

## “Dialog” and “love” in the work of Paulo Freire

**Anastassios Liambas**

Aristotelion University of Thessaloniki, Greece

and

**Ioannis Kaskaris**

37th Primary School of Thessaloniki, Greece

### **Abstract**

*Both “dialog” and “love” set out a compact theoretical-practical corpus of reference in order to understand, study and elaborate further the ideas and radical tradition of Freire’s pedagogy. One could argue that both notions reflect Freire’s influence from the main narrations that compose and configure his theoretical foundations i.e. liberation theology and his progressive account of Hegelianism, which had shaped his Philosophy of Praxis, suggesting thus a more historic-political exegesis in the form of emancipatory transformative pedagogy. “Dialog” in Freire is considered as a pedagogic method to realize the means, in order, to mould the “liberating pedagogic relationship”. Furthermore, it is been regarded as an epistemological category that constitutes the critical medium to associate individual consciousness with the individual critical possibility to anticipate entity as a collective ontological arrangement, enabling the individual to form, express and change knowledge for the world and the relationships/associations within the real world. “Dialog”, then, is establishing the critical setting and perspective to reflect the cognitive, cultural and societal conditions of existence for those who dare/ want to be involved in an act of learning and transformation towards a socially just and democratic society. Such a society would negate capitalism and the networks of power and ideology that sustain social reproduction through education in our epoch. In Freire, “love” facilitates the pedagogue in considering learners as human personalities who create knowledge with affection, desire, imagination, creativity. Hence, they are armed with an analytic approach to be aware of, understand and grasp the subjective substratum, the nattered layers which demarcate the historic objective conditions (economic, social, ideological, political) with the diverse distinct biographies (constantly preconditioned within power and cultural connotations, continually embodying practices, sublime attitudes and archetypal mentalities). In our paper, we argue that the notions of “dialogue” and “love” in Freire, endow pedagogy, didactics, the sociology of knowledge and the school curriculum with a theory to be integrated in a more political and social manner towards a radical transformation of society where class social struggle for social change ought to assume a theory of man.*

**Key words:** dialog; love; liberating pedagogy; Freire; pedagogic relation; praxis; social transformation

## **The liberating education of Paulo Freire**

To the authoritarian, democracy deteriorates whenever the popular classes become too present in the schools, on the streets, out in public, denouncing the ugliness of the world and announcing a more beautiful world.

(Paulo Freire, 1999, *Education & Community Involvement*).

A critique of Greek educational policy ought to consider the general neoliberal restructuration. Major socio-economic transformations actually validate a consensus from the bourgeoisie to mutate the political struggle for hegemony as an economic public fiscal crisis while permitting reactionary and conservative ideology to mould the implementation of rigid educational program amendments which adapts primary, secondary and tertiary educational institutions to the pure scenery of plain capitalist relationships. Curiously enough, when it comes to review the latest theoretical articulations on the nexus between education and society the more apparent capitalist and class defined the political and the ideological relationships are, the less strategic, politically oriented and pedagogically receptive radical educational theory is. Reproduction theories can no longer sustain their former validity as long as in the last instance structure remains the unquestionable, definite monolith where the subjects and the subjects' relations have to submerge and infuse, especially when the structural sociopolitical layout is successful in reaffirming the capitalist historic bloc in the disguise of liberal, extreme right or postmodern rhetoric. In this current conjuncture, the working class has been accommodated and captivated by the structures and arrangements of the neoliberal division of labor, reproducing ideological compromises in accord with the progress and advancement of the forces that preserve and maintain the dominant state of the realm. Apparently, education has to justify to a certain degree a theory/conception of man, a theory or a set of ideals to reinvent and speak about the subject which shall be educated and convey the values of a coherent (full of antinomies and contradictions but organically consistent) capitalist mechanism. We argue for a radical educational theory that would set the frame for a critique and praxis in education, to proceed towards a redefinition of pedagogy, to reiterate the meaning and the purpose of education by re-appraising the notions of love and dialogue in the tradition of liberating pedagogy as part of a Marxist class analysis of education

Liberating pedagogy refers to humans' freedom -- realizing man, though, as an entirety (a physical, mental and psychological wholeness) -- from the relations of exploitation and oppression that exist, affixing a vision: to abolish the processes that convert man into an object, simultaneously dehumanizing his/her substance. Liberating education allows us to reflect on the bond of the constitution of the Subject along with the necessary conditions of his/her social emancipation, since emancipation does not derive from a set of institutions that lead for his/her sake, but from himself/herself (the subject as an autonomous entity), while aiming at the social transformation. The liberating moment is inherent in the dialectic unity of consciousness and the subject's initiation for action, so that the subject's transformative attendance has a meaningful manifestation on his/her presence in the world, claiming the terms of freedom and autonomy. As Henry Giroux has made clear in order for learning to become meaningful, critical and emancipatory, it is central to struggle --in the form of cultural politics- over meaning and institutional power (Giroux, 2006), otherwise we pursue a cynical route that weaves words and symbols

void of political influence. Thus, emancipation is consolidated via the accomplishment of action as praxis (i.e. a theoretical-practical concord), as a construction of union of his/her reflection and his/her sociopolitical completion for change, in the world but also with the world.

Liberating education proposes a process of “critical realization” of the person, via the awareness and the transformation of the unit person-world, more concretely, the actual arrange: of the subjective ↔ objective -- subjective reality. In a mode, where it is the objective reality that could be humanized through the person’s transformative intervention, in a manner that it actually has an effect on him/her, by reforming his/her attitude and his/her discourse on the ways to realize the social and natural phenomena which interrelate man in every historical circumstance with knowledge and power (Foucault, 2011). In this way, the person realizes, the ontological and historical destination and, hence, becomes a finer person (Freire, 1977).

To the extent that the human conscience has historicity, the person has the possibility to look into his/her inner self to discover, through relationships with the social reality in order to change the latter (Freire, 1985b). However, the change does not happen simply in the mental sphere, but it is encompassed in the entirety of human experience. According to Freire, the dialectic relation of subject – object is consolidated and the disclosure of objective reality is feasible. Therefore, the subject can render possible the reinvention of meaning of his/her discourse and his/her action within the milieu of the social reality (Freire, 1985a).

For Freire, liberating pedagogy has the fundamental need of the person to be free for individual and collective creation as its starting point, as well as the need to inquire and question (Freire, 1985d). This is why liberating pedagogy has the strength to make the person capable of entering into processes to discover the oppressive conditions while ceaselessly releasing the faculty of the person’s reflection for self-conscience, undertaking sociopolitical and cultural action simultaneously. In this context, both the student and teacher are considered as equally knowing subjects, while, both, the one via the other, are trying to gain knowledge of each other (either pragmatic or existential in a broad socio-ethical approach to reconsider social reality in emancipatory terms) (Freire, 1985a). The first (the student) learns how to critically comprehend its own situation, seeking with epistemological curiosity those causes of existence of relationships that in h everyday routine serve to perpetuate exploitative, unfair and oppressive conditions in capitalist society, dehumanizing his/her entity, turning him/her into an object. Through description, analysis and comprehension of the social associations and relationships, the subjects “are committed” so that they intervene with a purpose of abolishing the dominant ethos and political alignment and become liberated social subjects. Of course, at the process of search of intentional/purposeful experience of reality, the student reveals the myths that fictionalize and misrepresent his/her conscience while being involved in the process of invention and reinvention of knowledge that fights student’s alienating standpoint.

The schoolteacher on the other hand, reflects, reconstructs and reorganizes his/her own viewpoints continually within the framework of the pedagogic relationship, through the awareness of the needs, wishes and dreams of the students, and when truly devoted to his/her mission, he/she struggles to offer the students critical ways of thought and forms of action (Freire, 2009), so that they become able to be self-liberated and self-humanized. Of course, the route to liberation presupposes a certain

educational practice that has broad social-cultural, historical and political psychoanalytical parameters since the terms of dehumanization are not only material but also mental, as the historical, the cultural, the political and social framework shapes the public as well as the private sphere of conduct (Freire, 1998a).

Because of the students’ capability of self-liberation and self-humanization, liberating education does include, in its rationale and purposes, the revelation of the ways we construct and configure ourselves (Glass, 2001). Education as a practice of freedom is been affected by powerful sentimental attachments developed between the teacher and the student (transfer of sincere sentiments and inscription of values) that stimulate, enrich and promote the mental abilities and the psyche as well, that is to say the lived experience (Freire, 1993). The subject, henceforth, reconstructs his/her existence as a whole, he is able to dare, intervene and put the existing and dominant principles which conserve, maintain and reproduce injustice, while at the same time the subject re-invents and re-creates its own relations with the world (Macedo, 1994).

Liberating education, among other things, fundamentally changes the ways of viewing the social topography for the dominating and exploiting social classes, since they are “blinded by the fetishism of the merchandise” consciousness (Aronowitz, 1996, p. 13), and perceive the sociopolitical character of social functions as the natural properties of things. For Freire, the class structure of modern industrial societies has been overshadowed by the “symbolic violence of” forms induced by dominant ideology, in as much as the dominant practice of such an ideology fictionalizes people’s conscience while at the same instance denying the subjects critical reflection and liberating action (Freire, 1985b). Capitalism by denying people critical education actually compels people to accept and consent to the values of capitalism, while establishing and replicating at a scholastic practical level the output of capitalistic relationships and semantics (Milius, 1981).

Liberating education surpasses false conscience – a false consciousness that is due to the subject’s submission under the conscience of the dominant status - and rising critical conscience commences from the transcendence of the conscience of the self as an object (Freire, 1977). It is like “an archeology of consciousness” through the process of reconstruction and rebuilding of the political meaning, the process of recognition of the subject. An attempt connected and realized simultaneously along with the reconstruction and rebuilding of the person’s educative level, and the person’s social intervention and participation as a political and historical entity (Freire, 1985b).

### **The education of the dialog**

Freire is clear that education and cultural processes aimed at liberation do not succeed by freeing people from their chains, but by preparing them collectively to free themselves. This is dialectically facilitated when conversation is replaced by a dialogical praxis.

(Peter McLaren, 2000, *Che Guevara, Paulo Freire, and the Pedagogy for Revolution*).

The reconstruction of the person has to be done with authentic, not-alienated materials. The promise of liberating education for emancipation is ensured through the use of the dialog (Lankshear, 1993). This happens because, the dialog is

characteristic of the human conscience, the dialog can be attributed as “the external form of the conscience expressed through actions, represents its basic capacity: its “intentionality” (Freire, 1977, p. 72). The dialog, thus, is associated with the conscience which is always addressing “something” that is found always “outside” of it (e.g. conscience could be directed towards the inner self, as in previous similar actions of knowledge by third parties) with the purpose of reasoning, understanding and expression through ideas. For Freire, dialog is the foundation of genuine communication and true education (Freire, 1977). Dialog is transformed, ultimately, into a method to “interpret” and “discover” the world and himself in a critical fashion to reveal the historical processes that shape the person. Dialog allows the person to work out the future by recreating the present utilizing the power of humanization (Glass, 2001).

As part of liberating education, dialog is not simple conversation, but mediates among the issues raised by oppressive reality and power relations, dialog "is structured, defined by purpose and contains directions" (Grollios et al, 2003, p. xxxiii). Dialog is a social act and is the starting point for building the political dimension of speech, where the ability to wonder (in the interest of whom? against whom?) coexists with the confrontation, since dialog gives value to conflict and works to overcome it. In this sense, dialogue takes into account conflict as a legitimate formation and relies on it as a means of fully realizing genuine dialog. Conflict is the engine of history. The nature of society and knowledge, develop as a result of the unity and the challenge of opposing forces (Gadotti, 1994).

Moreover, societies and knowledge, in essence, advance as the result of the unity but also opposing forces. Dialog illuminates the contradictions and how they are surpassed, so that the subjects preserve their historical-social character, as there may be an interaction of the subject and collectivity. Dialog allows us to study reality critically and build authentic and interactive content of concepts and words. The ethos that dialog forms allows participants to understand and challenge forms and the kinds of power that selectively permeate the relations of reality (Gastaldo and Figueiredo - Cowen, 1995).

Dialog focuses each time on the placement of problems of reality, a description that differentiates liberating education: (i). from “domesticated/taming” pedagogy disclosed in strict “commands” or “directed dialog” adopting, hence, passive learning and the banking module of teaching (a pedagogy prompt to adopt the dominant sociopolitical arrangements), (ii). from the pedagogy of statement, which is associated with the logic of problem solving.

Students, through dialog, are encouraged to participate in the adventure of understanding the *raisons d’être* (reasons for the existence) of reality, to learn how not to accept the “obvious” of the “directives that lead to the one and only solution”. This is a process full of challenges, uncertainties and risks but also of substantial pleasures (mental, bio-psychic). The students, through the critical examination of issues close to their reality, along with the net of relations which constitute them, are pushed to discover themselves and their possibilities to change (either by restating their social and personal status in a meaningful way or through direct intervention and collective participation into acts that change social and personal reality) (Freire, 1977). It upon the network of relationships, which shape them, where the students themselves discover the possibilities of change and, thus, gaining completeness (either

by re-giving meaning to reality itself or through intervention and students’ active participation in a manner where the existential, the epistemological and the praxis elements converge in a meaningful reality. As the students become more aware of their dialectic unity as subjects, the imprint of their presence in the world turns out to be more distinctive and firm, signifying, thus, that their deliberation is bridged with the social transformation of the world as a dipole of thought and action (since meaningful reality is a reality where contradictions and relationships of power and dominance are immanent). From mere passive, enforcers of orders the students-“objects” are converted into “amenable” students-“subjects” that “become something more” to the extent that they recognize themselves in their relations with the world and within the world, as long as they intervene to change the order and content of those relations. Therefore, the students live not only for themselves but also for those who are in the same situation as them, recognizing in the others aspects of themselves. Dialog, becomes a platform for a moral act of humanization, a prerequisite to realize and apply a pedagogical context where each one is in the same predicament as the other with sincere sentiments of love, solidarity, faith, hope, humbleness and confidence (Freire, 1977, 2003). Through dialog the horizontal inter-subjective relationship that catalyzes the contradiction of hierarchal power relations (e.g. dominant/dominated, teacher/student, oppressor/oppressed, mental/manual work, theory/practice, truth/knowledge) is been rescued. It is the emergence and the pointing out of the link “together and with” the oppressed which is unveiled without repressing the oppressed autonomy. A case that is evident even when “radical pedagogues” obtain hegemony and work towards the liberation of the rejected while at the same time undermine the value of existence of the subjects, incubating fear of authority, orienting the subjects in autocracy espousing a kind of cynicism to employ “rigid pathways to change”. Through the acceptance of predetermined, indisputable, planned in advance amalgam of guidelines for common use simply rephrases the actual features of oppression. Thus, the subjects are without claims and responsibility of terms of constitution and expression of their existence. In the instances where violence is been manifested either as paternalism or as domination we encounter a historical period where people have been treated as uniform objects; knowledge and the comprehension of reality is been realized fragmentary and partial, downgrading thus the appointment of terms of existence and the potential of the subjects to live as a conscious entity. As Freire reminds us, leaders who do not act dialogically, but insist on imposing their decisions, do not organize the people--they manipulate them. They do not liberate, nor are they liberated: they oppress (Freire, 1977).

On the other hand, dialog in the pedagogy of liberation acquires collective/collaborative study patterns that strengthen fellow solidarity, so that the transformed object becomes an empowered subject. Hence, the student is capable of reviving its own intimidated Ego, so that the student obtains an awareness of the actual (educational, socio-economic, and political) which affects the shaping of the student’s character. Only where there is low self-esteem and a wounded Ego (self-confidence) value, recognition and trust that is missing can be retrieved and experience is present and actual to seize (Shor, 1985). The attentive subject, henceforth, mediates (together with other) for the exposure of reality and the refutation of its “fables”, in accord with the adequate practices that adhere a “non-objective” impression to identify and engage knowledge, a process which employs the subject to intervene into the social terrain (Freire, 1985a). Because, the relation between objective reality and subjectivity is dialectic, the detection of the first leads to

the detection of the self as a subject, which is “self-committed” in the process of its humanization and is reborn.

Here, as all are subject to “praxis, reflective and cognitive” activity (Roberts, 2009), man/woman at the level of intellect, passes from the glory into the realm of reason (logos) and from there to a critical awareness of experiential and physical function (the embodiment of the lived experience). The terminal stage of liberating education through dialog is the appropriation through the body, via the transformation of all those ideas and actions, that initially constituted a struggle in order to emancipate the subject, finally, echoes as a consciousness within the body (as an embodied practice and performance). Only then is the subject able to deny the negative behavior and the unpleasant feelings of dependency, such as domination/animosity towards their peers and companions (due to the “internalization of” the image/symbol of the authoritarian ruler), fear to be free, devaluation, indisposition, fatalism and self-consciousness as an object (Freire, 1977). Donald Macedo, wrote that one aspect of Freire’s contribution to radical pedagogy is that he shifted the point of analysis, i.e. from the subject of the oppression (the deprived populations, an analysis which often ends up blaming the victims of exploitation) to study and understand the object of oppression, a description that brings analysis of political positions and social responsibility to distinguish the oppressors and the oppressed in classed societies (Macedo, 1994). It’s only then where people leave behind the status of objects to assume the status of historical-Subject (Freire, 1977).

Consequently, dialog is an existential necessity for the subjects, both because it is through dialog that they acquire a deeper awareness of their situation, and is why dualism that exceeds internal experience as “subjugated” beings, that is the dilemma to be or not to be themselves. Through dialog, both student and teacher, stand across from the oppressive reality to consciously and critically realize it. At the same moment, “the magic or naïve understanding” of the existence of subjects subsides, as they learn to represent themselves as emancipated subjects (Freire, 1977, p. 95). As long as both (the student and the teacher) perceive and regard the nature and the social reality of historicity. That is to say the Subjects (students, teachers) adjacent to objective reality (nature and the social reality), with a respect for difference, transform the realm – a process that leads into their humanization - enhancing at the same time a philosophy of dialogue (Gadotti, 1996) that emancipates society as a whole.

As Donald Macedo wrote, Freire’s pedagogy, forces us to view “dialog as a form of social praxis so that the sharing of experience becomes known by reflection and political action”. Dialog may free our pedagogy from certainties and specialisms, or from the mechanization of intellectualism, but Freire’s interpretation call us to walk the critical road toward the new synthesis of our endangered dignity, toward the reclaiming of our humanity, hence viewing education as revolutionary projection into the future, a historical affair that has the subject as the departing point of history by objectifying the promise of human emancipation (Macedo, 1997, p. 8).

### **The education of love**

Dialog cannot exist, however, in the absence of a profound love for the world and its people.

(Paulo Freire, 1997, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*).

For liberating education, the capacity for dialog is primarily an intellectual attitude (a scholarly disposition) (Roberts, 2008), which however, may perish without the presence of love, so that the “teachers can find strength, faith and humility to establish solidarity and struggle together to transform oppressive ideologies and practices of public education” (Darder, 2002, pp. 91-92). At the core, dialog is nothing else but a relation of love that turns into a humanizing relationship, “when I do not love the world - when I do not love life - when I do not love people - I cannot start a dialog” (Freire, 1977, p 104). For Freire, education becomes an open space for dialog only with the love, since learning is constituted by the construction of knowledge that derives from the research of humanity along with the human race. Education is considered as a process which is supported by the loving relationship between the teacher and the student, through which they both acquire self-knowledge and recognition (Cho, 2005).

However, love, for Freire, obtains a “radical” significance, particularly in his last works, where the notion of love is a continuous topic of reference. Even if his work has been influenced in diverse ways by the Christian teaching, the issue of love is not limited within the norms of theology since for Freire even Christians ought to reject and discard exploitation. As Peter McLaren observes, “love, for Freire, always stipulates a political project, since the love for humankind that remains disconnected from liberating politics does a profound disservice to its object” (McLaren, 2000, p. 171). Moreover, Freire’s concept of love is not standardized or described with abstract and nonrepresentational psychologisms (Gadotti, 1994, Roberts, 2008). On the contrary, Freire re-orientates the meaning of the notion, aligning it with a revolutionary essence, conceiving love as an act of freedom that becomes the pretext for other actions that lead to emancipation, conveying passion and commitment.

I have the right to be angry and to express that anger, to hold it as my motivation to fight; just I have the right to love and to express my love for the world, to hold it as my motivation to fight, because while a historical being, I live history as time of possibility, not of predetermination. (...) My right, my justice is based on my disgust towards the denial of the right to “be more”, which is etched in the nature of human beings

(Freire, 2004, pp. 58-59).

Thus, “love” at first would echo its Christian deliverance (Freire, 1985, 1997), but, for Freire “love” transgresses the unilateral psycho-sentimental interpretations, e.g. referring to sensitivity, tenderness, concern, pleasure, patience or sympathy. Freire re-defines love again as a combative love “for those that are sure of the right and duty to fight, to denounce and announce” (Freire, 2009, p. 147). The ethics of love forms the active, spirited (but not aggressive) attitude of the radical teacher (Roberts, 2009). Love provides the cohesive tissue in the teacher’s utopia; an utopia which is not idealism from the moment that the denunciation of the de-humanizing structure and the announcement of the humanized structure is a historical commitment to participate in the social and political transformation of the real conditions (Freire, 1985 a). The notion of love springs from Freire’s deep faith in humanity, and this is the ability of humans to create with others (Myles and Freire, 1990), a world “in which it will be easier to love” (Freire, in Mayo, 2004, p. 4). The notion of love derives from the assessment of the Brazilian educator “to bring together” revolution and love, embraces the rationale of Che Guevara (Gadotti, 1994). The genuine rebel is



motivated by a strong emotion of love. It is impossible for anyone to imagine a genuine rebel, without such a capacity (Che Guevara, in Freire, 1977, p. 104).

Upon the notion of love, Freire puts together the dialectic relation between the sentimental and the intellectual universe of the human being, reversing technocratic rationalism which shatters into discrete pieces and “isolated” parts of the totality and consistency of the subjects’ action and degrades the presence of the student in the school into simple sets of abilities and skills. Freire notes that, “it is absurd to be at a distance within a strict deliberate act of knowing the world from the passionate ability to know. I personally, just do not love the world, but also the process itself of getting to know the world” (Freire, in Gadotti, 1994, p. 153).

Bearing the above in mind, Freire highlights the “equivalent” presence of various aspects of the phenomenon of learning: competencies / abilities / knowledge / perceptions / culture. The appeal of the dominant social hierarchies, which create an image of a “firm (immovable) reality, is necessary to contest it and re-define (give meaning again), since “the intellectuals should be aware that his critical ability is neither superior nor inferior to popular sentiment, one requires both, in order to understand reality” (Freire, in Gadotti, 1994, p. 60).

Also, love as a “way of intervention, of commitment and action for justice” (Fraser, 1997, p. 177) and serves the experiential body’s need for enjoyment. This becomes evident both from the physical practices of the passionate struggle for transformation, but also through intellectual(mental) function due to the passion of the human being to know and feel something that is his/her own (Freire, 1993). Thus, love reveals the importance of the body that has a conscience. Through his/her experiential experience the subject forms its consciousness, and is a key factor in the construction of knowledge, “there’s a lot of sensuality that the body keeps and makes explicit, which is even connected to the cognitive capacity” (Gadotti, 1994, pp. 152). The moment where the subject undertakes action and intervenes in order to convert reality within a body that “memorizes its struggle for freedom. The body, after all, desires, points, announces, protests, bends, stands up, draws, and remakes the world”. Accordingly, the plenitude that lends into the presence of bodily ordeal of the self “what I do makes my body” is necessary not simply because of the presence of the individual body, nor from the fact that the body is socially constructed (Gadotti, 1994). More specifically, within the school, the experience of the subject is constituted inter alia from the “recognized”/“standard” pedagogical practices and the preparation and the socialization of students in the passivity of body (Darder, 2002). For the radical teacher the adoption of a value-loving attitude allows him/her to know and understand the ways of expression and resistance of the students. But such a description of the teachers’ standpoint occurs in a common arena, that of the public school. It is in the schools where the students participate in an instructive process which the teacher loves and by the use of love his/her students progress (Freire, 1995).

### **Reflective post-notes...**

To summarize, in liberating education, there is no dichotomy between the emotion and the discovery of the cause being a fact. On the contrary, both are ceaselessly nullified at the level of the existential state being dominated. This presence of militant/ contested/ armed love and dialog is inseparable, as love would provide the setting and dialog would function as the director in a project to liberate man. Both

love and dialog work together in a school which is demanding, serious, and at the same time, happy (Freire, 2009). It is within the school, where the students take part in the adventure of the praxis of learning and “do not confuse this joy with the easy joy of doing nothing” (Gadotti, 1994, p. 156).

Freire’s tendency to elaborate on the problematization of his main work concepts (i.e. liberation, justice, action, awareness and so forth) may lead some to conclude that he “retreats into mystical abstraction” attaching hence importance to the discourse on the construction of the subject over the theoretical tools of the Philosophy of Praxis. But as Peter McLaren believes, the issues with Freire’s work cannot be set in abstraction from the significant historical contexts in which knowledge is produced, engaged, and appropriated (McLaren, 2000). Freire’s visions assert that those who hope, think, write and act in the realms of education, have a responsible political and ethical position as radical theorists who hope and struggle for every distinct individual and for humanity as a whole, everyday.

Can the notions of love and dialogue inspire educational theory nowadays towards a radical re-appreciation of education (its content-curriculum, the pedagogic relation, the ethico-political foundations, a theory of the subject)? What would be the fundamentals of such a problematic to be molded with a Marxist interpretation of education and society? Neoliberals advance an educational system to re-appropriate people’s last sac in the public sphere (i.e. unrestricted, free for all education access) where citizens become conscious of a collective life, sustaining freedom, social justice, democracy, solidarity, humanistic / polytechnic education and knowledge, dignity, hope, communal understanding. The responsibilities (intellectual and political) of the Left are none other than to recharge the old questions of social struggle in class societies with creative theoretical ramifications, and to engage in an agenda – not only with concrete political aims to overcome various forms of repression, indoctrination and idleness – but including the principles towards emancipation, personal political anti-capitalist action that contributes en route into our psyche, our emotions, our desires, our aesthetics, our utopias, our subjectivity, our optimism to oppose and resist the dominant categories of neoliberal capitalism.

### **Author Details**

**Anastassios Liambas** [[aliabas@eled.auth.gr](mailto:aliabas@eled.auth.gr)], is a Senior Lecturer at the Department of Primary Education, Aristotelion University of Thessaloniki, Greece. He has studied Pedagogy (B.Ed., Ph.D.) and published in edited volumes, periodicals and journals. His academic interests are in critical pedagogy, Freire’s pedagogy, curriculum, assessment, and cultural studies in education.

**Ioannis Kaskaris** [[ikskg@hotmail.com](mailto:ikskg@hotmail.com)], is a primary school teacher at the Greek public/state education, since 1992, and a researcher. He has studied Pedagogy (B.Ed., Dip.Ed., M.Ed.) and Sociology (M.Sc.). He is an author and co-author of papers in edited volumes and journals. His academic interests are in critical pedagogy, social & political theory in education.

## References

- Aronowitz, S. (1996). "Paulo Freire's radical democratic humanism". In Peter McLaren and Peter Leonard (eds.). *Paulo Freire. A Critical Encounter*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Grollios, G, Karantaidou, R., Korompokis, D. Kotinis, X. and Liambas, T. (2003). *Grammatismos kai Syniditopois [Literacy and Awareness. A Pedagogic Approach based on the Theory of Paulo Freire]*. Athens: Metechmio.
- Cho, D. (2005). "Lessons of love: Psychoanalysis and teacher - student love". *Educational Theory*, vol. 55, no. 1, p.p. 79-95.
- Darder, A. (2002). *Reinventing Paulo Freire. A Pedagogy of Love*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Freire, P. (1977). *I Agogi tou Katapiezomenou [The Education of the Oppressed]*. Athens: Rappas.
- Fraser, J. (1997). "Love and history in the work of Paulo Freire". In Paulo Freire, et al (eds.). *Mentoring the Mentor. A Critical Dialog with Paulo Freire*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Freire, P. (1985). *Politics of Education*. Los Angeles: University of California.
- Freire, P. (1985a). "Some observations with regard to the significance of "critical awareness" ". In *For a Liberating Education*. Athens: Kentro Meleton & Automorfosis.
- Freire, P. (1985b). "Education for consciousness" (extracts from an interview with Rex Davies, *Risk*, vol. 6, no 4, 1970). In *For a Liberating Education*. Athens: Kentro Meleton & Automorfosis.
- Freire, P. (1985c). "Invitation for critical awareness and de-education". In *For a Liberating Education*. Athens: Kentro Meleton & Automorfosis.
- Freire, P. (1985d). "The humanitarian education". In *For a Liberating Education*. Athens: Kentro Meleton & Automorfosis.
- Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the City*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1995) *Paulo Freire at the Institute*. London: Institute of Education, University of London.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of the Heart*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1998a). "Pedagogy of hope: Reliving pedagogy of the oppressed". In Ana Maria Araujo Freire & Donald Macedo (eds.). *The Paulo Freire Reader*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1999). "Education & Community Involvement". In Manuel Castells, et al. *Critical Education In The New Information Age*. Lanham: Rowman Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Freire, P. (2003). *Education for Critical Consciousness*. New York: Continuum.

- Freire, P. (2004). *Pedagogy of Indignation*. Boulder, Colorado: Paradigm Publishers.
- Freire, P. (2009). *Deka Epistoles [Ten Letters to Those that Dare to Teach]*. Thessaloniki: Epikenton Editions.
- Foucault, M. (2011). *Epilogi apo ta Dits et Écrits [Notes from Foucault's Dits et Écrits]*. Athens: Stigmi.
- Gadotti, M. (1994). *Reading Paulo Freire. His Life and Work*. Albany: State University New York Press.
- Gadotti, M. (1996). *Pedagogy of Praxis. A Dialectical Philosophy of Education*. Albany: State University New York Press
- Giroux, H. (2006). “Mouse Power: Public Pedagogy, Cultural Studies, and the challenge of Disney”. In Ribbins G. C. (ed.). *The Giroux Reader*. Boulder, Colorado: Paradigm Publishers.
- Glass, D.R. (2001). “On Paulo Freire's philosophy of praxis and the foundations of Liberation Education”. *Educational Researcher*, vol. 30, no 2, pp. 15-25.
- Kentro Meleton & Aftomorfosis [Centre of Studies & Lifelong Education] (ed.) (1985). *Gia Mia Apeleftherotiki Agogi [For a Liberating Education]*. Athens: Kentro Meleton & Aftomorfosis (KEMEA).
- Lankshear, C. (1993). “Functional literacy from a Freirean point of view”. In Peter Mc Laren & Peter Leonard (eds.) *Paulo Freire. A Critical Encounter*. London -New York: Routledge.
- Macedo, D. (1994). *Literacies of Power. What Americans are not Allowed to Know*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Macedo, D. (1997). “An Anti-Method pedagogy: A Freirian Pedagogy”. In Paulo Freire, et al (eds.). *Mentoring the Mentor. A Critical dialog with Paulo Freire*.
- McLaren, P. (2000). *Che Guevara, Paulo Freire, and the Pedagogy for Revolution*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Mayo, P. (2004). *Liberating praxis. Paulo Freire's Legacy for Radical Education and Politics*. London: Praeger.
- Milios, G. (1986). *Ekipedefsi kai Eksousia [Education and Power]*. Athens: Theoria.
- Myles, H. & Freire, P. (1990). *We make the road by walking*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Roberts, P. (2008). “Liberation, Oppression, and Education: Extending Freirean Ideas”. *Journal of Educational Thought*, vol. 42, no 1, pp. 83-97.
- Roberts, P. (2009). “Bridging east and west - or, a bridge too far? Paulo Freire and the Tao Te Ching” [www.hawai.edu/-pesaconf/zpdfs/17roberts.pdf](http://www.hawai.edu/-pesaconf/zpdfs/17roberts.pdf)
- Shor, I. (1985). “Theory of critical teaching”. In *For a Liberating Education*. Athens: Kentro Meleton & Automorfosis.