

# **Latin American Adult Education Movements: “Humanistic” Versus “Structural” Approach**

**Soonghee Han**

*Department of Education*

In the history of “old” popular education experiences, two contrasting streams of popular education tradition co-existed: The “Christian radicalism” from Methodism to Liberation Theology on the one hand and the “scientific Marxism” from Marxian manuscripts to the Nicaraguan Liberation Movement on the other: Interestingly, both streams have provided together a concrete foundation of the idea and ideology of popular education in the context of “old” social movements. In other words, the two approaches have been intertwined and have collaboratively challenged the brutal capitalist control and have material monopoly in modern history, urging the creation of a new community model where humanistic voices were to be heard.

The purpose of this article is two fold: First, I argue that the phenomenological difference in the two models of popular education, in fact, has to do with the two extremely different epistemological and philosophical backgrounds. Second, I argue in this article that the accommodation of “scientificity” or “structural orientation” of scientific Marxists into the former radical Christian’s popular education movements eventually made the movement reified, instrumentalized, and influenced to lose its popular ground. For this purpose, first, I examined the popular characteristics or potentials of the two popular philosophy. Second, I compared the two forms of the Latin American experiences, the Christian Base Community and Nicaraguan Literacy Campaign, as the concrete realization of the two social thoughts, and discuss the problems, issues, and implications.

In this article, I tried to reveal the paradox of the conflict in the realm of many historical moments, especially in the context of Latin American popular education movements since the 1930s. In most cases, unlike the theological approach which presupposed the metaphysical utopia and God’s presence, the socialist approach, although it shared many similar aspects with the theological one, clearly revealed the inheritance of the remnant of modernist epistemology. “New” popular education is now focusing on ecological context where the Marxist positivism—called realism—no longer emphasizes its “scientificity,” which had disabled people’s emotional and realistic suffering in the name of “scientific knowledge and rigorousness.”

**KEY WORDS :** popular education, old social movements, Latin American education, Christian racial education, Marxism,

## I. Introduction

Recently many vivid and lived experiences of popular education are revived in various regions of the world. A reasonable definition of popular education has been presented by Wanderley, a most well-known Latin American popular educator:

Popular education is education established by, for and with the popular classes of the people according to their class interests. By 'classes of people' I mean all those suffering directly from *capitalist exploitation* and expropriation processes [italics added] (Wanderley, 1983, p.106).

It is remarkable that the basic portraits of popular education movement have rapidly changed since the "new social movement" prevailed the radical activism. Accordingly, the research on popular education is becoming more and more concentrated on the new phenomena regarding ecological, gender, and consumer movements. An alternative definition was illustrated by the 1990s' North American Popular Educator, a recognized North American popular educators' coalition (Hurst, 1989), remarking:

Popular education is the empowerment of individuals through democratically structured cooperative study and action, directed toward via study and action, directed toward achieving more just and peace and peacefull societies within a life sustaining global environment.

Not many researches, however, have looked back on the past history that popular educators had stepped on. Furthermore, few articles have attempted to critically review the inner dynamics and ideological conflicts that appeared in the context of popular education in the "old social movements" period. This article is about the disappearing memories of "old popular education experiences" that carried extreme ideological conflicts inside.

In the history of Latin American “old” popular education experiences, two contrasting streams of popular education tradition co-existed: The “Christian radicalism” from Methodism to Liberation Theology on the one hand and the “scientific Marxism” from Marxian manuscripts to the Nicaraguan Liberation Movement on the other: Interestingly, both streams have provided together a concrete foundation of the idea and ideology of “old” popular education movements. In other words, the two approaches have been intertwined and have collaboratively challenged the brutal capitalist control and material monopoly in modern history, urging the creation of new community model where humanistic voices were to be heard.

However, it is very important to be reminded that the two streams of the thoughts, despite their superficial collaboration and producing allegedly an allied voice, still are based on the totally different epistemological and ontological grounds.<sup>1)</sup> In fact, while Christian workers applied popular education to realize the God’s vocation to the people’s everyday lives, socialist activists instead gave the immense effort to establish the equal and just society from the perspective of materialism.<sup>2)</sup> Furthermore, since the Marxist socialism proclaimed their scientificity and the significance of infrastructure, they inevitably revealed a structural orthodoxy that paradoxically repressed people’s self-directed readiness in producing their own meanings, values, and culture. The prototype of popular education emerged in the context of the theological ontology under the influence of Liberation Theology. The well-known Paulo Freire’s literacy experiment was also linked with the idea of the realization of God’s kingdom. His educational practice and method were presumed to maximize people’s voice and their world to be subjective based on the voluntary organization of “Christian Base Community.” This attempt, however, was overthrown later by the structural Marxists who stressed the scientificity of historical materialism, emphasizing structural readjustment, which forced the implementation a large and massive top-down training system as a basic model of popular education, for the reproduction of state-monopolized socialist ideology.

The purpose of this article is two fold: First, I argue that the phenomenological difference in the two models of popular

education in Latin America, in fact, has to do with the two extremely different epistemological and philosophical foundations. Second, I argue in this article that the "scientificity" or "structural orientation" of scientific Marxists eventually made the former radical Christian's popular education movements reified, instrumentalized, and influenced to lose its popular ground in this region. For this purpose, first, I examine the popular characteristics or potentials of the two popular philosophy. Second, I compare the two forms of the Latin American experiences, the Christian Base Community and Nicaraguan Literacy Campaign, as the concrete realization of the two social thoughts, and discuss the problems, issues, and implications.

## **II. Latin American Popular Movement: Background**

Latin American popular education was formulated in the background of tremendous political instability and militant oppression (Torres, 1993; Mackie, 1981). Recent conflict between the state and the popular classes revealed new extremes of repression, and until the late 1980s the mechanism of state apparatus mostly relied upon *repressive* and *mechanical* way of social control (Ellner and Carr, 1993, pp.1-2).

First of all, the distinction of political oppression in Latin America goes beyond the explanatory boundary which the concepts like neo-colonialism, or dependent world capitalism can provide.<sup>3)</sup> The origin of underdevelopment goes far back to the introduction of "slavery colonial mode of production," which prevailed in both North and South America until the eighteenth century.<sup>4)</sup> This led to two important consequences: 1) the brutalizing nature of slavery itself was maximized in the Americas, the slave being no more than an instrument, a human beast of burden meant only for physical toil; 2) conditions attending slavery in the Americas favored the emergence of racial prejudice and posed difficulties for the integration into colonial society of slaves and freemen (Soares, 1991).<sup>5)</sup> The societal existence of popular classes in Latin America resulted from the effect of those slaves who had been segregated by the profound prejudiced ethnicity and alienated from the ideological

symbolic production system which supported the material and social conditions of discrimination.

Second, as O'Donnell (1979) mentioned, Latin American countries, especially Brazil, were the societies whose social base is drawn from the upper fractions of a highly oligopolized and transnationalized bourgeoisie. Bureaucratic authoritarianism prevailed in this region and endeavored to depoliticize social issues by dealing with them in terms of the supposedly neutral and objective criteria of technical rationality. This mechanism successfully excluded the previously active popular sectors from both political and economic participations, and suppressed the institutions of popular democracy, and closed democratic channels of access to government.<sup>6)</sup>

Third, such an inflexible state control mechanism was to a large extent reinforced by international politics. Since the Cuban Revolution in 1959, the United States attempted to implant an anti-communist environment domestically as well as internationally (Wright, 1991). According to Touraine (1985), the rise of the new South American military regime was recognized as the expression of a new doctrine of national security system derived from the Cold War and the American foreign policy since the Cuban Revolution. After the Cuban Revolution, *Anti-Revolutionary Regimes*<sup>7)</sup> that were set and supported by the CIA contributed to retaining the spread of New Left Ideology, which resulted in unlimited repression, political brutality, and total ignorance of human rights.<sup>8)</sup> Military regimes aimed to "sanitize" not only Marxist-oriented revolutions but also every grassroots protest against the brutality of military regimes.

An apparent consequence was the distortion of democracy and political retention of basic human rights. When Brazilian armed forces overthrew President Joao Goulart in March 1964, the government was using a new term, "manipulated democracy," to describe and defend its increasingly profound reshaping of the political system and the economy. In Chile after Allende's socialist government stepped down, the military government sought to legitimate repression with the declared fiction of "internal war." Institutional innovations by the military junta also anticipated an effort to establish a new political system, later called, "authoritarian democracy" or "protected democracy." (Loveman, 1993, p.25).

Confronting the apparent distortions of political, economic, and cultural domains in people's life, popular movement was taking on the characteristics of civil movement in the contestation against overwhelming power of the political sector over the civil sector. In Latin America, liberation movements are usually called "popular movements", and it has inherited the tradition of APRA (Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana) of Peru, which was founded in 1924 in Mexico by the exiled Peruvian leader Victor Haya de la Torre. His program consisted of five points: (1) action against American imperialism; (2) the political unity of Latin America; (3) progressive nationalization of the land and industries; (4) internationalization of the Panama Canal; (5) solidarity with all the oppressed peoples (Comblin, 1979).

Since the political system has been stabilized through the Bonapartist corporatism in some countries, like Brazil, Chile, or Argentina, the state could absorb the significant amount of demands of Lefts and socialists within the official decision-making channels. In fact, although personalized with Peron or Vargas, the prolonged tradition of populism inculcated the political consciousness of people and neither state nor local elites ignored workers or peasants' presence. Political populism in Latin America was the evidence of the corporative alliance between popular sector and national bourgeoisie.

### **III. Popular Education as The Community-Based Popular Challenge**

According to Torres (1990), popular education in most of the Latin American countries refers to a form of nonformal education which is progressive and led by NGOs (non-governmental organizations).<sup>9)</sup> Also Magendzo (1990) pointed out that popular education was a community-based education movement led by NGOs, concerned with empowering poor people and involving them in the transformation of society. The nature of the regime, like Brazil before 1985 or Honduras, made it impossible to work through or within the government structure which has more resources than any individual non-governmental organization and thus the chance to make greater

national impact (Archer and Costello, 1990). Against the repressive political situation, popular protests in those regions have engaged in reform-oriented popular movements led by mostly Non-Governmental Organizations, especially those of Christian religious activists in Brazil, Chile, Argentina, Bolivia, etc.

There are some exceptional experiences, although not many, in which popular education programs were run with the cooperation of the state-sponsorship. In Ecuador, a new socio-democratic government opened up channels through which progressive groups could work using the structure of a government program to strengthen the popular movement.<sup>10)</sup> Also, in Chile of the 1960s, some progressive organizations used the government literacy program (co-ordinated by Paulo Freire) under the support of Allende's Popular Front and more radical social policies. Recently the political development and re-democratization helped to decrease the level of conflict between governments and the NGOs. With the victory of the opposition parties in some larger states of the federation, doors were opened for the realization of many popular education assets within the official system (Gerhardt, 1986, p.17).

As another type of relation to state institution, popular education has been committed by the socialist governments, like Nicaragua, Cuba, and Grenada, as the means of revolutionary change in education.<sup>11)</sup> The states represented the position of popular class, and tried to purge past capitalist/authoritarian remnants on behalf of popular classes. Schooling as well as nonformal education in those countries played as key agents for delivering popular education idea.

However, despite the visible successes, critiques about the experiments led by the state body were being piled up as much as the eulogies. State-driven popular education movements were evaluated as successful in a short term period. Nevertheless, in a long term period, state's domination over education, even if it was revolutionary, consequenced anti-popular characteristics (Arnove, 1986, p.1988). As Archer and Costello (1990, p.40) has mentioned:

Revolutionary education implies the constant transformation of reality. In Nicaragua, the Literacy Crusade

set this process in motion, empowering people to transcend the limitations of their past. However, the difficulties really begin once the oppressive regime is forgotten, when the reality to be transformed is the product of the revolutionary state itself. If education is to continue to be transformative, it must challenge reality. How, then, is it possible for a revolutionary state to design educational programmes which to be revolutionary must challenge that state? Either the state dictates the content of a revolutionary education and silences criticism as counter-revolutionary, in which case, the education system becomes as oppressive as its predecessor, or the state accepts the challenge and nurtures a continuing revolution in education, which might overthrow the very structures that made it possible.

The skepticism about the possibility of state-driven popular education was, in fact, the reflection of the ontological limitations of the state itself. Even the most democratic and open societies have, to some extent, the conflict between the state and civil society, and the participation of the people is somewhat restricted. Any state policy accompanies its discontent of popular sector, and is continuously challenged. Education which is institutionalized or run by the state is apt to socialize the people with the dominant ideology, and invents and develops the mechanism to expand its control over the civil society.

Civil society, therefore, needs to build up its own educational system. Or in fact, as Jarvis (1993, p.1) remarked, "Throughout much of its history, the education of adults has been located within civil society." Although in many countries in the twentieth century it has become a matter of state policy, the state has not automatically been supportive of adult education throughout the past few hundred years. To explain the state's gradual intervention into the realm of the civil society and the adult education enterprise is another story, and it goes beyond the scope of this chapter. What I can point out here is that the state's intervention into the civil society has inevitably resulted in the encroachment of the people's lifeworld by the systematic state control or the political instrumentalism. The popular education in Europe and North America was, in this respect, the

descendant of the civil tradition of adult education.

In case of the Third World countries where civil society was not well developed, popular sector stands for the realm of the people. In other words, the picture is shown as the harsh confrontation between the state as bureaucratic authoritarianism and the popular sector as the directly victimized by the exploitation, without any bumper zone. Simply, the popular education stands for the education of the popular sector. Although some socialist states provide education for the popular sector, the people are not the subject, but only mediated by the state for the interest of the people. Under the state-driven framework, education is controlled under the large bureaucracy of the state, and the people are still outside or indirectly represented by the core of the decision-making. In this sense, it is very skeptical to name the state-driven education, in spite of its revolutionary characteristics, as popular education.

#### **IV. "Christian Radicalism" and "Scientific Socialism": Two Poles in Latin American Popular Education**

In the context of old social movements, the distinction between the Christian workers, if radical, and the socialist activists is not so valid. Because, in many areas the theoretical and ideological companionships between radical Christians and Marxist socialists are neither any longer strange combination. The tradition of Christian social participation that merged with Marxist scientific socialism produced various versions of Christianity: Christian socialism (Cort, 1988), Christian democracy (Lynch, 1991), or other Third World Liberation theologies (Boff and Boff, 1987). The church's encounter with Marxism made it accepted the class analysis, the dominance of the economic factor, the necessity of violent revolution, the possibility of dictatorship of the proletariat, by casting aside the atheism and materialism of Marxism (Cort, 1988, p.311).

In fact, many cases of popular education experiences under the socialist's influence have been strongly initiated or induced by the Christian belief: Highlander Folk School in the United States, Antigonish Movement in Canada, Christian base community movements in the various Latin American countries,

or even the Literacy Crusade of post-transitory Nicaragua are cases. The companionship, shown above, tends to reveal how the two social thoughts were deeply amalgamated into today's North as well as Latin American popular education.

Firm grounds where Christians and socialists have met were in the critique to the problems of capitalist modern society and the critique to the modernizing developmentalism. Popular education, from their common point of view, should have been a distinctively dedicated educational form and content to overcome the restrictions of the capitalist modern ideology and political economic problems as well as its attached educational limitations. Popular education, instead, was to be other alternative solutions against the problematic which Western capitalism has resulted, especially emphasizing the revitalization of the generative function of the people's educative participation, communication among each other, and the democratization (Berryman, 1987).

Paradoxically, the epistemological foundations of both Christianity and Marxism seem, by nature, to contradict with what popular education should have been. Because, by defining popular education from the perspective of people's generative knowledge and its legitimization, neither Christianity nor Marxism acknowledged the value or capability of people's potential to raise their own voices for themselves. Instead, both thinkings resumed knowledge as the absolute objectivity which ought to be pre-determined and provided from any certain dedicated class of people, like God's agents or the chosen intellectuals. For example, Christianity, although radical, presupposed God's preset vocation under which people are each to conduct their callings. The symbol of liberation is to come from heaven as a part of God's plan. Also, Marxism alleges that the epistemological foundation of truth is supposed to come from the materialistic and mechanical dynamics of infrastructure outside the people's everyday perception. In this respect, Christian radicalism and Marxism, taking a same danger of indoctrination over the people, seem to be inadequate to accommodate "popular" approach.

Nevertheless, there were some variations between them. To the Christian workers, the basic concern was human-beings and their way of living, so that christian workers tried to revitalize

the people according to God's vocation; while to the Marxist activists, the fundamental concern was to change the social structure and system in that people were regarded as the constituents of the system. These differences in basic perceptions resulted in two different attitudes or approaches in adopting educational projects. The Christian radicals tried to accommodate education within the "study circle," on the level of small-scale and local community movement. "Basic Christian Community movement" itself was educational movement, in which learning the Bible was not detached from discussing, discovering, and solving their problems. In other words, education was treated as a part of life.

In contrast, most of the scientific socialism movement tried to use education as a mass productive knowledge factory, through which so-called "new mankind" were to be trained and recruited into the guerrilla camp. As a result, education failed to be assimilated into the community network, remained as "school" solely for learning as an instrument to achieve something "external." Although the fundamental target should have been the critique of epistemological background of modernity, or so-called, "one-truth epistemology" of the modern capitalism, socialist activists were still prisoned within the limitations of economic determinism and political instrumentalism to education. With the influence of Marxist social movements, educational process was dealt with merely a political economic instrument for delivering "scientific knowledge" to the people, lacking the function of generating people's knowledge from their own lifeworld problems. As Pusey (1987, p.105) mentioned, Marxists still remained, if not all, in the 'one-sided' explanations that reduce social phenomena to the base to social structural and systems imperatives alone, and to the 'externalist perspective'. Considering Habermas's argument about the "colonization of the lifeworld" by the system, Marxist movements only dealt with the realm of the system, and failed to cope with the phenomenon of the colonized lifeworld of the people.

## **V. Humanistic Approach: Christian Base Community Movement**

### *A. Christian Radicalism*

Christianity is not so far from popular epistemology. The authentic tradition of Christianity follows the line of popular theology which has challenged the established set of orthodoxy. In the Old Testament, "Yahweh" was described as the opposite power against the materialist god, Baal, by delivering the Hebrew — the underclass, described as 'people of the earth' — from total oppression. The existence of Jesus Christ always accompanied the oppressed and the poor, and stood for the opposite of the established power of Pharisee. Paul, the Apostle was the one who was forbidden to preach in the temple, and preached in the yards and mountains. Martin Luther's Reformation was the first attempt to let the common people access directly God's Word, and his translation of the Bible from the Latin to the secular language was to open the direct relationship between God and the people.

The popular sector has been a site for the ceaseless concerns of the Christian workers, and the biblical importance of the popular was re-discovered by the emergence of the new radical theological trends. These historical trends go back to the eighteenth century Britain where religious and philanthropic bodies were almost the only source that provided educational opportunities to the poor. Methodism, especially, had a profound influence on the social and educational life of the uprooted people. A first attempt at that time was the activities of religious societies under the aegis of Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK) who began to tackle the education of the adult illiterate.

The religious revolt of Methodism and the emotional appeal of lay preachers made a dramatic impact on the working classes (Devereux, 1982, p.2). Kelly, in his *History of Adult Education in Great Britain*, pointed to the significance of adult education in the success of Methodism:

first and foremost because of the great moral reformation which it brought about in those who came under its influence ... it is certain that thousands of working men and women, who, because of the poverty and hopelessness of their situation, had become idle, drunken, and dissolute, were given new hope and put on the way to being honest, sober, and industrious citizens<sup>12)</sup> (Kelly, 1992).

The structure of the Methodist Societies themselves, according to Kelly (1992), took on clear popular characteristic, such as people's small-class-centeredness and their self-governance in learning. Kelly (1992) described:

the lowest unit in the organization was the class meeting, which incidentally provided a model for later forms of working class political organization. The weekly meeting for mutual examination and encouragement in the faith was a great training ground in the arts of democracy. Even the humblest and most illiterate might aspire to the position of class leader, and many a working man rose from class leader to local preacher, from local preacher to itinerant minister.

Also, Methodism directly responded to the great social and economic change following the increased industrialization and growth of factories by developing various educational movements, including the Sunday School Movement and Sunday Adult Schools. In this sense, according to Peers (1972, p.5), "While the emphasis of Methodism was upon the renewal of faith, its by-product was a growing concern for education." Their ultimate goal of mission was at least moving together with the "teaching and learning" about the Kingdom of Heaven.

The tradition of church's social participation ended up with the corroboration with socialist idea. Since Emmanuel Mounier stimulated or provoked Catholics in Europe into taking a new look at socialism, there have been significant encounters between Christian thoughts and Marxist ideology.<sup>13)</sup> The encounter produced Christian Socialism (Cort, 1988) or Christian Democracy (Lynch, 1991), or in specific, Liberation Theology in Latin America, African and Asian versions of Liberation Theology, Feminist Theology, or Black Theology

(Berryman, 1987, p.6).

In Liberation Theology, the poor were comprehended as the biblical subject with which the Bible as a whole was re-interpreted as the story of the poor and their deliverance, or liberation. As Berryman (1987, p.6) indicated, Liberation Theology was “the recovery of a prophetic tradition present in the Bible itself,” because it was the revitalization of the tradition of the poor as the biblical subject and the God’s Covenant to liberate them. In the Liberation Theology, the goal of Christian belief and education was “liberation” that meant “free action”<sup>14)</sup> of the people. In the Liberation Theology, the people or popular classes are defined as follows (Boff and Boff, 1987, p.3):

... the popular classes, which is a much wider category than the proletariat singled out by Karl Marx; the workers exploited by the capitalist system; the underemployed, those pushed aside by the production process; the laborers of the countryside, and the migrant workers with only seasonal work.

### *B. Christian Base Community*

A new theology took a new pastoral system, known as “Christian Base Community (CEB, abbreviated in Spanish initials),” which had tremendous influence on the establishment of the mode of popular education. The Christian Base Communities arose out of a critical awareness of the inadequacy of existing pastoral models and the results of some earlier pastoral efforts based on small groups (Berryman, 1987, p.68). The word “base” was usually understood to mean the “bottom” of society, that is, the poor majority.

Such communities have been organized either in rural areas or in the shantytowns surrounding large cities. The more personalized and small-scale unit of worship created a different manner of learning Bible, giving profound insight to invent new forms of education. It was more personal and collective. Many started with group dynamics and dialogue courses, or “Bible circles.” Church workers were involved more directly in the issues of peasants’ rights and ways of organizing themselves. In short, the process of education in this kind of organization produced a new way of grassroots learning programs and

methodologies. In other words, popular education in this region, including Paulo Freire's literacy experiment, was closely linked to the new theological approach toward social transformation. Education, which was committed by Christian workers, was linked to the realization of God's kingdom, evangelism to enhance religious belief, implementation of the methodology of "small and interactive unit" of educational interaction, and emphasis on the cultural revitalization rather than political economic restructuring.

CEB was one progressive evangelical unit and the base of Latin American popular movement, especially of the religious workers. Christian community activists in the region have accepted the idea of Freire and accommodated it into the new evangelical structure (Berryman, 1987). This form of community-based organization produced a distinct pedagogical theory and practice of popular education in many dependent capitalist countries like Brazil, Chile, Peru, and elsewhere as a part of the whole "popular protest" or "popular mobilization." Levine (1993b, p.174-5) summarized a few points upon which most recent accounts on Base Communities agree. First, CEBs began springing up throughout Latin America in the mid-1960s, with rapid expansion starting a decade later. Groups are small, gathering fifteen to twenty-five members on a regular basis (weekly or biweekly). They are composed mostly of poor people; peasants, rural wage workers, and urban slum and squatter settlement dwellers. The everyday life of the groups turns on reading and discussion of the Bible, prayer, reflection on common needs, and some cooperative action. Unlike the conventional parish, CEBs work with and reinforce existing friendships and community ties, putting religion in a familiar and accessible context.

CEBs emerged earlier in Brazil than elsewhere in Latin America (Levine and Mainwaring, 1989, p.214). The first ones in Brazil sprang up in the period immediately before the 1964 military coup when Paulo Freire had just begun his literacy projects. From this time on, the Brazilian church has served as a model for Catholic progressives throughout Latin America. The Brazilian church has been the continental leader in grassroots innovations, among which the CEBs are the most outstanding. The social and political impact of base communities may be

viewed in terms of (1) initial consciousness-raising, (2) their vision of life and motivation of involvement, (3) the sense of community and mutual aid and support they generate, (4) the experience of grassroots democracy, (5) the direct actions they engage in, and (6) their direct political effects (Berryman, 1987, p.73).

It is noteworthy that, from the structural point of view, CEB was a consequence of abandoning the previous large parish system which was bureaucratic and authoritarian over the poor. By the end of the 1960s, the base community model had gained wide acceptance, even though many clergy resisted. At Medellin, the bishops stated that the church should become present in *small local communities*, forming a core community of faith, hope, and charity. They saw the base community as the "initial cell" for building the church and the "focal point for evangelization." They also saw that it could make an important contribution to development efforts. CELAM (Latin American Bishop's Conference) training institutes in Chile, Colombia, and Ecuador spread the idea and methodology of base communities (Berryman, 1987, p.67). CEB as the new 'learning structure' was the actual condition with which Freire's consciousness-raising and Liberation Theology merged. As church people became aware of the method and spirit of conscientization, it was adapted as the major strategy in their evangelical tasks (Berryman, 1987; Torres and Eagleson, 1982). Medellin documents<sup>15)</sup> which used the term conscientization and related ideas were "especially Freirean in spirit (Berryman, 1987, p.37)." Wanderley (1983) once mentioned:

The grassroots church communities are one of the pillars of the popular education movement in Brazil. For these Christian communities, which have grown up among rural and urban marginal groups during the last ten years, their Christian faith is firmly linked to liberation theology. The word "base" is usually understood to mean the "bottom" of society, that is, the poor majority. Base communities have not taken root in the middle-and upper-class.

In his book *Liberation Theology*, Phillip Berryman (1987) vividly depicted how religious workers adapted Freire's idea and

incorporated it into the actual situation. According to him, (1) religious workers kept distance from political Marxist activists who usually preferred the "top-down" model in the relationship with the poor in order to accomplish their political agenda in vanguardism; and (2) religious workers tried best not to dump their elitist perceptions and relationship on the people, by employing the Freirean model.

Christian Base Community activists crystallized their goal as "consciousness-raising evangelization." According to Berryman, just as Freirean consciousness-raising was not regarded as a process by which a teacher who knows imparts knowledge to an "ignorant" learner but rather as one by which both seek to understand the world together, in this kind of evangelization it often turned out that the representatives of the church, despite their superior knowledge of the Scriptures, found that they were being evangelized by the poor, whose insight into life and suffering, and into the biblical text, may be very deep (p.41).

It was interesting that the CEBs have always stressed the importance of self-learning (Wanderley, 1983). At the first level, many communities desired literacy. At a second level, they felt the need for the study of a reality they experience but, in general, failed to understand. Starting from knowing laws and regulations, it went to "scientific analysis of reality." Those learning procedures were accomplished through varieties of methodologies and many group dynamics' techniques; the panels, and socio-dramas, activities in the areas of audiovisuals, theater, cinematography, all of which helped to generate an intensive participation, dialogue, debate, and mutual enlightenment. (Wanderley, 1983, p.114).

## **VI. Structural Approach: Scientific Marxism in Popular Education**

### *A. Scientific Socialism*

Socialism is probably the most important social thought that has affected the construction of popular education idea. On the one hand, a series of successful stories of the nationwide literacy campaigns held in several "transition states," like China, Cuba, Tanzania, or Nicaragua, gives us the abundant empirical clue for

convincing the keen relationship between popular education and socialist (Marxist) ideology as one of its major background ideas (Miller, 1985; Nyerere, 1974; Carnoy and Samoff, 1990). Paulo Freire himself, at the time when *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* was published, was a sort of Marxist, too:

I must say that I was, at that time, mostly influenced by Marxist analysis, particularly the analysis of class. When I wrote *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, I was so influenced by Marx's class analysis, and given the incredibly cruel class oppression that characterized my developing years in Northeast Brazil, my major preoccupation was, therefore, class oppression. It is ironic that some Marxists even criticised me for not paying enough attention to social class analysis (Conversation with Macedo, in McLaren and Leonard, 1993, p.172)

During the last few decades popular education has been identified with socialist education or "communist subversion"<sup>16)</sup> because its major ideology was against capitalism and its equivalent thinking (Torres, 1993). However, the dissonance between popular education and socialism was as large as the amount of their cooperative relations. Although popular education owes much to socialism and to socialist activists significantly, not all branches of socialism corresponded positively with the popular education idea. In sum, socialism itself was quite a diverse notion, and not all the socialist approach have supported the main ideas of popular education. In consideration of the logical conditions for the establishment of popular education as idealtype, especially Leninist strand of Marxism or militant guerrilla warfare strategy had many intrinsic problems in supporting the basic notions of popular education.

According to Cort (1988) there are two ends of socialism in its continuum, and to acknowledge the difference is very important to properly understand the epistemological basis of popular education: At one end of the spectrum are the Leninists, or *Soviet Marxism* according to Marcuse's terminology, those who tend to favor violent revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and almost total nationalization of property as

necessary tools for the construction of a socialist society. At the other end of the spectrum are Marxists like Michael Harrington or Rosa Luxemburg, who deny that there can be any socialism without democracy. They insist that "democracy is the only political means to achieve the economic and social power of the people, and oppose any bureaucratic and dictatorial state ownership (p.4)."<sup>17)</sup> I would like to simply call the two types of socialism respectively "Leninist Marxism" and "Democratic Socialism."

First of all, to Lenin, education should have been elite-oriented, and he emphasized the role of intelligentsia in delivering "the reality" to the "absurd" populace. The Russian revolutionary movement was, in the beginning, based almost exclusively on the intelligentsia (Linden, 1993, p.33), and Lenin was one of them who maintained the specific interpretation of Marxism which was derived basically from Plekhanov (p.34). Plekhanov had a profound distrust of the potential of popular classes, and believed that "a proletarian class consciousness could not be born at grassroots level in the factories but could be brought in only from the outside, through *education* (p.34)." Unfortunately Lenin shared the same mistake with Plekhanov, so that Lenin's original view on the popular consciousness, in the Russian Revolution, was narrow and mechanical. Also, his appraisal of popular culture was not so trustworthy (Bottomore, 1983). Linden (1993, pp.35-6) pointed out,

Because the socialist revolution was a purely political and juridical question for Lenin, he saw no possibility for the working class to gain political insights into society from the sphere of production; this was why scientific socialism had to be brought in from the outside by revolutionary intellectuals ... According to Lenin, since there can be no talk of an independent ideology formulated by the working masses themselves in the process of their movement, the only choice is either bourgeois or socialist [supplied by the intellectuals] ideology. The special task of the socialist intelligentsia would be to reverse the influence of bourgeois ideology. If the revolutionaries leave the propaganda to the bourgeoisie, then this will lead to a subordination to bourgeois ideology of the working class.

The second dissonance between the thinking of Leninist Marxists and that of popular educators was about the relation between *educational movement* and *political movement* within the total dynamics of socialist movement. This aspect was first exemplified in the conflict between Communist Party activists and the Labor College movement activists in the 1920s' England (Simon, 1990; Millar, 1979).<sup>18)</sup>

The conflict between the attempt of political organizations to rule over educational institutions and the advocacy of independence of educational institutions was found in the major sites of contemporary popular education movements. This conflict originated from the misconception of historical materialism that was interpreted as economic determinism. Because of this fallacy, education was treated merely as "dependent" realm of activism — a superstructural domain that should be passive according to the change of infrastructure.

In the late 1950s and early 1960s, Cultural Marxism took off, and this current of Marxist discourse contributed to minimizing much of the dogmatic authoritarianism or absolutism in the conceptualization of Marxist-socialism. At this moment, basic conceptions of socialism moved its theoretical ground to a more culture-oriented way of thinking. This new trend accompanied (or legitimated itself with) Thompson's eminent assertion:

By class I understand a historical phenomenon, unifying a number of disparate and seemingly unconnected events, both in the raw material of experience and in consciousness. I emphasize that it is a historical phenomenon. I do not see class as a "structure," nor even as a "category" but as something which in fact happens (and can be shown to have happened) in human relationships (1963, p.9).

Disenchanted with Leninist socialism, or "socialism of the heavy industrial base," some of Marxist thinkers like Thompson, Miliband, Raymond Williams, Habermas, Offe, or Apel moved away from the idea of determination by the economic structure and turned their interests to the *theories of language and culture*. They came to treat the nation-state and ideology as the main determining forces of domination. As Weiner (1981, p.19)

mentioned, "The focus turned to value, beliefs, attitudes, role expectancies, and political interactions, and so forth." Also, the other possibility — education would be the independent variable in transforming the infrastructure — became seriously examined and discussed by some Marxists themselves.

By encountering this new interpretation, the existence of education within this ideological framework came to experience a crucial turning point. Eventually education became respected as an independent sphere of social movement. The culture-oriented Marxist approach came to understand the "consciousness" as being shaped by political factors as well as by the socio-economic context. Cultural domain was no longer discerned as false-consciousness.<sup>20)</sup> The ideological<sup>21)</sup> dimension instead was more recognized as having relative autonomy compared to material production realm. This new stream has set free the idea of popular education from the shackles of rigorous class conception and underlined elite-superiority as the surrounding climate where popular education was located. First, the concept of popular classes, for example, as the major recipient of popular education, became broader and came to include more the socially and historically oppressed people in the realm of popular education discourse. Second, cultural consciousness or events, as much as socio-economic environments, were recognized in the making of social transformation, in which the role of education was highlighted again.<sup>22)</sup>

Among the Western Marxists mentioned, Gramsci is the most popularly cited scholar in the realm of popular education theory in today's Western Hemisphere (LaBelle, 1987; Torres, 1993; Mackie, 1981). The notion of "the popular" in Gramsci was conceptually linked with his notion of "hegemony," and his conceptualization provided the theoretical foundation for a contemporary analysis of "the popular" (Stout, 1992). To him, hegemony was the organizing principle of state and bourgeois control and was internalized by the masses as "common sense." Gramsci asserted that organic intellectuals should represent and embody the *counter-hegemonic movement*, and articulate the collective consciousness of the popular. Gramsci thus viewed the education of popular classes as an intellectual as well as a practical process, leading to a crisis of ideological hegemony

characterized by organized, long-term resistance and competition between the dominant and subaltern strata (Stout, 1992, p.54). Among the Third World Marxists, political activists in the region like Fidel Castro or Ernesto 'Che' Guevara worked significantly as the new socialist and progressive thinkers in the formation of popular education idea.<sup>23)</sup> Julius Nyerere in Tanzania also provided fundamental influence in the making of a popular perspective in relation to the construction of socialism in Africa.

#### *B. Nicaraguan Popular Education: A Fallacy*

Carnoy once asserted that the accomplishment of socialist revolution cannot naturally ripen, but is what can be obtained by cultural as well as economic struggle. Martin Carnoy (1990, p.15) has noted earlier that;

capitalist structures could mature within a precapitalist society but anticapitalist structures have not matured within a capitalist state. Marx's well-known prediction of the road of structural transition in which capitalist fundamental contradictions alone would result in the emergence of socialism seems no longer valid.

Indeed the transition, or at least any attempt to transit to socialism, is a matter beyond mechanical economic determinism. Rather it is a matter of ideological formation and political struggle. The link between popular education and socialism movements has been meaningful in this respect. The socialist political agenda delivered the portraits of popular education depicted mostly with its political and ideological action to produce and disseminate the socialist beliefs.

Nicaragua in the 1980s amalgamated popular education into the political experiment with Marxist ideology. During the period of socialist revolution, the New Sandinista government encouraged the population to actively participate in shaping a massive literacy crusade drawing on 100,000 volunteers who taught 400,000 people how to read and write. It succeeded in reducing the rate of illiteracy from 51% to 12% in six months. In recognition, Nicaragua was awarded the UNESCO Literacy Prize (Arnove, 1986; Miller, 1985).<sup>24)</sup> By the FSLN's triumph in July

1979, the Sandinista government articulated broad educational goals, and accordingly launched a national literacy campaign on March 23, 1980. Literally, popular education aimed to "transform the political culture of the country, and to inculcate a new set of values based on more egalitarian social relations, cooperative forms of labor, workers' participation in decision-making, a sense of sacrifice for others, and international solidarity with the struggles of peoples in other countries for self-determination and justice (Arnove, 1986, p.18)."

To understand FSLN's basic direction in education, it is necessary to examine the overall tendency of Marxism in Latin American far-Lefts.

First, the influence of Marxist-Leninist strand to the Latin American political socialism movement made the Freirean "soft" idea difficult to realize its full potential. Within the environment of socialism movements, not only revolutionary guerrilla movements, but also Christian socialism, were too unyielding to embrace the assumed open communication and true dialogue mode of education that Freire had dreamed. This phenomenon was what Freire has been anxious about when he filled one of four his chapters of *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed* with warnings and admonitions to the sectarian revolutionary's monologue.

Second, the basic tendency in the revolutionary socialist leaders in Latin America strongly took on the characteristics of Soviet Marxism. The only "elected" Marxist president, Allende in Chile also purported Leninist theoretical tendency. Compared with Afro-Marxism which was reported to have much less theoretical sophistication and clearness (Keller, 1987), Latin America had a relatively strong tradition in theoretical construction. Fidel Castro, Che Guevara, or Augusto Cesar Sandino, the best-known revolutionary leaders in this region were all alleged to be hard-core Marxist-Leninists despite the slight differences in their personal tastes.

Third, practical situations were far from what the theoretically rigorous Marxism implied. After the success of revolution, the implication of "scientific socialism" seemed not to work properly. While the top theoretical leaders in their movements were equipped with the theory, the general population rarely seemed to be armed with theoretical Marxism, and this was the common

phenomenon all around the Third World socialist countries. In Latin America, the solid background of Catholicism reduced the strictness of Leninist vanguardism, and the African or Asian Marxism embraced traditionalism or religious collectivism.

In this vein, the gap between the vision that the political leaders saw theoretically and the far-away practical condition, threatened the patience of the leaders. Inevitably, the "scientific socialism" came to produce the misuse and abuse of educational activities in the name of popular education, and gave little legitimate space for the independent growth of the Freirean conception of dialogical social transformation, or according to Arnove (1991), scientific socialism was a "massive effort at indoctrination." Archer and Costello (1990) described how Nicaraguan popular education mobilized the people involuntarily.

There was pressure on people to be involved to participate in everything, but many were reluctant. In popular education, students were in one pre-fabricated wooden house with a muddy floor. There would be four or five classes going on in one room with up to 500 students. Political jargon of the generative words and sentences was unacceptable to most learners. The workbooks were no longer starting points for self-discovery and collective understanding. They were the keys to certificates and qualifications.

The most significant fallacy of the Sandinista government was the attempt to provide popular education as the substitution of school, with less quality and financial expense. In fact, the Literacy Crusade or Popular Basic Education that followed could not be a comprehensive alternative to the schools. In principle, popular education was to be anti-school. Schools were associated with Somoza and the capitalist order. However, popular education was simply a poor substitute for real education, and "inferior in quality, a second-class education with amateur teachers (Archer and Costello, 1990, p.44)."

After the six month's National Literacy Crusade project, the Nicaraguan government launched the follow-up program of Popular Basic Education (*EducaciÛn Popular Básica, EPB*) which began in October 1980 under the auspices of the newly created

Vice-Ministry of Adult Education. Archer and Costello (1990) and Arnone and Dewees (1991) clearly illustrated their serious problems in both Literacy Crusade and EPB, both of which were directly linked to the distortion of the essence of popular education idea.

First, many of the younger students viewed EPB as a stepping stone to further formal education and certification. This system gradually began to resemble traditional schooling, namely, a bureaucratic, centralized, credentialing system not closely tied to local circumstances and learner needs<sup>25)</sup> (Arnone and Dewees, 1991).

Second, the role of the vanguard political party was emphasized too much in defining the meaning of popular empowerment. For example, the term "participation" was defined as the exercise of popular power *under the guidance of their vanguard*. The mass organizations, which were to be the mechanisms for mobilizing the population around the tasks of the revolution, were, in many instances, little more than forums for transmitting the political line being propounded by the FSLN at any given moment.

In sum, Marxists failed to incorporate education into the people and their lives as a form of living. The learning and living failed to accommodate each other, and popular education remained as a level of "institution" which is separated from the people's everyday lives. Education was recognized as an instrument to acquire some knowledge, skill, and value which were imposed from the outside of the peoples lives. Popular education was perceived a sort of bridge which delivered pre-determined knowledge to the people.

## **VII. Conclusion**

In this article, I have argued that the Christian radicalism tried to accommodate education within the community network as a learning organization on the level of small-scale and local community movement. "Basic Christian Community movement" itself was a learning community in which learning was not detached from discussing, discovering, and solving their lifeworld problems. In contrast, the scientific socialism

movements tried to use education as a mass productive knowledge factory through which so-called “new mankind” were to be trained by top-down method. In this relationship, education failed to be assimilated into the community issues, remaining as a isolated “school” which solely existed for learning as instrument to achieve something external—reading and writing, political ideology, or diploma.

This phenomenon seemed to reflect the paradox of the conflict between theological approach and socialist material approach in the realm of popular education in many historical moments: in eighteenth century England, Methodist movement vs. socialist working class education movement; Liberation Theology vs. socialist guerrilla warfare movement. In most cases, unlike the theological approach which presupposed the metaphysical utopia and God’s presence, the socialist approach, although it shared many similar aspects with the theological one, inherited the remnant of modernist epistemology — positivism called as realism, the emphasis on scientificity, which disabled people’s emotional and realistic suffering in the name of “scientific knowledge and rigorousness.”

## **Footnotes**

- 1). In fact, while Christian workers applied popular education to realize the God’s vocation to the people’s everyday lives, socialist activists instead gave the immense effort to establish the equal and just society from the perspective of materialism. Furthermore, since the Marxist socialism proclaimed their scientificity and the significance of infrastructure, they inevitably revealed a structural orthodoxy that paradoxically repressed people’s self-directed readiness in producing their own meanings, values, and culture.
- 2) Despite the different epistemological foundations in their approaches, they have encountered in the several sphere: they were both utopianists who did not negotiate the prevalent problems, and attempted to establish their ideal goals; in a broad sense, they criticized the problem of capitalism and social alienation; they concerned about the inequality and injustice in society; they believed in the power of education in the transformation of the given social structure.
- 3) This dependent system has been maintained by various superstructural reinforcements, one of which was the Cold-War ideological confrontation which was invented for support of the maintenance of United States’ international hegemony and neo-colonial cultural domination of the West accelerated the legitimacy of international intervention into this region (Wright, 1991; Carnoy and Samoff, 1990).
- 4) According to Cardoso (Quoted in Soares, 1991), the backwardness of Latin

American political economy was the dependence originated from "(1) mode of production based on the exploitation of Indian labor, established in the central region of pre-Columbian America...; (2) the colonial slave mode of production introduced in regions characterized, on the one hand, by a sparse indigenous population at the time the Europeans arrived, and on the other, by conditions propitious to exporting activities based on plantations producing tropical products or on the exploiting of precious metals...; and (3) in North America an autonomous and diversified economy made up of small proprietors, the only one among the colonial structures able to evolve toward industrialization and a capitalism of the 'metropolitan', not peripheral type."

- 5) In the mode of slaveholding, unlike the pattern of classical slaveholding, in which slaves were brought a few at a time from societies that had the same level of development as that of the masters, in Latin America, the practice meant the sudden and brutal impressment, continuously repeated from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries, of significant contingents from populations at a lower level of development than those of Europe and belonging to different "races".
- 6) It corresponds to and promotes an increasing transnationalization of the structure of production, and its institution comprise organizations in which specialists in coercion as well as those whose aim it is to achieve the normalization of the economy have a decisive weight. Consequently, it endeavors to depoliticize social issues by dealing with them in terms of the supposedly neutral and objective criteria of technical rationality. Finally, it excludes the previously active popular sectors from both political and economic participation, and suppresses the institutions of popular democracy, and closes democratic channels of access to government (O'Donnell, 1979).
- 7) The new-style military regimes generated many descriptive terms. Scholars have attempted to apply various theoretical schemes, including fascism, corporatism, new authoritarianism, bureaucratic-authoritarianism, the national security state, and the antipolitical regime. See Wright (1991).
- 8) A far greater potential threat was the spread of Cuban-style revolution throughout Latin America. While the United States could survive the economic and strategic loss of a single island, it feared the exportation of the Cuban model of revolution to other countries. For example, following the overthrow of the Goulart government in 1964, Brazil, the primary purpose of the new military government was to make Brazil immune to revolution, and its main instruments were economic development and political purification. In 1966 the Argentine military established a forerunner of a state with the same mission, which would appear in definitive form in 1976. In Chile and Uruguay, the countries with Latin America's strongest constitutionalist traditions, the armed forces seized power in 1973 to erect states similar to the Brazilian. With the 1976 coup in Argentina, over two-thirds of South America's population found itself living under extremely repressive military regimes just 15 years after John J. Kennedy's prediction of the demise of the "strong man" in Latin America" In short, as Wright (1991) argues, "the Brazilian, Uruguayan, Chilean, and Argentine military regimes were originated in major political crises that appeared to *presage Marxist revolution*".
- 9) Basically, governments of those countries have usually taken the form of authoritative militant dictatorship, and the antagonistic relationship between government and popular sector evoked popular education to have direct relationship with the anti-governmental challenge for social transformation

- by the socially subordinated people themselves. With this process, populist trend in education have provoked the grassroots to have critical consciousness by which the ordinary people engage in self-transformation process, and the education were urged to be planned, organized, and committed by the members of small village or community using nonformal educational device.
- 10) President Brja came to power in Ecuador at the head of a social-democratic coalition in 1988. On International Literacy Day 1988, the President announced that there would be a three-month National Literacy Campaign-Proa % Campaign, claiming that "This is clearly a government campaign but not a party one. The aim is to use the campaign for popular interests, not political ones". (Archer and Costello, 1990, p.78-79).
- 11) See, Carnoy and Samoff (1990).
- 12) John Wesley, the founder of the Methodist denomination, was also a person who was banished from the orthodox Churches. His methodism was indeed the first major movement for popular adult education.
- 13) Despite the encounter between Christianity and Humanistic Marxism, there are clear distinctions in their thoughts between Christian radicalism and scientific socialism. In the church's encounter with Marxism, the church cast aside the atheism and materialism, but accepted the class analysis, the dominance of the economic factor, the necessity of violent revolution, the possibility of some form of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a sort of necessary evil (Cort, 1988, p.311).
- 14) According to Boff and Boff (1987, p.10) the Portuguese word for "liberation" is *liberac %*, which was composed of the root *liber*, "free", and *ac %*, "action".
- 15) In August 1968, about 130 Catholic bishops met in Medellin, Colombia. It was the second plenary meeting of CELAM (Latin American Bishops Conference), calling for Christians to be involved in the transformation of society. More to see Berryman, Philip, (1987). *Liberation Theology*, NY: Pantheon Books, pp.1-44.
- 16) See Torres (1993); Horton (1990); Freire (1985).
- 17) Paulo Freire himself, at the time when *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* was published, was a sort of Marxist. Freire described as follows: "I must say that I was, at that time, mostly influenced by Marxist analysis, particularly the analysis of class. When I wrote *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, I was so influenced by Marx's class analysis, and given the incredibly cruel class oppression that characterized my developing years in Northeast Brazil, my major preoccupation was, therefore, class oppression. It is ironic that some Marxists even criticized me for not paying enough attention to social class analysis (Conversation with macedo, in McLaren and Leonard, 1993, p.172)."
- 18) From the beginning The Plebs League and Labor College-independent adult education institutions supporting socialist ideology and training for the then leaders of labor movement, has joined the Communist Party shortly after its foundation in 1920. At first, all went well and each supported their joint direction. But in 1922 there was a change of attitude. The communist Party set up its own educational organization, as part of its overall re-organization on *Leninist principles*, and this led to conflict. Communist party began to use Plebs as educational propaganda, and Plebs members were unable to grasp the necessity for a close connection between working-class education and revolutionary struggle, and ultimately both had to be divorced (Simon, 1990, p.60). For more information about Plebs League and Labor College Movement in England, see Millar, J.P.M. (1979). *The labour college movement* London: N.C.L.C. Publishing Society Ltd; Simon, Brian. (1990). "The struggle

- for Hegemony, 1920-1926". Brian Simon (ed.), *The Search for Enlightenment: The working class and adult education in the Twentieth century*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- 19) Cultural Marxism was called "Western Marxism" (see, Weiner, 1981), because it was launched from the Western Europe and flourished also in the United States. This version of Marxism was quite differentiated from those of classical version, as like Soviet style of Marxist-Leninist interpretation. North and Latin American Marxism have been significantly influenced by the Western Version of Marxism (Lorisolo, 1988; Torres, 1993).
- 20) Knowledge is recognized as "ideology, hegemony, or discourse" according to the background epistemology that define the fundamental presence of knowledge in relation to social power-determination. Ideology is mostly orthodox Marxist concept that emphasizes the determination of infrastructure and the cultural realm as the "false-consciousness". Hegemony came from the Gramscian notion that implies knowledge as autonomous existence for legitimating political leadership as well as intellectual and moral justification. Discourse means individualized post-modern epistemology on the existence of knowledge which is emphasized as the role of individualization and making differences rather than producing collectively. Mostly in popular education, knowledge was recognized as the level of hegemony-pedagogy plays a key role in producing political legitimacy and constructing an autonomous cultural and moral barracks, which was quite a developed way of understanding compared with ideology-based epistemology that regarded education as merely the passive reflection of economic base. However, at this moment, the discursive space for the common people to participate in the process of creating counter-hegemony was still extremely narrow. Political vanguards produce knowledge, and impose or at best persuade the popular participation in them. This is far from what Paulo Freire had suggested in his notion of consciousness-raising. In this dissertation, I will come to argue that the mode of knowledge in popular education has to be interpreted on the basis of "discourse". See Barret (1991).
- 21) In terms of the differences between ideology, hegemony, and discourse, according to Wexler, traditional Marxists concentrated on political economy, by arguing that ideology is merely false-consciousness. Whereas, new trends of critical theoretical root is not Hegelian historicism, but linguistic structuralism. Its object is not a political economic critique of industrialism, but the analysis and critique of language and discourse (Wexler, 1987: 125).
- 22) Giroux, for example, is a good example of one who tried to apply the new conception of Marx with the notion of "language of possibility" in the interpretation of Freire's thinking. He continuously emphasized the active role of ideology in making the differences in the world.
- 23) Paulo Freire himself admitted that the thought of Gramsci had much to do with his idea, and he actually admired Che Guevara or Castro. See Torres (1993) p.135; Mackie (1981).
- 24) While popular education in Brazil or Chile has been aimed at struggling against the military authoritarian governments, Cuba, Nicaragua, and El Salvador cases show how the reconstruction of after-revolutionary society can be accomplished through educational efforts. In those cases, we clearly observe what happens to popular education under guerrilla warfare pursuing Marxist Leninist ideology.
- 25) Moreover, it clearly showed systematic hierarchy by defining the program as basically of 2 years of study (260 hours) with eight common units and eight

or more optional units.

## References

- Archer, D. & Costello, P. 1990. *Literacy and Power*. London: Earthscan Publications, Ltd.
- Arnove, R.F. & Dewees, A. 1991. Education and Revolutionary Transformation in Nicaragua, 1979-1990. *Cmparative Education Review* 35(1). 92-109.
- Arnove, R.F. 1986. *Education and Revolution in Nicaragua*. New York: Praeger.
- Barret, M. 1991. *Politics of truth: from Marx to Foucault*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Berryman, P. 1987. *Liberation Theology: the Essential Facts about the Revolutionary Movememt in Latin America and Beyond*. New York: Pantheon.
- Boff, L. & Boff, C. 1987. *Introducing Liberation Theology*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Carnoy, M. & Samoff, J. 1990. *Education and Social Transition in the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Comblin, J. 1979. *The Church and the National Security State*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Cort, J.C. 1988. *Christian Socialism; An Informal History*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Devereux, W.A. 1982. *Adult Education in Inner London: 1970-1980*. London: Shepheard-Walwyn.
- Ellner, S. and Carr, B. 1993. *The Latin American Left: From the fall of Allende to Perestroika*. San Francisco: Westview Press.
- Freire, P. 1993. *Pedagogy of the City*. Donald Macedo. (trans.) New York: Continuum.
- Gerhardt, P.H. 1986. *Brazil's Popular Education in the Eighties* Frankfurt: Verlag fur Interkulturelle Kommunikation.
- Hurst, J. 1989. Popular Education and the Forth Biennial Congress on the Fate and Hope of the Earth, *Convergence* 22(1). 63-71.
- Jarvis, P. 1993. *Adult Education and the State: Toward a Politics of Adult Education*, London: Routledge
- Keller, Edmond J. 1987. Afro-Marxist Regimes. in: Keller, E. J. and Rotchild, D. (eds.) *Afro-Marxist Regimes: Ideology and Public Policy* 1(21). Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- LaBelle, T. J. 1987. *From Consciousness Raising to Popular*

- Education in Latin America and the Caribbean. *Comparative Education Review* 31(2). 201-217.
- Levine, D.H. & Mainwaring, S. 1989. Religion and Popular Protest in Latin America. in: Susan Echestein (ed.) *Power and Popular Protest*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Levine, D.H. 1993. Popular Groups, Popular Culture, and Popular Religion. in: Daniel, H. L. (ed). *Constructing culture and Power in Latin America*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press. 171-225.
- Linden, M. 1993. Reconsidering Leninism. in: Chronis Polychroniou (ed.) *Socialism: Crisis and Renewal*. Westport. CT: Praeger. 31-48.
- Loveman, B. 1993. The political left in Chile 1973-1990. in: Barry Carr and Stever Ellner (eds.) *The Latin American Left*, Boulder: Westview Press.
- Lovisolo, H. R. 1988. Adult Education between Two Models. *The Major Project in the Field od Education in Latin America and the Caribbean Region*. UNESCO Bulletin 16. 7-28.
- Lynch, E.A. 1991. *Religion and Politics in Latin America: Liberation Theology and Christian Democracy*. New York: Praeger.
- Mackie, R. (ed.) 1981. *Literacy and Revolution: the Pedagogy of Paulo Freire*. New York: Continuum.
- Magendzo, S. 1990. Popular Education in Nongovernmental Organizations: Education for Social Mobilization?. *Haverd Education Review* 60(1). 49-61.
- Miller, J.P.M. 1979. *The Labour College Movement*. London: N.C.L.C. Publishing Society Ltd.
- Miller, V. 1985. *Between Struggle and Hope: The Nicaraguan Literacy Crusade*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Nyerere, J.K. 1974. Education for Self- Reliance. in: Lister, I. (ed.) *Deschooling*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Donnell G. A. 1979. *Bureaucratic Authoritarism: Argentina 1966-1973*. McGuire, J. (trans.) Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Peers, R. 1972. *Adult Education: A Comparative Study*. London: Routledge & Kagan Paul.
- Simon, H. 1990. The Struggle for Hegemony, 1920-1926. in: Simon B. (ed.) *The Search for Enlightenment: The Working Class and Adult Education in the Twentieth Century*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Soares, L. C. (1991). From Slavery to Dependence: A Historiographical Perspective. *Graham, R. Brazil and the world system*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- Stout, M. 1992. Rethinking the Concept of "the Popular" in Critical and Poststructural Social and Educational Theory. *Educational Foundations* 6(3). 51-66.
- Thompson, E. P. 1963. *The Making of the English Working Class*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Torres, C. A. 1993. From the Pedagogy of the Oppressed to A Luta Continua. in: McLaren, P. and Leonard, P. (eds.) *Paulo Freire: A Critical Encounter*. London and New York: Routledge. 119-145
- Torres, C.A. 1990. *The Politics of Nonformal Education in Latin America*. New York: Praeger
- Touraine, A. 1985. An introduction to the Study of Social Movements, *Social Research* 52(4). 749-788.
- Wright, T.C. 1991. *Latin America in the Era of the Cuban Revolution*. New York: Praeger.