



Chapter 4

From Paulo Freire to Clodomir Morais: *from Critical to Organizational Consciousness*

Chapter dedicated to Clodomir Santos de Morais at the occasion of his 70th birthday (30 September 1998)

By Jacinta Costello Branco **Correia**¹

A final treasured moment with Paulo Freire² (March 1997)

The starting point of this chapter is the very last conversation we were privileged to have with Paulo Freire, merely a month and a half before his death, when he was the guest in our house in Rondônia at the occasion of the inaugural speech he was to make on 16 March 1997 in the new Aula Magna of our University in

¹ Jacinta Correia is Clodomir's wife. At the time of writing Professora at the Federal University of Rondônia, Amazonia, Br., where she has been closely involved in numerous urban and rural Organization Workshops. She was also OW Director in large group OWs run by FAO/IATTERMUND in São Paulo (see chapter 8 in this book on the Self-Employment Project 'PAE' written by minister Barelli. (PS. Jacinta Correia obtained her PhD on the Workshop at the National University of Chapingo in 2001)

² **Paulo** Reglus Neves **Freire** (September 19, 1921 – **May 2, 1997**)

Rondônia, Brazil³. At that occasion we spoke at length about the complementarity between his work and that of Clodomir Santos de Moraes, his great friend, former cellmate and co-exile, especially in matters related to rural development. We watched together videos about our field experiences in Rondônia and Mato Grosso, the two Brazilian States which have played a particularly important pioneering role in the application of Clodomir's method. We also spoke at length on how this method opens up avenues for a genuine and strongly dialogical practice, because, in its essence, the OW method, from the very beginning, starts from the dialogical engagement of the participants and communities involved in the Workshop process.

We also discussed how the lack of a method for community participation based in the objective reality, and using democratic, dialogical principles as proposed by Paulo Freire, had remained the abiding and fundamental problem with mainstream Government and University-based Extension practice and a great hindrance getting projects off the ground. It is now a good thirty years ago since Freire wrote and his book "*Extension or Communication*" (Freire, *Extension or Communication*) the first version of which was published in Chile. In this seminal text, Paulo critically questioned the prevalent use of the very word '*extension*', a term which, until then, was being used unproblematically by agronomists working for the Government Extension services in the field.

Extension and Extensionism

For Paulo Freire the problem was not merely a question of hollow terminology unrelated to actual practice, but, on the contrary, to put it in his own words, to capture the 'operational force of concepts' and what the underlying ideological associations were of the term 'extension': '*transmission, delivery, provision, messianism, mechanism, cultural invasion etc, etc*'⁴ which he referred to as actions which '*reduce humans with the capacity to transform the world to the status of mere objects, denying them their proper role in transforming the world*'(...). '*[Such] assistencialist notions of 'education' anaesthetize adults and reduce them to 'uncritical simpletons, when faced with the world'; 'education which recognizes itself -- (and has the courage to live by this insight) -- as a gnosological situation, challenges them to think, and not to memorize*'(ibid).

³ Freire at that occasion gave a resounding testimony of his '*velho de guerra, amigo-irmão*', Clodomir (re: also Paulo Freire, 1987 "*Aprendendo com a Propria historia*" Paz p135) (Transcribed from the video taken at that occasion, reminiscing about the time they spent together in prison, he said a.o. the following: "But even so, when I saw [that] food, I could not restrain myself from jumping on it. All this while Clodomir would not touch any food at all until he had brought food to his fellow prisoners, the peasants. It was the kind of thing one would have expected Christ to do - in that sense Clodomir was far more of a christian than I ever was. All I was interested in was jumping on that food"

⁴ Freire, Paulo, '*Extension or Communication*' in: "Education for Critical Consciousness" Sheed & Ward, 1974 p.95

While the former is rigid, dogmatic and authoritarian, the latter is mobile and critical: that is why authority should not be confused with authoritarianism nor liberty with libertarianism⁵. In spite of those warnings which have been with us for almost thirty years, the term 'Extension', bar a few rare exceptions, not only continues to be used, -- as was the case, for example, of the recent 'University Extension Congress' held in Costa Rica in September 1998, -- but it continues to underpin the very difusionist and authoritarian practices which were so roundly condemned by Paulo Freire.

Such practices navigate, purely and simply, between assistencialist and difusionist interpretations, pure and simple, of academic theoretical notions, thereby generating immobilism and the subsequent accommodation with the discapacitating⁶ tendencies, in organizational terms, for the great masses of the excluded, - who are increasing in numbers and becoming more alienated by the day -, in their search for organizational solutions to the problems they face. This regrettable state of affairs is only made worse by the actions, imbued with paternalism, of bodies with social responsibilities, such as Academia, which, when everything is said and done, reveal themselves incapable, apart from a few rare exceptions, to generate programs and projects ostensibly aimed at transforming the reality on the ground. Specifically turning now to the task of Academia, the contradictions or the backtracking are all the more serious if we remember that one the main demands of the student revolution at the University of Córdoba, Argentina, as long ago as the turn of the century, for example, was that the University should get actively involved in the search for solutions to the ever-changing challenges posed by society. Even though 80 years ago, this was one of the earliest examples of a extension-type engagement of academia with the real world outside⁷.

Paradoxically, extension, over time, has come to be identified with practices promoted by the *political right*, which, in turn, has helped to keep the student revolutionaries who came in the wake of the pioneers in Córdoba, in check. Interrelationships between Society and Academia, and vice versa, have, until now, remain as much on the agenda as before, as the problem of poverty, already so widespread in all layers of the population, is progressively getting worse. The fear is that this will lead to social on a global scale with the vast numbers of the excluded not so much (any more) fighting for their rights, but instead, banding together in armed struggle and/or specializing in criminal activities. This fear is

⁵ Freire, op.cit., p. 152

⁶ About the concept of '*discapacitation*': see Sobrado in Chapter 20 of this book. In Jacinta Correia's book, IATTERMUND, Brasília, 1994, the term is used in a way which complements the ideas of Sobrado.

⁷ About the influence of the Student Revolution in Córdoba, consult Jorge Fernández VARELA, Domingo PIGA, TUNNERMANN, in '*Notes on the Conceptualization of University Extension*' UNAM 1981

justified as it would not be the first time that, wherever the dominated class falls short in its liberatory task, and when popular movements are not properly organized so that they can cope with the challenges at hand, a backsliding into violence has almost always been the result. In the end, dreams turn into nightmares, or we see a flight forward into rightwing reactionism on the part of the very movements which originally were of leftist persuasion.

It is thirty years now since Paulo Freire traced the outlines of what genuine extension ought to be, ie a process of mutual learning rooted in communication and dialogical learning, in which all involved become critically aware. The fact that virtually nothing has changed in this long intervening period, has to be attributed to the fact that *critical consciousness*, based on dialogue, on its own, is fundamentally incapable of transcending the dialogical stage, ie, to generate also, and importantly, those very changes which are most required by society and by the poor and the excluded 'here and now'. What one has to be clearly aware of here is that Paulo Freire's methodology, in the end, did not provide an objective methodology (ie a methodology actively engaged with objective reality), but that his method, based on dialogue, largely remained within the ambit of the socialization of academic knowledge, mediated by a liberatory education process. It is for this reason that, with Freire, the '*what-to-do*' and the '*how-to-do-it*' always either remained unarticulated or were explained by each extensionist differently, as their own limitations and personal experiential background dictated.

Paulo Freire himself readily conceded that the '*how-to-do-it*' was still to be discovered by those taking up the teacher-learner challenge within a dialogical posture. However, the fundamental problem lies in the fact that the peasantry, accustomed as they are to paternalistic interventions, and to assistentialist relationships, for reasons of a long history of relationships of domination, remain rooted in their conviction that they will be forever inferior and '*incapable*': they therefore refuse, if not in words, then in deed, to participate in actions based on precisely the type of dialogical analysis as proposed by Paulo Freire. On this very subject, Paulo Freire comments in his early work, '*Extension or Communication*'(1973) that '*it only is natural that they - [the oppressed] - should show an extreme reluctance to dialogue. Nor is it surprising that they tell the educator after a mere fifteen to twenty minutes of active participation: 'Excuse us, sir, we-who-don't-know should keep quiet and listen to you who know*'(Freire,1974:121)

An identical situation presented itself as we watched the videofilm about the Organizatio Workshop (OW) in Urupá (Rondônia, Brazil), at the occasion of the above-mentioned visit of Paulo to our house. In this film, local people's resistance to calls, by the personnel of the State Rural Extension Service, to come and

participate in the various training sessions organized by EMATER, the State Rural Extension Enterprise, was only too obvious, as compared to the very positive response given by the very same people to the invitations to attend job-generating Organization Workshops (OW's). The great difference lay in the fact that the OW courses were proposed at the behest of the peasants themselves, and were previously negotiated between them and the director. As soon as this fact was established, participation and community support were assured. On this very topic, namely the enormous difficulties encountered when calling for community 'participation', Paulo Freire was categorical: "***That*** [ie, the Organization Workshop] ***is the way to go about it!***".

Freire has the following message to those who continue to argue that dialogue is all a waste of time: *'Those who declare dialogue is impossible will probably say that these observations only serve to confirm their hypotheses. This is not true. What those considerations clearly reveal is that the difficulty of dialogue with peasants does not come about because of their peasant status, but because of the social structure, perceived by them as 'permanent', oppressive and keeping them hostage'*(Freire,ibid). These are, then, some of the difficulties and the reasons why we propose here to analyze the very problems which cause agronomists - and not just them - to brand all attempts to dialogue as *'time wasting'*⁸.

Starting in the eighties, the State Extension Service in Brazil made its first attempts, coordinated by EMBRATER⁹, to use Paulo Freire's ideas in Extension work. As a result, a considerable number of male and female specialists were formed under the aegis of the 'New Extension Proposal'. One of the problems which emerged was that the extension workers were very clear about the *'what-to-do'* but extremely reticent when it came to the *'how-to'*. Their great fear was to be overheard talking technical jargon and thus being pointed with the finger as being of the *'difusionist'*¹⁰ tendency, a term which, by then, had acquired a number of pejorative connotations. The upshot of these developments was that other extensionists who had far more first-hand field experience, started to seriously question the technical competence of the *'New Extension Proposal'* recruits: a lot of wind but little wool. A great number of experiments were run in those days which tried to adapt field communication and extension methods, -- all broadly difusionist --, to new approaches which would live up as closely as

⁸ Freire, op. cit, p. 122

¹⁰ *Difusionism* is the model used in Governmental extension work. It is a model which originated in the United States of America and which was most intensively applied in the diffusion of agricultural innovations for accelerated development. Extension saw it as its proper vocation to 'diffuse' those technological innovations regardless of the attitudes, the cultural embedding or the needs of the 'target populations. For more about this model and other extension models, see in Bordenave, Juan E. Díaz "*Communication and Rural Development*" UNESCO, Paris, 1977 (Bordenave)

possible to the ideals propounded by Paulo Freire.

All of this coincided, in Brazil, with the final stages of military dictatorship, with new winds of democratization blowing, favoring the ideals of those who had been exiled for what they believed in. In educational matters, the ground was definitely shifting in the direction of more equality, social justice, freedom and a search for the reestablishment of human rights which had, for decades, been trampled on by successive dictatorships. That is why the State Extension services saw themselves now obliged to move away from their authoritarian ways and to democratize their relations with the public, starting with the peasantry. Towards the end of the eighties, the first experiments in Brazil with the new OW method took off with the support of EMBRATER, in the hope that a way could be found to fundamentally change the ingrained extensionist protocols in tune with the democratic transition which was taking place in Brazil at that time¹¹.

These experiments were based on the aforementioned method of large group *capacitation* as happens in the 'Organization Workshops' systematized by Clodomir Santos de Moraes. The OW method in very real terms allows for the very type of dialogue recommended by Paulo Freire, in that it starts from the organizational knowledge already embodied in the community. Thanks to the '*objective activity*'¹² of the Workshop new information and new organizational skills of a type which is far more complex than the pre-existing ones, are acquired. These organizational skills allowing the participants to cope with complex forms of organization, and this on a large scale, are generically different, it needs to be pointed out, from those prevailing among traditional small scale producers in the small 'family'-type economy. The different methodological phases of this method, therefore, establish a relationship completely at odds with of those usually established by mainstream extensionists, given the fact that what is at work here is the immediate delivery of the means of production to the participants involved in the process.

The OW usually starts with a grand assembly of those who have volunteered to participate, where all, men and women, make clear their wishes about the type of courses they want, where they want them, the time they want to spend on them and who are willing to subscribe to them. Everything which subsequently happens in the Workshop is patterned on the type of courses which have been requested by

¹¹ About the changes in the Extension model, see in Jacinta Correia, "*Comunicaçao y Capacitaçao*", IATTERMUND, Brasília, 2nd ed, 1995 (Correia)

¹² '*Objective Activity*' or '*Objectivized Activeness*'/'*dyatel'nost*' in the original Russian - see I & I Labra 1992) (Labra) is one of the foundation stones of the 'Organizational Workshop' (OW) approach. For more around the theme of social psychology and objective activity see in Labra, I, "*Psicología Social - Responsabilidad y Necesidad*" LOM Ediciones, Santiago, Chile, 1992 (I. Labra)

the participants, including at least ten teachers or specialists versed in the subjects chosen by the collective, whose numbers are often in the hundreds, with no numerical upper limit, except the physical facilities. It should be plain from all this that the driving force of the workshop does not originate in what the extensionist project but what the group themselves have decided they are interested in learning and under what conditions. It is then the proper function of the specialists engaged by the workshop to respond instantly to whatever request coming from the workshop participants: this includes content, time and place, in the way the participants have requested.

In practice, this means that the ultimate responsibility for organizing the proceedings of the subsequent 30 or 40 days that the workshop lasts, rests with the locals, be they peasants or urban unemployed, and their families. There are no restrictions as regards age or sex. Once the participants have set up the structures necessary for the smooth running of the workshop and of the courses requested by themselves, a series of lectures are made available on the *'Theory of Organization'*, as laid out in the several publications of a pamphlet of the same name written by Clodomir Santos de Morais¹³.

Those involved in the holistic capacitation process of the workshop, gradually learn - facilitated by the lectures on the 'Theory of Organization', - to appreciate the importance of organization in a socially divided work context, indispensable to bring the proceedings of the capacitating event to a successful conclusion. This complex structure, namely, the membership enterprise, is indeed the 'object' which capacitates, in matters of entrepreneurial organization, the collective '*subject*' (the community of learners) involved in the process. The inevitable problems -- (referred to by Clodomir as 'anomy' in the theoretical third chapter of this book) -- and which always arise in the course of getting organized for a complex production process, themselves, will become the very 'needs' and objectives which will guide the 'collective subject' in the '*how-to?*' use of a number of instruments in the collective problem solving effort. In this sense, the

¹³ Santos de Morais op.cit., (Morais) "*Theory of Organization*" by de Morais, republished over the years in several languages and as popular cartoon editions, too, is the base text for and during the proceedings of the Organization Workshops of Large Group Capacitation (*Entrepreneurial Literacy*). It is during this Workshop that the collective of learners become 'literate' in complex forms of organization through the division of labour as the main instruments by which both the internal and external 'enemies' of the budding organization are overcome. The *external* enemies are the external pressures on the self-managing organization, such as the capitalist system of organizing labor and its promoting agents of individualism and exploitation. Among the *internal* enemies we count the 'vices', ie those habits which are inconsistent with the new mode of production and which are inherent in the small producer or artisanal forms of production. Together those 'enemies' wage war against the two pillars on which the complex organization rests: unity and discipline. Without those two, the enterprise will fail. The '*bad habits*' characteristic of the artisanal or small scale production culture are mainly opportunism which finds its origin in the private ownership of the means of production, such as: individualism, subjectivism, self-sufficiency (which differs from the spirit of reliance on self).

very problems which turn up in the process of getting organized become the very needs and objectives which orient the 'subject- collective' in the use of the various organizational instruments and in the ways to arrive at a successful conclusion. In that sense, the problems which pop up in the course of the capacitation process take on the form of authentic pedagogical instruments of organizational experimentation.

This lived experience taking place under new conditions of existence which the participants never experienced before, becomes, little by little, the key factor underpinning a *new social consciousness*, referred to as '**organizational consciousness**' by de Morais (re: eg chapter 3 in this book). It is this (new) organizational experience, and this experience alone, which makes it possible for the participants to successfully make the transition from individual to collective consciousness. At the moment of becoming involved in the 'OrganizationWorkshop' experience, the consciousness of those '*artisans of the field*', as well as the consciousness of the 'urban artisans', can be called, at best, informed or critical, according to the classification provided by Santos de Morais¹⁴. This informed consciousness is determined by their conditions of life surrounding them.

By '*artisan*' de Morais understands those small producers involved in a seamless production process over which they have in complete control from beginning to end. The peasant, for example, is, alone, in charge of the sowing, the harvesting and the eventual marketing of the crop. In this process there is no need for a social division of labor and even less for a socially divided production process (re: technical division of labor) because production is organized parallel to other, similar productive groups. That is precisely the reason artisans are so adverse to associative processes in search of solutions. The large-group capacitation method is rooted in the practice which establishes a reversal in the relationships of power. This in stark contrast with virtually all other educational processes in which the centre of power(educator/ communicator) dictates the means and methodologies to be used. Under those conditions the situation prevailing in capitalist production where the workers are neither in possession nor in control of the means of production and remain alienated from the goods themselves they produce, is being reproduced indefinitely.

¹⁴ On the different types of consciousness, see in Santos de Morais, op cit 1986, where the 'bad habits' (such as individualism) of the artisanal or small family mode of production are described. In those forms of production the peasant or small family unit-producer typically execute all the production activities themselves, on their own. Naive or simple consciousness is characteristic of small subsistence producers, be they rural or urban, who produce mainly for the immediate needs of the family (with or without a small surplus). Their work produces hardly the equivalent of 'use value' - this consciousness will be called 'critical' when they have understood the difference of what it is to produce 'exchange' or 'market' value.

The organizational régime prevailing in the OW, on the other hand, creates the opportunity for the participants, for the month or so that the experience lasts, to achieve a change in the living conditions they had been used to until then, due to a radical change in the position of power, which is now entirely in their hands. The fact that they have ownership and control over not only the means of production but also over manner in which the process is conducted, fosters confidence in the values of unity which flow from actually working together and being in charge of their own destiny. Being in firm control of the instruments of the capacitation process in which they are the principal actors, they successfully achieve an analysis of their own life conditions, the origins of which they have now learned to understand in a critical manner. This experience will restore their self confidence at the same time as they develop new and vital capabilities which permit them to survive in the capitalist market economy in which, before, they found it so difficult to even survive.

Thus, the principal objective of the Organizational Workshop is that the group as a whole takes part in what is, at the same time, a real enterprise, and learns to start walking on its own feet, efficiently, competently and speedily. The soundness of the principles which apply in the OW methodology is confirmed by the fact that those already working in industrial or factory environments where the technical division of labor, or the social division of the production process, prevails, find it easier to engage in associative forms of cooperation. The nub of the problem is how to generate opportunities conducive to operate the necessary change from *'artisan'* to *'worker'* consciousness. Without this all important change, artisans will never be able to ensure their own survival in the complex market economy. They will continue to be exploited by the so-called *'coyotes'* (profiteering middlemen) in the first stage of the commercialization of the economy, while, in the productive stage, they find themselves not up to the task of installing the technology necessary for the efficiencies and speed needed in the increasingly competitive production environment. What the capacitation process above all aims at, therefore, is the total and unconditional exposure of the *'enterprise-object'* to the *'subject-collective'*, in such a way that -- to use a metaphor - only the total surrender of the object (eg: *'bicycle'*) to the apprentice-rider, the capacitation in *'bicycle-riding'* can be fully achieved. In the case of capacitation in organization for enterprise, it is only the surrender of the entire enterprise, with its entire complement of the all means of production, the so-called *'common resource pool'*¹⁵ that full entrepreneurial capacitation can be achieved.

¹⁵ See in de Moraes, op cit, about the *'Commonly Pooled Resource Base'*. This is another category which plays a role of great importance in the Organizational Workshops. The OWs indeed start from the principle that a group of people who come together also share a certain number of resources together, or a *'Common Pool'*. The latter consist of those things which cannot easily be broken up and divided among each member of the group (eg a 45 ton lorry for the marketing of the produce or perhaps the tractor). For example when they need

Extension, Popular Education and *Capacitation*

For far too long mainstream extensionism has confused fundamental issues, including in those matters which are at the heart of its natural vocation of diffusing technology. Extensionism is agnostic about the distinction between '*education*' and '*capacitation*'. '*Education*' is a process which takes place between a teacher, intent on transforming (the knowledge world of) learners. This is done by means the transmission of an already existing store of knowledge, via channels, to the learner. In the case of *capacitation*, the opposite is true: ***here it is the object which capacitates the subject***. The role of the educator consists in transmitting and socializing academic knowledge with the aim of 'teaching' the learner. The transmission of knowledge to the learners (who thus become 'objects', recipients and 'beneficiaries') can only be deemed successful if the knowledge of the teacher has been properly introduced in the head of the learners, to use another metaphor: the way one does when 'installing' software on a computer. Without that 'software' it is impossible to interpret the 'discourse' or the lecture.

The role of the facilitator in *Capacitation*, on the other hand, is to assist and encourage the relationship between the subject (in this case group of workshop participants) and the object (the real enterprise) so that the material facts pertaining to the object (enterprise) become comprehensible to the subject. In other words, it is only when the subject has been challenged by the object that the 'need' to change will become obvious to the subject. The facilitator is not a transmitter of knowledge, only someone who makes the capacitation process possible in actual 'practice' (ie in the process of being engaged with the object). The specialist or trainer in the capacitation process is only a facilitator and an adviser whose principal task it is to avoid all forms of gratuitous, overbearing authoritarianism which normally comes with the possession of superior knowledge (knowledge is power). The facilitator only acts when and if requested to do so. These actions have to be free of all assistentialist or paternalist overtones, allowing the problems which prop up all the time, themselves, to act as pedagogical tools. It is precisely this capacity to solve problems in actual practice which allows the collective of learner/workers to move in the direction which leads to the proper solutions. If, however, the facilitator becomes a problem-solver in lieu of the learners, it will only result in a gradual set-back in genuine capacitation, because those who ought to be subjects of their own learning, relapse in the old trap of being mere passive objects, wide open to re infection by the

to fill the Maracana stadium when there is a football match in Rio de Janeiro, the match is not shown on TV. Should this happen, the '*Commonly Held Resource*' is divided up with the result that people will stay at home (to watch the match there). When the need to organize is an essential requirement, and when people are motivated to get organized, the '*commonly held pool*' will be(come) the binding factor.

syndrome referred to by Freire as 'absolute ignorance', which in the past has held such a stranglehold on 'artisans of the field', due to centuries of domination and oppression.

Objective Activity

On the subject of '*objective activity*', Paulo Freire, in the third part of the work we already extensively quoted¹⁶, even while not referring to it by name, makes some extremely important comments which coincide with de Moraes' theoretical-methodological position:

- "I should once again emphasize that problematization is not an intellectual diversion, both alienated and alienating. Nor is it an escape from action, a way of disguising the fact that what is real has been denied" (Freire, 1974:153)
- "Problematization is not only inseparable from the act of knowing, but also inseparable from concrete situations" (...) problematization implies a critical return to action. *It starts from action and returns to it.* The process of problematization implies a critical turn to action" (the emphasis is ours) (ibid)
- "There can be no problematization without reality. Discussion about 'transcendence' must take its point of departure from discussion on the 'here', which for many humans is also the 'now', too"(ibid)

Continuing to take our cue from the same work by Paulo Freire, we summarize here what he has to say about genuine *capacitation*:

- '*Technical Proficiency Capacitation*'(14)(idem) is something more than mere instruction, because it is a search for knowledge, using the appropriate procedures"(ibid:160)
- "Technical Proficiency Capacitation can never be reduced to the level of mere 'training' (eg in the way animals are trained), since capacitation only takes place in a human setting"(ibid).
- Unlike animals, whose activity *is* themselves, human beings are capable of reflecting not only on themselves but also on their activity, which is something

¹⁶ A Note by the translator: the translator of Freire's original '*Extensión o Comunicación*' uses the term 'Technical Proficiency Capacitation' which, in Freire's mind, is clearly distinct from *Training* in that it is '*on the side of*' the learner, but which does not contain the full meaning of '*objective activity*' which we find in de Moraes.

separate from them, just as the product of their activity is separate from them" (ibid)

- ."Technical Aid, of which Technical Proficiency Capacitation is a part, can only exist through praxis, if it is to be genuine. It exists in action and reflection and in the critical comprehension of the implications of the method"(ibid)

- ."Technical Proficiency Capacitation, which should not no confused with the training of animals, can never be dissociated from the existential conditions of the life of the peasants, from their cultural viewpoint, from their magic beliefs. It must begin at the level at which they *are*, and not at the level at which the agronomists *think they ought to be*"(the emphases are ours) (ibid,163)

Theory Building, Research and Evaluation

A great number of enterprises, cooperatives and associations have resulted, in three continents. The work of simply putting on record, classifying and writing up of reports has, so far, lagged behind, partly because lack of personnel and funding, partly because the primary objective of the OW is not research, but people learning how not only to survive, but also lead a dignified life. What is certain is that the Workshop is not an employment or enterprise 'factory' - but it definitely is a space for a practice, of vast dimensions and potentialities, in which people make this vital transition in consciousness, the outcomes and long term consequences of which cannot be plotted in advance. This notwithstanding, there is an urgent need for more researchers to get involved and to recognize the value of the OW on its own terms, the more so as it is the proper role of universities and academics to, precisely, respond to the challenges constantly being thrown up by society at large. When those problems are inherent, structurally embedded in an economic system which now encompasses the world, the importance of this research cannot be overstated.

REFERENCES

Bordenave, Juan, E. Diaz. Communication and Rural Development. Paris: UNESCO, 1977.

Correia, Jacinta Castelo Branco. Comunicação e Capacitação (Communication and Capacitation). Brasilia, Brazil: IATTERMUND, 2001 (reprint).

Freire, P. "Extension or Communication." Freire, P. Education for Critical Consciousness. London: Sheed & Ward, 1974. 150ss.

Labra, Ivan & de Labra, Isabel. ""Contribuciones de la psicologia educativa al desarrollo del laboratorio experimental" Contributions of Educational Psychology to the development of (moraisean) Experimental Workshop." FAO/INA Conference Proceedings, RLAC/92/35 DERU-44. Tela: Honduras, 1992. 90ss.

Labra, Iván. Psicología Social - Responsabilidad y Necesidad (Social Psychology Responsibility and Need). Santiago de Chile: LOM Ediciones, 1992.

Morais, Clodomir Santos de. Notes on a Theory of Organization (translated from Portuguese by Ian Cherrett). Newcastle: ETC UK, 1986.