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Abstract
The goal of the present research was a comparative-analytic examination of common features existed between Paulo Freire & Al-Ghazali’s pedagogical comments. Such examination is of great importance in the sense that first, the common features between these two scientists in the area of pedagogy has been able to cause some reformation and changes in the field; and secondly, while living in two totally different cultures and eras, their attitudes toward pedagogy issue seem to resemble each other in a particular manner. Among such common ideas, the two scientists’ attention to the role of politics in pedagogy, the congruity between theory and practice, highlighting active teaching, critical pedagogy, anti-superstition during the flow of pedagogy and the importance of teacher training can be pointed out. However, some distinctions are observed between thoughts provoked by these great trainers in areas of adult pedagogy and dialogue-based pedagogy.
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1. Introduction
The issue of pedagogy has been permanently discussed by different scientists. The historical flow of pedagogical thoughts shows that there exists no evidence of the earliest pedagogical assumptions, since pedagogy enjoys an antiquity as long as the human history. However, during history, there have existed several pedagogical reflections attempting to resolve issues of their time in one way or another. Among Muslim scientists giving lectures in the field of pedagogy, Al-Farabi, Al-Ghazali, Ibn Khaldun, Nasir al-Din al-Tusi, Avicenna and others can be stated. Although no fundamental differences are observed among great Muslim pedagogical trainers, their views of pedagogy and its goals and methodologies seem to differ approximately, despite highlighting the importance of religion and Theology in their thoughts by them all. From among great Muslim educators, we selected Al-Ghazali, since the influence of his thoughts on his contemporary fellows has made him distinct from others, particularly through appearing his viewpoints in such books as Ehya’ (Revival), Kimiya-yi sa’adat & The Incoherence of the Philosophers.

On the other hand, the most eminent contemporary philosopher is-with no doubt- Paulo Freire, a Brazilian scholar who has transformed traditional training foundations in a critical manner creating new environment in the area of pedagogy. The effects of these two major scholars’ thoughts are considerable in their time frameworks; thus, a comparative-analytic examination of their common views seems to provide the individuals interested in the field with some new insight into pedagogical issues. While the temporal distance between these two trainers approximates 9 centuries, many of Ghazali’s viewpoints have much in common with those of Paulo Freire’s. However, some deep distinctions exist between their views regarding some particular areas which have not been examined in the present research.

As a Muslim scholar, Ghazali considers training as a means for soul refinement and reaching divinity; in fact, he examined pedagogy issues from a spiritual perspective. However, Paulo Freire considered pedagogy mostly on the basis of its worldly foundations, regarding spiritual aspects to a less extent. Despite some oppositions in several aspects, the exist important similarities between the thoughts of these two scholars concerning pedagogical issues. From among common viewpoints between them, such ideas as the congruity between theory & practice during the flow of pedagogy, the interactive relationship between politics & pedagogy, critical training, active training, attention to teacher training and the issue of anti-superstition in pedagogy can be stated. However, these two trainers were in disagreement about two issues namely adult training and dialogue-based training, both of which were highlighted by Paulo Freire, but underestimated by Ghazali.

2. The importance of pedagogy from Ghazali & Freire’s Perspectives:
Paulo Freire is considered as one of the most influential pedagogy scholars in the present century. His new viewpoints in philosophy of pedagogy have lead to create a modern movement in the field. His stance in pedagogy is described in such a way that some scholars attributed a title of “The most determined figure in philosophy of pedagogy during our era “To him, who considered pedagogy philosophy as a means for reconstructing human experiences, schools and society (Elias, 2002, p. 84).

Freire’s critical attitude toward pedagogy and his modern strategies now still being discussed by authorities has caused several researchers to reflect on his ideas. Through publication of “Pedagogy of the Oppressed”, he gained popularity worldwide. Since 1970, his ideas were eagerly studied and analyzed by a majority of the most
prominent theoreticians and active authorities in the world (Roberts, 1998, p. 6). As a matter of fact, Freire’s new insight into pedagogy issues led to create a new movement in the field (Tundon,2008, p. 288). For Freire, teaching is an activity combined with human life and it is a multi-faceted process comprising a complicated combination of logical, emotional, active and even spiritual aspects (Roberts, 1998,p. 67). Still, Freire’s view of training was derived from a region in which he had a bitter experience of oppression and being oppressed. Thus, a wide range of his ideas and thoughts in the field of pedagogy has been specified to the deprived and the oppressed. On the other hand, Ghazali was not a mere educator; still as an authority giving some lecture in this area, his viewpoints have been always highlighted among Muslim traders in the Islamic societies. His awareness of different sciences of his time, his creative thought and presenting new theories in different areas are among Ghazali’s scientific characteristics. He gave speech as a Faqih (an expert in Islamic Jurisprudence) and from the Religion’s perspectives. Still, he attempted to give speeches in an important area such as pedagogy. From his perspective, teaching is the noblest enterprise. During experiencing his mental crisis, he even abandoned this holy activity. Regarding this, he said:

“The teaching was the noblest of my activities which I found it futile for reaching eternity. The fact was that I found myself lacking good faith and an intention to reach divinity; indeed, my main motive in this work was to achieve fame and position” (Ghazali, 1971,p. 74).

Thus, Ghazali considered not any teaching as deserving praise and enumerated some characteristics for teaching to be profitable. From Ghazali’s perspective, human prosperity is inherited in human training (Ghazali, 1986, the 4th volume, p. 19), and no human can reach what he deserves except through training. For him, training is so important that any wise human should receive training and this is obligatory for any wise human (Ghazali,1996,p. 23). Thus, training is a necessity for us and as a sign of our being humans, and this is why Ghazali considered it as the noblest enterprise after Prophecy (Rafiei, 2003,p. 119). In some contexts, He emphasized the stance of training so as being more important than worship (Ghazali, 1986, the 2nd volume, p. 33). All this represents the importance of training and pedagogy for him. With no doubt, Ghazali was considered as the most eminent trainer and professor at Nezamiyeh university in Baghdad in his time, and several years of teaching and lecturing in that major scientific center brought him valuable experiences in pedagogy and training.

3. Examining common pedagogical views between Freire & Ghazali

3.1. Congruity between Theory & Practice

Probably, what is most common between pedagogical views of Freire & Ghazali is congruity between knowledge & practice or between theory and work in pedagogical learning.

From Freire’s perspective, pedagogy is reflected and reconstructed in practice and for it to exist, it has no way except turning to practice (Freire, 1980,p. 78). From his point of view, the mere theory presentation does not work; indeed, some attempt should be made to achieve original awareness. However, Freire considers breakage of the traditional teacher-student connection as a real cause of creating unity between theory and practice. He emphasizes the issue that the trainees should be requested to take active roles during learning process from its beginning, since they should teach something during this process as well. Meanwhile, such a direct contact between those being trained and those training will turn to be a basis for trainers to think about their immediate experiences reaching a unity between theory and practice (Freire, 1985, p. 98).

Freire held the view that presenting a new generation of intellectuals, rising from a unity between theory and practice and between manual as well as mental work is much easier than re-training Elitist intellectuals (Freire, 1985, p. 124). Thus, for Freire, real learning was a combination of theory and practice (Roberts, 1998, p. 16), and lack of such unity will lead to failure in pedagogical settings. Such issue was also considered by Ghazali who continually emphasized that some harmony and balance should be made between science and practice in order to reach what one deserves in religion and pedagogy contexts, as, in “ Makatib Farsi”, he said: “Some connection should be established between science and practice adding piety to them……and these are the individuals enjoying enough perception and awareness through which they can reach the science peaks and their nature have capacity to receive and accept piety” (Ghazali,1955, p. 77-78). Moreover, he considered human prosperity, the earliest and the eventual goal, as solely established through combination of science and practice (Ghazali, 1996, p. 16). Silence and practice are two means for reaching prosperity. Assuming practice is not possible except through having knowledge of the quality of practice (Ghazali, 1996, p. 116). It is worth mentioning that the connection between theory and practice is now considered as one fundamental condition for pedagogical ideals to be actualized, since presentation of new standpoints cannot be basically led to some change and variation in pedagogical settings except that they are confirmed through experiment and implementation.

The point should be made that considering the training system regarded by Ghazali, the concepts of efficacy and the state of being affected are inherent. Still, not any efficacy or the state of being affected is regarded as training, although any training can affect and be affected. In other words, training is creation of a change in students; still, not any change is regarded as training, although any training is a change (Rafiei, 2003, p. 97).

3.2. The mutual Relationship between education and politics

One evident feature of Freire’s pedagogical theories is their connection with politics. From Freire’s perspective,
literacy is a political phenomenon and has a close relationship with individuals’ personal and group experiences (Roberts, 1998, p. 19). Freire lived in a society in which everything was affected by politics and political changes of the time. With a change in politics, the pedagogical system underwent some change as well. Moreover, pedagogy itself could direct and orient political goals in the country, since the goal of pedagogy was to train people on the basis of the political ideals of the dominant governmental system. Thus, he believed that pedagogy organization in any given society is a complete political ministry. Pedagogy is in favor of the benefits of the dominant political class, and it is in favor of the people’s benefits in a revolution society (Freire, 1985, p. 95). On importance of the mutual relationship between politics & pedagogy, he emphasized that just as no governmental system in any city or country can be impartial towards political issues, there existed no impersonal pedagogical systems. For him, assuming pedagogy with no regard to the issue of power was impossible. (Raghfar, 1991, p. 22). This caused him to emphasize the mutual role of pedagogy and politics, although such an emphasis was not a new project and it was made by Plato before. Plato wanted to suppose a society presenting an image of unity or universal discipline in which politics and pedagogy would be as twins (Olic’, 1997, p. 9). Still, such a combination (between politics & pedagogy) seemed newborn in the present society regarding its political complications and economic crises. Freire incorporated pedagogy into the politics domain through the angle that he saw he could make people aware of and restore their trampled rights through awakening them leading to make some change in the society in which they are oppressed. But, for Plato, the twin state of politics and pedagogy held some other meaning. Since, contrary to Freire, he principally disagreed with democracy believing in a society possessing some social classes (Olic’, 1997, p. 11).

The issue of politics might have crossed Ghazali’s mind; however, he never made any attempt to widely bring it into pedagogy domain. This was a characteristic arisen from the environment in which he lived, and such a combination might not seem essential in his view in that time. Given that, he was not ignorant of the political issues in pedagogical affairs, in such a way believing that training is of the noblest enterprises and that there existed four principles behind which the world has its stability namely agriculture, clothing, building construction & politics, and he considers politics as the noblest of them, since he believed that the world would lose its stability in absence of politics (Ghazali, 1996, p. 116). However, during the time teaching in Baghdad Nezamiyeh center was a follower of the political system of the government, and after retirement, he never opposed the government, although he wrote several letters to the kings, ministers and officials representing his concern for political reform. For instance, he wrote a letter to one of the Islamic sultans in order to tell him to observe justice among people and talked to him of the people life troubles requesting him to treat them with kindness (Ghazali, 1955, p. 4). Still, he warned the governors that “Do not be pleased with your governance on Khorasan, since in the Hereafter in the Earths and skies, you will be assumed as having political power and you are told that “what did you do with MY affluences?” Because, the governors’ hearts serve as God’s treasuries (Ghazali, 1955, p. 9). Thus, Ghazali made some attempts to politically train the governors of his time. Probably, one cause of the fact that he relaxingly attempted to advise, or sometime warn governors against serving justice and not inflicting cruelty was his high stance among kings and people of his time. Still, he never wanted to widely incorporate politics into pedagogical settings, and this probably served as acceptable regarding the conditions of his time. Since at that time, no pedagogical system existed similar to what having today, nor did the government interfere with the pedagogical issues such as curriculum design and contents. Still, as pointed out before, Ghazali considered the teaching of politics as essential regarding it even more important than other sciences. Accordingly, a concern for making trainees’ minds aware of political issues was a matter highlighted by both Ghazali & Freire; however, it received more emphasis by Freire.

3.3 Critical Thinking:
One the most influential Marxist schools in this century was Frankfurt School or Critical Theory. The goal of this theory was to introduce and develop modern capitalist society and to present some ways through which the society can escape from dominance relationships and exploitation. Based on this, the theory of critical pedagogy was developed from some Neo-Marxism writings regarding the critical theory by scholar of Frankfurt School. Paulo Freire, the Brazilian trainer, was regarded to be one major thinker of this school who managed to develop a new project in pedagogy through application of Marx’s thoughts and its combination with humanistic viewpoints. Freire and his followers took in account the critical theory in pedagogy. The critical pedagogy viewpoint assumes that pedagogical works are correlated with social works, and that the role of a critical thinker is to identify and consider such works. In his analysis, Freire discussed the opposition between “teaching for the purpose of subjugation “& “teaching for the purpose of freedom”. In his view, “teaching for the purpose of subjugation “ causes training, knowledge, suggestion and repetition of the existing information to be separated from learning, practice, innovation and creativity or creation of new information, respectively, and generally, knowledge in this process turns to acceptance and accumulation of information. Conversely, “teaching for the purpose of freedom” is idealistic and optimistic about human perfection and attempts to achieve it. In this pedagogy style, teachers do not possess the whole knowledge and wisdom; indeed, a definite issue is placed as mediator between teachers and students, as two individuals in the wisdom process, and the speech between these
two members of the wisdom process commences during the philosophical relationship on the basis of wisdom and logic. Accordingly, teaching underlying freedom and dialogue-based teaching serve as two dimensions of thought and practice, without of each any speech will be deemed null (Marjani & Ziba Kalam, 2004, p. 117). In Freire’s critical attitude, teachers should serve to be guides and continue their activities with an aim of facilitating pedagogical processes (Blackburn, 2000, pp 8-9). Thus, teachers give students the main responsibility. In Freire’s critical classes, teachers reject the methods in which students exert few effects, are work-influenced and anti-intellectualism. They can no longer give lecture for those students trapped in a silence tempting to sleep (McLauren & Leonard, 2004, p. 24). Freire’s theory is a practical approach in such a way that, based on his thoughts, critical thinking leads us towards critical enterprise. Thus, pedagogy in this system moves away from the state of making students obey toward making them free (Leduish, 2001, p. 177). Thus, one of the critical ideas in Freire’s pedagogical process is his dialogue project. Established instead of the traditional teacher-student training method, dialogue-based teaching is basically an open mental method for having a conversation about issues generally posed by learners themselves. Dialogue, which is in need of critical thinking, has a capability of producing critical thinking, since critical thinking necessitates changes preparing people for struggle for revitalization of democracy and social equity (Woodward, 2000, p. 238). This Freire’s deconstructive and critical view of pedagogical system of the recent time has led to create a new movement in the world pedagogical process.

Seemingly, Ghazali looked at from a critical angle. He criticized imitative training and felt concern for the existence of a science and religion resulted from imitation, lacking thought. Since from his perspective, the one who imitates is blind and there is no goodness in obeying the blind and their followers (Ghazali, 1996, p. 50). Such an attitude represents Ghazali’s critical thoughts based on which any matter should be treated with some doubt. He believed: “If there is nothing, in these words, causing you to feel doubt about whichever belief you have inherited, you will gain no benefit from them; since one who has no doubt has not attempted to think, and one who does not think does not see, one who does not see reminds in mere blindness and goes astray (Ghazali, 1996, p. 163). Thus, Ghazali’s attitude toward training also seems to be a critical phenomenon. The adaptation of Ghazali’s attitudes with those of Freire’s is worth thinking about form the perspective that they both made some attempt to encourage individuals to gain intellectual independence, not to learn in a way in which students play a passive role. Playing student role means participation in discussions, the latter meaning the breakage of the pure teacher-oriented style and this is not achieved except through critical thinking. Training, as intellectual independence put forward by Ghazali, has a close relationship with Freire’s critical pedagogy. Ghazali said: “Understand the righteousness via intellection and do not imitatively follow one who makes you go to any path, since there are thousands of people, like your teacher, around you telling you not to obey him and he will destroy you making you go astray from the right path, just as your teacher says; finally you will recognize your injustice to your teacher; and be aware that the only way to escape from it is independence “ (Ghazali, 1996, p. 163).

Accordingly, pedagogy based on Ghazali’s thoughts is both freedoms from imitation and fanaticism as well as independence in thought. Any thoughts lacking independence will not find any way toward criticism. Ghazali’s critical attitude toward training is totally evident in his assertion that “a group of people are satisfied with imitation in that they feel no need for discussion and search and that they follow the way depicted by their imitators. Still, another group resembles the patients who do not imitate their doctors; indeed, they are inclined to see different doctors”. He added: “this is a far and complicated path and its conditions are solely met by some exceptional individuals in each period (Ghazali, 1996, p. 31). Moreover, he considered fanaticism as an obstacle to mental growth. He made a similarity between the heart of those inflicted with fanaticism and a piece of paper on which it was written something and the paper ink was saturated with it and could not be cleaned except through burning it. He even considered their tempers as to be impure regarding them impossible to be reformed and be trained. “Since, they will not accept the fact that the reality was something contrary to what they have heard. Indeed, they would try to follow they were told and deceive others in rejecting reality. Even if they listen to us and attempt to perceive the hearings, we should feel doubt about their perception........... the only way is silence regarding them. They should be left in their aberrations” (Ghazali, 1996 p. 162). The closeness of Freire and Ghazali’s thoughts regarding this issue (not imitating others slavishly) is evident from the point that whenever individuals lose their abilities to make their own selections and are influenced by those of others’ their decisions are out of their dominance, they are no longer theirs, since their decisions are affected by external pressures. They are not unique; indeed, they are compromised and made compatible with others. This is why those humans not pliable with a revolutionary spirit are called incompatible. The adapted humans do not struggle, nor they cooperate; they are indeed harmonized with the conditions imposed on them, thus they request power centralization and a non-critical basis (Freire, 1990, p. 25).

3.4. Active teaching

In the training process regarded by Freire, real learning occurs whenever teachers and students mutually make attempts to learn. Freire’s project underlies that, in pedagogical process, students are not the mere learners; indeed, the teachers should also gain some knowledge from students and the dialogue between them in this
process. Perhaps, teachers will manage to discover a new dimension of the issues which has been covered for them before (Freire, 1985, p. 21). The process emphasized by Freire is in such a way in which the students should accept themselves as problem-posers in the learning process not as somebody merely answering teachers’ questions. In other words, through problem-posing method, students learn to bring the answers into question, not only answering the regarded questions. Moreover, learning is not the amount of information sent to the mind nor is the combination of skills transmitted to the students (McLauren & Leonard, 2004, p. 24-25). Freire considered the one-way learning in which only the teachers play an active role as the banking education method. The banking education method described by Freire was similar to the action of pouring information onto students, in such a way that they serve as passive empty containers waiting to be filled (Suborden & Mao, 1999, p. 194). He refused to grant knowledge as a value merely owned by teachers, since teachers themselves need to be more educated. He considered an attempt to change the teaching methods as the duties of both students and teachers (Freire, 1979,p. 58). Thus, from Freire’s perspective, a teaching method is valuable that in which both teachers and students make attempts to reach a better learning; i.e., teachers who learn while they are teaching, and students who teach while they are learning (Freire, 1984,p. 126). Thus, he proposed some projects in which both teachers and students play an active role. For instance, the dialogical method or problem-posing teaching method are both constructed in a way taking the active role from teachers and dividing it between them and their students. This is a way presented by Freire in order to reform the existing traditional pedagogical system.

Such an issue was also considered by Ghazali. One of the pedagogical styles regarded by Ghazali was active teaching. Appeared having different pedagogical goals, learners transmit their knowledge to others under the supervision of teachers. this pedagogical style can be considered as lacking a serious form or sophisticated state, being as pre-learning for learners, as an introduction to the main teaching and as a repeating factor of the learning and its internalization for teachers; indeed, it can be serious and sophisticated leading to discover trainers’ creative power in some other cases (Rafiei, 2003, p. 281). It should be regarded that the method emphasized by Ghazali was regarded as new in his time. In this pedagogical style, teachers can also learn something from what is repeated just as they can correct their students’ faults. From Ghazali’s Perspective, training is sometimes solely an action, since trainees have no logical cooperation in it, and it is some time action and reaction, since trainees logically cooperate in it. For instance, in training young children, the trainers have a logical action, while trainees only accept the teachings having no logical reaction. However, in training teenagers, their cooperation and wills have the same importance as the trainers’ attempts do (Rafiei, 2003,p. 98).

Ghazali was a pragmatist trainer and, instead of applying the banking education method which was also rejected by Freire, attempted to apply a method in which students themselves try to discover reality and knowledge. Accordingly, he said: “I realize to let you know about this problem in order to discover it using your perception power. In so doing, your guide will be my previous teachings. The reason behind this is that you will feel more pleased if you yourself discover and become aware of this issue than if you learn it from me. Moreover, more motivation toward discovering realities will be increased; whenever you discover a secret through your own wisdom, you will be more inclined to search for other realities and secrets, and this is the core of education (Ghazali, 1986, p. 81). This exactly corresponds to what has been reflected by Freire’s views, where regarding teachers’ duties toward students, he said:” the teachers’ duty is not to apply methods and means to uncover issues himself and kindly give them to students and deprive them from an attempt to search for realities as an important factor in cognition. Indeed, the most important factor in the trainer-trainee relationship is creation of a critical view of the issues not trainers’ speech on them (Freire, 1985, p. 19-20).

3.5. Attention to teacher training &education

What is evident in Freire’s training perspectives is the importance of reforming teacher training structure. He attempted to nurture teachers, with their being as the main factor in such changes, on the basis of his modern ideas with regard to the changes being created in traditional education foundations. Freire enumerated some rights and duties for teachers and students. Among the characteristics which, according to Freire, should be displayed by teachers are such definite rights as freedom in teaching, some opportunities for criticizing authorities with no fear of being revenged by them (Roberts, 1998, p. 67). In other words, according to his critical attitudes, he attempted to break power hierarchy in such a way that all individuals would be capable of administering justice and giving their own ideas. Just as teachers can criticize their higher authorities, students should also be given some right to criticize and evaluate their teacher performances. However, the criticism highlighted by Freire was that of constructive not that of destructive not leading to desecration or spoiling the relationships in educational settings. He was in search for some environment in which all individuals can freely express their ideas and concerns. In Freire’s training approach, teachers play the role of guides not that of an absolute omniscient being obeyed by all. They learn to listen to students’ essential needs and pay attention to their own selections (Gedeti, 1994, pp 50-51). Thus, the role of trainers is to hold a dialogue with illiterate individuals on objective conditions and providing them with some tool to learn reading and writing on their own. Such training cannot be induced from top to bottom; however, it occurs from inside toward outside by the illiterate individuals with help of trainers (Freire, 1989, p. 94). Freire’s dialogue project needs a fundamental
evolution in thinking manner in such a way that teachers should make attempts to alter those of their anti-dialogue behaviors inherent in them (Blackburn, 2000, p. 8). This is an evidence of the fact that Freire pays the same attention to teacher training as he does to learner training; since teachers’ role in orienting pedagogical trends is considered a fundamental issue.

On the other hand, Ghazali has considered teachers as needing training and regarded some duties and responsibilities for them. In Ghazali’s view, teachers, as agents, need to train others and meet their needs through training and nurturing others, i.e. students, and this is one cause of great teachers’ love for their top students (Rafiei, 2003, p. 123). In *Kimiya-yi sa’ādat*, Ghazali enumerated a number of eight characteristics for teachers. In other words, he believed that just as students should observe a number of 10 features, teachers should follow some issues as well. Holding this view, he has implicitly talked of teacher training. Such issues involve that teachers should treat their students as their own children, they should not be ambitious for positions, do not urge students to do something out of their duties and talk at the same level as their student knowledge (Ghazali, 1996, pp 136-140). All this implies that Ghazali did not want to develop a teaching style in which education meant that students should be made obedient to their teachers. In other words, according to Ghazali (& Freire as well), training is not making students obedient; it is indeed an issue higher than motherhood and it resembles prophecy. He regarded teachers as God’s substitutes, giving the idea that God’s deeds are all based on love and affection (Rafiei, 2003, p. 98). Thus, Ghazali Has regarded particular importance to the teacher status, being not inclined to consider teacher status and student status as the same. To put it another way, Ghazali believed that it is obligatory to respect teachers and their knowledge and training. For instance, students should be silent even if they recognize their teachers are making mistakes. Regarding this, he said:

“When students are not at the service of teachers for gaining knowledge, they resemble a piece of land which receives a considerable amount of rain; but it cannot produce any fruits or vegetables. When a teacher implied something considered as an evident fault by students, they should accuse themselves of committing such a fault, be patient and follow their teacher, since teacher error is much better than their own right choices……. In short, any students who do not follow their teachers will be doomed to fail definitely” (Ghazali, 2003, p. 127).

However, Freire did not agree on this issue. Since, in his training approach, teachers are not considered as somebody being aware of everything. Indeed, teachers, just as students, may commit errors and be criticized.

3.6. Anti-superstition:

Freire has not based his training foundations on religious principles, i.e. he made no attempt to let religion enter training areas. Indeed, he never attempted to reject the importance of religion in educational issues. Moreover, he recognized that a misunderstanding of religion can prohibit humans from development and perfection and he considered such a misconception or what appeared as myths among people as a main cause of preventing humans, the oppressed and illiterate ones in particular, from moving toward development. Thus, he believed that problem-posing teaching style will attempt to counter myths (Freire, 1979, pp 77-80). He asserted “we should not believe in creating myths and ....in the world. We should work more and talk less than before” (Gedeti, 1994, p. 86). In his constant contact with the oppressed people in Brazil, he found that they sometime considered the existing misfortune as a result of their destined fate. Thus, he added that the oppressed people and the farmers considered their troubles, which are in fact as a result of exploitation, as God’s willing and that God has created such organized disharmony (Freire, 1979, p. 44). Thus, he attempted to help people abandon such a false belief through creating a critical attitude in them. Since, acceptance of beliefs and realities in any situation leads to human distress.

On the other hand, Ghazali has attempted to counter superstitions having by his opponents for many years. His lecture meetings with great figures of different religions and religious communion showed his consideration of his surrounding issues through a critical viewpoint. Moreover, he was eminent in that he considered as a religious scholar and an expert in Islamic Jurisprudence. He could not tolerate the disconnection between religion and training and condemned such training. Eventually, the training system regarded by Ghazali was that with which humans can come near to God (Rafiei, 2003, p. 209). However, he rejected any illogical and biased-oriented attitude toward religion. Thus, he condemned those individuals who considered God as the cause of their failure, saying “You should believe that the obstacle is from you not from Divine Mercy” (Ghazali, 1996, p. 36). This is exactly what highlighted by Freire in that unaware humans attempt to consider God as the cause of their misfortune and troubles avoiding any attempt in order to prevent them. He held the view that injustice and oppression can be developed by the oppressed themselves (Gedeti, 1994, p. 55). His critical view exactly referred to such people’s orientation towards superstitions and myths.

4. Results

In the present research, an attempt was made to express some common training ideas of two great educators, i.e. Brazilian Paulo Freire and Iranian Imam Muhammad Ghazali. As pointed out, these scholars have lived in two totally different time frameworks and societies as well in such a way that the conditions of their times are not comparable to each other. However, their training viewpoints are much common in many regards, some of which were stated in this article. Freire was a Christian educator who was totally moderate in his views and attempted
to highlight the mutual interrelationship between training and politics. On the other hand Ghazali was a Muslim radicalism educator spending much of his lifetime on joining religious debates with his opponents. Thus, he attempted to look at training from a religious perspective. However, he was also aware of the importance of political teaching in training-related settings. These two educators are both criticism-oriented considering the issues of their time from a critical viewpoint, and they emphasized critical training as opposed to the traditional and one-way training system among teachers and students. Being close to critical training, active teaching has been highlighted by them two as well. In such teaching style, an attempt was made to avoid teachers’ incomplete dominance during teaching trends respecting students as an influential factor in learning processes. Freire and Ghazali have determined some duties for both teachers and students in their training approaches. While Ghazali’s dominant viewpoint to be oriented towards teachers, just as Freire, he attempted to restrict teacher role in relation to students as compared to the existing traditional trend emphasizing teacher training. In other words, both educators believed that, in pedagogical settings, both teachers and students are in need of training. Despite their difference in beliefs and the role of religion in training, these trainers believed that they should struggle against superstitions in the field. To put it another way, superstitions and myths can cause difficulty in the humans’ development and evolution trend. The issues expressed were some common ideas of these two educators. However, they disagreed on two issues, i.e. adult training and dialogue-based teaching.
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