



Specters of Dewey in Latin America: Some Notes on the Reception of Educational Theories

Inés Dussel & Marcelo Caruso

To cite this article: Inés Dussel & Marcelo Caruso (1998) Specters of Dewey in Latin America: Some Notes on the Reception of Educational Theories, *Paedagogica Historica*, 34:sup1, 375-399, DOI: [10.1080/00309230.1998.11434894](https://doi.org/10.1080/00309230.1998.11434894)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00309230.1998.11434894>



Published online: 20 May 2015.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 23



View related articles [↗](#)

SPECTERS OF DEWEY IN LATIN AMERICA: SOME NOTES ON THE RECEPTION OF EDUCATIONAL THEORIES

**Inés Dussel & Marcelo Caruso¹
University of Buenos Aires, Argentina**

INTRODUCTION

In the past two decades, the internationalization of pedagogy has become an object of scrutiny within a broader concern about the complex emergence of the modern school². In this field, the question of reading and reception appears as a relevant issue, not only because printing and printed materials were the main means for the transfer of educational theories but because the process of reading itself can be used as a matrix for understanding other processes of receiving educational theories.

The problematic of reading has been considered traditionally with the pattern of the relation between the original and the copy. The links among educationists from disparate countries and historical moments have been talked about in terms of misadjustments, infidelities or degradations of the first version. Recent work on Dewey's repercussion in the Third World suggests other approaches. Ronald Goodenow finds significant transferences between progressive Latin American educationists and Dewey's pedagogy.³

In this article, however, we intend to have a look at Dewey's readings in Latin America from a different point of view, as suggested by the theory of articulation⁴ and modern literary theory, particularly the aesthetics of re-

ception⁵. Dewey's pedagogy and Latin American pedagogies will be considered as open discursive systems whose elements are permanently re-articulated, creating new series of meanings. Latin American pedagogical fields⁶ operate, in our regard, as "translation matrices" for ideas and proposals that are integrated in a particular constellation of meanings and/or discursive positions.

Throughout our argument, we would like to consider two central points of the problematic of reading. The first one is related to the articulation implied by reading, engaging political strategies, social fantasies and imaginaries both at the level of the individual subject and of social fields. The second one intends to point out the radical historicity of reading, following Bakhtin's argument about the dialogic and historical substance of utterances. That is why our article will begin by describing the horizons of reading⁷ of Argentine and Brazilian educationists, as the discursive fields in which they developed their pedagogical praxis.

To study Dewey's readings also implies to get involved in the complex meanderings of educational liberalism, which had one of its most productive representatives in Dewey himself. His prolific work - including psychological and philosophical issues, school problems, social concerns, political theories - and the wide semantic field comprising liberalism and educational reform were two "given" conditions that South American readers had to face. This complex of meanings were early read in Latin American societies, traced by variable subordinate but constitutive connections to the world system, weak modernization process and an increasing cultural hybridization. To know what, how and under which conditions Dewey was read is to get an approach to the "inclusion of the inclusiveness" and the democratic pedagogical optimism in our region.

PEDAGOGICAL HORIZONS OF READING DEWEY IN ARGENTINA AND BRAZIL

When William Brickman wrote about Dewey's foreign reputation as an educator, he needed just one paragraph to define that "it is in Brazil and Argentina that Dewey appears to have attracted his greatest following in Latin America"⁸. Brickman held that since Sarmiento and José Pedro Varela's works (liberal leaders of the XIXth century), Latin American educationists have generally considered their colleagues of the north with respect.

As for our part, we would not be so affirmative about the leadership of the south of the continent in the diffusion of Dewey's ideas in Latin America, as we keep in mind the Mexican process - with which Dewey himself

was particularly concerned⁹. But we can affirm that due to the relative educational progress and the vigorous publishing industry in Argentina during the first half of the XXth century, this country turned to be a powerful and relevant cultural center for the whole of the Latin American world. In Brazil, Dewey was one of the emblematic references for a generation of educationists who had a persistent yet heterogeneous activity in State policies. The experience of this generation was closely followed by those of their Latin American colleagues concerned about democracy and pedagogical renewal in education.

We would like to synthesize the main characteristics of the educational systems of both countries briefly, as they can purvey some clues for the delimitation of the *horizons of reading* of Dewey's work.

In Argentina, the modern educational system was settled in its essential guidelines in the second half of the XIXth century. Sarmiento, the fourth president of the Argentine Republic¹⁰, stressed the polarity "civilization vs. barbarism" as the basis for the building of the Nation-State. It can be said that this polarity had obvious pedagogical connotations: on one side, the "modern" and "civilized" country of the agricultural exporting oligarchy; on the other side, the "backwardness" and the "ignorance" of the provinces' *caudillos*, in many cases representatives of local oligarchies with competing interests. This definition of the national problem in pedagogical terms reserved a crucial place for education: Sarmiento called to "educate the sovereign", because "an uneducated people will always vote" *caudillos*¹¹.

Soon after, "education" was also given the task of achieving national unity, which was - in the minds of political leaders - threatened by immigration¹². A "patriotic crusade" was held in 1908-1910 by the national educational board, trespassing local autonomies and initiatives. To pursue these ends, political homogenization and national unity, the educational system received a lot of support. According to the national census, by 1914 almost 48% of the child population went to school; in 1930, school attendance reached 69%¹³.

In the meantime, struggles between different projects took place. Adriana Puiggrós has shown clearly how different groups emerged and fought to shape the Argentine curriculum¹⁴. She identifies two main pedagogical trends: the "normalizers" - who thought education was the best way of "keeping people on the right track" and wanted a centralized and homogeneous system - and the "radical democrats" - who emphasized self-government and political and pedagogical pluralism. The first group won the battle, settling the hegemony of the traditional humanist curriculum whose rituals and content showed a surprising resilience during this period¹⁵. Despite their differences, both groups agreed on a pedagogical

optimism which sustained the expansion of the educational system and which constituted the "sens du jeu" (Bourdieu) in the pedagogical field.

This consensus began to decline in the second decade of this century due to an increasing social and political mobilization. Universal suffrage was established in 1912 and four years later the first democratically elected government - a nationalist popular movement - came to power. When students took over the government at the very conservative University of Cordoba in 1918, a process known as the "University Reform"¹⁶, only a few among the educationists supported the movement and the great majority became suspicious of the political consequences of freedom in the classroom. For some of them, the students' demands to share the government were unbearable; for others, it was a sign that more prudent reforms should be developed to prevent such commotions. "Modernization" and "democratization" - altogether or separately - were the new keywords in the pedagogical field.

The 1930 world crisis caused deep changes in Argentine economic and social structure. It had strong repercussions on the pedagogical field too. The Catholic Church mounted a renewed offensive for including religious content in the school curriculum. The inclusion of religion was part of a proposal for "spiritualizing the Argentine school" directed against scientism and intellectualism. This offensive found heedful interlocutors in the government, e.g. the educational policies of José Evaristo Uriburu (1930-1931) and those of the military governments (1943-1946). In the meanwhile, conservative educational reforms held during 1931 and 1943 intended to link schooling to the incipient Argentine industry¹⁷. The pluralistic versions of liberalism and the pedagogical left concentrated their struggle in the defense of the secular state and the humanist curriculum. They did not pay attention to the new *scénario* which was emerging after the crisis.¹⁸

If the Argentine experience was one in which the struggles were held on a firmly rooted educational system, in Brazil the fight was substantially different. The Brazilian educational system was organized later than in Argentina. The Imperial State, which ruled the country in the XIXth century, delegated the administration of elementary schools to the states while it kept control over higher education. Its main concern was to gain and maintain the loyalty of local élites to the imperial power.¹⁹

The Emperor was overthrown in 1889 by a military coup that established the Republic later known as the *República Velha* (Old Republic). The first republican Constitution was promulgated in 1891 and it implied great changes for the whole country. Literacy became a requirement to vote, a condition fulfilled only by a few among the population²⁰. Education was, from that moment on, strongly tied to citizenship. The Constitution

ratified the states' responsibility for the government of education, which in fact made it extremely sensitive to the politics of local élites towards popular education and participation. Remarkably, the constitution did not proclaim obligation nor gratuitousness for school attendance. Yet it sanctioned the religious neutrality of curriculum contents, faithful to the doctrinaire positivism this generation adhered to.

By the turn of the century, a movement within the ruling coalition demanded the extension of the educational system. This widespread "enthusiasm for education"²¹ intended to achieve national integration, urban moralization and political modernization²². Led by liberals and conservatives tied to the régime as well as to oppositional groups within the élite, this movement explicitly attacked the educational activities held by the labour movement, mainly oriented by socialists and anarchists. In the 1920s, extended educational reforms were led by prominent intellectuals in many states. It was the heyday of a strong educational optimism based on a renewing educational science provided by the New School Movement. An outstanding generation of political-educationists - Fernando de Azevedo, Francisco Campos and Lourenço Filho among them - guided the educational modernization of the urban centres of the oligarchic state. Whatever their success may have been in expanding the system²³, this group began to structure the pedagogical field in Brazil under the opposition between "tradition vs. renewal"²⁴, closely related to the political arena.

In 1930, another *coup d'état* ended the times of the Old Republic. The heterogenous triumphant coalition, which included initially discontent liberals as well as proto-fascist groups, put Getúlio Vargas in power. Vargas promoted the modernization and regulation of society through the action of the Federal government. During the first years of his government, the generation of reformers had a more resolute intervention in educational policies. Francisco Campos - who had led the educational reform in Minas Gerais - carried out a reordering of secondary schools and universities during 1931-1932, as the National Ministry of Education²⁵. At the same time, the Catholic Church mounted an offensive to widen its presence in the school curriculum. Catholics and reformers clashed frequently in the National Conferences on Education - held yearly since 1927 - by the Brazilian Education Association²⁶. In 1932, the federal administration asked the A.B.E. IVth Conference for guidelines on educational politics. After the Conference's refusal to do so, the reformers produced a document that was to become a landmark in Brazilian educational history. The *Manifesto dos Pioneiros da Educação Nova* included both basic principles for the educational system - nationalization, obligation, gratuitousness and laicism - as well as a claim for methodological and didactic renewing. Some of their proposals were gathered in the 1934 Constitution.²⁷

Yet the foundation of the New State (*Estado Novo*) in 1937, held by Vargas himself through a putsch, produced a realignment of positions within the *Pioneiros*. Some of them, as Lourenço Filho, supported the new directions of vocational education, authoritarian pedagogy and open attack on leftist positions. On the other hand, Anísio Teixeira, a former student at Teachers' College in Columbia University, confined himself to ostracism. The 1937 Constitution strengthened federal administration but paved the way for catholic intervention. The legal basis of the modern educational system (obligation, gratuitousness, laicism, State responsibility) would wait until 1946 to be established as a whole, when a new republican régime promulgated another constitutional text.

Argentina: the marginalization of pragmatism

Some years before the first Spanish translations of Dewey's books in 1915 and 1917²⁸, his work was well-known among Argentine educators. Dewey's European readers seem to have taken part in this early diffusion - especially German readers -, but first-hand contact with North American education appears to have been the privileged way they came to know him.

At the beginning of the century most of the intellectual field concentrated its attention on Europe, especially on France. On the educational front, in spite of Sarmiento's devotion to Horace Mann, the "official line" of the educational system which claimed to be his legacy was in fact the opposite to his convictions: increasing centralization and homogenization and prevalence of the traditional humanist curriculum. Those who wanted alternative models looked towards Germany and, only in a few cases, to the United States.

There are a number of reasons to explain this weakness of the pro-North American intellectuals and educationists at that time. One important feature is the close economic dependency Argentina had to Great Britain. Another relevant issue was the ruling classes' conviction, favoured by a striking social and economical expansion until 1930, that Argentina would play an important role among the concert of nations ("*destino manifiesto*"). This led to a sharp competition between Argentina and the U.S. to influence the rest of the American countries²⁹. Argentina refused for a long time to constitute a Panamerican union, confronting Monroe's "America for the Americans" with the slogan "America for humanity".

As well as economic and political relationships, the intellectual climate in Latin America was affected by an anti-North American movement called "arielism". Influenced by the Spanish defeat at Cuba in 1898, the

Uruguayan José E. Rodó addressed the Latin American youth denouncing the perils of the imperialist expansion of the U.S. over Latin America, already experienced in the materialist temptation pervading our culture - the spirit of Caliban represented by North American values and fashions. Whether his sermon was modernist or not has been widely discussed in the literature³⁰; regarding our subject, it favoured anti-liberal responses and weakened the support for alternative educational models based on the U.S. experience.

Not surprisingly, during the first decades of the century the diffusion of Dewey's ideas was led by liberal and radical educationists who confronted the educational status-quo in many respects. Most of them considered the U.S. educational system and pedagogies as an example and a model for reforming a country where oligarchic landowners ruled a fraudulent democracy. Industrialism and popular participation were like city lights for them. However, their global admiration probably led them to disregard the differences and struggles that shaped the North American curriculum³¹.

Two of these "radical democratic" educationists who admired Dewey deserve special consideration. Raúl B. Díaz (1862-1918), one of the chief inspectors of federal education, quoted Dewey frequently in the articles he wrote for the official journal of education. He was commissioned by the national board of education to visit the U.S. in 1907-1908³². He returned deeply impressed by what he saw and he brought with him a lot of experiences with school government by children. He emphasized Dewey's commitment to democracy and consideration both of social and psychological aspects of education.

Ernesto Nelson (1873-1959) was probably the most resolute propagandist of Dewey in Argentina in the first decades of this century. In 1906, being inspector of secondary schools, he spent some time at Columbia University, where he probably met Dewey himself - although he has left no testimony of this. His contacts with the U.S. increased³³ and some years later he became a member of the National Education Association at Washington DC. In Argentina, Nelson was one of the founders of the North American-Argentine Cultural Institute, and wrote a lot of books and papers on North American culture and institutions³⁴. He was kindly accused by one of the establishment educationists of having an "inflamed yankeeism"³⁵.

Nelson was especially fond of Dewey's ideas. First of all, he shared the view that democracy in education implied respect of the child's nature and freedom as well as inclusion of all social classes in the school. Education would be, as for Dewey, a privileged way for social improvement. In his lecture at the Panamerican Congress, he denounced Argentine education as "a system of organized restriction", which perpetuated social injustice.

"Educated class", he said, "is still suggestive of an autocratic privilege"³⁶. This problem was much more acute in the secondary and university levels than in the primary. In his view, Argentina had to unify secondary schools as the American system had done³⁷.

As Inspector of Secondary Education, he proposed a plan for reforming secondary schools which found little echo. He criticized the traditional humanist curriculum and defended the ideal of an active school. Every genuine idea is a result of action, said Nelson, but in current education kids get into the habit of following the authority of teachers or texts. He was desolated by the fact that during his work he saw "thousands of children among whom there is no one who carries his own truth, not even his own mistake."³⁸ He believed that secondary school should be conceived as a system of activities through which the pupil can obtain the information by himself. He proposed not so much a change in the content of the curriculum as in the direction of activities. As in Dewey's *Pedagogical Creed*, the task of the professor should be to select the appropriate contexts of learning.³⁹

Nelson's efforts to include the adolescents' daily life and culture were remarkable. Being the director of the secondary school of the University of La Plata, he promoted the inclusion of newspapers and excursions as a means for learning. He also organized a football team for developing both physical and cooperative education.⁴⁰

Although Dewey's egalitarian liberalism was adopted by Nelson as his own creed, two points of his proposal differ from Dewey's ideas: the notion of "occupations" and the preparation for life. Dewey himself was particularly emphatic about the latter issue: school did not prepare for life, but was part of life itself. Nelson, on the contrary, spoke of secondary school's function as preparing for life and not exclusively for a university career⁴¹. He was arguing against a firmly-rooted anti-pragmatism which was entrenched in the humanist curriculum, and probably he was looking for allies among the partisans of industrial and vocational education. However, Nelson's shift towards vocationalism deepened when he dealt with the notion of "occupation": he believed it equivalent to manual training for the masses. Nelson complained: "to put it bluntly, the schools betray the working classes by denying to them the practical, manual training that would fit them to increase their efficiency..."⁴². The best education for the masses should be the one that made them more efficient within a taken-for-granted world - liberal capitalism -, and not a provider of alternative views, as Dewey intended with "occupations"⁴³.

Both Díaz' and Nelson's work purvey insightful clues to understanding later readings of Dewey in Argentina. Liberal democracy, school government, school related to life, utilitarian pragmatism, practical curriculum,

efficientism, manual training, Americanism, became the "key words" with which Dewey was most frequently associated - even if some of them were not his own words. No distinction was made between Dewey and other North American educationists.

The inspectors' influence seems to have been important in the constitution of the discursive plot of the New School in Argentina. They were widely known among the teachers, and were quoted and respected even by those who rejected North American imperialism⁴⁴. They contributed to Dewey's diffusion among many teachers who led alternative experiences in the 1920s and the 1930s⁴⁵. But these alternatives went beyond Dewey's pragmatism and democratic plea to include the aesthetic bias of the Italian Scuola Serena, Decroly's centers of interest and Montessori system. This mixture of readings produced a peculiar synthesis that sought to blend foreign pedagogies with native culture and experience in the field⁴⁶. The combination was partly provoked by the diminishing importance of doctrinarian liberalism both in the intellectual and political fields⁴⁷, which made it hard to build a pedagogical vision exclusively based on it.

This diffusion went along with a wider movement of reform in Argentine education in the 1920s. The educational battle between conservatism and activism tainted the cultural climate, and traditionalists, newspapers, and intellectuals accused the latter of promoting moral and political subversion⁴⁸. But even if contested, activism tended to be assimilated "in a definitive and silent way" to school practice⁴⁹. Most of the educational reforms held in those years invoked its name⁵⁰. Official educational journals and teachers' unions magazines published a lot of articles from and on European and North American educationists who ascribed to the New School movement. Dewey's *How we think* and *The child and the curriculum* were among them⁵¹.

It has been said that along with this silent incorporation to hegemonic discourse, the voice of teachers criticizing the traditional school from a "revolutionary" perspective was silenced too⁵². What turned out to be the official New School discourse was an abstract child-centered pedagogy without any trace of social critique or democratic proposal, something quite different from Dewey's, Díaz' or Nelson's legacy. Furthermore, it had strong ties with Catholicism, in an open attack to the laic core of Argentine educational laws.

Juan Bautista Terán (1880-1938) constitutes a singular example of this shift, which could be defined more properly as a reaction within the New School movement. Being the president of the National Board of Education from 1930 to 1932 - under the military government of José E. Uriburu -, Terán led a movement "to spiritualize the school"⁵³. He criticized both

positivism and pragmatism, which he accused of reducing the child to a "beam of instincts and tendencies". "School should not only be a gym to awake and give full shape to child spontaneousness", as Dewey and Montessori sought⁵⁴. The aim of education, in Terán's view, should be to form a moral being with freedom and responsibility, and project it to a transcendent level.

Terán considered Dewey as a naturalist philosopher, heir of Rousseau. "Dewey's practicism sets aside the purely intellectual and ethical aims (of education), or considers them already included in the teaching adapted to the conditions and conveniences of the environment in which the child is going to develop. (His philosophy) is a strict application of pragmatism, of the doctrine characteristic of his own race and country, according to which utility is the supreme aim of philosophy."⁵⁵ For Terán, not only was this philosophical system ethically wrong but it was also condemned to historical failure, as the recent crisis of the U.S. showed. In his view, its incapacity of achieving material commonwealth and disdain of pure culture had led that country to bankruptcy. Obviously, he did not recommend to follow the model but to fight against it.

Terán defended spiritualism as educational philosophy, as it implied a return to intelligence in opposition to the pragmatism's "cult of life"⁵⁶. He advocated the traditional humanist curriculum and denied the value of vocational schools because they "condemn people to live in empiricism and close them the access to the highest possibilities of intelligence"⁵⁷. In his argument, activism was subordinated to discipline, order and respect to the rules, these latter being the government's pedagogical principles. The New School that Terán and his partners had in mind was similar to the one developed in fascist Italy. Terán's appeal in 1930 opened a decade in which alternative experiences within the New School were to be persecuted, and radical teachers expelled.

It may be then surprising to find some resemblances at first sight between Terán's view of Dewey and Aníbal Ponce's one, the latter being one of the professors expelled in that period. Ponce (1899-1939), in his book *Educación y lucha de clases*, condemned Dewey's pedagogy as a utilitarian and purely methodological expression of American bourgeois civilization. He inscribed his criticism on a roughly deterministic marxism. He considered Dewey as part of the "methodological trend" of the New School, which sought to increase the performance of students by adjusting pedagogy to the child's personality, both biological and psychical⁵⁸. Dewey's claim for collective work at school was a response to changes in capitalism. Fordism required a new school centered on childhood socialization, instead of the traditional school's individualism. According to Ponce, Dewey and Montessori implied the capitalist rationalization of teaching.

Ponce's condemnation of Dewey and the whole New School movement was probably related to the class reductionism that structured his discourse. This bias may have prevented him from deconstructing the equivalences between Dewey's pedagogy, efficientism and manual training settled years ago. Another important issue involved in his rejection of Dewey was the traditional admiration that Argentine leftist political parties had devoted to Sarmiento's "civilizing" endeavour, sharing the official pedagogical grammar - in terms of Adriana Puiggrós. Thus the left had criticized all the reforms which intended to dispute classical *bachillerato's* legitimacy. Briefly put, the left constituted an unexpected ally in the subsistence of the traditional humanist curriculum. Unable to distinguish between official discourse and teachers' praxis⁵⁹, a distinction that if made could have contributed to the emergence of a curricular alternative, neither could Ponce include Dewey's "inclusiveness".

There was another man from the left who was distinctively and firmly engaged in the New School Movement. The teacher Jesualdo Sosa (1905-1982), born Uruguayan and with a vast experience in Argentina, had a different view on Dewey and New Education from Ponce's. He considered Dewey as "one of the most progressive bourgeois partisans of the school of work"⁶⁰, the school of the socialist tomorrow. Dewey's proposal articulated school work to intelligence and democracy, both issues eschewed by Kerschensteiner. In a later work, Jesualdo considered the influence of Fordism and Taylorism in Dewey's work but he qualified his concepts as "evidently progressive"⁶¹ with respect to his predecessors' educative means and objectives. One of the negative remarks Jesualdo made about Dewey was the presence of religion, a fact that in South America was associated with conservatism. Once again, Jesualdo stood out among leftist educationists when he recognized that the term "religion" could include some kind of constructive mysticism "necessary for human perfection"⁶². Jesualdo was one of the few educationists framed in the political left who laid bridges to religious spiritualism.

Returning to the pedagogical field, it was Terán's reaction that articulated the prevailing reading on Dewey in the 1930s and the 1940s, and not Jesualdo's plea. In the pedagogical field, humanist curriculum was strengthened by the aim of "cultivation of intelligence" and authoritarian discipline, and by the condemnation of vocational and professional schools. Dewey's legacy tended to be contested by the official New School discourse, evidence of the latter's narrow borders. However, evidence has been found that teachers studied Dewey's work in courses they organized by themselves.⁶³

The last reading we will revisit is that of Juan Mantovani (1896-1961). He was a representative of laic spiritualism, a trend among official dis-

course which sought to reconcile spiritualist anti-positivism with laicism. Not being a pragmatic, Mantovani dedicated the major part of his review to underlining Dewey's ideal of democracy: it was not a given achievement but a way of life that had to be continually rebuilt through education and social mobilization⁶⁴. This was obviously related to the post-war context as well as to the Argentine political situation after Perón's deposition, which put "democracy" as a privileged signifier⁶⁵. He also underscored Dewey's critiques of U.S.' imperialism and social injustice. However, he said, "it is possible that Dewey's thoughts are less adaptable to the spiritual environment of Latin America, in which prevailing categories and mentalities are different from those characteristic in Dewey's country."⁶⁶ Due to Latin Americans' inclination to the sensitive and the spiritual instead of the intelligible and material. Dewey's work would never be well adapted to Latin American conditions. Anyway, Latin Americans could learn from him his democratic faith and his views on children's interest and freedom. Remarkably, Mantovani consecrated Dewey in the hall of great educationists while at the same time he excluded the possibility of his playing a role in specific curricular orientations. In the midst of the century, once again, Dewey's legacy and pragmatism were relegated to the margins of the Argentine school system, as professional schools, adult education or education for disabled people.

Brazil: a pedagogical reference in the construction of the educational system

The Brazilian readings of Dewey were substantially different from the ones developed in Argentina. First of all, they began later. Even if there had been an informal diffusion of his ideas prior to the 1920s, official Portuguese translations were published only in 1930⁶⁷. A decade before, under the impulse of Francisco Campos in Minas Gerais, some educational missions went to the U.S. and got in touch with Dewey⁶⁸. But probably most important factors for Dewey's impact in Brazil were the studies made by Anísio Teixeira at the Teachers' College of Columbia University. Teixeira's works were to be considered the "official reference" of Deweyan pedagogy in Brazil at the very point that they were quoted indistinctly. He translated or supervised Dewey's works, that were later published in Lourenço Filho's "Biblioteca de Educação" and Fernando de Azevedo's "Biblioteca Pedagógica".

On the other hand, as it has been underlined above, Dewey's ideas were gathered and read by a generation of educationists who conducted educational reforms in the 1920s and the 1930s. These particular links

between Deweyan followers and government policies is an outstanding mark of Brazilian readers, quite distinct from what has been said about Argentina. Not only were Dewey's Brazilian followers active politicians, but they were at the top of the educational administration.

The profile of this generation of educationists has been deeply studied in educational historiography, and it is a matter of sharp controversy⁶⁹. As for our concern, it is remarkable that in the 1920s part of the group that would sign the *Manifesto dos Pioneiros da Escola Nova* discussed the possibility of founding a political party, but after their failure, they decided to create the *Associação Brasileira de Educação*⁷⁰. It is clear that the point of their constitution as a group was the purpose of political intervention in their society. Most of them defined themselves as statesmen and based their legitimation on technical grounds. Pedagogy was the peculiar capital they counted on to intervene in the political field. One of their main concerns was to update Brazilian education according to North American and European contemporary trends. Among the former, Dewey's pragmatism was specially considered.⁷¹

The fact that Dewey's introduction in Brazil was tied to the action of this group suggests that the spread of his ideas was more systematic and less scattered than in Argentina. However, significant differences and emphases can be found within this generation. Three representatives of the *Pioneiros* will receive special consideration in this article: Fernando de Azevedo, Lourenço Filho and Anísio Teixeira.

Fernando de Azevedo (1894-1974) guided educational reforms in Sao Paulo from 1927 to 1930. In fact, more than reforms, he and his contemporaries directed the construction of an educational system. Even though the city was one of the most advanced jurisdictions in education, Azevedo started his job with two school buildings and a great mess of ruling norms⁷². His work was considered as one of the more organic reforms held in that period. After the 1930 revolution, he adopted a low profile, but deluded by political changes in 1937, he abandoned politics almost completely. He continued teaching in Sao Paulo and writing on educational subjects, most of all on sociology of education. The insistence on organicity and organization was one of his favourite topics, related to his Durkheimian orientation⁷³.

Azevedo's appeal to Dewey is linked to the latter's consideration of social as well as psychological aspects of education. Azevedo criticized the partial scopes of positivism, limited to empiricism and didactic formula. New paths were needed for educational reform: "It is by putting at the bottom (of the revolutionary pyramid of the reform) the equalitarian ideals of an industrial society on its way to democracy, and at the top the ideals of research, experience and action, that the State will prepare next gen-

erations for social life"⁷⁴. As for Dewey, school was an institution for social redemption. The scope of reformed education went beyond the production of citizens to include the building of a new community. In Azevedo's view, instead of adjusting and adapting to social life, school should become a dynamic element, an apparatus "that creates and disciplines activities and energies"⁷⁵.

Combination of influences and quotations from everywhere was the most noticeable feature of a discourse that claimed to be universal. Azevedo quoted Dewey, Lunacharskii, Decroly and Kerschensteiner to show models of that type of school, but he explicitly refused a literal copy. As he stated in a later lecture: "Socially (our reform) was based on the principles accumulated by Dewey to build his theory of education; the psychological basis was provided by Decroly; technically it was inspired by Kerschensteiner; and in the didactic aspect it adopted techniques from Montessori, Decroly and Kilpatrick, but according to the principles and means more adequate to reach our aims"⁷⁶. Azevedo's position has been characterized as "liberal elitism", concerned as he was about the building of a viable and sustainable order which should be based on the impulse and creative action of élites. In his view, the formation of this type of élite was the major contribution of the school system to the desirable order. Dewey's egalitarian positions⁷⁷ were then cast into oblivion.

Lourenço Filho (1897-1970) shared with Azevedo this emphasis on what he called the "sociology" of Dewey. Unlike many renewing educators Dewey provided a complex view of the social aspects involved in education, and explicitly intended to reconcile the child's interests and social needs. In his most famous book, *Introdução ao estudo da escola nova*, Lourenço Filho underlined this aspect, favourably compared to Montessori's vitalism or experimental essays developed in Great Britain or Italy⁷⁸. Being the last chapter of his introduction to the "pedagogical systems" of the New School Movement, Dewey's presentation helped Lourenço Filho to close his argument on a central point: the relevance of the social functions of the educational system. Instead of the biological determinism implied in Montessori or Decroly, Dewey provided an emphasis on socialization as well as consideration of child psychology⁷⁹. In Dewey's reading, Lourenço Filho found the theoretical ground that gave support to the group's resolute action in the government and their aim to build a new type of community.

In his review, no mention is found of Dewey's concern about democracy. As has been said, in 1937 he clearly engaged the anti-communist crusade led by the *Estado Novo*. The régime then established has been characterized as an authoritarian corporative system. Other interpretations suggest it was a response to the breakdown of the oligarchic State -

that is to say, a way of getting out of a more authoritarian situation⁸⁰. In the educational arena, even their opponents recognized the value of certain directions in Vargasism's politics. The National Commission for Primary Education was created in 1938 to fight against illiteracy; the same year the National Institute for Pedagogical Studies began to promote studies and to centralize information. Rural education and technical instruction were developed as well⁸¹. Some years later, the National Fund for Primary Schools was established to increase federal contributions to the states' budgets. On the other hand, Vargasism led an authoritarian crusade against communism and social protest and obliged teachers to include this ideological struggle as content in their classroom.⁸²

Lourenço Filho's involvement was linked to the conservative wing of Vargasism. He was deeply concerned about social discipline and the élite-masses relationship. Education should restrain disruptive and anarchic factors through a network of institutions that would reach each member of the family. He thought education should improve the race - loosely defined - and provide qualified people for the tasks of defense and national security. The prevalent contents of the reforms he inspired were civic education and technical knowledge⁸³.

However, he continued to claim his allegiance to the renewing educational trends. In his speech at the Military Academy in 1939 he tried to articulate New School statements with military discipline and hierarchy. Lourenço Filho signalled that the production of citizenship through education was an instrument for social organization. In this task, soldiers and teachers were the "*Falanges* (phalanxes) of a unique and similar army".⁸⁴ Even though military organization does not seem easily compatible with the renewing pedagogy, Lourenço Filho made this particular, authoritarian, articulation.

Anísio Teixeira (1900-1971), the last reformer we will consider, was the most consequent follower of educational liberalism in Brazil. Coming from a powerful northern family, he was commissioned by the northeastern State of Bahia's government to pursue his studies at Columbia University, where he got an M.A. in 1929. Back in Brazil, he was elected Secretary of Education in his homeland. From 1932 to 1935, he moved to the Federal District to help the new government in the educational area. After the upheaval that led to the *Estado Novo*, Teixeira retired from the political scene until a new liberal republic was founded in 1946.

Teixeira's position has been characterized as an egalitarian liberalism, far different from the elitist or authoritarian versions supported by his colleagues⁸⁵. It has been mentioned in the first part of this article that Dewey's particular version of liberalism was distinguished by its inclusiveness. This "organic liberalism" contained values associated both to the

commonwealth and to political freedom. This program was adopted by Teixeira and translated pedagogically as the defense of the unified school for everybody. He was worried about the low rates of school attendance (less than 30%) and about the fact that the majority of children did not finish two years of schooling.⁸⁶

Although freedom and justice were his main concerns, Teixeira also looked for the reconstruction of a social fabric. As was said before, the building of a community⁸⁷ was a crucial issue for this generation. The Brazilian culture of the 1930s has been described as the seat of a movement for cultural unification which went along with the building of the Nation-State. The historical disarticulation of Brazilian society was seen as problematic by all parties. From fascism and Catholic integrism to the leftist Aliança Libertadora Nacional, everyone shared a negative view of this situation, even if they differed in their interpretations⁸⁸.

Teixeira's position was tributary of Dewey's also in this respect. In his introduction to the translation of *Democracy and Education* in 1936, he wrote: "It is not redundant to insist on the reconciling and integrative character of the Deweyan thought, most of all in moments like ours in which a national claim grows for a new synthesis that would pacify and guide the altered spirits."⁸⁹ It should be remarked that there were many ties between Teixeira's discourse, as an attempt to restore unity, and the Protestant pietism as a moral idealism with commonwealth goals - a central issue of North American pragmatism⁹⁰. Even if Teixeira was not a Protestant, he had to fight against fundamentalist Catholics to build a laic morality⁹¹.

This confrontation included the work of Dewey himself. In 1929, the Catholic Church protested against the inclusion of Dewey's *My pedagogical creed* in a course for teachers in Minas Gerais. The final compromise was to add some materials recommended by Catholics⁹². It must be said that, in Latin America, the spread of liberalism was mainly related to Protestantism and Masonry, probably due to the Catholic condemnation of liberal proposals during the XIXth century⁹³. The educational field was particularly sensitive to these struggles, as the Catholic Church had traditionally held the monopoly of schools. Dewey's readings, then, were also crossed by politics of religion.⁹⁴

It is possible to organize this set of readings as divergent positions on the inclusion of Dewey's inclusiveness. Azevedo produced a sociological reading based on the theoretical oblivion of egalitarian liberalism and a strict "division of labour" among foreign pedagogical influences that placed Dewey among the ones who advocated a social community, but not individual freedom or social justice. This forgetting is related to his option for a segmented system in which the privileged branches were the

ones that guaranteed the formation of modern élites. Lourenço Filho's silence is even stronger. His reading enhanced an abstract socialization through certain techniques and a psychological functionalism without any trace of democratic ideals or reference to the North American context. These two operations, the neutralization of egalitarian liberalism and the bringing out of technical and didactic aspects, were two ways of hindering the display of inclusiveness contained in Dewey's thoughts. Even if he was one of the most radical educationists of this generation, Teixeira also kept silent on the deep structural changes that were needed in Brazil and narrowed the scope of his liberalism to education. It can be said that the *Estado Novo* constituted for him a tragic evidence of this limit. In 1939 he would write nostalgically to Fernando de Azevedo that, in that difficult moment of repression and persecution, the only things that kept him tied to his old profession were the books of his master, John Dewey.⁹⁵

After the defeat of the *Estado Novo* in 1946, the New School Movement, in this particular version, continued to be the hegemonic reference for educational policies. Its influence led the Catholic schools to adopt Montessori's pedagogy. In broad terms, it can be said that there was a shifting to psychological theories, Piaget and his disciple Lauro de Oliveira Lima being the new authorities in the pedagogical field. The way was made for the technical pedagogy, along with Juscelino Kubitschek's developmentalism in the 1950s⁹⁶. Lourenço Filho's psychological tests were to become the main reference of the renewed pedagogy, completely distant from the original claims towards democracy in education.⁹⁷

SOME FINAL COMMENTS ON THE DYNAMICS OF RECEPTION IN SOUTH AMERICAN PEDAGOGICAL FIELDS

We would like to conclude by pointing out the most relevant of the conditions from which Dewey was read in Argentina in the first half of our century.

The spread of liberalism was undoubtedly one of the conditions for reception of Dewey's work. But Latin American liberalism, at the end of the nineteenth century, was in fact quite different from European or North American versions. As Roberto Schwarz has said in the Brazilian case, the adoption of liberalism supposed that "liberal ideas could not be practiced but were all the same un-rejectable"⁹⁸. Progress was a disgrace due to wild modernization processes, but backwardness was not bearable either: this was one of the most constitutive paradoxes of our societies. Slave system, oligarchic landowners, political fraud and disorganization, were among the characteristics of South American societies that claimed

to be organized and governed on liberal grounds. This was recognized as problematic as early as 1880 in Argentina, and new integrative ideals were proposed quickly: the nation, the people, the class. Liberalism evolved into positivistic conservatism, creating new series of equivalences; doctrinarians were left alone with an industrialist utopia. In Brazil, on the contrary, liberalism unified old monarchists and republicans around the ideals of progress and order. Even though it was contested, its prevalence as a unifying myth was not undermined so fast as in Argentina. This persistence purveyed wider possibilities for Dewey's readings.

The development of the Nation-State was another relevant issue. In Argentina, the quantitative dimension of inclusion was already looked after by the centralized board of education. The disputes took place in an organized system and addressed effective democracy and modernization. Dewey's readings were more fragmented and emphasized limited aspects, generally the technical and practical ones. But for others, Dewey's authority opened the possibility of critique of the educational status-quo, a critique that reached its peak in the 1920s. The diffusion of his ideas was dispersed and more capillary than hierarchic. In Brazil, the limited autonomy of the pedagogical field was directly related to the weakness of liberal democracy. Brazilian educational liberalism was subordinated and shaped by a political discourse mainly concerned about the building of a new community under the impulse of a reformed élite. This led to enhancing the role of education as a duty of the State instead of fostering the notion of education as a civic right - an ideal cherished by liberals.⁹⁹ But Dewey remained a central reference for all of them.

The third remark refers to *the role North-Americanism* had played in international references, whose minor place in the Argentine culture of the period has already been outlined. In our view, the scattered character of Argentine readings is also related to the fact that Dewey has never been *the* legitimating pedagogical authority either for official or for alternative discourses, as he was in Brazil. His readings were inscribed in a beam of influences and field configurations which made it very difficult to follow the North American pedagogue. Except Nelson, none of the educationists considered followed Dewey organically. Pragmatism was confined to the margins of the school system, as it affected the core of the humanist curriculum on which a powerful alliance was built. Brazilian readers were in a slightly different situation: they did not have to face a well-rooted anti-North Americanism. In the 1920s, the "enthusiasm for education" paved the way for the building of a national consensus on industrialism and modernism that was basically associated to North American and European industrialized societies.

The pedagogical field's configurations were also important for defining the horizons of reading from which Dewey was received. In our opinion, the journey through Dewey's Argentine readings shows a multiplicity of images which act as mirrors of the pedagogical field. They speak of the possibilities Dewey's concepts opened to discursive articulation, but most of all they refer to the struggles for structuring the Argentine curriculum, in which Dewey was invoked both to promote reforms and to prevent them. The Argentine pedagogical field acted as a matrix for translation, and each translator built different sets of meanings and equivalences. No matter what their differences may have been, a distinctive feature of the field appears in the difficulty of including firmly Dewey's inclusiveness. In the 1930s, he was reduced to a methodologist and practician, and thus rejected. In the 1950s, he was frozen out as a general philosopher. The operation made by Mantovani is a symptom of this freezing: while he produced the final reconciliation of Argentine spiritualism with Dewey, he blocked an effective intervention of his ideas in the renewing of pedagogy. Despite Sarmiento's original appeal, egalitarian liberalism and pragmatism were not to have a privileged role in the Argentine curriculum in the XXth century. The Brazilian pedagogical field, configured later, was structured under the opposition "tradition vs. renewal" settled by the generation of reformers. Dewey was, from the very beginning, a reference for the leading fraction. Dewey's proposal was included as the most complete of the renewing systems, due to its consideration of social and political aspects that allowed them to act as statesmen. Dewey appeared in Brazilian readings as part of government actions and as a compulsory referent for those who wanted to intervene politically, but no mention was made about his concerns of democracy or citizenship - except in Teixeira's works. So it can be said that Dewey was also frozen out as a methodologist and abstract sociologist, blocking his potential to articulate new series of meanings among democracy, community and science.

Finally, we would like to emphasize that the inclusion of Dewey's inclusiveness in Argentina and Brazil appears as a site of struggle where different articulations seemed possible at the beginning of the century. To question how they were produced and why some did succeed over the others, is to come closer to understanding the fate of democratic educational reforms in Latin America.

NOTES

- 1 The authors would like to thank Diana Gonçalves Vidal, Elisabete Cruvelho and Terri Catlow for their help with content and translation. Also to Pablo Cafiero and Torsten Lösel for their support.
- 2 MEYER, J., D. KAMENS and A. BENAVIDOT (1992). *School knowledge for the masses. World models and national primary curricular categories in the twentieth century*. Washington: The Falmer Press.
- 3 GOODENOW, R. (1990). The progressive educator and the Third World: a first look at John Dewey. *History of Education* 19 (1), 23-40.
- 4 For Ernesto Laclau, articulation is constitutive of all social practices and social identities. Subjects are constituted by systems of differences (institutions) and the fissures or gaps they reveal. "Our whole analysis goes against an objectivistic conception and presupposes the reduction of 'fact' to 'sense', and of 'the given' to its conditions of possibility. This 'sense' is not a fixed transcendental horizon, but appears as essentially historic and contingent", as a result of articulation, see: LA-CLAU, E. (1990). *New reflections on the revolution of our time*. London: Verso, 212-213. This articulation is not infinite: it is limited both by history and politics. On the historicity of meanings, see BAKHTIN, M. (1984). *Estética de la creación verbal*. México, Siglo XXI; on the impossibility of a complete sense, see Laclau, *op.cit.*
- 5 See especially JAUSS, H.R. (1978). *Pour une esthétique de la réception*. Paris, Tel-Gallimard; ALTAMIRANO, C. and B. SARLO (1983). *Literatura/Sociedad*. Buenos Aires: Hachette; and SELDEN, R. and P. WIDDOWSON (1993). *Contemporary literary theory*. London: Harvester/Wheatsheaf.
- 6 "En termes analytiques, un champ peut être défini comme un réseau, ou une configuration de relations objectives entre des positions. Ces positions sont définies objectivement dans leur existence et dans les déterminations qu'elles imposent à leurs occupants, agents ou institutions, par leur situation (situs) actuelle et potentielle dans la structure de la distribution des différentes espèces de pouvoir (ou de capital) dont la possession commande l'accès aux profits spécifiques qui sont en jeu dans le champ, et, du même coup, par leur relations objectives aux autres positions (domination, subordination, homologie, etc.)" (BOURDIEU, P. [1992]. *Réponses*. Paris: Du Seuil, 72-73).
- 7 ALTAMIRANO and SARLO (1983) talk about "horizons of reading" that both shape and limit the reception of any given text. They borrowed this concept from Jauss, who uses the term "horizons of expectations" to describe the criteria readers use to judge literary text in any given period. These criteria refer to the reader's previous experiences on reading, the literary norm and the distinction (submitted to historical change) between imaginary world and everyday life. See note 4.
- 8 BRICKMAN, W. (1949). John Dewey's foreign reputation as an educator. *School and society* 70, 1818.
- 9 See *John Dewey's Impressions of Soviet Russia and the revolutionary world. Mexico-China-Turkey, 1929 (1964)*. Introduction and notes by W. BRICKMAN. New York: Teachers College-Columbia University.
- 10 Domingo Faustino Sarmiento (1811-1888) was an intellectual and political leader of his time. He was a great admirer of the United States, especially of Horace Mann's work in Massachusetts.
- 11 Quoted by TEDESCO, J.C. (1986). *Educación y sociedad en la Argentina (1880-1945)*. Buenos Aires: Ed. Solar-Hachette, 31.
- 12 The 1914 Census showed that almost 80% of the population was immigrant or son of immigrants.

- 13 TEDESCO, J.C. (1986), 248 - see note 11.
- 14 See PUIGGRÓS, A. (1990). *Sujetos, disciplina y curriculum en los orígenes del sistema educativo argentino (1885-1916)*. Buenos Aires: Galerna.
- 15 Part of its hegemony was based in the support received by subordinate social groups, who considered humanist curriculum as a sign of social distinction (in Bourdieu's terms) and fought mostly for its widening instead of its replacement.
- 16 The University Reform was a movement led by students from the University of Córdoba, Argentina, in 1918, that soon spread out to Latin American countries. Students fought against the conservative organization of universities, and were for participation in its government, autonomy and an effective social and cultural engagement. See: PORTANTIERO, J.C. (1977). *Estudiantes y política en América latina (1918-1938)*. *El proceso de la Reforma Universitaria*. México: Siglo XXI.
- 17 See TEDESCO, J. C. (1986). La crisis de la hegemonía oligárquica y el sistema educativo argentino, 1930-1945. In J.C. Tedesco (ed.). *Educación y sociedad en Argentina (1880-1945)*. Buenos Aires: Solar.
- 18 For a detailed discussion on the period, see PUIGGRÓS, A. (1992). La educación argentina desde la reforma Saavedra Lamas hasta el fin de la década infame. Hipótesis para la discusión. In A. Puiggrós (ed.). *Escuela, democracia y orden (1916-1943)*. Buenos Aires: Galerna, 15-97.
- 19 VIOTTI DA COSTA, E. (1987). *Da monarquia a República. Momentos decisivos*. Sao Paulo: Ed. Brasiliense.
- 20 In 1920, illiteracy rates reached 20%. This condition was not abolished until 1988.
- 21 It has been so called by NAGLE, J. (1974). *Educação e sociedade na Primeira República*. Sao Paulo: EPU/EDUSP.
- 22 See NUNES, C. (1992). Historia da Educação Brasileira: novas abordagens de velhos objetos. *Teoria & Educação* 6, 151-182.
- 23 See DEMARTINI, Z. de B. (1989). Cidadãos analfabetos: propostas e realidade do ensino rural em Sao Paulo na Primeira República. *Cadernos de Pesquisa* 71, 5-19, on the difficulties for rural education. On the disorganization of teacher education, see SOUZA CAMPOS, M.C. (1990). Formação do magistério em Sao Paulo: do império a 1930. *Cadernos de Pesquisa* 72, 5-16.
- 24 See the narrative of AZEVEDO, F. de (1943). *A cultura brasileira*. Rio de Janeiro: Serviço Gráfico do Instituto Brasileiro de geografia e Estatística.
- 25 ROMANELLI, O. (1978). *História da educação no Brasil (1930-1973)*. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- 26 The first years of the Associação Brasileira de Educação have been deeply studied by Marta Carvalho. In her well-documented and suggestive Ph.D. thesis, she states that the ABE was the first attempt to nationalize the educational reform, in order to promote the moralization and industrialization of urban centres. The ABE played a central role in the educational policies and debates held during those years. See: CHAGAS DE CARVALHO, M. (1986). *Molde nacional e forma cívica: Higiene, moral e trabalho no projeto da Associação Brasileira de Educação (1924-1931)*. Sao Paulo: USP.
- 27 CURY, C.R.J. (1986). *Ideologia e educação brasileira (católicos e liberais)*. Sao Paulo: Cortez Ed.
- 28 The first one was *The school and the society* (Madrid, Beltrán, 1915), translated by Domingo Barnés; and *How we think* (edited in Boston in 1917 under the title of "Psicología del pensamiento"), translated by Alejandro Jascalevich. Cf. BRICKMAN, W. (1949), 263 (see note 8). SÁNCHEZ REULET, A. (ed.) (1949). *John Dewey en sus noventa años*. Washington D.C.: Unión Panamericana, 27.
- 29 See ESCUDÉ, C. (1988). *1942-1949. Gran Bretaña, Estados Unidos y la declinación argentina*. Buenos Aires: Ed. de Belgrano.

- 30 See HALE, CH. (1985). Political and social ideas in Latin America, 1870-1930. In L. Bethell (ed.). *The Cambridge History of Latin America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 367-441.
- 31 See KLIEBARD, H. (1986). *The struggle for the american curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- 32 DÍAZ, RAÚL B. (1913). *Ideales y esperanzas en educación común*. Buenos Aires: Talleres Gráficos de L.J.Roso y Cía. In his view, the U.S. were the only country in the world which could show a school being "the center of the life and happiness of the child, close to his home, ... guided by the nation's ideals of democracy and greatness." (p.1).
- 33 In 1915, he shared the tribune with Charles W. Eliot at the Panamerican Congress and some years later the Panamerican Union and the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace published some of his works.
- 34 See i.e. NELSON, E. (1916). *The Spanish Reader*. Boston, DC: Heath and Co.; - (1929). *Las bibliotecas en los EE.UU.* Dotación Carnegie para la Paz Internacional; - (1929). *La salud del niño, su protección social en la legislación y en las obras*. New York: La nueva democracia.
- 35 MERCANTE, V. (1927). *Charlas pedagógicas*. Buenos Aires: R. Gleizer, 12.
- 36 NELSON, E. (1916). The secondary school and the university. In Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education Bulletin (ed.). *Needed changes in secondary education*, 10. Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 21-32.
- 37 NELSON, E. (1939). *Filiación histórica de la educación argentina*. Buenos Aires: Confederación de Maestros. Here he repeated almost the same arguments held by Dewey in *The educational situation* in 1902.
- 38 NELSON, E. (1915). *Plan de reformas a la enseñanza secundaria en sus fines, su organización y su función social*. Buenos Aires: A. Mentruyt, p. 13. See also GAGLIANO, R. (1992). Aportes para la construcción de una historia crítica de la adolescencia en la Argentina. In *Escuela, democracia y orden (1916-1943)* ed. by A. Puiggrós. Buenos Aires: Galerna, 299-341.
- 39 NELSON, E. (1916), 27, see note 36.
- 40 NELSON, E. (1912). Un experimento trascendental en la educación argentina. El internado del Colegio Nacional de la UNLP. *Boletín del Museo Social Argentino*. Buenos Aires: Coni Hnos., 3-27. On the other side of the educational battle, Victor Mercante, writer of the official Plan of reforms for secondary education in 1915, re-proved football and popular culture as educational activities.
- 41 NELSON, E. (1912), 31 - see note 40.
- 42 NELSON, E. (1942). A problem for the Americas. *Points of View* 5, pp. 3-8, p. 5 (Panamerican Union, Washington D.C.).
- 43 See KLIEBARD, H. (1986), chapter 3 - see note 31.
- 44 See i.e. BARCOS, J.R. (1928). *Cómo educa el Estado a tu hijo*. Buenos Aires: Ed. Acción (2nd. edition), especially Preface.
- 45 See ZIPEROVICH, R. (1992). Memorias de una educadora. In A. Puiggrós (ed.). *Escuela, democracia y orden (1916-1943)*. Buenos Aires: Galerna, 161-256; and CARLI, S. (1992). El campo de la niñez. Entre el discurso de la minoridad y el discurso de la Educación Nueva. *idem*, 99-160.
- 46 See note 45 and ETCHEVERRY, D. (1958). *Los artesanos de la escuela moderna. La lucha por la libertad creadora en la escuela argentina*. Buenos Aires: Galatea-Nueva Visión.
- 47 GALLO, E. (1994). Las ideas liberales en la Argentina. In A Iturrieta (ed.). *El pensamiento político argentino contemporáneo*. Buenos Aires: GEL, 151-176.
- 48 See PUIGGRÓS, A. (1992), 15-97, here p. 37 - see note 18. See also GÁLVEZ, M. (1924). *En defensa de nuestra cultura*. Buenos Aires.
- 49 Ciotilde Guillén de Rezzano, quoted by CARLI, S. (1992), 148 - see note 45.

- 50 See PUIGGRÓS, A. (1992), 49-65 - see note 18.
- 51 The majority of the articles referred to European writers, as Ferrière, Montessori, Décroly and Claparède. As one article devoted to Dewey said: "It is familiar to us the work developed in Europe under the direct inspiration of Rousseau...; but we do have only loose information from the North American crusade to establish the New School ... " SALAS MARCHAN, M. (1920). John Dewey y la escuela norteamericana. *El Monitor de la Educación Común* 576, 219-225.
- 52 CARLI, S. (1992), 148 - see note 45.
- 53 TERÁN, JUAN B. (1932). *Espiritualizar nuestra escuela. La instrucción primaria argentina en 1931*. Buenos Aires: Librería del Colegio.
- 54 TERÁN, 4.
- 55 TERÁN, 12.
- 56 TERÁN, 13.
- 57 TERÁN, 42.
- 58 PONCE, A. (1984). *Educación y lucha de clases*. Buenos Aires: Cartago, 163. He considered the existence of a second trend, "doctrinarian", which he also criticized. In Ponce's view, the doctrinarians held that the methodological tendency wanted to prepare children for present times and not for the future, as it was its own aim. According to Ponce, Terán's pedagogy could be inscribed in this second type.
- 59 CARLI, S. (1992), 152 - see note 45.
- 60 JESUALDO (1943). *Los fundamentos de la nueva pedagogía*. Buenos Aires: Ed. Americalee, 132.
- 61 JESUALDO (1945). *Diecisiete educadores de América. Los constructores, los reformadores*. Montevideo: Ed. Pueblos Unidos, 198.
- 62 JESUALDO (1945), 199 - see note 61.
- 63 See PUIGGRÓS, A. (1992), 95 - see note 18.
- 64 MANTOVANI, J. (1957). John Dewey. Su fe en la democracia y en la educación. *Filósofos y educadores*. Buenos Aires: Librería El Ateneo, 45-53.
- 65 Perón's government was accused by liberal opposition of being a "tyranny". See BERNETTI AND PUIGGRÓS, A. (1993). *Peronismo, cultura política y educación (1946-1955)*. Buenos Aires: Galerna.
- 66 MANTOVANI, J. (1957), 53 see note 64.
- 67 The first title was *Vida e educação*, a compilation made by Lourenço Filho, which had a preface written by Anísio Teixeira, published in 1930 by the Cia. de Melhoramentos de Sao Paulo, in the "Biblioteca de Educação" series. The second one was *How we think*, trans. Godofredo Rangel (Sao Paulo, Cia. Editora Nacional, 1933), and the third, *Democracy and education*, translated by Rangel and Teixeira in 1934. These appeared in the Biblioteca Pedagógica Brasileira directed by Fernando de Azevedo, an important leader of the Pioneiros (see above).
- 68 CASASANTA PEIXOTO, A. (1983). *Educação no Brasil - Anos vinte*. Sao Paulo: Loyola.
- 69 Among other for example CASASANTA PEIXOTO, A. (1983 - see note 68); CURY, C.R.J. (1986 - see note 27); GHIRADELLI, P. (1991). *Historia da Educação*. Sao Paulo: Cortez; CARVALHO, M. (1986 - see note 26).
- 70 LEMME, P. (1988). *Memórias*. Sao Paulo: Cortez/INEP.
- 71 At the same time, they were deeply involved in developing a "national pedagogy", an original voice that would come out of the translation of alien pedagogies to the Brazilian scene. See CHAGAS DE CARVALHO, M. (1986 - see note 26).
- 72 AZEVEDO, F. (1972). *História da minha vida*. Rio de Janeiro: J. Olímpio.
- 73 AZEVEDO, F. (1958). *Sociologia educacional*. Sao Paulo: Cia. Editora Nacional.
- 74 AZEVEDO, F. (ed.) (1931). *Novos caminhos e novos fins. A nova política educacional brasileira*. Sao Paulo: Biblioteca Pedagógica Brasileira - Cia. Editoria Nacional, 21-22.

- 75 AZEVEDO, F. (1931), 42 - see note 74.
- 76 AZEVEDO, F. (1931). Exposição na Conferencia Educacional de Diretores da Instrução no Rio de Janeiro, Setembro 1930. In Azevedo, F. (ed.) (1931 - see note 74), 261-268.
- 77 During the 1930s, progressive liberalism was radicalized by the challenge of trespassing the "social frontier". As Dewey wrote: "the ends remain valid. But the means of attaining them demand a radical change in economic institutions and the political arrangements based upon them". DEWEY, J. (1935). The meaning of liberalism. *The Social Frontier* II (3), 74-75. This critical dimension of Dewey's thought was absent from Azevedo's reading.
- 78 FILHO, L. (1930). *Introdução ao estudo da escola nova*. Sao Paulo: Cia. Melhoramentos.
- 79 Lourenço Filho devoted almost half of his review to psychological concepts: interest and will, experience, Dewey and behaviorism. See *Introdução* (note 78), chapter IV.
- 80 See FUNES, P. (ed.) (1992). *América Latina. Planteos, problemas, preguntas*. Buenos Aires: M.Suárez Ed.
- 81 PAIVA, V. (1983). *Educação popular e educação de adultos*. Sao Paulo: Loyola.
- 82 It is interesting to point that a denouncement of this situation found an echo in the pages of *The Social Frontier* (See the issue: IV,23 [March 1938], 199). The connection between radical educationists from both countries should be deeply studied.
- 83 PAIVA, V. (1983), 137 - see note 81.
- 84 Quoted by VIEIRA, L.R. (1992). Educação e autoritarismo no Estado Novo. *Educação e filosofia* VI (12), 87.
- 85 SANTOS TEIXEIRA, M.M. (1985). *O significado pedagógico da obra de Anísio Teixeira*. Sao Paulo: Loyola.
- 86 TEIXEIRA, A. (1934). Sistema escolar do Distrito Federal. *Revista de Educação* 7 (6), 208-213.
- 87 See FRANKLIN, B. (1986). *Building the American Community*. London and Philadelphia: Falmer Press.
- 88 CÂNDIDO, A. (1987). *A educação pela noite e outros ensaios*. Sao Paulo: Ed. Atica.
- 89 TEIXEIRA, A. (1936). Introdução. In J. Dewey: *Democracia e educação*. Sao Paulo: Biblioteca Pedagógica Brasileira/Cia. Editora Nacional, 13. He referred to the 1935 revolutionary attempt of the leftist Aliança Libertadora Nacional, led by Luiz Carlos Prestes.
- 90 See MOORE, E. (1961). *American pragmatism: Peirce, James and Dewey*. New York and London: Columbia University Press.
- 91 In his daughter's view, the hidden interlocutor Teixeira had in those years was the Catholic Church. SANTOS TEIXEIRA, M.M. (1985) - see note 85.
- 92 CASASANTA PEIXOTO, A. (1983) - see note 68.
- 93 See BASTIAN, J.P. (ed.) (1990). *Protestantes, liberales y francmasones. Sociedades de ideas y modernidad en América latina*. México: Siglo XIX, D.F., F.C.E./Cehila.
- 94 See GOODENOW, R. (1990 - see note 3), on the peruvian case.
- 95 O'NEILL, CH. (1972). Documentos de uma geração. Cartas de Anísio Teixeira a Fernando de Azevedo. *Revista do Instituto de Estudos Brasileiros* 13, pp. 125-135, p. 129.
- 96 LORENZO-FERNÁNDEZ, O. (1991). O papel do intelectual no Brasil. Uma perspectiva recente. In K. Kohut (ed.). *Palavra e Poder. Os intelectuais na sociedades brasileira*. Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert, 29-42.
- 97 Although his action falls out of our scope, it is remarkable that Paulo Freire's actions began few years later. From a completely different cultural register - that of

catholicism - Freire would produce another view of inclusiveness, which included equality, experience and action as well as the social conditions for them to become effective: the empowerment of subject. His proposal of a dialogical and active popular education would modify in a short time the utopian horizons of latinamerican educationists.

98 SCHWARZ, R. (1977). *Ao vencedor as batatas*. Sao Paulo: Duas cidades, 22.

99 This argument is developed by CHAGAS DE CARVALHO, M. (1986 - see note 26).