participation in government and other manifestations of culture) than supposedly neutral scientific analysis, experimentation, and technology. The latter all need integration with the wider interests of humanity.²²

Both men view knowing as an unfinished process and describe it as such not only because of the possibility of discovery of new knowledge but also and especially because of the need for former knowledge to be corrected in light of new social needs. In this respect Freire and Brameld are both critical of the tendency to preserve outworn ideologies as cultural goals.²³ The social nature of knowing and truth requires men to examine and refine older knowledge for the benefit of humanity. When knowledge no longer serves the purpose of extension of freedom, both men say that it is no longer true. Hence neither equates knowledge with truth.²⁴

The concern of each man with cultural institutions and with the conditioning effects of ideologies upon human thinking and knowing indicates political implications in their epistemologies.

Divergencies

While both Freire and Brameld insist that thinking and knowing are not independent of history and culture, their approaches to the problem of how people know are markedly different. Brameld explains that he elaborates his own theory of knowing with seven operational concepts (goal-seeking, prehension, the unrational, ideology, utopia, consensual validation and "group mind") which he says he selected in light of reconstructionist ontology.²⁵ Examination of the progressivists' "experience and nature" reveals that man functions as an individual and as a member of groups and that he is a goal-seeking being. Brameld's epistemology enlarges upon the phenomenon of goal-seeking because men must know and decide what is true in order to determine and pursue goals. The concepts he chooses for his study of human knowledge are operational and with the possible exception of his notion of prehension do not seem to intend a full explanation of how men know.²⁶ Instead they present a highly selective treatment of knowledge as it pertains to individual and group goal-seeking. Brameld's theory of knowing is put vis-a-vis older epistemologies.

²¹Brameld, *The Climactic Decades*, pp. 28-33.

²²Brameld devoted an entire book to this thesis: *Education as Power* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965).

²³Brameld, *Patterns of Educational Philosophy*, pp. 396-399.

²⁴*Ibid.*, p. 411f.

²⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 384-412.

²⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 389-392.

Freire's approach to knowing and truth is more elaborate than Brameld's and manifests his central concern with human consciousness. His focus upon consciousness and upon the unity of subjectivity with objectivity clearly places Freire in the tradition of Marx and other philosophers after Marx who have elaborated philosophies of praxis.²⁷ Since praxis is always combination of action with reflection, Freire's statements about cultural action are divorced from statements about consciousness and human reflection only in order to speak about action or reflection. But there is no denying the fact that his insistence upon the necessity of performing an "archaeology of the consciousness" and the role of conscientization in the process of human liberation call attention to the centrality of epistemology in his philosophy. Brameld in no way detracts from the importance of the theory of knowing to philosophy of education. He even emphasizes that social—self-realization (his supreme goal of human culture) is dependent upon consensual validation and formation of "group mind."²⁸ Nevertheless concern for epistemology cannot be said to characterize his philosophy to the same extent as epistemology is a preoccupation with Freire.

Both speak of the conditioning effect of history and culture upon knowing. Freire describes the effect as oppressed consciousness and carefully traces out many stages of consciousness through which men emerge toward a praxis of liberation. He describes human consciousness, when it is permitted to function freely, as intentionality. Because knowing is social, Freire speaks of it also as co-intentionality. Co-intentionality identifies knowing as an essentially active process whereby consciousness scrutinizes history and culture in order to act upon them. Brameld's explanation of knowing as prehension is similar in that it ascribes an active role to knowing, but derives from Whitehead rather than from Husserl and Marx, the two chief philosophical sources of Freire's theory of knowing. While Freire seems to include all acts of knowing and decision-making under the rubric of co-intentionality, Brameld prefers to distinguish prehension from apprehension, observing that analytic knowledge is for the most part more important to the process of planning society. Prehension integrates apprehended knowledge with cultural unities, bringing together individual and societal goals.²⁹

The two theories of knowing also differ in the vocabularies used to express them. Freire's Marxist-existentialism speaks of "alienated," "necrophilic," "dehumanized and dehumanizing," "false" consciousness. Brameld speaks more in psychological terms, saying that knowledge that falls short of that derived through consensual validation is merely "conditioned" and "untrue."³⁰ Freire speaks of irrationality housed in oppressive and oppressed consciousness; Brameld prefers to discuss the role of the unrational discovered by psychology and psychoanalysis. In

²⁷Adolfo Sanchez Vazquez, *Filosofía de la Praxis* (Mexico, D.F.: Editorial Grijalbo, S.A., 1967), pp. 14-23; also pp. 82-85.

²⁸Brameld, *Patterns of Educational Philosophy*, p. 421f.

²⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 389-392.

³⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 400-404.

doing so he explores both the negative conditioning effect of ideologies imposed by forces of contraction and non-rational factors contributing positively to individual and group thought and behavior.³¹ Both men see a necessity to heighten individual awareness of reality to social awareness. The means for Brameld is consensual validation, for Freire, conscientization.

Brameld identifies truth with the utopian content of the "group mind" and shows that what is true at one time (e.g. social goals of one generation) may not be true at another. (Utopian thought should analyze and criticize cultural lag embodied in outlived ideologies, providing new social goals.)³² Freire does not actually state what truth is in so many words, choosing to speak of "true acts of knowing" and "critical consciousness" which is critical to the extent it questions, decides, and overcomes through action the contradictions which limit human freedom. It does not appear evident to this writer that Freire and Brameld differ greatly in their estimations of truth, except for the fact that Brameld has been more specific by the definition he offers of truth, which he calls the "utopian content of the group mind."³³

Both men use the words *ideology*, *utopian*, *myth*. They are agreed that utopian thought is desirable because it seeks to produce a better world and social reality than that which exists. However Freire nearly always speaks of ideologies and myths as instruments of oppression that should be denounced by utopian thinkers. Brameld preserves a role for ideology, qualifying its legitimacy as the rational expression of cultural patterns, by showing it is always in need of correction and reformulation by utopian thinking. As seen in the section which follows, Brameld holds that myths can be beneficial in the reconstructed society, but Freire's use of the word *myth* is nearly always disparaging.

Axiology

Similarities

The most clearly evident similarity between the axiologies of Freire and Brameld is the willingness of each thinker to describe an over-arching value for all individuals and society that serves both as supreme value and norm for culture in the present and future. For Freire it is "hominization" or "becoming fully human,"³⁴ for Brameld it is social—self-realization."³⁵ Because each believes man and culture are evolving, both men describe the goals of humanity as unfinished process, and both believe it can be made attainable once people are willing to take the risks necessary to agree upon values and then address themselves to selecting means of arriving at their goal.

³¹*Ibid.*, pp. 392-396.

³²*Ibid.*, pp. 398.

³³*Ibid.*, p. 412.

³⁴Paulo Freire, "Investigación de la Temática Generadora," *Sobre la Acción Cultural* (México, D.D.: Secretariado Social Mexicano, 1970), p. 75.

³⁵Brameld, *Patterns of Educational Philosophy*, p. 420.

Both men are well aware that human beings have a number of interdependent needs which are sought and expressed on physical, psychological, intellectual, political, cultural, and economic levels of human existence. According to both men satisfaction of these needs are real values but subordinate to the supreme value each ascertains as the finality of all human activity. It does not seem inappropriate to describe the values of each thinker as value-means, understanding that the chief value recommended by each man functions as a norm, an objective in light of which all other activity has meaning as "good" or "bad," "valuable" or "useless," "meaningful" or "insignificant."

The supreme values sought by Brameld and Freire are political values, implying radical changes in present social structures. Each thinker speaks at considerable length and with great energy of the need for men to commit themselves to attainment of political goals. In this regard both are utopian thinkers who envision and believe feasible a social order other than any so far established in human societies. Neither is convinced that a truly humane order yet exists in any nation.³⁶

Each man believes in a new order that is democratic, and both lay emphasis upon a need for the means employed to seek that order to be democratic. Hence both speak of the values of dialogue, self-criticism, communication, inter-subjectivity and freedoms of speech, press, and association indispensable to democracy. Both men view education for participation in democracy as a similarly indispensable value-means for modern humanity.³⁷

When Freire and Brameld speak of commitment to values neither hesitates to affirm that men have real religious needs.³⁸ As each man understands it, religion is a value-means suitable to opening the door of human consciousness to the commitment championed by both philosophers.

Divergencies

The new order suggested as the highest human value by Freire is "humanization through a praxis of liberation." Brameld names it "social—self-realization" or the "reconstructed society." This writer is not convinced that the new orders sought by either man are essentially different, especially since both men describe the unfinished character of the new order and because of insistence by each upon fulfillment of the individual being contingent upon the emergence of a social structure that realizes the individual's fulfillment in terms of society. While the socialism sought by Freire is probably conceived as evolving into some kind of world order, in his written works he has not advocated world government. Brameld is far more specific and has repeated his assertion that the aim of all human endeavor should be establishment of an

³⁶Brameld, *Education for the Emerging Age*, pp. 125-130.

³⁷Brameld, *Patterns of Educational Philosophy*, pp. 425-435.

³⁸*Ibid.*, pp. 439-442; cf. Brameld, *Education as Power*, pp. 108f.

international world government to provide the widest possible participation in politics by the majority of mankind.³⁹

By advocacy of the value-means to be employed in establishing a new order, both men propose a radical scientific humanism, yet Brameld's remarks are generally proposed to advocate a democratically planned international society. Freire does not seem opposed to democratic social planning, but the main thrust of his writings emphasizes value-means desirable for participation in revolutionary activity. This is not to say he ignores the post-revolutionary phase of liberation through conscientization. It does illuminate the origins of each man's thought: Brameld (with no desire to belittle the sufferings of Third World peoples) is a voice from twentieth century North America who urges nations with highly advanced technological resources and capital to cooperate with less prosperous countries to reconstruct society for a more humane future. Freire's attention is drawn to the exigencies of political and cultural revolution which are greatly aggravated due to the historical situation of dependence and exploitation endured by his countrymen and the dispossessed masses of the Third World. Both speak to pressing needs in modern society; the form of expression each chooses reflects the nature of audiences addressed.

Freire and Brameld are conspicuous among modern philosophers (with the exception of some existentialist writers) for prompting commitment to values. Both believe there is a demonstrable direction to life and history and assert a need for men to become committed to attainment of a more humane world order. Yet their vigorous arguments for a need for commitment intimate different postures toward humanity. Brameld nearly always speaks of the necessity of bold, dramatic action warranted by contemporary culture-in-crisis if the human organism is to survive. He concludes that men need to be committed to cultural change as a scientist or logician is forced by apparently overwhelming evidence to draw specific conclusions from stated premises.⁴⁰ The urgency in his argumentation is compelling, but there is an air of antiseptic calculation throughout Brameld's writing and planning. Freire on the other hand urges men to be committed to hominization of the universe because he apparently believes commitment to hominization and compassion are desirable human qualities. Many educators speak of a need to dialogue, but it is rare to find anyone like Freire who speaks of humility, trust, faith, solidarity with and love of people in so compelling a manner. He even finds a place for humor in educational philosophy!

With regard to religion as a value-means the difference between Freire and Brameld is that the former is a Christian while Brameld is unconcerned with any god or existence apart from human experience or nature.⁴¹ Of course both men are insistent that religion cannot be used to oppress human consciousness or open scientific inquiry or progress. For

³⁹Brameld, *Education as Power*, p. 55f; pp. 103-109.

⁴⁰Brameld, *Patterns of Educational Philosophy*, pp. 424f.

⁴¹*Ibid.* p. 358f.

Freire religious myths are frequently in need of clarification and correction by demythologization. Brameld prefers to make a case for employment of religious myths and symbols as being "culturally therapeutic," easing commitment of men to the work of building and maintaining new cultural designs. He says men have legitimate religious needs which he believes can be met by religious myths and symbols without dragging in belief in a god or other-wordly existence.

Educational Theory

Similarities

Just as Freire and Brameld are in agreement that the supreme value for mankind is the rebuilding of culture to allow men to be in a process of permanent liberation, they are equally in agreement that education is the means by which the race can attain that value. Since the value sought is a political end, education is envisioned by each man as the partner of political action. Both men are severely critical of traditional education and educational philosophies whose function has for the most part been culturally transmissive. Both believe every stage of the educative process should, according to age of student and difference in subject matter, seek the liberation of mankind.

Neither Freire nor Brameld is unaware that the educational theories they espouse are partial to stated socio-political ends. In the interests of human survival and liberation they believe partiality is defensible and that taking sides concerning the aims of education does not necessarily destroy scientific objectivity.⁴² Just as each is critical of transmissive educational methods, so each is critical of indoctrination and restraint upon free inquiry.

Both men stress the need for education to be dialogical. Students and teachers should share the experience of inquiry and discovery and solution of problems but the two men agree that problem-solving and communication should not be purely academic experiences. Communication should result in community action. Both men recommend that education prepare men to participate in decision-making and determination of the political and cultural future of mankind.

One finds emphasis in Freire and Brameld upon study of determinants of individual and group experiences employing methods of behavioral sciences. Each studies thinking and the reasons why men want to know at the same time he addresses historical conditions and conflicts. Each man finds the anthropological concept of culture especially helpful in assisting men to inquire into human experience to confront the interactions of subgroupings within societies in order to transcend them. While each is careful to assert concern for the individual, both believe individual concern and rights need to be evaluated in light of broader needs and rights of society.⁴³

⁴²*Ibid.*, pp. 468-474.

⁴³*Ibid.*, p. 463.

By their insistence upon dialogical education neither Freire nor Brameld abolishes need for teachers or expert knowledge. Both likewise esteem study of educational philosophy in order that educators may become aware of the non-neutrality of education.

Divergencies

Agreement upon objectives and the importance of education does not mean that descriptions of the educational process by Brameld and Freire are identical. Brameld has offered detailed suggestions for revised curricula and for changes to be made in organization and control of schools. In his studies of Japan and Puerto Rico he has concentrated for the most part upon revision of existing educational systems.⁴⁴ Freire's pedagogy is proposed within the context of educational tactics effective in organization of marginal populations for political and cultural revolutions. He operates on a much more fundamental level than Brameld and leaves discussion of problems involved in building and restructuring systematic education to a post-revolutionary stage. It does not seem there is any evidence to assert that Brameld is just a reformer while Freire is a revolutionary; there is good reason to draw attention to the fact they have written in different cultures and addressed different audiences. Brameld is as discontent with the failure of the United States' revolution of 1776 to provide social—self-realization to all Americans as Freire laments failures of socialist and communist revolutions of the present century. One might say Freire has written a pedagogy that aims at political literacy with attention focused upon the grass-roots need for literacy. Brameld has presumed literacy, or treated it only in passing, while trying to elaborate a pedagogy that systematically provides political literacy. Brameld believes a world-wide cultural revolution is already underway and seeks to direct it toward reconstruction of society.⁴⁵

Brameld and Freire differ in their criticism of traditional education. Both criticize the use of memorization, recitation, and testing as means that stifle student creativity and innovation. Both agree that transfer of information and culture is a ploy to preserve the *status quo* which serves the interests of a privileged minority. But Freire goes even further by designation of banking methods of education as a kind of violence. Since violence is initiated by oppressors, according to Freire violent means used to overthrow oppression are never put beyond question. Brameld advocates radical changes in education but in his anxiety to mollify critics and probably because of his faith in the limited success of democracy in the United States has not justified violence. He has contented himself with advocacy of due process through consensual validation.⁴⁶

The approach to dialogical education by each man betrays cultural distinctions. Brameld sees his educational theory as an extension and

⁴⁴Theodore Brameld, *Japan: Culture, Education and Change in Two Communities* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1968); *The Remaking of a Culture: Life and Education in Puerto Rico* (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1959).

⁴⁵Brameld, *Patterns of Educational Philosophy*, pp. 33-37.

⁴⁶*Ibid.*, p. 408.

rectification of hitherto poorly implemented progressivism. He criticizes American educators for preoccupation with scientific method as a means to problem-solving that insufficiently relates to the great cultural problems of the modern era. He wants education to be experience in problem-solving that extends beyond the classroom and provides practice in participation in community problem-solving. Freire is confronted with more immediate demands that involve elimination of peasant fatalism, magical and naive consciousness, and literacy. Hence Freire's pedagogy places more emphasis than Brameld's on the role of consciousness and alienation in problem-posing, problem-solving, and cultural action.

Conclusion

These pages have summarized, compared, and contrasted the thought of two utopian philosophers of education, Paulo Freire of Brazil and Theodore Brameld of the United States of America. It is my hope that their exhortations and advocacy of dialogical education will not go unheeded in the remaking of modern democratic societies where men and women can someday live and work enjoying the full freedoms God bestowed on His sons and daughters.