

PAULO FREIRE'S
PEDAGOGY OF LOVE

BY EDWARD MICHAEL SCHODER

A dissertation submitted to
The Graduate School of Education
Rutgers-The State University of New Jersey,
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree
Doctor of Education
Graduate Program in Social and Philosophical Foundations
in Education

Approved by

James M. Giarelli, Chair

J.J. Chambliss

Harold Beder

New Brunswick, New Jersey

May, 2010

Acknowledgements

This study indirectly began in classes taught by Michael Foley, John Glavin, and Otto Hentz, three Georgetown professors who taught with love at a time when I was developing critical consciousness. My first encounter with Paulo Freire's writings, in a class taught by Jim Giarelli, was mesmerizing: a conscious life—as an ongoing process of education—is an act of love; we need the courage to risk acts of love; we can create a world in which it will be easier to love. If we do not consciously strive to love, we risk letting other, less noble, ethics dominate our lives. And while actively seeking love does not guarantee our success, we cannot be successful if we do not attempt to love.

I am grateful to everyone who has listened to me talk about Paulo Freire and love these past twenty years. I am indebted to my mother, Margaret Ann Schoder, who knew not to nag, and my friend, Janet Maldonado, who knew to nag every day. In between these two extremes, there have been countless family members and friends, who like my father, Stewart A. Schoder, Jr., simply asked: “Do you need anything?” My sister, Helen, and brothers, Stew and Joe, have been unwavering in their love and support. Many fellow travelers have joined me on this journey. I want to thank Marty Malague, Rose Malague, Dawn and Tony Bertino, Bill Cahill, Holly Coughlin, Jackie Cunningham, Beth DiSciullo, Eileen Foley-Breck, Michelle Frankert, Bob Gardner, Don Hindman, Ed Powers, Laura Ryder, and George Seaton. In addition, during the course of this project, I have incurred an immense debt to Jim Giarelli and J.J. Chambliss, who have bestowed value on this project and given me new ways of thinking. I thank all of them; they have my unending gratitude. The responsibility for the ideas presented in this study is mine alone.

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Paulo Freire's Pedagogy of Love

by EDWARD MICHAEL SCHODER

Dissertation Chairperson: James M. Giarelli, Ph. D.

Problem: Throughout his writings, Paulo Freire asserted that education was an act of love, that educators must risk acts of love, and that education should aim at establishing a world where it would be easier to love. But, Freire neither defined love nor explained how education constitutes an act of love. To date, the centrality of love in Freire's thought has been ignored. Defining and interpreting Freire's concept of love constitutes a problem in the philosophy of education.

Research Questions: The following interrelated questions will help uncover and clarify this theme in Freire's writings and place love in education in its proper philosophical context. 1) What is Freire's theory of love as presented in *Education as the Practice of Freedom* and *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*? 2) What literature on love can help us understand his theory? and 3) How does his theory of love guide his educational theory?

Method: Taking Freire's writings as his effort to create a coherent pedagogy of the oppressed that both requires love and fosters it, a rhetorical analysis of his writings should yield an educational theory that encompasses a theory of love; comparison with recent philosophical ideals regarding love should give pointed definition to Freire's ideals.

Significance: This study will provide a new perspective on Freire's work and its place in educational philosophy. It aims at restoring the primacy of love in Freire's pedagogy of the oppressed and achieving an understanding of what love means in Freire's thought and practice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
Chapter	
I INTRODUCTION	1
II METHODOLOGY	11
III FINDINGS	59
IV SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, & RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	80
REFERENCES	86

Paulo Freire (1921-1997) was the most influential educator of the second half of the twentieth century. An eclectic philosopher, prolific writer, political activist, and avowed radical utopian, Freire enjoyed a multifaceted educational career: teacher of Portuguese to secondary students at Colegio Oswald Cruz in Recife, Brazil; director of adult literacy programs for Brazil's Industrial Social Services (SESI); consultant to the Chilean Institute for Agrarian Reform; visiting professor at Harvard's Graduate School of Education; Special Consultant to the Office of Education of the World Council of Churches; professor at the University of Sao Paulo; and Secretary of Education for the City of Sao Paulo, Brazil. Through his work and writings, Paulo Freire transcended these positions; he mentored an international community of educators—of cultural workers—who were concerned with the humanization and liberation of oppressed peoples throughout the world. His classroom was without walls as his educational theory profoundly influenced millions of people around the globe. Freire's works spoke to radicals and revolutionaries, humanists, Marxists, and Christians. His writings resound with words and phrases such as humanization, liberation, ontological vocation, *conscientizacao*, problem-posing education, re-creation, and praxis. These were and remain central facets of Paulo Freire's epic theory of education.

In addition, at its core, Freire's theory emanated from a profound conviction regarding the efficacy of love. His pedagogy was grounded in educators acting with love. It aimed at fostering greater love as a necessary condition for humanization and liberation. In

Pedagogy of the Oppressed (1970), the best known, most concise, and most comprehensive statement of his educational theory, Freire annunciated his lifelong goal—his vision—for his revolutionary educational theory. For Freire, being fully human, reading and writing the word and world, being in the world, with the world, and with each other, were predicated on conscious acts of love that precipitated further love. As such, Freire's theory of education, his pedagogy of the oppressed, incorporated an implicit theory of love that aimed at creating greater love as a necessary prerequisite in our ongoing pursuit of full humanity.

Throughout his writings, Paulo Freire asserted the centrality of love in his theory of education. In his first work, *Education as the Practice of Freedom*, which was a 1965 revision of his earlier doctoral dissertation, Freire delineated his practice for teaching adult literacy in Brazil and Chile. In it Freire claimed, "Education is an act of love" (1973, p. 38). [In 1973, after the English publication of *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, this work was also translated into English and published with the 1968 essay *Extension or Communication as Education for Critical Consciousness*.]

His second and most theoretical work, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970), remains the cornerstone of his educational thought; it also established the primacy of love in his educational theory. This essay proclaimed Freire's utopian vision and goal; he wrote, "From these pages I hope at least the following will endure: my trust in the people, and my faith in men and in the creation of a world in which it will be easier to love" (p. 24). According to Freire, education occurred "when [the teacher] stops making pious, sentimental, and individualistic gestures and risks an act of love. True solidarity is found

only in the plenitude of this act of love” (1970, p. 35). Love became both the means to and the end of Freire’s educational project.

While the implicit and intrinsic role of love can be traced throughout the vast corpus of Freire’s work, it was most apparent in his first two works, *Education as the Practice of Freedom* (1973) and *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970). These works established the primacy of love in Freire’s educational theory. The problem arises, however, that in his works Freire did not offer a definition of love nor did he expound upon what it means to risk an act of love. Paulo Freire did not provide a systematic explanation of how education is an act of love, yet these works inherently emphasize love as the sine qua non of education and human existence.

Thus, it is necessary to cognize and educate love. This study makes Freire’s use of the term love in *Education as the Practice of Freedom* and *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* the object of investigation with the intent of clarifying how his theory of education, his pedagogy of the oppressed, implicitly incorporates a theory of love. It will address the following questions:

- 1) What is Freire’s theory of love as presented in *Education as the Practice of Freedom* (1973) and *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970)?
- 2) What literature on love can help us understand his theory? and
- 3) How does his theory of love guide his educational theory?

Being true to Freire’s beliefs about knowledge, this study purports an “uncertain certainty” regarding its paradigm of love. It is herein proposed that love is “a conscious moral appraisal and bestowal of value on a person or thing.”

While this definition is elaborated in the second chapter, some clarification is necessary at the start. This definition is derived from works by Irving Singer and Mike Martin. Irving Singer's books *The Nature of Love: Plato to Luther* (1984) and *The Pursuit of Love* (1994) establish a framework for love. In *The Nature of Love: Plato to Luther*, Singer states: "I start with the idea that love is a way of valuing something. It is a positive response *toward* the 'object of love'—which is to say, anyone or anything that is loved" (1984, p. 3). Singer traces the intellectual history of the idea of love in Western thought in terms of appraisals and bestowals of value. Appraisals are objective valuing; bestowed values are "created by the affirmative relationship itself" (1984, pp. 4, 5). A decade later, Singer wrote *The Pursuit of Love*, where he creates "a systematic 'mapping' of the concept of love" (p. xii). Singer categorizes three regions within love's domain: sexual, social, and religious love. Singer's analysis of social love in terms of love relationships such as self-love, parental love, peer love, friendship, and love for humanity can help clarify Freire's concept of love. According to Singer, while there is a developmental aspect to the types of love, they are not hierarchical. The development of love for one's nation is not superior to parental or filial love, although it develops after experiences with parental and filial love. For Singer, humans inherently engage in a multitude of simultaneous love relationships as they appraise and bestow value and receive appraisals and bestowals of value in return. Progressing to new regions of love creates a greater capacity to give and receive love, but it does not supersede the prior loves. Singer's theory is pluralistic in that it recognizes the importance of all love relationships in the larger concept of love. This "systematic 'mapping'" provides a model for Freire's "world in which it will be easier to love" (1970, p. 24) because it

recognizes all human loves, is fluid, and avoids rigid hierarchies, methodologies, and dogmas.

Mike Martin's theory of love stems from his difference with Irving Singer. In *Love's Virtues* (1996), Martin writes

His [Singer's] masterful trilogy, *The Nature of Love*, begins with a suggestion that influenced me: love is a way to value persons. Immediately, however, he insists that valuing is *nonmoral*: "In loving another person . . . we enact a nonmoral *loyalty*." [. . .] In general, "love is not *inherently* moral. There is no guarantee that it will bestow value properly, at the right time, in the right way." (p. 22)

According to Martin, "love is inherently related to morality: moral values partly constitute love from within, rather than merely constraining it from without. Moral values define love as ways to value people" (1996, p. 10). Martin contests Singer's assertions, stating:

Whether overall or in limited respects, instances of love can be morally flawed. It does not follow, however, that love is a nonmoral loyalty. Moral imperfection does not imply moral insignificance, and love that is primarily bad can still embody elements of goodness. (1996, pp. 22, 23)

Martin's work presents a pluralistic concept of love as virtue-structured ways to value people. It is the conscious and fluid interplay of virtues such as caring, courage, fairness, faithfulness, fidelity, gratitude, honesty, and respect that structures, creates, and defines love (1996, p. 21). Martin's essay presents nine moral virtues that work together to constitute love from within. Ultimately, it is by consciously striving to achieve proper balances among these virtues that humans appraise and bestow value. This requires good judgment or wisdom, which is one of the nine virtues that structure love; humans err because they lack or ignore good judgment, not because morality is insignificant to love (1996, p. 23).

Although Martin's theory is grounded in this philosophical difference, the two theories are compatible and can work together to provide greater insight to love.

Martin's position that "moral values define love" does not negate Singer's "systematic 'mapping,'" or vice versa. In fact, to think metaphorically, Martin's analysis provides a "systematic mapping" of the virtues that define love from within. His work places love under a microscope to examine the elements that create love. Martin's work clarifies what it means to appraise and bestow moral value. Singer, on the other hand, analyzes love through a telescope; he examines the vast multitude of complex love relationships humans enter.

Martin's theory of love clarifies the role that love plays in Paulo Freire's theory of education. According to Martin, it is the conscious and fluid interplay of caring, courage, fairness, faithfulness, fidelity, gratitude, honesty, respect, and, wisdom that create and define love from within. Moral acts of love encompass these virtues, and each virtue directly or indirectly bolsters and supports the other virtues. While this will be further developed in chapter two, fairness is inherently concerned with the equality of participants in their relationships and their equal autonomy in making decisions. Fairness is also concerned with equity in the distribution of benefits or goods within relationships. Fairness defines acts of love, yet requires caring, respect, wisdom, courage, and gratitude. The absence of these other components hinders love. Actions that consistently lack fairness—or any of the other eight virtues—are not love; they are morally misguided acts that fail to love. Martin's theory helps in understanding Freire's pedagogy because, like Freire and Singer, Martin is not dogmatic. Despite Martin's identification of nine virtues in love, this is not a rule-driven method or formula for love. Instead, Martin offers moral

ideas for autonomous peoples engaged in relationships to consciously consider, if they wish to, regarding how to act with love. Like Freire, Martin offers these ideas for consideration and contemplation as part of an investigation—a pedagogy—regarding how to act in ways that promote liberation, humanization, and love.

Martin's *Love's Virtues* (1996) generates a specific sub-question for this study: How does Martin's belief that love is defined by the fluid interplay of moral virtues clarify Freire's theory of love? Martin also provides the methodology for this rhetorical analysis of Freire's *Education as the Practice of Freedom* (1973) and *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970). While Martin's nine virtues, their synonyms, and their antonyms appear throughout Freire's writings, this study limits its scope to three of the identified virtues. It will analyze Freire's use of fairness, respect, and gratitude as representative of Freire's virtue-structured theory of love. Freire's pedagogy of the oppressed sought liberation from oppression; it sought fairness as a critical component of love for men and women in their ongoing quest for humanization. Freire sought fairness as a part of love for all peoples and as the just benefit of their creative labor. It was the lack of fairness, the lack of love, that prevented dialogue, inquiry, humanization, and further love. Oppression could be surmounted only by risking acts of love in a problem-posing education. This education was grounded in dialogue that aimed at creating further humanization and love. Injustices were overcome by pursuing fairness as an integral part of larger acts of love.

This is not a study in fairness. It is a study in Freire's concept of love. Yet fairness is a necessary component of love; it is necessary but not sufficient to structure love. By itself, fairness can slip into a check-list of analytical procedures regarding the process of making decisions or a moral calculus regarding the distribution of benefits. Simply put,

fairness appraises moral value, but it does not bestow moral value. It lacks the value “created by the affirmative relationship itself” (Singer, 1984, p. 5). Bestowals of moral value require the addition of caring, courage, faithfulness, gratitude, honesty, respect, and wisdom. This study, therefore, focuses on Freire’s use of fairness in conjunction with respect and gratitude to illustrate Freire’s implicit belief that love is morally structured by virtues from within and that love requires the conscious interaction of these virtues in bestowals of value.

Limiting this analysis to these three virtues does not eliminate the necessity of the other virtues in love. Love cannot exist without caring and faithfulness. Instead, the identification of these three virtues in Freire’s writings illustrates how Freire implicitly believed these virtues worked together to define love from within. For instance, Freire’s assertion that dialogue is an act of love readily yields to analysis in terms of fairness (1970, p. 77). Dialogue is the exchange of ideas between equal participants. Dialogue requires respect for the other participants and for oneself. There is gratitude for the insights others provide and gratitude for the new insights participants achieve through this just act of social love. To remove fairness, respect, or gratitude is to terminate dialogue. The same holds true with caring and faithfulness. In addition, the subject of dialogue is inquiry regarding fairness of opportunities and fairness of outcomes in ways that foster greater humanization. The subject of dialogue and education is how to end oppression and create “a world in which it will be easier to love” (Freire, 1970, p. 24). To analyze oppression is to analyze injustices with the intent of being fair. Dialogue, as an act of education, aims at the conscious moral appraisal and bestowal of value with the intent of creating love. It requires love and aims at love.

Building on this synopsis, chapter two provides a brief overview of Paulo Freire's writings, primarily *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970) and *Education as the Practice of Freedom* (1973) and their bearing on this study. It provides an overview of writings on Paulo Freire's works and an overview of recent literature on love; the chapter provides an analysis of these works for their relevance to this study. The chapter examines how these texts provide insights to love but fail to provide an adequate paradigm for love that can guide this study. Chapter two then elaborates Mike Martin's and Irving Singer's theories of love as "a conscious moral appraisal and bestowal of value on a person and things." It presents Martin's theory as a systematic mapping of the moral virtues that define love from within, and presents Martin's criteria for fairness, respect, and gratitude in acts of love. Finally, chapter two elaborates how these virtues work together through Singer's mapping of the social region of love, primarily love of peers, love of nation, and love of humanity.

Chapter three uses this theory as a template to analyze Paulo Freire's pedagogical theory as presented in *Education as the Practice of Freedom* (1973) and *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970). It is proposed that Martin and Singer provide a definition and systematic mapping for love that is compatible with Freire's vision of love in education. This mapping gives human inquiries, actions, creations, and relationships the potential to be acts of love because they require the conscious moral appraisal and bestowal of value on persons and things. By analyzing Freire's use of the word "love" and the identified moral values that structure love, it is possible to educate love. Understanding love gives education the potential to be an act of love.

Chapter four examines the significance, implications, and possibilities for Freire's utopian vision of the "creation of a world in which it is easier to love" (1970, p. 24). It also offers suggestions for areas of further research.

Methodology

This study proposes a definition and paradigm of love to clarify the role of love in Paulo Freire's pedagogical theory. In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970), the best known and most comprehensive statement of his educational theory, Paulo Freire announced his lifelong goal of his revolutionary theory. This work remains the cornerstone of his educational thought; it also asserted the primacy of love in his educational theory. In the preface, Freire proclaimed his utopian vision and his goal; he wrote, "From these pages I hope at least the following will endure: my trust in the people, and my faith in men and in the creation of a world in which it will be easier to love" (p. 24). Freire's educational theory and projects explicitly aimed at fostering love. As such, love was both the means to and the end of his educational philosophy and project.

Freire's earlier writings had also asserted the centrality of love in his educational philosophy. In his first work, *Education as the Practice of Freedom*, a 1965 revision of his doctoral dissertation which was later published as part of *Education for Critical Consciousness* (1973), Freire delineated his practice for teaching adult literacy in Brazil and Chile. In this work, Freire claimed "Education is an act of love" (1973, p. 38).

Returning to his second and more theoretical work, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970), Freire claimed that education occurred "when [the teacher] stops making a pious, sentimental, and individualistic gesture and risks an act of love. True solidarity is found only in the plenitude of this act of love" (1970, p. 35). In this book, problem-posing education transcended being an act of love and became contingent upon the educator "risking an act of love." Problem-posing education, which fostered humanization and

love, was grounded in love. According to Freire

Dialogue cannot exist, however, in the absence of a profound love for the world and men. The naming of the world, which is an act of creation and re-creation, is not possible if it is not infused with love. Love is at the same time the foundation of dialogue and dialogue itself. It is thus necessarily the task of responsible Subjects and cannot exist in a relation of domination. Domination reveals the pathology of love: sadism in the dominator and masochism in the dominated. Because love is an act of courage, not of fear, love is commitment to other men. No matter where the oppressed are found, the act of love is commitment to their cause—the cause of liberation. And, this commitment, because it is loving, is dialogical. As an act of bravery, love cannot be sentimental; as an act of freedom, it must not serve as a pretext for manipulation. It must generate other acts of freedom; otherwise it is not love. Only by abolishing the situations of oppression is it possible to restore the love which that situation made impossible. If I do not love the world—if I do not love life—if I do not love men—I cannot enter into dialogue. (1970, pp. 77, 78)

From the above passages, love is a necessary precondition for dialogue and problem-posing education. The teacher must “risk an act of love;” love is essential for dialogue and freedom. Freire seems to suggest that love is inherently the cause and effect of his pedagogy, but the reader is left without a definition of love. Without that definition, it is not clear what must be risked, what is necessary for dialogue and freedom, and what is to be created by the educator in solidarity with others. This study attempts to answer the central question: What was Freire’s theory of love as presented in *Education as the Practice of Freedom* and *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*?

A review of Paulo Freire’s prolific writings reveals his consistent use of the term “love” and evidence of his unwavering belief that love is the sine qua non of education. In his later works, Freire explicitly used the term “love” with a frequency that replicates that of his earliest books. In *Pedagogy of Hope* (1994), he asserted the teacher’s need for “an armed love” (p. 151); *Letters to Cristina* (1996) spoke of a “taste for freedom, a love for life” (p. 164). Freire wrote, “I am a being who loves” (*Pedagogy of the Heart*, 1997,

p. 35) and advised that “Loving is not enough; one must know how to love (*Teachers as Cultural Workers*, 1998b, p. 45). Finally, he urged educators to “teach with love” in his last work, *Pedagogy of Freedom* (1998a, p. 126). In these works, Freire did not offer a definition of love; he did not expound upon what it means to “know how to love” or “teach with love.”

These works also abound in a secondary vocabulary about love. Freire wrote that love is an act of bravery, courage, faith, hope, humility, patience, respect, and trust; he used these terms throughout his works in conjunction with love and educational practices. However, Freire’s writings remain unclear about how these ideas shape love and education.

Freire also wrote about love in his personal life. First and foremost, he wrote about his love for his first and second wives, Elza and Ana Maria. He proclaimed his love for his parents, brothers, sisters, children, and grandchildren. He claimed love for his friends and colleagues. Freire wrote lovingly of his childhood neighborhood in Recife, Brazil. He commented on his love of language, dialogue, writing, and ideas. He joked about his love of soccer and good wine. Yet how these loves are part of a larger educational theory remains problematic.

In addition to the works mentioned above, Paulo Freire wrote extensively elsewhere about an educational practice founded on love. But, these other writings, which include *Cultural Action for Freedom* (2000), *Pedagogy in Process* (1978), *The Politics of Education* (1985), *A Pedagogy of Liberation* (1987), *Literacy: Reading the Word and World* (1987), *Learning to Question* (1989), *We Make the Road by Walking* (1990), and *Pedagogy of the City* (1993) all lack direct references to education as an act of love.

However, this second group of texts, largely from the middle of Freire's writing career, was filled with references to love's virtues, including bravery, courage, faith, hope, humility, patience, respect, and trust. These works repeatedly refer to people, ideas, places, and things that he loved. In his "talking book" with Myles Horton, *We Make the Road by Walking* (1990), Freire had several moving passages regarding his relationship with Elza, his first wife, who had died a few months before Freire began this project. And, in *The Politics of Education* (1985), Freire quipped about his love of wine.

While Freire did not establish direct links between love and education in these works, they too are suffused with references to the subject of love. After writing *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970), his other works were re-inventions of that pedagogy as Freire responded to objections, probed new insights, and turned his attention to new problems of oppression. Freire made no recantations; his works constitute a continuum of new creations and re-creations that expand on his prior thought. His works represented an ongoing struggle against oppression; they risked acts of love and were acts of love. By making oppression their central problem, they refuted non-love in the hopes of fostering love. Finally, his works were part of his ongoing dialogue, which required love. In fact, four of his books were "talking books," including the work with Myles Horton. These works were dialogues within a larger dialogue based on love; an understanding of Freire's use of the term love, as established in his first two works, will embrace his other writings as well.

Returning to the central problem, for over thirty years Paulo Freire held that love was quintessential to education. Love was the means to and final aim of his pedagogical theory, yet Freire provided no definition of love; he offered no systematic explanation of

how education is an act of love. However, Freire's pedagogy of the oppressed, his theory of education, was intrinsically grounded in a theory of love. In order to analyze Freire's use of the term love, this study has turned to other authors to uncover a suitable definition and understanding of love.

Freire's works have prompted an outpouring of response. Since *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970) appeared, over fifteen books and four hundred journal articles have explored, explained, and expanded Freire's thought. None of these works have broached the question of Freire's definition of love or how his pedagogical theory offers a theory of love. The vast majority of these works ignore the term love altogether. Like the articles in Ira Shor's *Freire for the Classroom* (1987), they offer practical applications of Freire's theory as it confronts issues of oppression and freedom.

Other works, like John Elias's *Paulo Freire: Pedagogue of Liberation* (1994), Moacir Gadotti's *Reading Paulo Freire* (1994), and Peter McClaren's *Paulo Freire's Pedagogy of Possibility* (2000), have cited passages from Freire that refer to love. However, like Freire, they have neither defined love nor explored how education is an act of love. Since Freire's death in 1997, there have been several journal articles that evoked the term love. These works, like Antonia Darder's *Teaching as an Act of Love* (1998) and *Reinventing Paulo Freire: A Pedagogy of Love* (2002), or Paula Allman's "*the creation of a world in which it will be easier to love*" (1998), have been fitting eulogies to Freire who is remembered for his humility and love. However, they do not shed light on the fundamental problem posed here, primarily a definition of love and a systematic mapping of love, in order to further understand Freire's work.

Going beyond these writings that specifically focus on Paulo Freire, educational philosophy of the past fifty years has offered little insight into the subject of love or love in education. As Freire noted in his preface to *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, “Some will regard my position vis-à-vis the problem of human liberation as purely idealistic or may even consider discussion of ontological vocation, love, dialogue, hope, humility, and sympathy as so much reactionary ‘blah’.” (1970, p. 21). Love has received scant attention. Some works, however, like David P. Liston’s *Love and Despair in Teaching* (2000), Theodor Klein’s *Teaching and Mother Love* (1989), and Nel Noddling’s *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education* (1984), provide insights to specific types of love or love’s virtues, but they do not yield a broad theory of love that encompasses what remains unexplored in Paulo Freire’s works.

For the past century, philosophy has offered few insights to the topic of love. Some works like Allan Bloom’s *Love and Friendship* (1993) present love as esoteric, and thus, beyond the reach of most people. Others, like C. S. Lewis’s *The Four Loves* (1960), create rigid hierarchies between the types of love that humans experience. Often these hierarchies rely on and subjugate all love to a supreme being’s love for humanity. Finally, other works, such as Frances Berenson’s *What is this Thing Called Love* (1991), Alan Soble’s *The Structure of Love* (1990), and Robert C. Solomon’s *About Love* (1994), provide tremendous insight to a specific type of love (erotic or romantic), but fail to capture the vast domain of what Freire, and most humans, call love.

Building on Irving Singer’s *The Nature of Love: Plato to Luther* (1984) and *The Pursuit of Love* (1994) as well as Mike Martin’s *Love’s Virtues* (1996), it is proposed that love is a “conscious moral appraisal and bestowal of value on a person or thing.”

Although Martin's theory is grounded in a philosophical difference with Singer, the two theories are compatible and work together to provide greater insight to love. Martin does not reject Singer's theory. Martin qualifies and further clarifies Singer's theory by asserting that love is guided from within by moral virtues. This chapter explains how Irving Singer's and Mike Martin's works create a theory of love that illuminates Paulo Freire's concept of love. Ultimately, to understand the vast role of love in Paulo Freire's epic pedagogical theory it is necessary to turn to equally fluid and epic theories of love.

At the outset, this study offers interconnected observations regarding Singer's and Martin's theories of love. These observations provide insight to the authors' theories of love and their suitability for both this study and an analysis of Paulo Freire. While these observations are not always explicit in the texts, they are implicit and hence reflect the authors' thoughts and theories on love. Simply put, Irving Singer, Mike Martin, and Paulo Freire consciously engaged in lifelong philosophical investigations regarding humanization and love. The fact that these individuals viewed life as an ongoing, conscious investigation regarding how humans ought to live—and the fact that through their writings they directly predicated their responses to this question on the efficacy of love in human existence—establishes common ground among the three authors for this analysis. Given this reality, the following observations are provided.

First, human existence and love are conscious, open-ended investigations regarding human existence and love. For critically conscious humans, who are aware of their role as historical agents, there are no fixed or definitive answers regarding how humans ought to live or love. Conscious human existence resists prescribed answers and closure to these questions. Human existence is affirmed by finding—or creating—meaningful

answers to questions regarding human existence and love. There would be no need for the works of Paulo Freire, Irving Singer, or Mike Martin if human existence and love were predetermined and closed to further inquiry.

Second, since human existence and love are open investigations that resist closure, they are part of a historical continuum that respects tradition and history even in the midst of change. This study's definition of love as "appraisals and bestowals of value" is based on Irving Singer's *The Nature of Love* (1984), where Singer traced the intellectual history of love through Western thought in terms of appraisals and bestowals of value. In his larger, three-volume analysis, Singer viewed appraisals and bestowals as the constant characteristics of love even when human understanding and thought regarding love were in transition. Likewise, Martin is part of this Western tradition as he qualified Singer and propounded the necessary moral nature of love; he accepted Singer's larger history of love as appraisals and bestowals of value. The corpus of Freire's writings embraced this idea of human advancement and transition within a historical continuum. His earliest writing, *Education as the Practice of Freedom* (1973), expounded on this reality when he analyzed societies in transition. Historical epochs are inherently defined by the evolution of ideas that reflect society's changing values, but within the changes there is continuity as people remain partly what they were before. Human thought and action do not completely change throughout a society in one night.

Third, while Singer, Martin, and Freire respect historical traditions, they do not advocate tradition for the sake of the tradition. Singer, Martin, and Freire are pluralistic in their approaches to their investigations. There is an inherent dialogue within these investigations so that beneficial ideas from the past that promote humanization and love

are respected and incorporated with the new voices and ideas of the present. These authors respect the wisdom found in multiple points of view. Yet, while they are appreciative of plurality, some ideas or practices are intolerable. Simply put, while society can respect a variety of definitions of humanization or love, it is not acceptable to practice oppression or mutilation as part of a supposedly loving practice. For Freire, the false generosity of paternalism is never healthy in society and must be rejected. Similarly, Martin rejects “any form of cruelty, for example the systematic suppression of women” (1996, p. 27). Plurality allows multiple ideas that enrich everyone’s thinking and lives; it permits multiple ways of pursuing humanization and love. But it does not affirm every possible practice as beneficial to the parties concerned. Pluralism is not ethical relativism.

The fourth observation is that these authors present their audiences with paradigms for methods of investigation and exemplars of human inquiry regarding humanization and love. This statement does not purport a “Freirian method” or a “Singer and Martin method.” Freire disavowed such ideas. Nor does this statement imply some narrow set of procedures and rules to follow as a method of investigation. Yet there are implied guidelines for investigations, dialogues, and love—or else they would not be investigations, dialogues, and love. Freire himself advocated critical dialogue as the means to critical, liberating education. He proposed dialogical methods. This does not imply a strict set of procedure to follow. The same is true with love. Singer’s and Martin’s investigations into love do not reveal hard and fast rules or checklists for actions. Instead, it is more appropriate to think of love, as Martin does, as a tapestry. At any given moment, some of Mike Martin’s identified virtues may be more clearly and

boldly present in an act of love. Yet, it was a human choice to emphasize those virtues instead of others at that moment. It was a conscious human choice to create love in that way at that moment and not the result of a quantitative, methodical, rule-driven system. Similarly, some people may receive preferential treatment at any given moment in Irving Singer's social domain of love. This too is a human choice and not the result of a strict, unbending method. These decisions are not the result of ethical imperatives or ethical checklists, but the result of ethical thinking about ethical actions and conduct. For the three authors in the study, conscious ethical thinking about love and humanization, as well as appropriate ways to achieve ethical aims through action, is their method. The method is simply the conscious awareness that ethical choices are being consciously made regarding humanization and love. It is not a list of traditions to follow but a conscious way of being, of conducting oneself in life.

The method derived from Singer and Martin provides the key understanding Paulo Freire's theory of love. They are kindred spirits in a joint investigation regarding humanization and love. Furthermore, Freire's realization that humans "are not limited to the natural (biological) sphere but participate in the creative dimensions as well, men can intervene in reality in order to change it" (Freire, 1973, p. 4), implies that humans alone can consciously create and re-create their world. Humans alone are capable of "conscious moral appraisals and bestowals of value on a person or thing." To investigate, to make choices, and to create is to appraise and bestow value. Singer, Martin, and Freire were unavoidably engaged in an investigation of the same questions albeit from different vantage points. Questions of ethics and love can be teased out for academic studies, but they are inescapably intertwined in the conscious human life. As Freire claimed when

describing the dialectical phases of investigations, they are just different moments in the larger cycles of human life and cannot be removed from those cycles.

Finally, given Singer's, Martin's, and Freire's vision of humanization and love as open-ended, life-long investigations that require a plurality of ideas, there is often a projected uncertainty, humility, and self-deprecating humor in their works. If life and love are ongoing investigations regarding how to live with love, then there cannot be certainty regardless of how much these authors do know. There is always more to be considered. There are always other men and women who can provide additional insights regarding life and love. This leads these authors to embrace their own humility and humorously invoke their own ignorance. Singer illustrates this quality when analyzing appraisals and bestowals of value. He abruptly ends a sub-chapter: "The lover is attending to a *person*. And who can say what that is?" (Singer, 1984, p. 8). Despite his three-volume study on love, Singer hesitates to offer absolute prescriptions regarding love. By leaving the question open, he is simply inviting his readers to join in this investigation. Humanization and love remain ongoing investigations in the very pursuit of humanization and love; they are questions for all humans, and they are part of humanization and love.

Given these implicit yet intertwined aspects of these authors' works regarding humanization and love, aspects that shape and inform the very ideas and paradigms of humanization and love, it is time to focus explicitly on this study's paradigm of love.

In developing his pedagogy of the oppressed, Paulo Freire wrote, "Men relate to their world in a critical way" (1973, p. 3). He expanded on this stating, "Inheriting acquired experience, creating and re-creating, integrating themselves into their context, responding

to its challenges, objectifying themselves, discerning, transcending, men enter into the domain which is theirs exclusively—that of History and Culture” (1973, p.4). Freire further developed this idea of human consciousness; he wrote, “‘Problem-posing’ education, responding to the essence of consciousness—*intentionality*—rejects communiqués and embodies communication. It epitomizes the special characteristic of consciousness: being *conscious of*, not only as intent on objects but as turned in upon itself in a Jasperian ‘split’—consciousness as consciousness *of* consciousness” (1970, pp. 66, 67). According to Freire, humans consciously create and re-create themselves, their history, and their culture. Problem-posing education awakens humans to the essence of their potential consciousness—*intentionality*—or the consciousness that they consciously create. Within this concept rests the potentiality for infinite meta-cognitions of consciousness. Essentially, for Freire, what makes humans human and capable of pursuing their ontological vocations of being more fully human is their ability to transcend time and place in order to think about their thinking, their actions, their creations, and the consequences of their thoughts and actions. And this can be taken to higher levels of thought in thinking about thinking about thinking.

Freire’s view of the nature of humanization, human consciousness and human creations serves as the entrance to this study’s proposed definition and paradigm for love as a conscious appraisal and bestowal of value. In his preface to *The Nature of Love*, Irving Singer wrote, “La Rochefoucauld spoke better than he knew when he said that many people would never have been in love if they had not heard love talked about” (1984, p. xii). Love exists because humans consciously created it and named it. Singer states “the source of love is not God or the libido; it is rather ideas about love that have

developed throughout the history of mankind” (1984, p. xii). Love is a human construct that shifts and transforms itself within time based on the meaning humans bestow upon the idea in any given epoch. The shifting nature of the idea of love is the reason and purpose of Irving Singer’s trilogy, *The Nature of Love*. In its ideal state, love is a conscious human activity, and one that humans consciously pursue. Without consciousness, love “is simply a means to sexual satisfaction” (1984, p. 8). It is akin to animal instinct. In Freirian terms, it reduces humans and their actions to simply being in the world. This does not negate sexual desire and satisfaction as integral parts of sexual love, but in order to be love, there needs to be something more than “private gratification. [. . .] love demands an interest in that vague complexity we call another person” (Singer, 1984, p. 8). Love requires human consciousness of itself as love. This is an implicit aspect of both Irving Singer’s and Mike Martin’s theories; they both think about their thinking about love. Their works are conscious appraisals and bestowals of value on the idea of love. For these men, as for Freire, their very thinking and writing about love constitutes a conscious act of love regarding love itself. They consciously appraised and bestowed value on love as well as the men and women who might read their works in their pursuit of love. Love is implicitly and explicitly a conscious act, or capable of being a conscious act, as humans are often simply “in the world.” But, as an act of human creation, it also requires conscious creative thought and conscious creative action.

At the outset of *The Nature of Love* (1984), Singer established his terms for analyzing love. He wrote: “I start with the idea that love is a way of valuing something. It is a positive response *toward* the “object of love”—which is to say anyone or anything that is loved” (1984, p. 3). He proceeded to suggest that humans value the object of their love

via appraisals and bestowals of value. In presenting these terms to his readers, Singer likened appraisals of value to the appraisal of a house. He stated that an appraisal:

establishes various facts—the size of the building, its physical condition, the cost of repairs, the proximity to schools. [The appraiser] then weights these facts in accordance with their importance to a hypothetical society of likely buyers. [. . .] It seeks to find an objective value that things have in relations to one or another community of human interests. I call this value ‘objective’ because although it exists only insofar as there are people who want the house, the estimate is open to public verification. [. . .] In other words, appraising is a branch of empirical science, specifically directed towards the determining of value. (1984, pp. 3, 4)

According to Singer, appraisals are objective, verifiable, and empirical; yet they are also conscious human choices regarding what and how to value. While not subject to capricious shifts, appraisals can change their value over time and place. (In *Education as the Practice of Freedom* (1973), Freire explained this phenomenon of shifting value on a larger scale of human history as creating epochs in his analysis of societies in transition.) While appraisals are often community-wide and based on “facts in accordance with their importance to a hypothetical society of likely buyers,” they are also individual: a particular person “decides what the house is worth to him. To the extent that his preferences differ from other people’s the house will have a different value for him” (1984, p. 8). There is an inherent dialectic between collective and individual appraisals, but it does not necessarily reflect the entire range of individual appraisals, only what the typical buyer would pay in a given typical community. Individuals remain unique in determining how well an individual house meets their unique individual needs. Thus, an individual appraisal is not necessarily objective as it does not have to conform to nor confirm the larger community’s appraisal.

This idea of appraisals applies to humans as well as homes. A community can appraise value for certain human skills or talents based on their ability to fulfill needs. A society can appraise value for certain physical characteristics or traits in a person. Individuals appraise their own individual values based on the unique desirability of an appraised skill or trait to that individual.

While appraisal is necessary for love, it is not sufficient by itself. Singer states, “I suggest that love creates a new value, one that is not reducible to the individual objective value that something may also have. This further type of valuing, I call bestowal” (1984, p. 5). Appraisals, or individual and objective values,

depend upon an object’s ability to satisfy prior interests—the needs, the desires, the wants, or whatever it is that motivates us toward one object and not another. Bestowed value is different. It is created by the affirmative relationship *itself*, by the very act of responding favorably, giving an object emotional and pervasive importance regardless of its capacity to satisfy interests. Here it makes no sense to speak of verifiability; [. . .] For now it is the valuing alone that *makes* the value. (1984, p. 5)

Bestowed value transcends appraised value and transforms it into love.

Returning to the analogy of the appraised house, Singer explains how a given house “takes on a special value” for the homeowner.

It is now *his* house, not merely as a possession or a means of shelter but also as something he *cares about*, a part of his affective life. Of course, we also care about objects of mere utility. We need them for the benefits they provide. But in the process of loving, the man establishes another kind of relationship. He gives the house an importance beyond its individual or objective value. (1984, p. 5)

In this example, the house “becomes a focus of attention;” it “assumes a presence and attains a dignity” (1984, p. 5). The homeowner comes to bestow value on both the house and his or her relationship with the house, which further adds to the bestowed value. The

house acquires greater value and importance than before. As Singer quipped after explaining bestowals, “And who can say what that is?” (1984, p. 8). Put differently, why do memories of newborns coming into a house for the first time, pictures or memories of birthday parties in the kitchen, and pencil marks on a basement door noting a child’s growth elicit such strong emotional responses from many homeowners? It is the homeowner’s bestowal of value on the house which transcends individual and collective appraisals of value. It is the added value that a person gives another person or object based on the subjective emotional relationship with the other person or object, and the value thus bestowed upon the relationship itself.

In explaining bestowals, Singer provides attributes of bestowed value. First, “love would not be love unless appraising was accompanied by the bestowing of value” (1984, p. 10). Second,

The lover takes an interest in the beloved as a *person*, and not merely as a commodity—which she may also be. [. . .] He bestows importance upon *her* needs and *her* desires, even when they do not further the satisfaction of his own. Whatever her personality, he gives it a value it would not have apart from his loving attitude. In relation to the lover, the beloved has become valuable for her own sake. (1984, p. 6)

While bestowals appear to be self-sacrificial in giving value, Singer rejects this notion.

He writes,

In the love of persons, then, people bestow value upon one another over and above their individual or objective value. The reciprocity of love occurs when each participant receives bestowed value while also bestowing it upon the other. Reciprocity has always been recognized as the desired outcome of love. (1984, p. 6)

While love may be self-sacrificial at times, that does not necessarily constitute the norm; self-sacrifice is not the paradigm for a healthy, reciprocal love.

Although the term bestowal is vague, love “bestows value without calculation. It confers importance no matter *what* the object is worth” (1984, p. 10). Bestowals are imaginative and creative. They do not create the object of the bestowal, the beloved, nor do they create the appraised value, but they imaginatively create both the perception of the beloved and relationship with the beloved. Bestowals imaginatively create value in the bestowal itself (1984, p. 15). Because bestowals are imaginative and creative, “love has infinite modulations, all possible degrees of intensity, and endless variety in its means of imaginative expression” (1984, p. 21). Bestowals, love, and humanization remain open-ended, pluralistic, and creative investigations and actions; there is no single correct answer for them outside the conscious moral creation of them.

Singer’s analysis of love in terms of appraisals and bestowals of value is beneficial to this study’s understanding of love; appraisals are conscious, objective, empirical valuations of another person or object. Bestowals are the additional, more imaginative and emotive, conscious valuations of another person or object based on the established and ongoing relationship with the other person or object. Despite four volumes on love to his credit, Singer admits that a more comprehensive understanding of bestowal remains elusive. He acknowledges, “Who can say what that is?” (1984, p. 8). The answer itself is a shifting human construct based on conscious inquiry and creative imagination in each society and each epoch. This reality broaches equally timeless, equally evasive, and equally ephemeral questions of Western civilization regarding the role and balance of reason and imagination, logic and emotion, and objectivity and subjectivity in human life.

Singer's analysis of appraisal and bestowal as the central components of love also serves as the cornerstone for Mike Martin's theory. In *Love's Virtues* (1996), Martin writes

His [Singer's] masterful trilogy, *The Nature of Love*, begins with a suggestion that influenced me: love is a way to value persons. Immediately, however, he insists that valuing is *nonmoral*: "In loving another person . . . we enact a nonmoral *loyalty*." [. . .] In general, "love is not *inherently* moral. There is no guarantee that it will bestow value properly, at the right time, in the right way." (1996, p. 22)

While Martin agrees that Singer is often correct in his assessment that there is no guarantee love will bestow value properly, it does not prove that love is nonmoral. Martin writes: "Whether overall or in limited respects, however, instances of love can be morally flawed. It does not follow, however, that love is a nonmoral loyalty. Moral imperfection does not imply moral insignificance, and love that is bad can still embody elements of goodness" (1996, pp. 22, 23). According to Martin, "love is inherently related to morality: moral values partly constitute love from within, rather than merely constraining it from without. Moral values define love as ways to value people" (1996, p. 10). Martin proposes that "love encompasses a wide variety of virtue-structured ways in which persons value each other as having irreplaceable worth. The valuing is *moral* because it involves affirming the moral worth of persons, but primarily because it must be understood in terms of moral virtues and their corresponding ideals" (1996, p.1). Martin holds that caring is love's chief virtue, but adds that "it is manifested in and interwoven with additional virtues. [. . .] faithfulness, sexual fidelity, respect (including self-respect), fairness, honesty, wisdom, courage, and gratitude" (1996, p. 1). He acknowledges that "self-control, perseverance, responsibility and hope" could be added to his study, but concedes that while his study cannot be "exhaustive," he hopes to "have

explored enough of them [love's virtues] to unfold a conception of love as virtue-structured ways to value people" (1996, p. 1).

According to Mike Martin, "values structure all types of love, including parental, filial, sibling, friendship, humanitarian, and religious" (1996, p. 2); in his study, Martin focuses on erotic love or love within a pluralistic range of monogamous relationships.

Martin adds that

virtues are desirable ways of relating to other persons, as well as to communities, social practices, animals, the environment, and ourselves. They are patterns of character that correspond to ideals about the kinds of persons we aspire to be and the kinds of relationships we find desirable. In this way, virtues are essentially moral ideals as embedded in character and relationships, in many different ways and ideas. (1996, p. 3)

Martin suggests that it is difficult, if not impossible, to imagine love without caring, fidelity, faithfulness, fairness, and the other identified virtues (1996, p. 21). The removal of any of these virtues results in something less than an ideal of love. These ideals define and shape love from within. While they may appear "idealistic," Martin holds that they are "eminently practical, even pragmatic." These virtues enable love to "combine aspirations with earthiness" (1996, p. 3). Love's virtues create a utopian ideal for love, an achievable ideal of love, as well as a sometimes earthy reality. As Martin states, "instances of love can be morally flawed. [. . .] Moral imperfection does not imply moral insignificance" (1996, pp. 22, 23). Sometimes human efforts to love others are beautifully successful; sometimes they simply satisfy the parties' immediate needs; sometimes they fail.

Singer's and Martin's paradigm of love, the paradigm used in this study, is tremendously complex. Martin's work examines nine virtues that guide love from

within. He identifies four additional virtues that could be incorporated in his study. Martin limits his analysis to erotic love, yet notes at least seven other types of love that are incorporated within Singer's social domain of love. Martin and Singer therefore imply that there are more than one thousand potential combinations for conscious and creative moral appraisals and bestowals of value by men and women as they weave love's virtues in a complex tapestry of daily human life. [This number reflects thirteen different potential combinations of the thirteen virtues through eight types of love in the social domain.] There are infinite opportunities and complexities for conscious, moral appraisals and bestowals of value towards people and objects when potential appraisals and bestowals are multiplied by the virtues and the concrete relationships of human life beyond the abstract categories of Singer's and Martin's studies. For instance, it is not a bestowal of love in an abstract category of "friendships" but a question of how does one bestow value on each of one's unique friendships in the present living of one's daily life? As stated earlier in this chapter, human existence and love are conscious, open-ended investigations regarding human existence and love. Love is inherently pluralistic. With so many potential conscious choices for appraisals and bestowals of value, there are many acceptable and good ways to love others. Yet, there are many ways that love fails, and it fails because the appraisals and bestowals neglect conscious moral valuing through love's vast domains.

As an example of this complexity, Singer and Martin cite the fictitious "mother who stands by her criminal son even though she knows he is guilty" (Singer, 1984, p. 11). According to Singer, her loyalty and love "need not be *immoral*," if she realizes he needs to be punished. But her love is "based on faulty appraisals and will not be moral love" if

“the value she has bestowed upon her child blinds her to the harm he has done, deters her from handing him over to the police” (1984, p. 11). Mike Martin grounds his objection to Singer’s analysis of love in this example. It is the springboard for Martin’s work. Martin holds that “moral imperfection does not imply moral insignificance” (1996, pp. 22, 23). According to Martin, the mother errs in this example in her moral bestowal of value. She consciously or unconsciously fails to create a moral love when she fails to turn her son over to the police because she erroneously appraises his value as greater than it is. At the same time, she neglects proper moral appraisals and bestowals of value within the social domains of love. The mother has inappropriately bestowed value on her son at the expense of the value she should bestow on her neighbors. She is mistaken in both her appraisals and bestowals of caring, fairness, respect, and wisdom towards her community. She lacks the proper balance of love’s virtues in the various domains because she lacks wisdom and good judgment.

Within this vast pluralistic paradigm of love, there are inherent preferences in appraisals and bestowals of value for some people. Not everyone must be treated equally by bestowals of value, but that does not require or imply that some people be treated unfairly. Spouses consciously and unconsciously appraise and bestow greater moral value on their significant others than they do on strangers; parents bestow greater value on their own children than they do on others’ children. A greater preference for one does not override the need for fairness and respect for others. Preferential bestowals do not mitigate against others receiving moral love. And, this realization is necessary if humans are to pursue Freire’s vision of “a world in which it will be easier to love” (1970, p. 24). Simply put, men and women need to develop—to educate—their consciousness of love

throughout the vast plurality of possible loves without intentionally or unintentionally blocking or preventing love in other domains. To improperly love—or to improperly appraise and bestow love—is to prevent love in all the domains. If love fails to consciously consider the moral virtues that construct love or fails to consciously consider all the potential relationships within love’s domain, it is flawed love.

Although Martin’s and Singer’s works suggest a vast number of potential combinations of appraisals and bestowals of love, this study focuses on three of Martin’s identified virtues: fairness, respect, and gratitude. As stated in chapter one, these three virtues are representative of Freire’s virtue-structured theory of love. While a conscious weaving of all virtues that shape love from within is necessary in order to make conscious moral appraisals and bestowals of value or love, fairness presents a dominant, recurring motif in Freire’s pedagogy of the oppressed. Simply put, oppression is a moral injustice. It is inherently unfair. Freire’s pedagogy of the oppressed sought liberation from oppression; it sought fairness as an essential component of love for men and women in their ongoing quest for humanization. This does not imply that fairness alone creates love; fairness is necessary but not sufficient to appraisals and bestowals of value. Fairness is the foothold for this study of how the virtues work together to create and shape love from within in Paulo Freire’s pedagogical theory.

At the outset of his analysis of fairness as one of love’s virtues, Mike Martin introduces what he calls the “fairness paradox.” According to Martin, “Mutual consent and balanced distributions are plausible but seemingly incompatible criteria for fairness in a marriage” (1996, p. 105). Put differently, the fairness paradox raises the question of what counts for fairness in a loving relationship, the free consent by the concerned parties

to the agreements within the relationship or a “fifty-fifty distribution to benefits and burdens” (1996, p. 105). Given this dilemma, it appears that one could freely consent to arrangements that are inherently unfair in their distribution of benefits and burdens. Similarly, if the equal distribution of benefits and burdens is the sole goal of fairness in the relationship, the concerned parties can lose their autonomy or their ability to consent to an agreement. There is no need to discuss or agree to practices in the relationship if what matters is the empirical equality of benefits.

Martin’s discussion of the fairness paradox as it pertains to conventional marriages is strikingly similar to Freire’s analysis of oppressive societies in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970). In conventional marriages, women are often denied educational opportunities and economic resources. Martin claims that “external forces mold women from infancy on” so they “internalized oppression” and hold “negative attitudes of themselves” (1996, pp. 108, 109). According to Martin, “Internalized oppression violates the procedures that promote mutual autonomy through subtle forms of inner coercion, both from negative attitudes toward oneself and ignorance about one’s possibilities” (1996, p. 109). In an oppressive relationship or marriage, women develop a “false consciousness” which may take years to overcome, if ever (1996, p. 109). Oppressive marriages and oppressive societies neither seek nor require the approval or consent of the oppressed. They are not concerned with the fair distribution of benefits. They are inherently unfair and, thus, lack love.

To surmount the fairness paradox, Martin offers “the wider idea of equal autonomy” (1996, p. 105). Martin writes:

In my view, autonomy combines rights, capacities, competencies, and caring. Rights-autonomy is possessing moral rights to pursue one’s interests. Some

rights are liberty rights: the right to pursue our lives without interference by others. Others are welfare rights: the right to receive certain minimum resources when we cannot earn them on our own and when society can afford to make them available. [. . .] Capacity-autonomy is possessing fundamental human capacities such as reasoning and self-control, feeling and social participation. Competence-autonomy is exercising these capacities in guiding one's life rationally and responsibly. Moral autonomy implies respect for persons, including sufficient care for oneself to exercise competence-autonomy in pursuing self-fulfillment.

Using this four-faceted concept, autonomy implies more than exercising one's rights without outside interferences. It includes competent assertions of one's needs in morally responsible ways so as to serve primary goods. (1996, p.108)

Martin defines primary goods as “goods that rational persons recognize as valuable, as essential to their self-fulfillment” (1996, p. 108). Primary goods include self-respect, education, physical safety, economic security, power in making decisions and meaningful work (1996, p.108). In a sense, primary goods are both a precondition for fairness and a result of fairness. Individuals and societies require physical safety and economic security to be fair in fostering physical safety and economic security. As Martin notes later in his chapter on fairness, there is a shared autonomy and primary equality when “both partners’ needs for primary goods are taken seriously, but it does not require any exact division of each primary good or other goods” (1996, p. 113).

Other components of equal autonomy that promote fairness, according to Martin, are negotiations and a vision of a shared good (1996, pp. 114-116). According to Martin, negotiations within a relationship incorporate both equality and equivalence regarding what the parties perceive as fair. For Martin, if the parties agree to certain decisions—based upon a primary equality in receiving primary goods—there does not need to be an exact division of benefits and burdens. For instance, within a marriage, one party might detest dusting and vacuuming while his or her spouse does not object to performing these chores. At the same time, the first party might enjoy doing laundry and do it every week

so as not to dust and vacuum. There is a negotiated equivalence without a fifty-fifty equality in every chore. For Martin, there is a need for macro-level equivalence in fairness. A wife may support her husband while he pursues his education provided she is given an equal opportunity to pursue her education within a mutually negotiated and agreed-upon period after the husband completes his schooling. Momentary, short range decisions that might appear unfair to outsiders require a macro-equivalence to maintain their fairness. Again, this presupposes that these decisions are made on a footing of primary equality regarding primary goods. It presupposes equality of capacities and competencies in making these jointly negotiated decisions. Finally, fairness transcends the individual; there is concern not for the individual's desires but the shared vision of good that is negotiated and held by all parties affected by the decision. Even when one person might appear to benefit more from a given decision at a given moment, fairness requires that the benefits be equitably shared by the parties to the decision.

Following Martin's exposition of fairness, Irving Singer's question regarding bestowals resounds for the reader, "And who can say what that is?" (Singer, 1984, p. 8). What does this mean to being fair? Yet that is the core value of Martin's analysis. As a pluralistic investigation into fairness—one of love's virtues—there is no adamant and single correct answer or checklist of procedures to follow in the pursuit of fairness and love. Instead, there are infinite moral ideas and questions for people concerned with fairness, love, and humanization in all its forms. Fairness as a virtue that structures love from within is not a question of luck or happenstance; it is a conscious moral choice to seek fairness. Martin's analysis of fairness provides the foundation for an investigation into moral thinking about fairness as a part of love. It does not guarantee fairness, but

without such thinking and questioning, the possibility of fairness dwindles to an evasive question of luck.

On another plane, the questions posed by the fairness paradox are important questions to answer. Fairness necessarily incorporates free consent to the decisions and equitable distribution of benefits and burdens. Yet these questions seek empirical logic and answers. They are quantitative in nature. These are necessary questions to answer, but by themselves the answers do not guarantee fairness. Just as empirical appraisals require subjective bestowals of value to become love, subjective and qualitative answers are needed to shape and create fairness.

Here Mike Martin's theory transcends a simple moral calculus regarding fairness by promoting moral thinking about fairness. For instance, a decision may appear fair on the surface because the concerned parties give their free consent and receive equal shares of the benefits, yet the decision could be intrinsically unfair because it reaffirms past injustices of physical and economic inequality. Oppression continues simply because it is not halted or reversed. If rights autonomy, primary goods, and primary equality are not called into questions then unequal and unfair balances of power can persist. And that is not fair. Martin's presentation of fairness in terms of primary equal autonomy allows for considerations of affirmative action without mandating it as "the solution." Solutions to investigations of fairness are only reached by the free consent of the parties in the investigation and their decisions regarding potential solutions to fairness and love. Moral thinking, which necessarily incorporates concern about fairness towards others, only occurs when it is bolstered by subjective bestowals of value prompted by caring, respect, honesty, trust, and wisdom. Fairness, like love, is neither objective nor subjective; it is

both working together in harmony. Fairness, like love, transcends moral ideas about fairness and love by inspiring moral actions that are guided by moral thinking. And fairness, like love, requires negotiation—or dialogue—regarding the shared vision of a shared good of the world that is to be created.

According to Mike Martin's thesis, just as fairness is necessary to love, respect is required for both fairness and love. It is impossible to speak of love as a moral appraisal and bestowal of value if the lover does not respect the beloved. Similarly, love cannot exist if lovers lack self-respect; the lovers must believe that they are capable both of appraising and of bestowing moral value upon another person, and they must believe that they are worthy of bestowals of value in return.

While Martin examines these two facets of respect in love, he begins his analysis of respect with the paradoxical dilemma that "Lovers become one, yet remain two" (1996, p. 88). According to Martin, "this paradox reflects their [the lovers'] deepest dilemma: How can they continually grow closer together while maintaining individuality? This paradox, however, also embodies a creative tension: lovers must remain two in order to become one, and their unity strengthens their individuality" (1996, p. 88). In resolving this paradox, Martin holds that mutual respect and self-respect constitute what love is. And in addressing this paradox, Martin also refutes what he perceives as the mistaken yet enduring belief of the Romantic era: that two become one in all aspects of life like "Aristophanes' version of the Romantic myth," where humans yearn to be permanently fused with their perfect mate (1996, p. 91).

To counter this myth and advance an understanding of respect as a part of love, Martin advocates what he terms "mutual respect" which follows a "'cyclical model' of love—not

complete unity or ongoing conflict, but instead cycles of recurring interaction” (1996, p. 95). This incorporates recognition-respect, which “implies caring for other persons for their sake” (1996, p. 90). It respects a partner’s feelings, which

means acting in appropriate ways so as to avoid hurt. Respect for a partner’s views and attitudes implies sensitive listening and sympathetic responses. Respect for a partner’s talents and strengths means supporting his or her endeavors, participating in solving problems and appreciating the other’s achievements. Respect for a partner’s rights means recognizing areas of personal liberty. And respect for privacy means not being intrusive, something that remains important even in intimate relationships. (1996, p. 90)

Given mutual respect, men and women value their partners’ talents in solving problems, yet they also respect their partners’ right to privacy. The “cyclical model” allows people to move in a “figure-eight pattern” where they value and respect their time together as well as their time apart to pursue their own individual interests. This oneness in love thus becomes “a continuous interaction between two individuals rather than a static unity” and “highlights both intimacy and individuality” (1996, p. 96). To return to Martin’s ideas of fairness, how a couple or group resolves this dilemma requires negotiations and a shared vision of the good. Ideas of fairness bolster respect and ideas of respect reinforce the ideas of fairness.

In the initial paradox, however, mutual respect is simply one aspect of the overall concept of respect. Equally important is self-respect, and self-respect is necessary to understanding Freire’s idea of love as a force that enables men and women to overcome oppression. For Freire, most of the problems connected to oppression have their roots in a lack of self-respect and self-love, on the part of both the oppressor and the oppressed. At the outset of his chapter, Mike Martin quotes Toni Morrison’s *Song of Solomon*, “Could you really love somebody who was absolutely nothing without you? You really

want somebody like that? Somebody who falls apart when you walk out the door?”

(1996, p. 88). Expectations of respect from others is founded on self-respect, the belief that one is both capable of loving others and worthy of being loved by others. According to Martin, “In order to love others, we must respect ourselves, that is, we must value ourselves in morally desirable ways” (1996, p. 97).

Self-respect is based on four ideas. First, men and women require self-acceptance and tolerance. Martin writes,

Self-acceptance comes despite awareness of our limitations and flaws. It differs, however, from complacency and self-indulgence, which imply neglect rather than care for oneself. An absence of self-acceptance is shown in chronically hostile attitudes towards ourselves such as hate, anger, shame, guilt, and depression. These attitudes erode our capacity to love others by lowering tolerance for their weakness and increasing a tendency to blame them for our problems. (1996, p. 100)

In addition, self-acceptance requires eradicating self-righteous superiority over others.

Oppression has its roots in projecting “false consciousness” onto others, preventing them from achieving self-acceptance. The oppressed learn to blame themselves first and then others for their position in life.

Second, men and women require self-confidence or “faith in [their] ability to pursue and achieve goals. As such, it is essential to pursuing endeavors with any degree of enthusiasm. In particular, self-confidence helps sustain love relationships” (1996, p. 101). Essentially, self-confidence is faith in one’s purpose and faith in one’s ability to pursue his or her humanization in conjunction with others.

Martin cites self-esteem as the third aspect of self-respect. According to Martin, “Self-respect and self-esteem are closely connected but not synonymous. ‘Self-respect’ is a moral concept; it refers to the virtue of valuing oneself in appropriate ways according

to justified standards. ‘Self-esteem’ is a psychological concept; it means thinking well of and having a positive attitude towards oneself” (1996, p. 102). Yet not all self-esteem is justifiable, as in the case of arrogance. Justifiable self-esteem “enables us to feel worthy of being loved, worthy of having our love returned in ways essential to the reciprocity that makes love flourish” (1996, p. 102). Humans must believe that they are worthy of self-respect; they must think that they are capable of making meaningful moral appraisals and bestowals of value, and that they deserve these appraisals and bestowals in return. Men and women need to think that they deserve to be treated fairly by others, and must in fact insist upon being treated with respect and fairness.

Finally, Martin claims that self-respect implies self-responsibility or “being responsible for [one’s] own well being” (1996, p. 102). Men and women need to take care of themselves, “physically and psychologically, guided by an attitude that [they] are worthy of such attention” (1996, p. 102). With self-respect men and women acquire consciousness of their own agency and their own ability to appraise and bestow value on their creative tasks, which ultimately encompasses all their conscious endeavors. And, in their awareness of their responsibility for their creative acts, men and women also find happiness (1996, p. 102). They believe that they are giving a worthwhile gift of respect to others; they are responsible for their creative efforts, and they respect themselves as worthy of the appraisals and bestowals of value from others. This promotes not complacency but a content happiness or joy.

This study holds that oppression is morally unjust and thus unfair; oppression is unfair because it lacks respect for the oppressed. The next chapter analyzes how oppression inherently undermines self-respect. It demeans the oppressed by robbing them of their

self-confidence, self-esteem, and their sense of agency. The oppressed lose their sense of responsibility for their own creative acts. Oppression denies the oppressed their conscious awareness of their own creative appraisals and bestowals of love. Men and women in this state experience life as a joyless drudgery of simply being in the world. Paulo Freire's pedagogy of the oppressed advocates an education that overcomes oppression through acts of love; these acts bestow respect on those who have been unfairly robbed of their self-respect and therefore restore it.

Working with others in solidarity that is guided by respect and self-respect, and in ways that consciously negotiate fairness and create shared visions of the good, the oppressed discover the joys of gratitude. According to Mike Martin,

Gratitude is an enabling virtue, one that sustains love between partners who cherish their shared history and identity. It is also a constitutive virtue that partly defines love as a relationship based on mutuality and reciprocity. Given its intimate connection with joy, gratitude is one of love's crowning virtues. At the same time, gratitude blends joy with responsibility, much like love itself. (1996, p. 164)

Like fairness and respect, gratitude is both necessary for love and a benefit of love.

Gratitude for the beloved shapes and guides the lovers and their love; gratitude nourishes respect and love, leading to greater gratitude.

At the outset of his analysis of gratitude, Martin claims "gratitude is the disposition to have and express emotions and attitudes of gratefulness, in desirable ways and on appropriate occasions" (1996, p. 166). While gratitude has often been viewed as an obligation to one's parents, country, or God (1996, p. 165), gratitude transcends obligation because humans cannot be obligated or required to develop specific emotions. Gratitude is "an attitude as well as an emotion;" it can be guided by "rational reflection,"

but it cannot be forced or mandated by fiat (1996, p. 167). According to Martin, gratitude has three characteristics: “First, we are grateful *to* persons *for* gifts they provide us with. [. . .] Second, the response to the benefit is welcoming or pleasure combined with a desire to make a return, if only a thank you, by way of showing one’s appreciation. Third, the reason for the desire to make a return is goodwill toward the donor” (1996, p.166). In its ideal state, gratitude, like love, is freely bestowed upon another. It is not viewed as an obligation. Martin holds that “In happy marriages, gratitude for love becomes gratitude for an entire life together. Spouses live with an ongoing sense of joyous gratitude for their shared life, including its past, present, and hoped for future” (1996, p.172). Again, in its ideal state, gratitude leads to an ever-escalating sense of appreciation, wonder, and joy for this shared life. This requires mutual acceptance and support founded on the primary equality of fairness (1996, p. 175).

Martin’s analysis of flawed gratitude illuminates multiple facets of Freire’s theory of oppression. Gratitude by definition is a freely bestowed virtue; if it is an obligation, if it is expected or required by one party, gratitude transforms into resentment and ingratitude. Similarly, if it is withheld, it atrophies to its opposite, ingratitude. Martin asserts that “ingratitude makes love impossible” (1996, p. 173). Yet, as will be examined in the next chapter, unwarranted expectations of gratitude guide the oppressor’s psyche toward what Freire termed false generosity or paternalism (1970, pp. 28, 29). The oppressor forces or imposes his or her ideas and methods upon the oppressed and expects the oppressed to be thankful for these “gifts.” Gifts given without consultation, without negotiation, without dialogue, without respect and love for the oppressed are false gifts or false generosity. Love or true generosity cannot exist where there are expectations or obligations that

one's gifts be appreciated, nor can love exist where one's gifts are never appreciated. In these circumstances, both parties become resentful of the expectation of others, and this resentment necessarily fosters ingratitude. Finding appropriate balances among the virtues in specific life situations is an ongoing investigation with others who are intent on fostering gratitude, love, and humanization. And that itself becomes a reason for genuine gratitude. When investigations are successful, relationships fuel further wonder, joy, and love. The relationship spurs all the virtues to further acts of love. When the investigation fails, it can instill hope for future success, or it can cause fear of further failure. When the investigation is hindered or prevented by others in acts of oppression, it can either lead to further oppression, or it can provoke what Freire describes as critical consciousness for liberating love and action.

Mike Martin's analysis of love as virtue-structured ways of valuing others provides an excellent guide for inquiries into moral thinking and moral action, and thereby into Freire's work. Martin avoids a rule-driven theory for love, and instead offers hundreds of questions regarding how to appraise and bestow moral value on another person. After one reads his discussion of fairness, respect, and gratitude, it becomes nearly impossible to envision love without them. Using Martin's own simile, the virtues construct or guide love like the threads in a tightly woven tapestry. While a single virtue may appear to be dominant in loving relationships at a given moment, that virtue ultimately bleeds into the other virtues, in the same way that an individual color in the tapestry may appear dominant in one place but ultimately blends into other shades. Fairness blends into respect; fairness and respect require caring and wisdom. While the thread colors in the tapestry can be painstakingly separated, the tapestry is not a study in the individual

colors. The tapestry is a creative human effort that combines various colors to artistically make sense of life. Similarly, the individual virtues can be teased out of love in order to understand love itself as Martin has done, yet it is through the conscious creative and artistic combination of love's virtues that men and women attempt to create loving and meaningful lives in the multifaceted relationships of human life.

This study draws on Singer and Martin to establish a paradigm and understanding of love as a conscious moral appraisal and bestowal of value on a person or thing, and uses this in order to analyze the meaning of the term "love" in Paulo Freire's pedagogy of the oppressed. In Martin's exposition, love is guided by moral virtues such as fairness, respect, gratitude, caring, fidelity, and wisdom. Martin provides a microscopic view and analysis of love. He offers a "systematic mapping" of the virtues that create and guide love from within. Yet Martin's study is primarily limited to analyzing love in sexual relationships, one of the three domains Irving Singer identifies in *The Pursuit of Love* (1994). While sexual love is undeniably a domain of love and necessary for human procreation and the survival of the species, social and religious love are also essential for the existence of humans as critically conscious beings. At this juncture, it is necessary to turn to Singer's *The Pursuit of Love*, where he offers a "systematic mapping of the concept of love" (1994, p. xii). Moving from Martin's to Singer's work is also a shift from analyzing love under a microscope to gazing at it through a telescope, since love encompasses not only the virtues that guide it from within but the wide gamut of conscious, moral, loving relationships created by individuals with others.

In his preface to *The Pursuit of Love*, Irving Singer presents three regions of love: sexual love, social love, and religious love (1994, p. xii). While his understanding of

religious love is guided by theological concepts, it also incorporates what Singer terms “my ideas about ‘the love of life’” (1994, p. xiii). Singer “argues for a pluralistic and ‘self-realizationist’ approach.” He acknowledges his own lack of certainty, and views his work as part of a larger ongoing investigation to provoke creative thought by his readers.

Singer writes:

In mapping out this diversity of conceptual elements, I write as a humanistic philosopher. I employ literary examples, insights about human nature, and speculative intuitions that may induce further research. As an essay in the theory of love, the present book does not offer counseling or even definitive conclusions. Instead it seeks to provoke thought in the reader, to open new areas for investigation, and to sketch a panoramic view that others may use in their own search for affective as well as cognitive significance. (1994, p. xii)

Singer’s *The Pursuit of Love* (1994) evokes questions for moral thinking about love, but it avoids definitive guidelines or solutions that would ultimately deny men and women their own creative investigations and thoughts about how they should construct love. In this, the book resembles Singer’s earlier study, *The Nature of Love* (1984), and Mike Martin’s and Paulo Freire’s writings.

While Singer identifies three regions of love in his book, the regions can be separated only for intellectual study. Like Mike Martin’s virtues that guide and shape love, Singer’s regions are interrelated and intertwined. For instance, it is difficult to imagine conscious, meaningful sexual love in a marriage if the parties did not receive and cannot bestow meaningful, morally structured parental love. Furthermore, sexual love is guided by societal values even if humans are acting in rebellion against those values. While marital love embraces sexual love, marital love is also a type of societal love. When societal love extends to love for humanity, societal love’s borders with religious love become blurred and fuzzy, since the idea of love for humanity straddles both domains.

Finally, successful appraisals and bestowals of value on others and from others throughout love's three domains foster a "love of life." This echoes Mike Martin's statement that "In happy marriages, gratitude for love becomes gratitude for an entire life together" (1996, p. 172). Successful loves throughout love's domains enhances men's and women's sense of appreciation, wonder, and joy. It nourishes their love for life. While Singer's three regions of love have bearing on our understanding of love, societal or social love is the most important region for understanding Freire's theory of love in his pedagogy of the oppressed. Therefore, this study will limit its focus to that domain.

Although Irving Singer stated that love is a nonmoral loyalty (1984, p.11), he also cites Socrates' statement from the *Symposium* that "'love is the desire for the perpetual possession of the good'" (1994, p. 40). Singer qualifies this quote by adding "Without committing ourselves to the metaphysics that underlies his philosophy, we may agree with him that no love can be justified unless it satisfies our perpetual desire for goodness" (1994, p. 40). In loving relationships throughout all of love's domains, there is a belief that the beloved embodies the good. Yet in bestowing value on what one perceives as the good, a person may act in ways that are neither rational nor irrational. According to Singer, rationality is not always a necessary part of love. He states that there are

people who are sensitive to the suffering of others, people who have a natural disposition toward nurturance, people who are cheerfully gregarious and therefore capable of *liking* others, people who enjoy the good things of life (above all good health) and are capable of sharing their serendipity in acts of spontaneous generosity, people who have acute awareness of the physical and moral beauty in others, or people who acquire the ability to maximize their own pleasures through the fostering of pleurability in someone else. (1994, p. 40)

This is not always the result of a rational thought process or investigation regarding ways to bestow value and love in relationships with others. Often men and women are simply

“in the world” (Freire, 1970, p. 58) in their relationships with others. Not every moment warrants profound investigation and thought. Humans cannot reflect on their every action, although they can cultivate ways of being “in the world” while at the same time being conscious that these ways of being can be examined and re-examined in future investigations.

This facet of human relationships is important because men and women engage in hundreds of social interactions with others each day, yet each relationship cannot be the subject of conscious investigations to appraise and bestow moral value on others. There can be a general respect, caring, and concern for fairness and trust that guides casual interactions with other men and women ranging from the cashier at the supermarket, to the people one encounters while waiting for a bus, and the fan in the next seat at a baseball game. These relationships encompass a genial gregariousness; they are the common relationships experienced during the course of day-to-day living. There is no requirement that these relationships transcend this genial gregariousness, but there is nothing to prevent their growing into something more. Relationships with others can be the subject of further conscious investigation and actions if the parties choose to pursue that course. Furthermore, even when profound critical consciousness has been achieved in a friendship, friendships do not require that every moment in the relationship be the subject of a critical and conscious moral investigation regarding bestowals of value and humanization. There is a quiet joy and gratitude in simply sharing each other’s company while taking a walk together; there may be a boisterous comradeship in watching a baseball game together without conversation about humanization. While these moments might lack conscious dialogue regarding love and humanization, they nourish the

potentiality for such investigations and actions. And nothing prevents dialogue regarding humanization at a ballgame.

Returning to Singer's ideas concerning love's desire and pursuit of goodness, an irrational and unreflective ability to bestow value on others in gregarious relationships may be more beneficial for society than "a destructive love of ideas" that thwarts or prevents the love of others (1994, pp. 40, 41). Again, the vast complexities of all potential human relationships surface presenting infinite challenges for the conscious moral appraisal and bestowal of value on others in the pursuit of goodness, humanization, and love. Moving outward into the immense telescopic universe of human relations, we see that social loves require conscious moral tethers to the virtues Martin identified, including fairness, respect, gratitude, caring, wisdom, and humility; the virtues help men and women to consciously guide and morally create their loves and lives. While reflection cannot guarantee successful love nor immunity from destructive loves, the conscious moral creation of human relationships is a cornerstone of the pursuit of one's ontological vocation of being "with the world, and with each other" (Freire, 1970, p.58).

In sketching his systematic mapping of love in society, Irving Singer (1994) identifies six love relationships that serve as the basis for his fourth chapter. In his overview of this chapter, Singer writes that it "deals with different types of love relationships starting with self-love and continuing through parental love, filial love, peer and friendship love, love of one's clan or group or nation, and then ending with love of humanity" (1994, p. xii). As one moves through this continuum of social loves from self-love to a love of humanity, there are numerous potential types of relationships within each of the subgroups. For instance, peer love includes a love for one's siblings, all types of

friendship, and love of one's spouse, which partakes of both sexual love and marital friendship. There are many actual relationships within each group as well as many more people who might receive conscious moral appraisals and bestowals of value. One's parents are limited in number, but peers and friends are not. In addition, love for humanity can be abstract, an ideal rather than a concrete relationship that encompasses a set group of relatives or friends who are known by name as individuals. It is more difficult to be consciously aware of those who are not seen and may never be seen in different communities or parts of the world.

As his starting point for what he terms a "chromatic spectrum" of love in society, Irving Singer takes self-love. He writes,

In an obvious sense we do not have a society with ourselves. We simply are what we are, individuals that flourish or falter in the world of our experience, enjoying our personal life as best we can. Though it is perfectly correct in ordinary language to say that we like and even love ourselves, the logical form of such utterances must always seem odd. (1994, p. 74)

According to Singer, self-love has often been depicted as a human defect. Singer states, "Self-love is thought to be a fall from grace, a manifestation of pride, as in Lucifer, or else an animalistic substratum that humankind must transcend if it can ever attain authentic love" (1994, p. 75). Singer claims that Martin Luther contributed to this negative view of self-love when he concluded that "our self-love [. . .] corrupts and ultimately destroys our efforts to love God and other people, however well-intentioned we may be" (1994, p. 75). Luther held that self-love distorts God's love and "prevents us from creating love that is worthy of that name" (1994, p. 75). In this frequently dominant strain of Western thought, self-love is simply perceived as selfish.

Singer does not share this belief. He writes that “the idea of self-love would thus encompass the fact that each of us can feel delight in merely being what we are” (1994, p. 75). He adds that Luther’s views contradict an older view of the Church fathers like St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas, who “recognized the difference between earthly and divine love, but [. . .] believed there was an aspect of self-love that is entirely commendable” (1994, p. 75). According to Singer, “caritas” included the proper self-love that “leads to the love of God and one’s neighbor” (1994, p. 76). It “enables us to emulate Christ while also loving ourselves in accordance with human nature” (1994, p. 76). Martin’s discussion of virtue illuminates this aspect of Singer’s analysis: any love can be morally flawed if not guided by caring, respect, fairness, gratitude, and wisdom. As Singer states, “to love oneself is to have a sense of self-affirmation, assurance about the potentialities of one’s being, confidence and even delight in existing as one does” (1994, p. 76). Properly guided, self-love, which requires self-respect, is necessary for all other loves. If men and women lack self-respect, they cannot love themselves. If they cannot bestow moral value on themselves, they cannot believe that they are capable of bestowals of value worth giving to others, nor can they believe that they deserve the love of others in return.

In his chromatic spectrum of social loves, Singer places parental and filial love next to self-love. These loves are vertical rather than horizontal, as they are initially grounded in authority and obligations that do not necessarily require the parties’ consent. For better or worse these family love relationships are humans’ first conscious and subconscious experiences with love. These experiences can be positive, or they “may also help explain why we develop in later years such extreme capacities for hatred as well as love, and for

the frequent interpenetration of these feelings” (Singer, 1994, p. 87). Mothers bestow value on their children, but “the loving mother needs the infant just as it needs her, though obviously in different ways. Her love cannot be unconditional” (1994, p. 82).

According to Singer,

[the mothers’] capacity for love is limited by forces deep within themselves, it inevitably reflects the extent to which their own interests are satisfied. Loving mothers are those who happily accept the mutuality of demands that bind them to their children. They are able to find means by which they can enjoy the neonate while also giving sustenance and gratification to it. Maternal love is predicated upon a reciprocal and humorous satisfaction of needs and desires. (1994, p. 83)

Singer continues his analysis of parental love stating that there is little difference between mother love and father love. He claims that “without being *more* conditional, fathers’ love has generally involved social and political standards that supervene upon the personal or nurturant goods that mothers can provide” (1994, p. 83). Simply put, father love may appear more conditional, but only because fathers often control greater types of tangible social, economic, and political rewards for approved behaviors. Ultimately, a parent’s appraisals and bestowals of value are in some way contingent upon receiving gratification or bestowal of value in return, even if only a subconscious smile from a newborn while enjoying playful activities with the parent.

From these experiences, the newborn learns subconsciously to bestow value upon his or her parents. Yet, at this early stage, “however much a newborn child may sense the goodness of the food and drink and comfort that it receives, it does not recognize the parental love that bestows these values” (1994, p. 86). For this reason, conscious awareness of love is developmental, and both consciousness of the love and the love itself can be easily thwarted. Parental love is largely based on a parent’s own experience

of love from his or her parents and the experienced social norms of this love. Filial love is initially unconscious; it evolves into subconscious efforts to return love, although the reasons for the infant's bestowal of love are often self-centered: the baby learns to smile in order to receive a bottle of milk. But parental love can later become the subject of inquiry. Parents can question how and why they do things as part of love. Likewise, children can question how to bestow value on their parents. While some degrees of their vertical nature always endures, parental and filial relationships and loves are subject to renegotiation, as when an adult child must care for his or her parents. Singer writes,

An elderly father may not welcome his increased dependence on his son; he will resent being told how to spend the remaining years of his life. But he may be comforted by the idea that the younger man will share some of his burdens and possibly take care of him in his final illness. (1994, p. 90)

Although they are vertical loves, parental and filial loves are also constructed by moral virtues and guided by negotiations even if they are limited to a smile in exchange for a bottle. And, as with all the types of love, there are utopian ideals for successful loves present in each relationship and a wide array of human successes and failures in appraising and bestowing value that fall somewhere beneath these ideals.

Singer places peer love and friendship after parental and filial loves in his systematic mapping of social loves. Unlike parental and filial loves, peer love and friendship are horizontal; there are no authorities or predetermined obligations. The only obligations that ultimately exist in these loves are those that the parties freely and fairly negotiate and consent to meet. This category of loves encompasses a wide array of peoples and an equally vast variety of relationships. It includes one's siblings and one's spouse. It incorporates the vast number of peoples whom one befriends in life. Peer love includes

the casual acquaintances we see every day on the bus while traveling to work, as well as the people we see once a year at a conference.

Yet, Singer notes, it also includes individuals engaged in joint investigations for the good. In his analysis of friendship, Singer summarizes Plato's view of friendship as the human love "embodied in friendship, which [. . . is] an adventure of like-minded companions striving to attain the Good" (1994, p. 93). In his analysis of Plato and Aristotle, Singer states

What he [Plato] designates as a "perfect friendship" is a social but usually nonsexual love between persons who admire one another as virtuous human beings, who see this much of themselves in each other, and who establish a kind of moral partnership that benefits everyone. What Plato interprets as a mutual search for goodness Aristotle depicts as the basis of an ideal community in which likes are not only attracted to likes but also fulfill their social and political potentialities as the fruition of their perfect friendship. (1994, p. 94)

Although this may appear to be a noble utopian ideal, it is also a possible goal. And this is precisely where Freire's pedagogy of the oppressed is anchored: it is problem-posing education that makes oppression and its causes the subject of investigation (1970, p. 33). As Freire noted, "apart from inquiry, apart from the praxis, men cannot be truly human. Knowledge emerges only through invention and re-invention, through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry men pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other" (1970, p. 58). Freire would have agreed with Singer's account of Aristotelian friendship as striving to "fulfill [. . .] social and political potentialities" in pursuit of the good (Singer, 1994, p. 94). Men and women work together in loving solidarity to create a political and social world in which it will be easier to love. Solidarity is thus a type of the peer love or friendship that Freire sought to foster through

his educational projects. It does not preclude other loves. It is not superior to other loves; it is necessary but not sufficient for the pursuit of love and humanization.

Singer observes of inequalities between friends, “To the extent that we are able to love, we act as if we are all alike—each of us, as in the words of the Negro spiritual, “standing in need of prayer” (1994, p. 94). In friendship, men and women are often oblivious to differences between the parties. But this observation also points to the ever-present need for fairness, respect, gratitude, humility, and wisdom because of inherent imperfection and incompleteness. We are “standing in need of prayer” to combat individual and collective imperfections.

Within peer love and friendship, Singer places family love, which is inherently linked to the horizontal love for one’s siblings and spouse as well as the vertical loves for one’s parents and children. This love introduces greater abstractions, since knowledge and feelings are cultivated for other relatives without necessarily having immediate knowledge of them. Singer writes:

Family love can also encompass sentiments related to human beings greatly distant in time or space. Piety towards one’s forbearers, which sometimes turns into retroactive devotion bordering on love, is a feeling of that sort. Knowledge about remote ancestors cannot elicit the same affection that one might have toward parents, children, or siblings. Nor are we capable of experiencing a love of future descendants that would be comparable to our love for those who now surround us. Yet we sense an identity with people who share our lineage even though they live in different periods of time. (1994, p. 98)

While family love might lead to an elitist snobbery towards others in some cases, it also places individuals in an historical continuum. It offers a sense of those who came before and those who will follow. This knowledge helps individuals develop greater respect and

gratitude for one's ancestors and respect for one's potential descendents. It can also foster humility through conscious awareness of one's own finite existence.

In examining peer love and friendship, Singer introduces ideas of closed and open morality in relationships. Singer writes about a book his daughter received as a young girl, which stated "A friend is someone who likes you" (1994, p. 92). He qualifies this statement by claiming "A friend is not only someone who likes you, a friend is also someone *like* you. We cannot hope to be friends with aliens from another galaxy whose minds and manners are totally strange to us" (1994, p. 92). In closed-morality relations we tend to pick as our friends people who are like us, who share our interests, who share our activities, who look like us. But open-morality relationships require us to be virtuous in relationships with those who are not like us; there we need many of what Martin identifies as love's virtues: respect, caring, fairness, trust, and gratitude. These relationships are often more difficult since they require greater abstract reflection; they require greater openness to those who are different. This cannot be achieved by mandate, but rather through problem-posing education, through hopeful inquiry, and through loving dialogue with both those who are like and those who are unlike us.

Beyond peer love and friendship, Irving Singer places love for one's clan, group, or nation. Singer holds that "the move from love of family to love of nation or country is fairly gradual, and most people make this transition with relative ease" (1994, p. 102). These groups are often closed societies of similar individuals, although that is not necessarily the case. And, while individuals may develop relationships with those who are members of their nation but not like them, love of nation is "entirely compatible with distrust and even hatred of one's neighbor. For no individual, above all the person who

lives next door, need represent the land we claim to love” (1994, p. 101). Singer also notes that “The country is itself a somewhat fictive entity, unified in the imagination mainly at moments of crisis” (1994, p. 102). Love of nation is partly the love of an abstract ideal. As with all love, it can inspire noble thought and action dedicated to the goodness in others. It can also lead to misguided actions, “as when soccer fans forget their love of soccer and fight among themselves merely because they support different national teams” (1994, p. 102). Again, Singer offers an ideal of love and the gamut of human realities that lie below that ideal.

Beyond love of nation, Singer places the love of humanity. According to Singer, this is a major transition from love of country, one that many people never make (1994, p. 103). Singer returns to the ideas of “closed morality” and “open morality,” which he attributes to Henri Bergson. Singer paraphrases Bergson as follows:

As he defines the relevant terms, closed morality arises from instinctual bonds that impose a sense of obligation upon each individual, while open morality consists in sympathetic identification with the creative vitality in all people.

In the open society, which Bergson recognizes to be utopian, we love all members of our species with a love that is God himself. We do the right thing not because the voice of conscience tells us to, but rather through a spiritual impulse to bring the world closer to an absolute goodness. (1994, p. 104)

While Singer cites Bergson at length in this section, he disagrees with Bergson’s belief that love of humanity is a “sympathetic identification” or “a spiritual impulse.” Love of humanity encompasses more than our rightly guided emotional response (1994, p. 104). It needs to work in tandem with reason.

However, Irving Singer has an even greater difficulty with Bergson. Singer states:

It seems to me that he is mistaken when he gives the love of humankind principal importance in questions of either ontology or morality. Not only can one doubt the notion that God is in the world as the creative energy that explains our

biological or vital development, but also one may refuse to identify ideal morality with an attitude that subordinates every other social love to our love of humanity. What happens in friendship, in sexual and married love, or in the relationships that we have studied can be equally valuable. (1994, p. 105)

Singer holds that all the loves work together in unison to nurture a love for humanity. No single type of love relationship is superior to, or inferior to, the other relationships; no single love creates love by itself. As Singer reminds his readers, it is peer love, love for one's siblings and family, extended to one's friends and nation, that fosters "phrases such as 'the brotherhood of man'" or love for humanity (1994, p. 106). Developing love for humanity does not preclude or supersede the other loves. The loves themselves bolster and nourish each other as well as the individuals who appraise, bestow, and receive moral values in the wide range of loving relationships.

While all these loves are necessary and work together as part of the human quest to love, solidarity, as created in peer love and love for humanity, is the cornerstone for Freire's pedagogy of the oppressed. The conscious moral appraisal and bestowal of value on others and with others in the ongoing pursuit of humanization—the quest to be more fully human—is both the means to and the end of Freire's educational practice.

Thus far, this study has first placed love under Mike Martin's microscope to analyze love as morally guided and structured from within. Love does not exist without fairness, respect, and gratitude. Irving Singer has then provided a telescope to analyze love's vast domains ranging from self-love out to love for humanity. But love is not stationary. Like the quest to be more fully human, love is an ongoing inquiry and doing. Love is the conscious, fluid interplay of love's virtues through love's regions in relationship with others. The quest for love, and "the creation of a world in which it will be easier to love"

(Freire, 1970, p. 24), are ongoing inquiries regarding how to act with love in ways that promote liberation and humanization. This study will now apply Martin's virtues and Singer's domains to analyze the role that love plays in Paulo Freire's pedagogy of the oppressed. Love has been analyzed under a microscope; it has been examined through a telescope. Chapter three uses this paradigm to analyze Freire's concept of love. Set in motion, love resembles a kaleidoscope, as men and women consciously determine how to blend love's virtues through love's domains to imaginatively create meaningful, colorful lives of joy, wonder, and awe in their pursuit of humanization. And, in doing so, this paradigm remains faithful to Mike Martin, Irving Singer, and Paulo Freire.

Findings

This study has defined love as a conscious moral appraisal and bestowal of value on a person or thing. It has then offered a systematic mapping of love as both shaped from within by moral virtues and extending outward through a vast range of human social relationships. It now uses this exploration of love to show that Paulo Freire's faith in "the creation of a world in which it will be easier to love" (1970, p. 24) expresses a utopian, yet achievable, goal, and that this goal is attained by undertaking the pedagogy of the oppressed. To claim that Freire's goal is achievable is to say that there are no natural or physical barriers to prevent its attainment; to characterize it as utopian is to point out that it requires difficult conscious human choice. This chapter uses the paradigm of love presented previously to analyze Freire's theory of education as a theory of love, and to show how these theories have the potential to realize Freire's lifelong utopian dream.

This analysis of Paulo Freire's educational theory begins by returning to Freire's steadfast and articulated vision of education as an act of love. In his first work, *Education as the Practice of Freedom*, Freire claimed that "Education is an act of love, and thus an act of courage" (1973, p. 38). Similarly, in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, he asserted that

The oppressor [as educator] is solidary with the oppressed only when he stops regarding the oppressed as an abstract category and sees them as persons who have been unjustly dealt with, deprived of their voice, cheated in the sale of their labor—when he stops making pious, sentimental, and individualistic gestures and risks an act of love. True solidarity is found only in the plentitude of this act of love, in its existentiality, in its praxis. (1970, p. 35)

Freire's entire educational project aimed at "the creation of a world in which it will be easier to love" (1970, p. 24). These assertions explicitly illustrate Freire's unwavering belief that love was the sine qua non of education as well as the desired outcome of his educational projects. These quotes provide the explicit annunciation of what is implicit throughout his texts. Education is an act of love because conscious human activity is imbued with the potential to be and create further acts of love. This will occur if educators themselves consciously choose to appraise and bestow moral value on their students and on the pedagogical process, which aims at humanization through the conscious creation and re-creation of the world.

Three basic questions guide this analysis of Freire's educational theory and exploration of the implicit and inherent role of love in his work. First, educational theories necessarily encompass a view of who is being educated; they presuppose ideas regarding human nature. Second, educational theories address why these men and women are being educated and the purpose of the proposed educational project. Third, educational theories address how the proposed education will be achieved and the methods to be used in the educational project. In Freire's pedagogy of the oppressed, these three questions are inextricably intertwined; they can be separated on a theoretical plane, but not in the practice of education. In addition, this study will show that love as a conscious moral appraisal and bestowal of value is the cornerstone of each facet of Freire's theory.

Educational theory necessarily begins with a vision—either implied or explicitly stated—of who is being educated. This is not a simple or static "who;" it encompasses multiple, simultaneous visions of the student. For instance, it incorporates a vision of the

educated person or the person who emerges as a result of the educational project. There is a concomitant vision of the person who is being educated or what men and women are before the educational project begins. Without these joint and related visions of who is being educated and what they should be as a result of the educational project, there is no reason for any educational project. Stated differently, educational theories offer an annunciation of the person who will emerge from the proposed educational project as well as a denunciation of the person or—in Freire's case—the oppressive conditions that shaped and limited the person who needs the proposed educational project and will benefit from it. In addition, epic educational theories like Freire's incorporate multiple visions of what students might be at various moments within the educational project, since large transformations do not occur in a single historical moment. These sub-visions may reflect a positive transformation of people as they move towards the goal, or indicate failed or flawed educational projects. Simply put, educational theories abound with suppositions regarding the nature and abilities of their proposed students throughout their lives as members of a given society. These theories make claims about what the proposed educational process will contribute to the individual's development, and how the educational process will effect desired changes in these students and their society.

Paulo Freire began *Education as the Practice of Freedom* (1973) by offering a vision of men and women as capable of conscious relationships in the world, with the world, and with each other, and thus as capable of critical reflection and action that enables them to transcend a single-dimensional existence in time and space. He wrote:

To be human is to engage in relationships with others and with the world. It is to experience that world as an objective reality, independent of oneself, capable of being known. Animals, submerged within society, cannot relate to it; they are creatures of mere *contacts*. But man's separateness from and openness to the

world distinguishes him as a being of *relationships*. Men, unlike animals, are not only *in* the world but *with* the world. Human relationships with the world are plural in nature. Whether facing widely different challenges of the environment or the same challenges, men are not limited to a single reaction pattern. They organize themselves, choose the best response, test themselves, act, and change in the very act of responding. They do all this consciously as one uses a tool to deal with a problem.

Men relate to the world in a critical way. They apprehend the objective data of their reality (as well as the ties that link one datum to another) through reflection—not by reflex as do animals. And in the act of critical perception, men discover their own temporality. Transcending a single dimension, they reach back to yesterday, recognize today, and come upon tomorrow. The dimensionality of time is one of the fundamental discoveries in the history of human culture. (1973, p. 3).

Freire continues:

Men exist in time. They are inside. They are outside. They inherit. They incorporate. They modify. Men are not imprisoned within a permanent “today;” they emerge and become temporalized. As men emerge from time, discover temporality, and free themselves from “today,” their relations with the world become impregnated with consequences. The normal role of human beings in and with the world is not a passive one. Because they are not limited to the natural (biological) sphere but participate in the creative dimensions as well, men can intervene in reality in order to change it. Inheriting acquired experience, creating and recreating, integrating themselves into their context, responding to its challenges, objectifying themselves, discerning, transcending, men enter into the domain which is theirs exclusively—that of History and Culture.

Integration with one’s context, as distinguished from *adaptation*, is distinctively human activity. Integration results from the capacity to adapt oneself to reality *plus* the critical capacity to make choices and to transform that reality. To the extent that man loses his ability to make choices and is subjected to the choices of others, to the extent that his decisions are no longer his own because they result from external prescriptions, he is no longer integrated. Rather he is adapted. He has “adjusted.” (1973, pp. 3, 4)

This passage provided the first glimpse of Freire’s terse, unwavering, and explicit vision of human nature and potentiality. It simultaneously captured his ideas regarding who was being educated and what men and women should be as a result of his proposed educational process. Men and women are capable of conscious integration with their world.

Unlike other animals, humans have the potential to use language as a means to reflect on their position in the world, including their relationships with the world and with other humans. They have the potential for “integration with one’s context” (1973, p. 4), which enables them to reflect on the challenges they confront and then find creative ways to overcome these obstacles. Freire stated, “Integration results from the capacity to adapt oneself to reality *plus* the critical capacity to make choices and to transform that reality” (1973, p. 4). Humans use language in their reflections—or dialogues with themselves—and in their dialogues with others to consciously achieve an understanding of their natural world and what can and cannot be changed within that natural world. Nature can and does impose physical limits on human action. Human history resounds with the efforts of men and women to consciously and creatively surmount these physical limitations, ranging from creating shelters to overcoming gravity through flight. The human capacity to consciously and creatively identify and respond to physical and natural challenges in the world transforms men and women into beings with the world. For Freire, this was synonymous with the human potential to consciously and creatively read and write the word and world.

As Freire noted, this transformation to being with the world places men and women in “the domain which is theirs exclusively—that of History and Culture” (1973, p. 4). This also thrusts men and women into infinite, ongoing, conscious relationships with the world and others. Men and women face the “widely different challenges of the environment” (1973, p. 3), and they thus also confront the widely different challenges of the historical, social, political, economic, educational, religious, and other institutions that they create to deal with those challenges. Conscious reflection reveals infinite human creations for “the

critical capacity to make choices and to transform that reality” (1973, p. 4), ranging from the very words used by Paulo Freire or employed in this study, to the wide array of historical and cultural institutions listed above. As human creations, they are tools that are consciously used to diagnose and creatively solve problems. Freire described this phenomenon in a similar way when he wrote about the men and women who would emerge from his educational project. His words were also an expression of human potentiality, or what humans could be. In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire wrote, “For apart from inquiry, apart from praxis, men cannot be truly human. Knowledge emerges only through invention and re-invention, through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry men pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other” (1970, p. 58). Humans are engaged in conscious inquiries in order to transform themselves and their world. This ties the question of who is being educated to the questions of how and why they are being educated. Men and women who can consciously inquire and decide how to transform their world are being educated by reflecting on their conscious choices about how to transform their world. This promotes further reflection on the consequences of those choices, which in turn, leads to further action.

These passages point to the inherent potential for love and the potential for “the creation of a world in which it will be easier to love” (1970, p. 24) in Freire’s educational theory. Humans choose, create, and re-create their responses to the world; they also choose, create and re-create their relationships with others as they respond to the world. Every human response has the potential to be a conscious moral appraisal and bestowal of value on other people or things. Every human response has the potential to be an act of love. The men and women educated through Freire’s pedagogy of the

oppressed are capable of grounding their thoughts and actions in an ethic of love. They have the potential to read and write their word and world as conscious, creative acts of love.

In a perfect utopian world founded on an infallible ethic of love, men and women would engage in ongoing inquiries and actions, or praxis, to effect the positive transformation of their world. There would be a constant, unbroken improvement in the quality of human life as men and women worked together to transform their natural world. This ideal, however, represents an impractical utopia since love, like education, democracy, and humanization, is never complete. They are ongoing activities and thus prone to human fallibility. Freire was pragmatic; he envisioned a “world in which it will be easier to love” (1970, p. 24) rather than an impractical utopian world of love. Striving for a world where it is easier to love is a difficult goal, yet it is achievable if men and women consciously strive to make moral appraisals and bestowals of value on the relationships they create with the world and others.

This qualification and distinction represents Freire’s awareness of the pervasive nature of oppression. It is not just the natural or physical world that men and women respond to, but the world of human institutions and ideas that needs to be surmounted. These institutions, and the myths associated with them, often limit human inquiry and praxis. They are frequently and consciously created by some people intent to limit the inquiry and praxis of others through acts of oppression. Indeed, for his educational work, Freire spent seventy days in prison and sixteen years in exile following the military coup in Brazil in 1964. The military, as a national institution, temporarily put an end to his work in Brazil. And while oppression often takes the form of physical violence against others,

it can also take a more nefarious and covert form by hindering or misleading the inquiry and thought of others. It inhibits creative solutions by men and women in their pursuit of humanization. In other words, some human institutions either intentionally or unintentionally promote a false reading of the word and world. They prescribe an illiteracy that unfairly thwarts men and women in their creative power. These people and institutions thereby thwart love.

This study notes two ways in which Freire's vision of who was being educated evolved between his first work, *Education as the Practice of Freedom* (1973), and his second work, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970). *Education as the Practice of Freedom* held an optimistic vision of men and women confronting the challenges of their world. Freire was cognizant of oppression or the imposition of one person's will upon another; he was not naïve. He wrote: "To the extent that man loses his ability to make choices and is subjected to the choices of others, to the extent that his decisions are no longer his own because they result from external prescriptions, he is no longer integrated. Rather he is adapted. He is 'adjusted'" (1973, p. 4). *Education as the Practice of Freedom* annunciated a mostly positive view of human potential and elaborated that potential in its opening pages cited previously. Freire's optimism for humanity was not absent from *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, but the opening paragraphs contained a darker account of the ongoing historical presence of dehumanizing oppression. Freire established a Manichaeian dialectic between oppression and liberation; ultimately it reflects the ongoing dialectic between hate and love, since oppression is inherently violent and thwarts love. For Freire, humanization, or the pursuit of one's ontological vocation of being more fully human, is not an evolutionary certainty.

Humanization is a hard-fought and ongoing struggle because humanization eclipses being with the world and transcends the physical challenges of nature. Humanization, or being more fully human, required surmounting the prescriptions of others that inherently limit or thwart critically conscious creativity. This was evident in Freire's opening paragraphs of *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* where he wrote:

While the problem of humanization has always, from an axiological point of view, been man's central problem, it now takes on a character of inescapable concern. Concern for humanization leads at once to the recognition of dehumanization, not only as an ontological possibility but as an historical reality. And as man perceives the extent of dehumanization, he asks himself if humanization is a viable possibility. Within history, in concrete, objective contexts, both humanization and dehumanization are possibilities for man as an uncompleted being conscious of his incompleteness.

But while both humanization and dehumanization are real alternatives, only the first is man's vocation. This vocation is constantly negated, yet it is affirmed by that very negation. It is thwarted by injustice, exploitation, oppression, and the violence of the oppressors; it is affirmed by the yearning of the oppressed for freedom and justice, and by the struggle to recover their lost humanity.

Dehumanization, which marks not only those whose humanity has been stolen, but also (though in a different way) those who have stolen it, is a *distortion* of the vocation of becoming more fully human. This distortion occurs within history; but it is not an historical vocation. Indeed, to admit of dehumanization as an historical vocation would lead either to cynicism or total despair. The struggle for humanization, for the emancipation of labor, for the overcoming of alienation, for the affirmation of men as persons would be meaningless. This struggle is possible only because dehumanization, although a concrete historical fact, is *not* a given destiny but the result of an unjust order that engenders violence in the oppressors, which in turn dehumanizes the oppressed.

Because it is a distortion of being more fully human, sooner or later being less human leads the oppressed to struggle against those who made them so. In order for this struggle to have meaning, the oppressed must not, in seeking to regain their humanity (which is a way to create it), become in turn oppressors of the oppressed, but rather restorers of the humanity of both.

This then, is the great humanistic and historical task of the oppressed: to liberate themselves and their oppressors as well. (1970, pp. 27, 28)

According to Freire, the study of human history offers no guarantees of humanization and liberation. It remains the human task, men's and women's ontological vocation, to

consciously pursue humanization in opposition to the oppressor's unjust acts of dehumanizing violence. Freire was not naïve to the ominous nature of oppression when writing *Education as the Practice of Freedom* (1973), but his own fate after the military coup in Brazil underlined the prevalent nature of violent oppression and the power of people who institute or condone violent oppression against others. This necessarily affects and shapes the human nature of the oppressed, those who need Freire's pedagogical project, because they have internalized their fear of liberation and their fear of the necessary struggle for their humanization.

The second evolution in Freire's vision is an extension in geographical scope. *Education as the Practice of Freedom* (1973) was Freire's explanation of his educational projects in Brazil. It offered Freire's vision of what men and women can achieve. Although this book provides an understanding of how humans create and re-create their culture and history, it was nevertheless profoundly rooted in Brazilian history and social transitions. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970) is also grounded in Freire's native Brazil, but it uses his experiences there as the foundation for an outward-looking, broad and epic educational theory. Just as Mike Martin's work provides the microscope to analyze the components of love in a micro-theory, and Irving Singer's works provides the telescope or macro-theory for analyzing love's regions, Freire's two essays work in tandem and complement each other. *Education as the Practice of Freedom* provides an explanation of his initial literacy projects—the cultural circles—in his native Brazil, while *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* presents his epic theory of education with its roots in his earlier projects and text. This shift in Freire's focus and vision had other ramifications: the “who” to be educated evolved from the historically oppressed and illiterate Brazilian peasants and

workers who had lived their lives on plantations and in the increasingly industrialized cities, and came to include oppressed people in all times and places. Violent acts of oppression against men and women that hinder humanization can be found in Paris and New York City as well as Recife, Brazil. Oppression exists in all eras of history and all geographic locations, because dehumanization and oppression are “an historical reality” (1970, p. 27).

Given this study’s paradigm of love, the opening paragraphs from *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970) reflect Freire’s adamant belief in the necessity of love for humanization. Humanization is “man’s central problem,” and involves appraisals and bestowals of value given “an axiological point of view” of human history (1970, p. 27). Only men and women who are concerned with theories of value are capable of consciously appraising and bestowing value in acts of love, and thus capable of the pursuit of humanization. To avoid or ignore questions of value does not necessarily lead to dehumanization, but it reduces human existence from a conscious and creative activity to a capricious question of chance. Nor can such an attitude truly lead to humanization, because humanization is necessarily a conscious act. For Freire,

while both humanization and dehumanization are real alternatives, only the first is man’s vocation. This vocation is constantly negated, yet it is affirmed by that very negation. It is thwarted by injustice, exploitation, oppression, and the violence of the oppressors; it is affirmed by the yearning of the oppressed for freedom and justice” (1970, p. 27).

According to Freire, dehumanizing oppression necessarily perverts and prevents love. In oppressive conditions, humanization is thwarted by injustice and exploitation. These factors inhibit love because they ignore fairness and respect, two of the essential virtues that guide love from within. Without fairness and respect, gratitude—as well as love’s

other virtues—atrophies in loveless relationships. For Freire it was “the great humanistic and historical task of the oppressed: to liberate themselves and their oppressors as well” through acts of love (1970, p. 28).

This thought reveals “who” is truly being educated in Freire’s pedagogy of the oppressed. While his theory is concerned with the humanization of oppressed Third World peoples and those marginalized in the First and Second Worlds, Freire’s writings are directed at educators—teachers—who can either consciously foster humanizing liberation or else act as agents of dehumanizing oppression. Teachers are responsible for making conscious choices about how they will teach and whether they will employ teaching practices that promote love. When they fail to make choices that promote love, they enable dehumanizing oppression. It is educators who have to stop “making pious, sentimental, and individualistic gestures and risk an act of love” (1970, p. 35). For potential oppressors turned liberating educators in the struggle for humanization, “True solidarity is found only in the plenitude of this act of love, in its existentiality, in its praxis” (1970, p. 35). Ultimately, in Freire’s pedagogy of the oppressed, the educators themselves are being taught to teach with love. Freire’s works constitute a loving dialogue with his fellow educators, a dialogue in which he challenges them to consciously foster an educational practice that promotes the liberation, humanization, and love of all peoples in Brazil and around the world. Freire’s educational theory and practice aim at creating a world in which it will be easier to love, through conscious moral appraisals and bestowals of value on others and their ideas, and through reflective dialogues and actions that seeks to create and re-create the world.

In both *Education as the Practice of Freedom* (1973) and *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970), Freire asserts the necessity for dialogue, which comprises conscious acts of love.

In *Education as the Practice of Freedom*, Freire wrote:

Our method, then, was to be based on dialogue, which is a horizontal relationship between persons.

DIALOGUE

A with B = communication
 intercommunication

Relations of “empathy” between two “poles” who are engaged in a joint search.
MATRIX: Loving, humble, hopeful, trusting, critical.

Born of a critical matrix, dialogue creates a critical attitude (Jaspers). It is nourished by love, humility, hope, faith, and trust. When the two “poles” of the dialogue are thus linked by love, hope, and mutual trust, they can join in a critical search for something. Only dialogue truly communicates. (1973, p. 45)

As a loving, horizontal relationship between people that is “nourished by love,” and nourishes future acts of love, dialogue necessarily requires fairness of opportunity for those participating in the dialogue. It requires fairness in terms of mutual consent. Similarly, dialogue requires respect. Without respect for the other parties, dialogue ceases to be horizontal and becomes vertical communication, which is the antithesis of dialogue. The issuance of prescriptions or communiqués negates mutual consent. In *Education as the Practice of Freedom*, Freire labels this “ANTI-DIALOGUE” and describes it as “loveless, arrogant, hopeless, mistrustful, acritical” (1973, p. 46). By its lack of respect for people, anti-dialogue thwarts the fairness of mutual consent. It ignores shared autonomy. Even if the decision imposed the oppressor provides an equitable distribution of goods, the process lacks fairness and respect for others. As a result, these

actions constitute what Freire terms a “false generosity” or paternalism, which is designed to maintain an unjust social order. In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire writes:

In order to have the continued opportunity to express their “generosity,” the oppressed must perpetuate injustice as well. An unjust social order is the permanent fount of their “generosity,” which is nourished by death, despair, and poverty. That is why the dispensers of false generosity become desperate at the slightest threat to its source. (1970 p. 29)

False generosity, regardless of its purported magnanimity from the oppressor’s point of view, is the result of flawed or non-existent dialogue—anti-dialogue—that intrinsically rejects the fairness of mutual consent and respect for people. As such, the oppressors’ actions hinder gratitude and foster resentment in its place. Dialogue, as a “loving, horizontal relationship” requires fairness, respect and gratitude—the three virtues from Martin’s list that guide love from within. How those virtues shape the dialogues and relationships between the parties is part of the investigation or dialogue itself. One party cannot unilaterally make these decisions for all the affected parties and still have communication remain dialogue or an act of love. For Freire, when that occurs, it is “loveless, arrogant,” and anti-dialogue, which is simply a dehumanizing oppression.

In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970) love becomes synonymous with dialogue and freedom because they depend on each other. Freire writes:

Dialogue cannot exist, however, in the absence of a profound love for the world and for men. The naming of the world, which is an act of creation and re-creation, is not possible if it is not infused with love. Love is at the same time the foundation of dialogue and dialogue itself. It is thus necessarily the task of responsible Subjects and cannot exist in a relation of domination. Domination reveals the pathology of love: sadism in the dominator and masochism in the dominated. Because love is an act of courage, not of fear, love is commitment to other men. No matter where the oppressed are found, the act of love is commitment to their cause—the cause of liberation. And, this commitment, because it is loving, is dialogical. As an act of bravery, love cannot be sentimental; as an act of freedom, it must not serve as a pretext for manipulation.

It must generate other acts of freedom; otherwise it is not love. Only by abolishing the situation of oppression is it possible to restore the love which that situation made impossible. If I do not love the world—if I do not love life—if I do not love men—I cannot enter into dialogue. (1970, pp. 77, 78)

Love is a precondition for dialogue and the result of dialogue. Love is likewise necessary for freedom and the result of that freedom. Put differently, the conscious moral appraisal and bestowal of value on a person or thing is possible only if men and women are aware of how their use of language allows the conscious moral appraisal and bestowal of value. Love guides the formation of thought about thought, inquiry, relationships, actions, and love itself. The ideal of love directs the course of human actions and the analysis of the consequences of those actions. Men and women consciously bestow moral value on the ideas and ideals of love, dialogue, freedom, and humanization; their bestowals of value include their initial reflections on the realization of love, dialogue, and freedom; and they consciously expand their thoughts and activities in a loving praxis that is the means for surmounting oppression and pursuing humanization. For Freire, love is the axiological sine qua non of dialogue, because dialogue occurs in loving horizontal relationships with other men and women. Without love, dialogue can not exist. And without loving dialogue to guide thought and action, men and women are not free to consciously choose their course of action. They are oppressed by the violent prescriptions of others.

Like the passage from *Education as the Practice of Freedom* (1973) about dialogue and love this quotation from *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970) ties to Mike Martin's moral virtues that shape love from within. For Freire, love is an act of courage. Love is commitment to others. Love requires hope. The succeeding four paragraphs in

Pedagogy of the Oppressed contain multiple references to love's virtues as they guide or shape dialogue. Dialogue requires humility:

Dialogue cannot exist without humility. The naming of the world, through which men constantly re-create that world, cannot be an act of arrogance. [. . .] How can I dialogue if I always project ignorance onto others and never perceive my own? [. . .] How can I dialogue if I consider myself a member of the in-group of "pure" men, the owners of truth and knowledge, for whom all non-members are "these people" or "the great unwashed"? How can I dialogue if I start from the premise that naming the world is the task of an elite and that the presence of the people in history is a sign of deterioration, thus to be avoided? How can I dialogue if I am closed to—and even offended by—the contributions of others? (1970 pp. 78, 79)

Without humility, the educator cannot respect those engaged in dialogue; the dialogue degenerates into vertical communiqués or anti-dialogue. If naming the world is the task of the elite few, then fairness is absent and mutual consent is not attained. And if the privileged few are "offended by the contributions of others," they are incapable of gratitude that recognizes and appreciates the intellectual contributions of others. The absence of the three virtues that shape love from within results in Freire's "anti-dialogue," the antithesis of true dialogue and love.

In addition, dialogue is grounded in faith. Freire writes:

Dialogue further requires an intense faith in man, faith in his power to make and remake, to create and re-create, faith in his vocation to be more fully human (which is not the privilege of an elite, but the birthright of all men). Faith in man is an *a priori* requirement for dialogue; the "dialogical man" believes in other men even before he meets them face to face. (1970, p. 79)

Faith is one of Martin's virtues (1996) that shape love from within. And, like the collective sum of love's virtues, it is reinforced by the others. Faith in others does not exist without respect for them. A lack of faith in the rights and power of others to "make

and remake, to create and re-create” (Freire, 1970, p. 79) projects an arrogance that betrays the potential for love.

As an act of love, dialogue (like love itself) requires the fairness of mutual consent to discuss the balanced—or fair—distribution of goods. Dialogue is predicated on respect for others; it is established on respect for their knowledge and their right to both elements of fairness: fairness of autonomy and fairness of distribution. Genuine, loving dialogue increases gratitude as the parties mutually grow in their ability to love and their ability to consciously create or re-create their world, which is synonymous with their freedom from dehumanizing oppression.

Freire’s works constitute his risking an act of love in a loving dialogue regarding love, dialogue, education, freedom, and humanization. He exhorts his fellow educators to “risk an act of love” with those persons “who have been unjustly dealt with, deprived of their voice, cheated in the sale of their labor” (1970, p. 35). The educator needs to enter loving dialogue with those who are marginalized by society in order to achieve solidarity with them, not as a gift to them, but as a means of achieving liberation and humanization for all peoples.

By drawing together the oppressed, oppressors, and educators, the theories of Paulo Freire, Mike Martin, and Irving Singer theories are aligned. Educators risk conscious acts of love by entering dialogue, a manifestation of that love, with those who are oppressed or marginalized in society, with the intent of transforming the world so that it is easier to love. It is “only by abolishing the situation of oppression [that] it [is] possible to restore the love that the situation made impossible. If I do not love the world—if I do not love life—if I do not love men, I cannot enter into dialogue” (1970, p. 78). The act of

true dialogue is shaped from within by love's virtues, and it extends outward through love for society. It requires conscious appraisals and bestowals of value on oneself, continuing through "peer and friendship love, love for one's clan or group or nation, and then ending with love of humanity" (Singer, 1994, p. xii). By urging his fellow educators to risk acts of love and to teach with love, Freire is personally engaged in a self-love that extends to peer love or friendship love and ultimately to a love for all humanity. As indicated in the passage above, Friere's act of love and exhortations are guided by a conscious appraisal and bestowal of value on those who are oppressed, on those who have been cheated, and on those who have been deprived of their voice.

In Freire's educational theory, the marginalized are no longer "those people" or "the great unwashed." They are necessarily fellow teachers and fellow students. According to Freire, "there are neither utter ignoramuses nor perfect sages; there are only men who are attempting, together, to learn more than they now know" (1970, p. 79). Love, even for those that one has not met, is peer love. By advocating a loving dialogue among all people, a dialogue that respects their knowledge and seeks fairness of both mutual consent and equitable distribution of goods, Freire's educational projects and theory necessarily eschews any project that is anti-dialogical because it is intrinsically unfair. It does not respect people. Such programs only further oppression because these programs ignore the lived realities and knowledge of the people. These false programs of education impose prescriptions or set visions of the world onto their students. According to Freire,

In the banking concept of education, knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing. Projecting an absolute ignorance onto others, a characteristic of the

ideology of oppression, negates education and knowledge as the process of inquiry. (1970, p. 58)

True educational projects aim at liberation and humanization by requiring loving dialogue that respects and restores the voices of the oppressed. These educational projects are dialogical and problem-posing.

In Freire's problem-posing theory of education, the voices of those silenced and marginalized by oppressive societies through the banking concept of education are restored to humanity by loving dialogue that respects all humans as teacher-students and student-teachers. For Freire, the ongoing questions of humanization are the constant subject of these dialogues. Inquiries regarding liberation and humanization are the course content because they are the ongoing struggle of men and women being educated. It is the reason for their education. According to Freire, hopeful inquiry is essential to education. He writes:

For apart from inquiry, apart from the praxis, men cannot be truly human. Knowledge emerges only through invention and reinvention, through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry men pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other. (1970, p. 58)

Inquiries about how to live in the world, with the world, and with each other are the axiological questions of humanizing existence and education. They address conscious moral appraisals and bestowals of value on peoples and things in every conscious act of creation, and respond to the eternal question of humanity as it pursues its freedom and its ontological vocation, "How ought I / we act to achieve humanization?" For Freire, this transcends to the question "How ought I / we act to create a world in which it will be easier to love?"

Put differently, Freire's pedagogy of the oppressed is

a pedagogy which must be forged *with*, not *for*, the oppressed (whether individuals or peoples) in the incessant struggle to regain their humanity. This pedagogy makes oppression and its causes objects of reflection by the oppressed, and from that reflection will come their necessary engagement in the struggle for their liberation. And in the struggle this pedagogy will be made and remade. (1970, p. 33).

For those engaged in this pedagogy of the oppressed, the project is an ongoing inquiry that denounces the causes of dehumanizing oppression. At the same time, it is an annunciation of a "new man: no longer oppressor no longer oppressed, but man in the process of achieving freedom" (1970, pp. 33, 34). Freire's pedagogy of the oppressed was his conceptual option, his creative choice, for humanization as the conscious appraisal and bestowal of value on others. His pedagogy of the oppressed was intended to create a world in which it would be easier to love.

According to Freire, "Education is an act of love" (1973, p. 38). Education becomes the conscious moral appraisal and bestowal of value on people and things, including ideas themselves. Education is a conscious, loving dialogue with others; as a process of inquiry with others, it denounces oppression and announces the creation of a new person who is conscious of his or her creative power to appraise and bestow value in and with the world. Dialogue and education are acts of love because they are guided by fairness and respect. They foster gratitude and joy of life in solidarity with others. Only through dialogue with oneself and others can one make conscious moral appraisals and bestowals of value. Only through dialogue is love possible. It is through dialogue that the lenses of Martin's microscope, Singer's telescope, and life's kaleidoscope align in their focus despite continually moving at the blinding speed of human thought and action. Dialogue

is about building loving horizontal relationships with one's peers and humanity—especially those previously silenced and marginalized. And, humanity becomes one's peers as fellow students and teachers.

Finally, dialogue grounded in love provides the answer to the three questions about educational projects. The participants in Freire's educational project of loving dialogue are educating themselves and others as fellow teachers and students so that they can pursue their ontological vocation of being more fully human. They are being educated, through acts of love, to multiply their acts of love as they create and re-create themselves and their world; in that way it will be easier to love. Men and women use dialogue to guide their actions as they consciously appraise and bestow moral value in and with their world and with each other. The only way to educate and be educated for these acts of creative humanization is through loving dialogue. One learns to be free by consciously being free; one learns to dialogue by consciously dialoguing; one learns to love by consciously loving. An imperfection in any of these creative challenges does not imply insignificance. Human imperfections and failures are bound to occur. Through humility and awareness of their own imperfection, educators risk acts of love in dialogue and solidarity with others.

Summary, Conclusions, & Recommendations for Future Research

This study has used “the conscious moral appraisal and bestowal of value on a person or thing” as the definition and paradigm for love to elucidate the concept of love in Paulo Freire’s educational theory. This definition was derived from the works of Mike Martin and Irving Singer. Mike Martin’s *Love’s Virtues* (1996) offers a microscopic view that analyzes how love is morally structured and guided from within by virtues such as fairness, respect, and gratitude. These virtues are present in Freire’s educational theory as components of love; they guide problem-posing education grounded in inquiry and dialogue with others in order to promote liberating humanization. Freire’s educational theory and projects seek to overcome the moral injustices of dehumanizing oppression by fostering the conscious pursuit of fairness and respect as indispensable facets of love for all people. This study then adopted Irving Singer’s *The Pursuit of Love* (1994) as a telescopic lens to view the “systematic ‘mapping’” of love’s social relationships as they progress outward from the individual. This mapping started with self-love and extended out “through parental love, filial love, peer and friendship love, love of one’s clan or group or nation, and then ending with love of humanity” (1994 p. xii). Freire’s educational theory enjoins conscious moral choices to appraise and bestow value on those who have been marginalized by society; he exercised a preferential option to appraise and bestow value on those who were oppressed. These appraisals and bestowals of value apply to all people, regardless of their social class, if they have been dehumanized by the prescribed thoughts and actions of others. He morally values those individuals and peoples limited in or denied their rights to creative inquiries and actions. Conscious,

liberating love advocates fairness and respect throughout this systematic mapping of love's social region. As a result, this love nourishes gratitude. It necessarily transcends self-love and parental love as it consciously reflects on, and then acts with, a love for humanity in cooperation with others. Education becomes synonymous with loving dialogue, in solidarity with others, about how to be in and with the world and each other. The conscious moral appraisal and bestowal of value on others or things requires an ongoing inquiry with others into love's virtues and how to apply them in appropriate appraisals and bestowals of value throughout love's regions to promote liberation with others. By doing this, men and women can use Paulo Freire's educational theory to achieve his utopian vision, "the creation of a world in which it will be easier to love" (1970, p. 24). But this is not the same as a world of love; that is an impractical utopian ideal given human imperfection, which necessarily implies the end of human thought, creativity, and existence.

In his introduction to *Education for Critical Consciousness* (1973), Denis Goulet commented on Freire's "naivete" in *Education as the Practice of Freedom*. Goulet wrote:

"Education as the Practice of Freedom" grows out of Paulo Freire's creative efforts in adult literacy throughout Brazil prior to the coup of April 1, 1964, which eventually resulted in his exile. Were the piece to be written today, I feel certain that its title would become "Education as the Praxis of Liberation." For although Freire's earlier work does view action as *praxis*, the precise symbiosis between reflective action and critical theorizing is the fruit of later work [. . .]" (1973, p. vii)

Goulet is correct in his assertion, but Freire's essay could also be titled "Education as the Praxis of Dialogue", "Education as the Praxis of Inquiry", "Education as the Praxis of Love," or "Education as the Praxis of Humanization." The choice of multiple possible

titles reflects the reality that there is an array of conceptual options regarding where to enter Freire's educational theory and projects. To argue for one title over another is to engage in a pedantic debate about the first causes rather than to participate in a loving dialogue that acknowledges inquiry, dialogue, liberation, and love as important and indispensable elements of critical consciousness, education, and humanization. Dialogue, inquiry, freedom, and love are necessary and mutually reinforcing components of Freire's educational theory, and together lead to humanization (just as in Martin's theory, virtues work together to create love). They inherently shape and guide education from within. Each is necessary for humanization, but alone each is insufficient to foster humanization. Like Martin's virtues, these components represent the individual colors in the tapestry. An individual color may be more dominant in one area of the tapestry, but each color needs all the others to create the entire work. Dialogue, inquiry, freedom, and love intrinsically bolster and nurture each other in Freire's theory of education as the practice of freedom and the practice of love.

As Freire stated in the opening paragraph of *Education as the Practice of Freedom*, to be human is to be conscious of the relationships one has with the world and with others. Freire wrote:

To be human is to engage in relationships with others and with the world. It is to experience that world as an objective reality, independent of oneself, capable of being known. [. . .] Man's separateness from and openness to the world distinguishes him as a being of *relationships*. Men, unlike animals, are not only *in* the world but *with* the world [and with others]." (1973, p. 3)

Being human, pursuing one's ontological vocation, includes being consciously free to investigate the relationship between peoples, places, objects, and ideas. It implies being free to create and re-create these relationships as well. This is what a problem-posing

education seeks to achieve. And, “from an axiological point of view” (Freire, 1970, p. 27), this is inherently within love’s domain.

Every conscious human creation is imbued with the potential to be a conscious moral appraisal and bestowal of value on a person or thing. Every human act can be an act of love if it consciously strives to foster fairness, respect, and gratitude—as well as love’s other virtues—through all of love’s domains. Education is an act of love. Dialogue is an act of love. As human acts, acts of love may be flawed and may consciously undermine love of self and others through injustices and exploitations intended to preserve unjust privileges for one group of people. But humans can “risk acts of love” to surmount the oppressive acts of others. Humanization remains an act of love and a part of the knowledge that “emerges only through invention and re-invention, through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry men pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other” (1970, p. 58). It is thus that men and women can fulfill Freire’s vision of “the creation of a world in which it is easier to love,” by consciously choosing to morally appraise and bestow value on the ideal of love in their relationships with the world and with others.

This study is significant as an analysis of Paulo Freire’s use of the term “love” in his epic theory of education. It has provided a suitable definition of and paradigm for love as “the conscious moral appraisal and bestowal of value on a person or thing,” thereby clarifying Freire’s assertions that “education is an act of love” (1973, p. 38) and that the educator “risks an act of love” (1970, p. 35) in order to act with others for greater love, freedom, and humanization. This love—like humanization itself—requires constant, ongoing, conscious inquiry regarding how to act with the virtues that structure love from

within, especially fairness, respect, and gratitude. It requires concrete demonstrations of solidarity with love of others throughout love's social region. In Freire's educational theory, this love is not a checklist of methods, but an ongoing, conscious investigation regarding how men and women will exist in the world, with the world, and with each other. It requires ongoing, conscious reflection and action.

Education as an act of love is an act of courage because it confronts oppression in an incessant struggle to regain humanity. Freire's pedagogy constantly and consciously questions what is fair and looks for practices that promote respect for the people, especially those who are marginalized by others. His educational theory seeks both the fairness of free, democratic dialogue and decision-making as well as fairness in the distribution of society's benefits. Education, love, and liberation, like humanization itself, are constantly being rethought and remade. That is men's and women's ontological vocation.

Finally, having combined Freire's pedagogical theory and its implicit theory of love with an explicit paradigm of love, this study has suggested some directions for future studies. First, future studies may expand the application of this paradigm of love to Freire's later works. It is believed that this paradigm will illuminate and clarify Freire's use of the term "love" throughout the corpus of his writings. In addition, the definition of love offered here can be used to test every human thought and institution: Does it promote Freire's goal of fulfilling the ontological vocation of being more fully human? Or does it continue dehumanizing oppression? The paradigm of love presented in this study can be used to ask whether economic, political, educational, and cultural practices promote injustice or cultivate fairness for all people. Future studies may clarify ideas

presented here, just as this study has sought to clarify Freire's work. Irving Singer said of his work, "As an essay in the theory of love, the present book does not offer [. . .] definitive conclusions. Instead it seeks to provoke thought in the reader, to open new areas for investigation, and to sketch a panoramic view that others may use in their own search for affective as well as cognitive significance" (1994, p. xii). Greater insight and clarity must always be sought, since that is the "impatient, hopeful inquiry men pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other" (Freire, 1970, p. 58). That is the cornerstone ideal of education. That is what makes us human and enables "the creation of a world in which it will be easier to love."

Bibliography

- Allman, P. (1998). "...the creation of a world in which it will be easier to love."
Convergence, 31, 9-16.
- Berenson, F. (1991). What is this thing called 'love'? *Philosophy: The Journal of the Royal Institute of Philosophy*, 66, 65-79.
- Bloom, A. (1993). *Love and friendship*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Darder, A. (1998, April). *Teaching as an act of love: In memory of Paulo Freire*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.
- _____. (2002). *Reinventing Paulo Freire: A pedagogy of love*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Elias, J.L. (1994). *Paulo Freire: Pedagogue of liberation*. Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Co.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- _____. (1973). Education as the Practice of Freedom. In *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Continuum.
- _____. (1978). *Pedagogy in process: The letters to Guinea-Bissau*. New York: Seabury.
- _____. (1985). *The politics of education*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.
- _____. (1993). *Pedagogy of the city*. New York: Continuum.
- _____. (1994). *Pedagogy of hope*. New York: Continuum.
- _____. (1996). *Letters to Cristina: Reflections on my life and work*. New York: Routledge.

- _____. (1997). *Pedagogy of the heart*. New York: Continuum.
- _____. (1998a). *Pedagogy of freedom*. Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield.
- _____. (1998b). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare to teach*.
Boulder, CO: Westview.
- _____. (2000). *Cultural action for freedom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational
Review.
- Freire, P., & Faundez, A. (1989). *Learning to question: A pedagogy of liberation*. New
York: Continuum.
- Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. New York:
Bergin & Garvey.
- Gadotti, M. (1994). *Reading Paulo Freire*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Horton, M., & Freire, P. (1990). *We make the road by walking*. Philadelphia: Temple
University Press.
- Klein, J.T. (1989). Teaching and mother love. *Educational Theory*, 39(4), 373-383.
- Lewis, C.S. (1960). *The four loves*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Liston, D.P. (2000). Love and despair in teaching. *Educational Theory*, 50(1), 81-102.
- Martin, M. (1996). *Love's virtues*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.
- McLaren, P. (2000). Paulo Freire's Pedagogy of Possibility. In S.F. Steiner, H.M. Krank,
P. McLaren, & R.E. Bahruth (Eds.), *Freirean pedagogy, praxis, and possibilities*
(pp. 1-22). New York: Falmer Press.
- Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics & moral education*.
Berkeley: University of California Press.

Shor, I. (Ed.). (1987). *Freire for the classroom: A sourcebook for liberatory teaching*.

Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Shor, I., & Freire, P. (1987). *A pedagogy for liberation*. South Hadley, MA, Washington,

D.C.: Bergin & Garvey.

Singer, I. (1984). *The nature of love: Plato to Luther* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of

Chicago Press.

_____. (1994). *The pursuit of love*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Soble, A. (1990). *The structure of love*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Solomon, R. (1994). *About love*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.