

PHYSICAL EDUCATION, CRITICAL PEDAGOGY AND IDEOLOGY: GENESIS AND INTERPRETATIONS

EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA, PEDAGOGIA CRÍTICA E IDEOLOGIA: GÊNESE E INTERPRETAÇÕES

EDUCACIÓN FÍSICA, PEDAGOGÍA CRÍTICA E IDEOLOGÍA: GÉNESIS E INTERPRETACIONES

Felipe Quintão de Almeida*, Valter Bracht *, Alexandre Fernandez Vaz **

Keywords:

Education.
Epistemology.
Journal article.
Marxism.

Abstract: This paper describes the framework of critical thinking in Brazilian Physical Education that was influenced after the 1980s by “Critical and Historical Pedagogy”. The paper reflects on the basis of ideological critique in Physical Education in a dialogue with by Paul Thompson’s and Paul Ricoeur’s views on that concept under Marxist tradition. Its sources are papers published between 1979 and 2010 in four scientific journals: Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte, Movimento, Motrivivência and Pensar a Prática. The paper concludes with a discussion about some difficulties to understand that ideological critique in Physical Education and proposes more research

Palavras chave:

Educação.
Epistemologia.
Artigo de revista.
Marxismo.

Resumo: Descreve os contornos da produção crítica em Educação Física explicitamente influenciada, a partir dos anos 1980, pela pedagogia histórico-crítica. Reflete sobre os fundamentos da crítica ideológica em Educação Física, ocasião para dialogar com as interpretações que John Thompson e Paul Ricoeur fizeram desse conceito na tradição marxista. Em termos metodológicos, a análise toma como fonte os artigos da Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte, da revista Movimento, da revista Motrivivência e da revista Pensar a Prática, publicados entre 1979 e 2010. Conclui com as dificuldades dessa compreensão da crítica ideológica em Educação Física, situando o leitor sobre a continuidade da investigação.

Palabras clave:

Educación.
Epistemología.
Artículo de revista.
Marxismo.

Resumen: Describe los contornos de la producción crítica en la Educación Física explicitamente influenciada, a partir de los años 1980, por la “Pedagogía Histórico-Crítica”. Reflexiona sobre los fundamentos de la crítica ideológica en Educación Física, ocasión para dialogar con la interpretación que Paul Thompson y Paul Ricoeur hicieron de este concepto en la tradición marxista. En términos metodológicos, el análisis toma como fuente los artículos de las siguientes publicaciones: Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte, revista Movimento, revista Pensar a Prática y revista Motrivivência, publicados entre 1979 y 2010. Concluye con las dificultades de esa comprensión de crítica ideológica en la Educación Física, situando al lector a respecto de la continuidad de la investigación.

*Federal University of Espírito Santo.
Vitória, ES, Brazil.
E-mail: fqalmeida@hotmail.com

**Federal University of Santa Catarina.
Florianópolis, SC, Brazil.
E-mail: alexfvaz@uol.com.br

Received on: : 7- 21- 2014

Approved on: 1- 23-2015



1 INTRODUCTION

This article offers a description of critical production in Physical Education, especially that which has been influenced, from the 1980s on, by historical-critical pedagogy (SAVIANI, 2008; 2009). The goal is to characterize its presence in articles published in journals of the field. Therefore, we consider that critical production in Brazilian Physical Education is directly related to what has been retrospectively called the Renewal Movement. Although that movement was initially structured as a broad front intended to transform the discipline in order to make it more scientific, differences soon emerged in the understanding of science and its relationship with politics. From that point on, and under the influence of debates in the field of education, one segment calls itself “progressive” or “critical”. This article focuses on that segment.

We analyze specifically articles published between 1979 and 2010 that fit the above characterization. The timeframe is justified because that pedagogy is effectively constituted and consolidated in that period. Therefore, we considered four journals: *Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte (RBCE)*, *Motrivivência*, *Movimento* and *Pensar a Prática*. Regarding RBCE, we use 86 editions published between 1979 and 2010. For *Motrivivência*, we used 31 editions published between 1988 and 2010; for *Movimento*, 46 editions published between 1994 and 2010. For *Pensar a Prática*, we consulted the 23 editions available between 1998 and 2010. After organizing the material, we looked for texts that advocated a critical perspective on Physical Education. Considering the 31 years covered by the investigation, we identified 117 works that, according to their abstracts, could serve the purposes of our work. Then the analysis involved a full reading of the texts, when a thematic categorization was made. The resulting analytical description was developed after confronting the sources examined and classifications already available in literature, especially considerations made by Dermeval Saviani in the two books (2008, 2009) in which he established the foundations of his historical-critical pedagogy.

Of the total material identified after reading each text and analyzing its content (BARDIN, 1977), we dismissed 52 texts and effectively operated with the 65 remaining ones. Of those, we decided to analyze those related to one of the main goals of the pedagogy analyzed here: critique of ideology. That means that we eliminated texts, among the 65 listed, which were not focused on that goal (critique of ideology), but which were related to other dimensions of that pedagogy. Considering its limits, this article actually used 42 works (those listed in the references). Thus, some works analyzed are repeated throughout the text, since they cover more than one point analyzed.

The article is organized in two parts. The first part characterizes critical pedagogy in Physical Education while the second part offers a reading on the critique of ideology. Then, the text closes with its final remarks.

2 DESCRIBING CRITICAL PEDAGOGY IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION: THE MARXIST INFLUENCE

The development of a critical pedagogy in Physical Education is indebted to the influence of historical and dialectical materialism on some intellectuals of the so-called Renewal Movement. That tradition, however, is not a homogeneous or uniform block because “there are distinct Marxisms,” as they say. In the 1980s, the theories and concepts of Marx and

the followers of the tradition he initiated were known by the interpretation of authors in the educational field. Therefore, the development of historical-critical pedagogy (SAVIANI, 2008; 2009) in the context of Education was a very important reference for building a critical pedagogy of Brazilian Physical Education.

In the articles investigated, we found direct references to Saviani's work and his view of education (CASTELLANI FILHO, 1983; MIYAGIMA, 1989; GHIRALDELLI JÚNIOR, 1990a; PALAFOX, 1993; RESENDE, 1994; ESCOBAR, 1995; OLIVEIRA, 2001; PINA, 2008). Castellani Filho (2009) ratified that influence when he described the history that resulted in the publication of the book that is one of the main expressions of historical-critical pedagogy in Brazilian Physical Education: *Metodologia do ensino de Educação Física* (SOARES et al., 1992),¹ written by a "Group of Authors". That pedagogy should promote:

[...] The clarity of the social determinants of education, the understanding of the degree to which society's contradictions mark education and consequently, how educators should position themselves on those contradictions and free education from ambiguous views in order to see the direction that should be given to the educational issue. That is the fundamental sense of what we call historical-critical pedagogy. (SAVIANI, 2008, p. 100).

Saviani (2008, 2009) sees the emergence of that pedagogy as an alternative in the field of Education as a result of non-critical theories on the one hand and, critical-reproductivist theories on the other. In non-critical theories of Education, Saviani (2008; 2009) included pedagogies, the New School and technicist traditional. This characterization, initially presented in his book *Escola e democracia*, had strong repercussions on Physical Education. Based on that book, Soares (1988) says that the discipline was influenced

[...] by theoretical constructs that reduce it to biologism or biopsychologism, which allows us to place them in the context of non-critical theories of education (traditional pedagogy, new pedagogy and technicist pedagogy). From this analysis, it can be understood as something autonomous in relation to society, as something that happens independently of subjects and concrete reality, thereby providing elements for us to consider it, because of the way it has been organized in Brazilian schools, as an ahistorical way of relating to the world. (SOARES, 1988, p. 21).

This "ahistorical way of relating to the world" expresses what Saviani (2008; 2009) sees as typical of traditional theories: not considering the historical and social conditions of education. Therefore, those theories would be "[...] naive and non-critical, since critical consciousness typically knows it is conditioned, objectively and materially determined, while the naive consciousness is that which does not know it is conditioned" (SAVIANI, 2009, p. 57). Unlike this perspective, Saviani's (2010, p. 71) revolutionary pedagogy was intended to signal the historical character of Education, "[...] somewhat contrasting with the ahistorical meaning of non-critical theories".

Mazo and Goellner (1993, p. 65) express what became the keynote of certain Physical Education texts from the 1980s: "[...] the analysis of an educational strain should not be separated from the social, political, economic and cultural context in which it is placed", since it is "[...] the broader horizon within which the Physical Education class acquires its meaning" (TAFFAREL 1993: p. 45). In this context, we underscore eleven articles that denounce acritical, ahistorical and naive views in Physical Education on the one hand and, on the other, advocate

¹ Castellani's own son, according to his statement (CASTELLANI FILHO, 2009), was Saviani's student in the Graduate Program in Education at PUC/SP, considered the "cradle" of historical-critical pedagogy.

the need for the discipline to foster engaged, political, conscious, critical practices – in short, practices concerned about the social determinants of the educational task.²

As Saviani (2008; 2009) defined them, critical-reproductivist theories, even considering the social determinants of education, “[...] only [...] explain school’s operating mechanism such as it is constituted. In other words, for their reproductivist character, those theories believe that school could be nothing but what it is” (SAVIANI, 2009, p. 27). Saviani (2008; 2009) includes three theories in that group: a) the theory of the educational system as symbolic violence, whose maximum expression is Bourdieu and Passeron’s *La Reproduction. Éléments pour une théorie du système d’enseignement*; b) the theory of school as an ideological apparatus of the State, whose main representative was Althusser; c) the theory of the dualist school, whose landmark is Baudelot and Establet’s *L’école capitaliste en France*. The articles that have served as sources for our research mention only the thesis of the school as an ideological state apparatus (FERREIRA NETO, 1989; LACKS, 1993; MAZO; GOELLNER, 1993; CASTELLANI FILHO, 1983), but in order to criticize it. Chagas (1989, p. 103) went right to the point:

However, through a critical and committed attitude, we sought to overcome Althusser’s critical-reproductivist view that sees no way to counter dominant values. This overcoming assumes the belief in collective strength of men as builders of their own history and therefore of human history: the formation of critical consciousness, political commitment and the technical competence of those who struggle for the transformation of a given state of affairs.

Even before Chagas, Castellani Filho’s *A (des)caracterização profissional-filosófica da Educação Física*, published in the same year (1983) as Dermeval Saviani’s *Escola e democracia*, warned of the limits of critical-reproductivist theories in favor the historical-critical pedagogy:

But, in order for us not to leave the ‘theater’ with the uncomfortable feeling of helplessness, which could be caused by the facts above, it is important to keep in mind, as Saviani does, that ‘far from understanding education as the main determinant of social changes, we recognize it as a secondary and determined element. However, far from thinking – as does the critical-reproductivist view – that education is unidirectionally determined by social structure, dissolving its specificity, we understand that education is dialectically related to society. Therefore, even though it is the determined element, it still influences the determinant one. Although secondary, it is nevertheless an important and sometimes decisive instrument in the process of changing society (CASTELLANI FILHO, 1983, p. 100).

Still according to Saviani (2009, p. 28), considering that the ruling class has no interest in the historical transformation of school because “[...] it is committed to preserving its domain, it will only trigger adaptive mechanisms that prevent change”, education should be criticized as distorted by the interests of that class against the dominated class, with the curriculum being “cut through” by an ideological view of society and pedagogy that strengthens reproductive aspects of the social structure. We found twenty texts denouncing such conservative and/or ideological dimension of school and therefore of Physical Education. That discourse was observed mainly in articles from the 1980s and 1990s, although it was still present in the following decade (BRACHT, 1986; SOARES, 1988; FREITAS; CARDOSO FILHO, 1988; MONTALVÃO FILHO, 1988; LACKS, 1993; ESCOBAR, 1995; RIGO, 1995; TAFFAREL, 2001; SILVA, 2004).

A critical pedagogy would have as its role to reveal school’s ideological dimension while

2 Those discourses, mostly stressing the socioeconomic determinants of Education, were present not only between the 1980s and 1990s (MOREIRA, 1986; BRACHT, 1986; FREITAS; CARDOSO FILHO, 1988; ESCOBAR, 1988; FERREIRA NETO, 1989; WIGGERS *et al.*, 1990; TAFFAREL, 1990, 1998/1999; PALAFOX, 1993), but were still reproduced in texts from the 2000s (MICHELOTTI; SOUZA, 2008; DIAS, 2010).

presenting itself as an alternative for an education and a curriculum that, based on the interests of the dominated class, represented a liberating, democratic, just and egalitarian view, since it had not been “corrupted” by the ideological interests of the ruling classes. According to Silva (1993), it can be said that such feature covers the essential in modern critical theory in education. To this end, its pedagogy would have the obligation of revealing the dominant ideology, looking “behind” it in order to demonstrate school’s role in legitimizing a society divided in classes. As an expression of that task, we detect terms and/or concepts that indicate the notion of ideology as a representation that hides, obscures, distorts, conceals, reverses, in short, which results in false interpretation of reality (BRACHT, 1986; WIGGERS, 1988; FREITAS; CARDOSO FILHO, 1988; CHAGAS, 1989; RIGO; CHAGAS, 1990; MAZO; GOELLNER, 1993; PALAFOX, 1993; OLIVEIRA, 2001; SILVA, 2001).

The understanding of ideology as false consciousness or as a distorted view of the real stemmed from strong realism that assumed the existence of two levels of reality evaluation: one that cannot go beyond the “appearance” of the phenomena and a “deeper” one that reveals the real in its materiality, reaching its essence and totality. Again we can see, in this context, the influence of the perspective opened by Saviani (2010, p. 53), because, for him, “the role of science and theory is to build concepts that allow going beyond the appearances of reality to discover the concrete movement”. This realistic commitment also resonated in the critical pedagogy of Physical Education (ESCOBAR, 1988; CAVALCANTI; BASSOLI, 1989; CASTRO, 1989; CAVALCANTI; BASSOLI, 1989; MOCKER, 1992; TAFFAREL, 1993, 1995; RIGO, 1995; ALBUQUERQUE *et al.*, 2007; SOUZA, 2007; MICHELOTTI; SOUZA, 2008).³

The need to arrived at the real in its “materiality” was accompanied in the articles investigated by a critique of philosophical idealism, since, according to Taffarel (1995, p. 130),

reality can be apprehended from the perspective of an abstract knowing subject, a thinking mind that examines reality speculatively – idealism, where representations of reality prevail, pseudo-concept – or from the perspective of a historical individual who carries on his or her practical activity in dealing with knowledge, under certain relations, seeking to destroy the world of pseudo-concreteness, thus responding to the organic crisis of the civilizational process.⁴

Also according to this diagnosis, the idealistic perspective has prevailed in the field. Therefore, we should question these “representations” of the world that fragment science and philosophy and disregard the laws and categories of dialectical thought, for “materialistic dialectics [...] provides the best conditions to understand the totality of the real in its objective and subjective aspects” (LACKS, 1993, p. 39). In this context, views that consider the social determinants of education would be materialistic, while those that do not would be idealistic because “[...] they theorize about Physical Education and Sports outside the socio-economic and cultural framework” (TAFFAREL 1995: p. 126). This view is also present in Saviani’s (2008, 2009) work, where he links Traditional Pedagogy and New School Pedagogy to idealistic perspectives on the one hand and to the interests of the bourgeoisie on the other.

Elsewhere, we find more reasons for criticizing idealism, since that view: “[...] interprets nature and society ideally, subjectively” (CAVALCANTI; BASSOLI, 1989, p. 12); it believes that it “[...] revolutionizes Physical Education only and solely through conceptual changes”

³ It resonated and it still does, as shown by Almeida and Vaz (2010) and Almeida, Bracht and Vaz (2012).

⁴ A similar diagnosis is found in other articles by Taffarel (1994, 1998/1999) and Taffarel and colleagues (ALBUQUERQUE *et al.*, 2007; MEDINA; SOARES; TAFFAREL, 1993).

(CASTELLANI FILHO, 1993, p. 124); it would deny historicity and the ability of men and women to interfere in society as agents of change (MAZO; GOELLNER, 1993); “[...] it ignores the social conditionings of action and reaction to focus on the subject as an isolated, autonomous and non-social being” (FRIZZO, 2008, p. 162.); “[...] it lies in the fact that the universe consists of ideas that, in one way or another, always precede the real (PALAFOX, 1993, p. 30); or yet because this “[...] [theory] would be cynical and reactionary, preaching the idea that the world is unknowable, that is, that it cannot be known by the human brain” (PALAFOX 1993, p. 31). Also according to Palafox (1993, p. 33), “objective reality exists regardless of our consciousness that reflects it (nature is the primary datum and consciousness is derived from it)”. It would be the task of those that operate under critical pedagogy to work “[...] on the understanding and critical-social application of the fundamental theses of materialism, while demystifying the bases and practices of idealism’s followers” (PALAFOX, 1993, p. 34-35).

Thirteen of the articles analyzed lead us to understand that, by operating under the framework of idealism, we could not obtain more than a pseudo school Physical Education, its “pseudo-concreteness” (RIGO; CHAGAS, 1990; RIGO, 1995; CHAGAS, 1989; TAFFAREL, 1994; 1995; ALBUQUERQUE *et al.*, 2007). Idealism would not allow what is a striking feature of critical thinking: the critique of bourgeois ideology, as it would be the intellectual expression of that class in itself. With the materialistic perspective, it would be possible, however, to find out “what Physical Education is” (ESCOBAR, 1988, p. 63), to achieve “objective knowledge of the truth” (TAFFAREL, 1995), a “truly human praxis” (MAZO; GOELLNER, 1993) or “truly scientific” (CAVALCANTI; BASSOLI, 1989, p. 15); to identify the “true identity of Physical Education” (CASTELLANI FILHO, 1983, p. 95; CAVALCANTI, 1989) or its “true social function” (BRUEL, 1989); to achieve a “[...] new social order, based on truly democratic principles and faithful to historical truth” (MEDINA; SOARES; TAFFAREL, 1993); or to get to what Ghirdelli Junior (1990b, p. 198) wanted: “[...] to sequence a real practice where changing elements inherent in the movement could come up to subordinate merely reproductive elements”. That zeal for “truth”, understood as something opposed to knowledge “contaminated” by bourgeois ideology is in line with what Saviani (2010, p. 115-116) advocated for a political-critical perspective. According to him, this stance

[...] which is transformative, leftist, does not need indoctrination because the truth is on its side (I said that truth is always revolutionary).⁵ Therefore, it is about a work of unveiling, that is, of showing the truth with all its strength, or, as they say, the unvarnished truth, no matter who gets hurt. The conservative stance is that, since it no longer has truth on its side, to preserve itself, it needs to indoctrinate, that is, to enforce the argument of faith, of authority, of the natural, i. e., that which is rationally inexplicable. (Saviani, 2010, p. 115-116)

In one of the prefaces of *Escola e Democracia*, referring to its Chapter 2, Saviani (2009, p. XXVI) says that “[...] it is not about making an exhaustive and systematic presentation; it is about indicating pathways to criticize what exists and to discover historical truth”.

Associated with the task of “showing the truth in all its strength” and then “discovering historical truth”, denouncing alienation is yet another recurring goal in the texts of critical pedagogy in Physical Education. This will not be explored here. Instead, our option is to interpret the critique of ideology – an essential task of critical pedagogy in education (SILVA, 1993) in texts of Physical Education. To do so, we will revisit some uses of the concept in Marx and Engels.

⁵ Saviani (2008) says that besides being revolutionary, truth is inscribed in history.

3 THE CRITIQUE OF IDEOLOGY IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION: INTERPRETING A CERTAIN MARXIST APPROACH

The history of nature, called natural science, does not concern us here; but we will have to examine the history of men, since almost the whole ideology amounts either to a distorted conception of this history or to a complete abstraction from it. Ideology is itself only one of the aspects of this history. (Marx and Engels, 2007, p. 87).

The concept of ideology dates back to revolutionary France. The first use of the term is attributed to Destutt de Tracy, in his *Eléments d'idéologie*. It was understood as a new science that would be interested in the systematic analysis of ideas and representations (CHAUÍ, 1980; LÖWY, 1991). It is especially with Marx and the tradition he started that the concept achieved new status as a critical instrument and as an essential component of a theoretical system. It was also after Marx that the concept took on different connotations, both within Marxism (with Lenin, Lukács, the Frankfurt School, Gramsci, Althusser) and under other theoretical perspectives such as Weber's and Mannheim's. Our focus is not to understand the shifts that ideology notion underwent after Marx, but rather to demonstrate how the version of critical pedagogy with which we dialogue reproduces the view of ideology that stems from the philosopher's writings. To accomplish that task, besides Marx and Engels (2007), we will take Ricoeur's (1990a, 1990b) and Thompson's (1995) interpretations as references.

Both Thompson and Ricoeur think that Marx's writings did not present just one perspective on the term. Thompson (1995) distinguishes three concepts of ideology in the German philosophers. A "controversial" one: "[...] ideology, on this account, is a theoretical doctrine and an activity which erroneously regards ideas as autonomous and efficacious and which fails to grasp the real conditions and characteristics of socio-historical life" (THOMPSON, 1995, p. 51). The other is identified as an "epiphenomenal" view, according to which a system of ideas expresses the interests of the ruling class, representing class relations in an illusory way. The third construct, called "latent", is "[...] a system of representations which conceal, deceive and which, in so doing, serve to sustain the relations of domination" (THOMPSON, 1995: p. 75).

These "ways" of reading ideology, according to Thompson (1995), ascribe a negative, critical or derogatory meaning to Marx's and Engels' (2007) concept. In those circumstances, ideology always expressed a partial condition. Tied to that understanding is the assumption that ideology is a form of thinking that expresses inability to "see" reality (and domination) in its entirety.

These definitions help to interpret the uses of ideology in Physical Education texts. In them, ideology also has that critical meaning, whether it is to denounce school's or sport's role as a system that expresses the interests of the ruling class ("epiphenomenal" view) or to criticize dominant "representations" as false or as offering a partial view of the real ("latent" view). To unmask that form of consciousness – the critical pedagogue's craft – is to show that it is wrong or has no rational justification, implying:

[...] not only that it can be explained with reference to socio-economic conditions, but also that it misinterprets those conditions or that it has no justifications other than the empirically demonstrable fact that it expresses particular interests of groups whose positions are determined by these conditions (THOMPSON, 1995, p. 56).

Moreover, critical pedagogy's critique of "idealistic" perspectives can be read from the "controversial" use of ideology, since idealism would be a perspective that overestimates the value and role of ideas in history and social life, so as not to see, as allowed by historical and dialectical materialism, the connections between its ideas and socio-historical conditions. Marx and Engels (2007) teach us that, only where speculation ends in real life, that real, positive science and the exposure of practical activity, of the practical process of development of men begins. Under those conditions, "phraseology about consciousness ceases, and real knowledge has to take its place" (Marx and Engels, 2007, p. 95).

Ricoeur (1990a, 1990b) offers us yet another reading to understand the meaning of ideology in the texts described here. For him, Marx's ideology is seen as an inverted and distorted image of what is real. Therefore, the author believes that the concept of ideology in Marx is less opposed to science than to reality. Ricoeur (1990a, 1990b) refers to a famous metaphor used by Marx and Engels (2007, p. 94) in *The German Ideology*:

If in all ideology men and their circumstances appear upside-down as in a *camera obscura*, this phenomenon arises just as much from their historical life-process as the inversion of objects on the retina does from their physical life-process.

For Ricoeur (1990a; 1999b), it is this kind of text that plays a defining role in orthodox Marxism. This view assumed the thesis, present in *The German Ideology*, that ideological is that which is opposed to real, a world of shadows unable to grasp the essence by offering a false representation of reality. In the words of Ricoeur (1990a, p. 73)

What Marx tries to think, based on that model, is a general process by which the real activity, the process of real life, ceases to be the basis and is replaced by what men say, imagine, represent. Ideology is that contempt that causes us take the image as the real, the reflection as the original.⁶

In circumstances like these, of deformation of reality, the role of critique is to operate an inversion of reversal, restoring the concrete or real to replace its representation/interpretation. According to Ricoeur (1999b, p. 95), in such circumstances critique is a reduction of the concept to its concrete basis of existence, because "something was reversed in human consciousness and we have to reverse the reversal; this is the procedure of critique". Marx and Engels not are in "combat" (in *The German Ideology*) against Hegel, but against young leftist Hegelians, because, according to the two German thinkers, "[i]t has not occurred to any one of these philosophers to inquire into the connection of German philosophy with German reality, the relation of their criticism to their own material surroundings" (MARX AND ENGELS, 2007, p. 84). In the passage, according to Ricoeur (1999b), material is synonym with real, just as ideal is the same as imaginary/representation. The passage helps to understand the eleventh sentence that Marx (2007) directs at Feuerbach, according to which the philosophers had only interpreted the world in different ways so far, when what matters is to change it, based on the material conditions of their existence. Representations, thoughts or concepts (the "phraseology" that Marx and Engels refer to in *The German Ideology*) are illusions of consciousness and therefore, ideological. Elsewhere, Ricoeur (1999b, p. 175) again refers to the real/representation duality to explain Marx's concept of ideology:

⁶ Also according to Ricoeur (1990a, p. 83), Marx's metaphors to refer to the discussion of the concept of ideology remain tied to a bundle of mirror images and a system of binary oppositions: "[...] theory-practice, real-imaginary, light-darkness, which attest to the metaphysical belonging of the concept of ideology as reversal of a reversal".

For Marx, ideological is what is reflected through representations. It is the world of representation as opposed to the historical world. The latter has its own consistency thanks to the activity, the conditions of activity, the history of needs, the history of production, etc. The concept of reality covers all processes that can be described under the heading of historical materialism.

Conversely, Marx and Engels (2007) suggest a “rise from earth to heaven” instead of a “descent from heaven to earth”, that is, it is not about starting, as Leftist Hegelians want, from what men

[...] what men say, imagine, conceive, nor from men as narrated, thought of, imagined, conceived, in order to arrive at men in the flesh. We set out from real, active men, and on the basis of their real life-process we demonstrate the development of the ideological reflexes and echoes of this life-process. The phantoms formed in the human brain are also, necessarily, sublimates of their material life-process, which is empirically verifiable and bound to material premises. Morality, religion, metaphysics, all the rest of ideology and their corresponding forms of consciousness, thus no longer retain the semblance of independence. [...] As soon as this active life-process is described, history ceases to be a collection of dead facts as it is with the empiricists (themselves still abstract), or an imagined activity of imagined subjects, as with the idealists (MARX and ENGELS, 2007, p. 94-95).

Since ideology is the opposite of the real conditions of material life or an inverted, partial and distorted image of what is real, Ricoeur’s interpretation also helps to understand the criticism that Marxist pedagogy⁷ analyzed here produced about what it saw as idealistic perspectives. The result was the opposition – according to Ricoeur (1999b), common to orthodox Marxism – between materialism and idealism, as if we could choose between one and the other to explain the world. One would have to be either a historical materialist or an idealist; if we are not on one side, we are necessarily on the other. Without historical materialism, we cannot capture the real essence, only in its appearance (pseudo-concreteness). In the first part of this article, we showed how this reasoning was present in Brazilian Physical Education.

4 FINAL REMARKS

Our description, unlike others who also looked into the critical discourse of the Renewal Movement of Brazilian Physical Education, aimed at a more epistemological analysis of its pedagogy. We know that such discourse was not limited to the texts described here, the authors cited or the journals taken under investigation. In addition, it must be said that many of the authors who had their work linked to the Marxist pedagogy in question abandoned that framework by identifying with other theoretical traditions; some of them were linked to Marxism while others were far from historical and dialectical materialism.

The results demonstrate the way in which historical-critical pedagogy (SAVIANI, 2008; 2009) was vital for the emergence of a critical perspective within Brazilian Physical Education. They also show that such tradition was very important until the mid-1990s, when the authors of texts linked to that theoretical orientation, then hegemonic, become less recurring. Nevertheless, in the 2000s, some authors continue employing concepts linked to that critical orientation, therefore using a vocabulary that values primarily macroeconomic issues affecting education (in

⁷ With Almeida and Vaz (2013), we called Marxist pedagogy that educational perspective that since the 1980s, bases its reflections on Marx’s work and the tradition that has developed from it. As we have said, we know that there are distinct Marxisms in Education and Physical Education, so this article dialogues with a particular interpretation of that tradition, represented by the authors mentioned here.

some cases, it comes down to class struggle) arguing about school's or sport's ideological and alienating role in a class society, opposing critical theories to others that would be ahistorical, naive and uncritical, asserting materialism as "the" best reference to provide us with a correct reading of the world, advocating a critique of dominant ideology and its manifestations at the level of knowledge. From these manifestations, we show how it resulted in a critique of philosophical idealism, since it is unable to provide a proper reading, as more real, of reality and of course of School Physical Education. In that procedure, critical pedagogy schematically resumed the criticism that Marx and Engels (2007) addressed to Leftist Hegelians.

In this regard, it is interesting to note that the reality/appearance dualism has occupied this version of critical pedagogy of Physical Education since the 1980s. Today this concern is updated, as shown by Almeida and Vaz (2010) and Almeida, Bracht and Vaz (2012) in another context, at the critique of that pedagogy to "postmodernism" and "anti-realism" implied in strains that assumed the linguistic turn in philosophy. The argument is the same: those perspectives do not allow unveiling what reality actually is, resulting in its unknowability. Not surprisingly, those theoretical orientations are called fads, irrational and conservative,⁸ and an "ontological turn" is advocated, since only then the death of the "real" or "concrete" would be avoided and Physical Education could be theorized in its "essence" or "totality".

Helped by Thompson (1995) and Ricoeur (1990a; 1990b), we also offer an interpretation on the foundations of the critique of ideology within the pedagogy analyzed. With them, we saw that the notion of ideology with which critical pedagogy operates is quite problematic.⁹ For Thompson, for instance, this interpretation of ideology leads us to think of it as a set of ideas or representations improperly reflecting social reality. This reading requires "strong realism" that is quite questionable in contemporary philosophy.¹⁰ Ricoeur, in turn, argues that this notion of ideology presupposes the existence of a point of view that escapes the ideological condition of knowledge, a situation from which one could say that the truth is on one side and false knowledge is on the other – usually that of its opponent. The critique of ideology would thus be free of the suspicion he denounces. That is why he asks: "[...] Could social theory, conceived as critical, rise to an entirely non-ideological status, according to its own criteria for ideology?" (RICOEUR, 1990a, p 81). Another claim is added to that: not only that non-ideological place is possible, but it is occupied by science. In Marx, that contrary did not exist, but when Marxism consolidates itself as a theory rather than "collection of writings" and, in some cases, as a scientific doctrine, it provides the opposite of ideology: Marxism as a science or as an expression of truth in history, after all, truth is inscribed in history, at least according to Saviani (2008), and it is Marxism that provides the correct reading of that history.

We assume that the "critical field" is now marked by a plurality of theoretical and political perspectives not restricted to Marxism marked by the historical-critical pedagogy (which remains

8 Here too, critical pedagogy of Physical Education does not proceed differently from the disqualification strategy identified in Saviani (2008, 2009), as the author also uses the term "pseudo-scientific" to refer to the new methods or, in his opinion, educational fads (in his case, as already mentioned, the New School and technician pedagogy).

9 Although we do not treat it in this article, our interpreters, each in their own way, advocated a different conception of ideology, proposing an overhaul of its concept and hence of the ideological criticism in contemporary times.

10 Philosophers such as Rorty incite us to try to overcome, in philosophy, the dualistic vocabulary which results in "strong realism". This is assumed in the critical discourse of Physical Education. According to the author's words, we should insist that "[...] the way a thing is in itself does not exist, [that there is not] a description beyond any use that human beings want to make of it. The advantage of insisting on these points is that any dualism we find, any division we find a philosopher trying to fulfill and connect, can be made to look like a simple difference between two sets of descriptions of the same group of things. "It can be made so that it appears" not to contrast in this context with what "really is". It is not as if there is a procedure to find out if we are indeed dealing with two groups of things or with one. The thing itself, identity, depends on the description" (RORTY, 1999, p. 19-20).

active in the field). This differentiation happened because the Marxist reference itself has become more nuanced in Physical Education. In addition, other theoretical references began to circulate in the field. Those new traditions, at least in relation to the concept of ideology as it is employed in the writings analyzed here, operate with conceptual tools that, though critical, are distinct from those employed by Marxism (of historical-critical pedagogy) which we at the base of many texts published between 1979 and 2010. That changes the meaning of critical intellectuals and their task.

We are driven, then, by the desire to rebuild the task of criticism within Physical Education. This re-description demands not only recovering the critical tradition of the field, but also facing questions such as: Do its “original” assumptions hold up in the light of criticism already made to them (by other theories)? When do we consider the current historical-social conditionings of Education? Which meaning would the critique of ideology take on today in pedagogical discussion? Is any unity possible in the midst of pluralism? On what basis can the normative character of the critical tradition be sustained? Which demands do new theoretical (and political) developments pose to this pedagogy? These are challenges for the future.

REFERENCES

ALBUQUERQUE, Joelma *et al.* A prática pedagógica da educação física no MS: possibilidades de articulação entre teoria pedagógica, teoria do conhecimento e projeto histórico. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, Campinas, v. 28, no. 2, p. 121-140, 2007.

ALMEIDA, Felipe Quintão de; BRACHT, Valter; VAZ, Alexandre Fernandez. Classificações epistemológicas na educação física... redescritções. **Movimento**, Porto Alegre, v. 18, no. 4, p. 241-263, 2012.

ALMEIDA, Felipe Quintão de; VAZ, Alexandre Fernandez. Richard Rorty e a filosofia da educação: uma análise da recepção marxista. **Educação e Realidade**, v. 38, no.1, p. 249-270, 2013.

BARDIN, Laurence. **Análise de conteúdo**. Portugal: Edições 70, 1977.

BRACHT, Valter. A criança que pratica esportes respeita as regras do jogo... capitalista. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, São Paulo, v. 7, no. 2, p. 62-68, Jan. 1986.

BRUEL, Maria Rita. Função social do esporte. **Motrivivência**, Florianópolis, no. 2, p. 108-111, Jun. 1989.

CASTELLANI FILHO, Lino. A cultura corporal em questão. *In*: CASTELLANI FILHO, L. *et al.* **Metodologia do ensino de educação física**. São Paulo: Cortez, 2009. p. 184-198.

CASTELLANI FILHO, Lino. A (des)caracterização profissional-filosófica da educação física. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, São Paulo, v. 4, no. 3, p. 95-101, May 1983.

CASTELLANI FILHO, Lino. A. Educação física/ciências do esporte no Brasil hoje: pelos meandros da educação física. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, Maringá, v. 14, no. 3, p. 119-125, May 1993.

CASTRO, Iran Junqueira. Formação profissional de educação física em uma sociedade em transformação. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, Campinas, v.10, no. 3, p. 34-37, May 1989.

CAVALCANTI, Kátia Brandão. O papel dos grupos de estudo no desenvolvimento da ciência da motricidade humana. **Motrivivência**, Florianópolis, v. 2, no. 2, p. 95-96, Jun. 1989.

CAVALCANTI, Kátia Brandão; BASSOLI, P. R. O fenômeno esportivo e o papel da concepção histórico-dialética. **Motrivivência**, Florianópolis, v. 1, no. 1, p. 12-15, Jun. 1989.

CHAGAS, Eliane Pardo. Esporte de lazer – esporte de rendimento: análise de seus pressupostos. **Motrivivência**, Florianópolis, v. 2, no. 2, p. 101-104, Jun. 1989.

CHAUÍ, Marilena. **O que é ideologia**. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1980.

DIAS, Graziany Penna. Empreendedorismo e educação física: reflexões à sua apreensão/ implementação na formação humana. **Motrivivência**, Florianópolis, v. 35, no. 10, p. 147-165, 2010.

ESCOBAR, Micheli O. Cultura corporal na escola: tarefas da educação física. **Motrivivência**, Florianópolis, v. 8, no. 8, p. 91-102, Dec. 1995.

ESCOBAR, Micheli O. Reformulação dos currículos de formação em educação física. **Motrivivência**, Florianópolis, v. 1, no. 1, p. 63-67, Dec. 1988.

FERREIRA NETO, Amarílio. Esporte escolar e oligarquia em Sergipe. **Motrivivência**, Florianópolis, v. 1, no. 2, p. 76-80, Jun. 1989.

FREITAS, Francisco Mauri; CARDOSO FILHO, Joaquim Ignácio. Educação física: decapitação cultural e hegemonia imperialista. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, São Paulo, v. 9, no. 2, p. 55-61, Jan. 1988.

FRIZZO, Giovanni. O trabalho pedagógico como referência para a pesquisa em educação física. **Pensar a Prática**, Goiânia, v. 11, no. 2, p. 159-167, 2008.

GHIRALDELLI JÚNIOR, Paulo. Educação física e pedagogia: a questão dos conteúdos. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, Campinas, v. 11, no. 2, p. 133-135, Jan. 1990a.

GHIRALDELLI JÚNIOR, Paulo. Indicações para o estudo do movimento corporal humano da educação física a partir da dialética materialista. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, Campinas, v. 11, no. 3, p. 197-200, 1990b.

LACKS, Solange. O cotidiano da educação física escolar e suas tendências. **Motrivivência**, Aracaju, v. 6, no. 4, p. 36-40, Jun. 1993.

LÖWY, Michel. **Ideologias e ciência social**: para uma análise marxista. São Paulo: Cortez, 1991.

MARX, Karl; ENGELS, Friedrich. **A ideologia alemã**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2007.

MAZO, Janice Zarpellon; GOELLNER, Silvana Vilodre. Pensando a educação física humanista conservadora ou emancipatória? **Motrivivência**, Florianópolis, v. 4, no. 4, p. 65-71, Jun. 1993.

MEDINA, João Paulo Subirá; SOARES, Carmen Lúcia Soares; TAFFAREL, Celi Nelza Zulque. Ação pedagógica da escola pela via da interdisciplinaridade. **Motrivivência**, Florianópolis, v. 4, no. 4, p. 55-64, Jun. 1993.

- MIYAGIMA, Cláudio. O esporte (des)educa. **Motrivivência**, Florianópolis, v. 1, no. 2, p. 31-34, Jun. 1989.
- MICHELOTTI, Daniele de Vargas; SOUZA, Maristela da Silva. Análise do conhecimento teórico-metodológico dos professores em educação física do CEFD/UFSM em relação à sua prática pedagógica. **Movimento**, Porto Alegre, v. 14, no. 2, p. 63-82, 2008.
- MOCKER, Maria Cecília de Miranda. Educação física escolar, uma disciplina humanizante? **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, Maringá, v. 13, no. 2, p. 293-295, Jan. 1992.
- MONTALVÃO FILHO, Arivaldo. Ponto de vista: educação física escolar e o compromisso com a escola. **Motrivivência**, Florianópolis, v. 6, no. 4, p. 93-99, Jun. 1993.
- MOREIRA, Wagner Wey. Educação física na escola de 1º grau: 1ª a 4ª séries. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, São Paulo, v. 7, no. 2, p. 75-79, Jan. 1986.
- OLIVEIRA, Cristina Borges de. Aproximações exploratórias sobre educação, educação física e sociedade: adversidades de um currículo. **Pensar a Prática**, Goiânia, v. 4, p. 99-114, 2001.
- PALAFIX, Gabriel Humberto. As tendências pedagógicas em educação física e sua relação com as categorias idealistas e materialistas da história. **Motrivivência**, Florianópolis, v. 4, no. 4, p. 30-35, Jun. 1993.
- PINA, Leonardo Docena. Pedagogia histórico-crítica e transmissão do conhecimento sistematizado sobre o esporte na educação física. **Motrivivência**, Florianópolis, no. 31, p. 99-114, 2008.
- RESENDE, Helder Guerra. Reflexões sobre algumas contradições da educação física no âmbito da escola pública e alguns caminhos didáticos pedagógicos na perspectiva da cultura corporal. **Movimento**, Porto Alegre, v. 1, no. 1, p. 20-28, 1994.
- RICOEUR, Paul. **Ideologia e utopia**. Lisboa: Edições 70, 1990b.
- RICOEUR, Paul. **Interpretações e ideologias**. Rio de Janeiro: Francisco Alves, 1990a.
- RIGO, Luis Carlos. A educação física fora de forma. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, Porto Alegre, v. 16, no. 2, p. 82-93, Jan. 1995.
- RIGO, Luis Carlos; CHAGAS, Eliane Pardo. Educação física escolar e reprodução social. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, Campinas, v. 11, no. 3, p. 179-185, 1990.
- RORTY, Richard. **Ensaio sobre Heidegger e outros: escritos filosóficos 2**. Rio de Janeiro: Relume-Dumará, 1999.
- SAVIANI, Dermeval. **Escola e democracia**. São Paulo: Autores Associados, 2009.
- SAVIANI, Dermeval. **Interlocuções pedagógicas: conversa com Paulo Freire e Adriano Nogueira e 30 entrevistas sobre educação**. São Paulo: Autores Associados, 2010.
- SAVIANI, Dermeval. **Pedagogia histórico-crítica: primeiras aproximações**. São Paulo: Autores Associados, 2008.
- SILVA, Maria Cecília de Paula. Educar para superar: uma reflexão sobre a educação física escolar. **Pensar a Prática**, Goiânia, v. 7, no. 2, p. 205-220, 2004.

SILVA, Tomaz Tadeu da. Sociologia da educação e a pedagogia crítica em tempos pós-modernos. In: SILVA, Tomaz Tadeu da (Ed.). **Teoria educacional crítica em tempos pós-modernos**. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas, 1993. p. 122-140.

SOARES, Carmen Lúcia. Fundamentos da educação física escolar. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, São Paulo, v. 10, no. 1, p. 19-27, Sept. 1988.

SOARES, Carme Lúcia *et al.* **Metodologia do ensino da educação física**. São Paulo: Cortez, 1992.

SOUZA, Maristela da Silva. Didática da educação física escolar e o processo lógico de apreensão do saber. **Movimento**, Porto Alegre, v. 13, no. 3, p. 181-199, 2007.

TAFFAREL, Celi Nelza Zulke. A carta de carpina educação física: novos compromissos: pedagogia, movimento, miséria. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, Campinas, v. 23, no. 1, p. 41-55, 2001.

TAFFAREL, Celi Nelza Zulke. Concepções de aulas abertas a experiências em educação física: discussão de pressupostos em relação a fins e objetivos, à luz da realidade da educação física escolar brasileira. **Motrivivência**, Florianópolis, v. 6, no. 4, p. 41-46, Jun. 1993.

TAFFAREL, Celi Nelza Zulke. A educação física em Pernambuco: quadro atual e perspectivas. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, Campinas, v. 11, no. 3, p. 219-223, 1990.

TAFFAREL, Celi Nelza Zulke. Políticas públicas e educação física e esportes no Brasil: reformas ou ruptura? Entrevistador: Nivaldo Antônio David Nogueira com Celi Taffarel. **Pensar a Prática**, Goiânia, v. 2, p. 1-24, Jan./Jun.1998/1999.

TAFFAREL, Celi Nelza Zulke. Proposta para eixos orientadores de um curso de pós-graduação a nível de especialização em metodologia do ensino da educação física. **Motrivivência**, Florianópolis, v. 5, no. 5/7, p. 146-165, Dec. 1994.

TAFFAREL, Celi Nelza Zulke. Referencial teórico-metodológico para produção do conhecimento sobre metodologia do ensino da educação física e esportes. **Revista Brasileira de Ciências do Esporte**, Porto Alegre, v. 16, no. 2, p. 122-133, Jan. 1995.

THOMPSON, John. **Ideologia e cultura moderna**: teoria social crítica na era dos meios de comunicação de massa. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 1995.

VAZ, Alexandre Fernandez; ALMEIDA, Felipe Quintão de. Do giro lingüístico ao giro ontológico na atividade epistemológica em educação física. **Movimento**, Porto Alegre, v. 16, no. 3, p. 11-28, 2010.

WIGGERS, Ingrid Dittrich. Currículo e ideologia: um estudo introdutório. **Motrivivência**, Florianópolis, v. 1, no. 1, p. 43-49, Dec. 1988.

WIGGERS, Ingrid Dittrich *et al.* Didática da educação física: ordem unida, recreação e pedagogia do movimento crítico. **Motrivivência**, Florianópolis, v. 3, no. 3, p. 93-97, Jan. 1990.

Research sponsored by CNPQ's Edital Universal no. 14/2011.