

JOURNAL FÜR ENTWICKLUNGSPOLITIK

vol. XXXX 4-2024

THE PRAXIS OF TRANSFORMATIVE RESEARCH: REVISITING PAULO FREIRE

Special Issue Guest Editor: Gerald Faschingeder,
Ulli Vilsmaier,
Juliana Merçon

Published by:
Mattersburger Kreis für Entwicklungspolitik
an den österreichischen Universitäten

Journal für Entwicklungspolitik (JEP)
Austrian Journal of Development Studies

Publisher: Mattersburger Kreis für Entwicklungspolitik an den österreichischen Universitäten

Editorial Team: Monika Austaller, Tobias Boos, Martin Černý, Antje Daniel, Felix Dorn, Julia Eder, Nora Katharina Faltmann, Gerald Faschingeder, Karin Fischer, Daniel Fuchs, Sophie Gleitsmann, Inge Grau, Alina Heuser, Johannes Jäger, Johannes Knierzinger, Bettina Köhler, Johannes Korak, Magdalena Kraus, Franziska Kusche, Luisa Leisenheimer, Valerie Lenikus, Sebastian Luckeneder, Teresa Millesi, Clemens Pfeffer, Jonathan Scalet, Lukas Schmidt, Gregor Seidl, Nicolas Schlitz, Marcela Torres Heredia

Board of Editors: Henry Bernstein (London), Patrick Bond (Johannesburg), John-ren Chen (Innsbruck), Jacques Forster (Genève), John Friedman (St. Kilda), Peter Jankowitsch (Wien), Franz Kolland (Wien), Helmut Konrad (Graz), Uma Kothari (Manchester), Ulrich Menzel (Braunschweig), Jean-Philippe Platteau (Namur), Alfredo Saad-Filho (London), Dieter Senghaas (Bremen), Heribert Steinbauer (Wien), Osvaldo Sunkel (Santiago de Chile)

Publications Manager: Clemens Pfeffer

Cover: Clemens Pfeffer

Photo: Alex Mak, São Paulo: Paulo Freire, 2023

Contents

- 4 ULLI VILSMAIER, GERALD FASCHINGEDER, JULIANA MERÇON
Learning from Paulo Freire for Transformative Research

- 17 ULLI VILSMAIER, DANILO STRECK
The Transformative Momentum of Praxis: Paulo Freire's Guide for
Radicals

- 37 JULIANA MERÇON
Critical Hope. On Affective, Epistemic and Ethico-Political Care in
Participatory Action Research

- 52 DANILO R. STRECK, SANDRO DE CASTRO PITANO,
NILDA STECANELA
Connectivity: A Research Principle of Paulo Freire

- 72 ALAIN SANTANDREU
Criticising "Logframitis" with Paulo Freire. A Critique of the
Project-Centric Vision of the World and a Plea for the Building of a
Shared Vision of the World

- 92 WALTER OMAR KOHAN, CEANE ANDRADE SIMÕES
Transformation. Between Paulo Freire and Michel Foucault:
A Critique to Countercolonise Discourses and Education from Abya
Yala

- III Nachrufe auf Dieter Boris (1943–2024)

- 121 Book Review
- 126 Editors and Authors of the Special Issue
- 130 Publication Details

ALAIN SANTANDREU

Criticising “Logframitis” with Paulo Freire. A Critique of the Project-Centric Vision of the World and a Plea for the Building of a Shared Vision of the World

ABSTRACT *This article deals with the problematic dominance of the project logic of our times, a dominance which has been noticeable for decades. The author refers particularly to development projects, which in his view aim to demotivate, separate and paralyse people’s struggles by not recognising their self-determined paths to change. Projects are based on what the author calls “the logic of the logical framework” – the “logiframitis”. The author criticises the project-centric and finally positivistic vision of the world that is created by this approach. Drawing on Paulo Freire, he calls for a political approach that recognises social and political processes instead of projects and does not smooth over conflicts. The article argues in favour of subversion, because it is important to work on a shared world view, as Freire explains in chapter 4 of the *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*.*

KEYWORDS *Paulo Freire, development cooperation, project logic, logiframitis*

1. Where we start from

In recent decades, *projects* have become the most widely used form of intervention by governments, funding agencies and development cooperation. Their influence has been so great that leaders, militants and activists, community organisations and social movements have incorporated terms such as ‘beneficiaries’, ‘products’ and ‘means of verification’ into their language. The projects are based on what I call the *logic of the logical framework* that defines both a problem and a result that is expected to

be achieved in a given time and space, for which these projects design instruments and implement sequential financed activities, building a self-referential narrative that excludes everything that is left out of the intervention. In this way, they configure a *project-centric vision of the world* that, by definition, is limited to our intervention. Projects are formulated using the logical framework and, for some years now, the theory of change, with the aim of obtaining measurable products with objectively verifiable and quantifiable indicators. They map actors and build alliances to implement the activities foreseen in their operational plan, but avoid something that I formulate as articulating with the different ones to confront the antagonists. What this might mean will be clarified in the following pages.

Several authors have shown that the assumptions, activities and technocratic language that guide projects are not neutral and, therefore, have concrete effects on change processes. For example, they have very clearly warned that, by focusing on short-term changes associated with quantifiable results, projects increase the risk of blocking long-term transformations (Scott 2023). This concern seeks to improve the contributions that development projects make to governance, bringing to the debate some aspects usually neglected in the world of projects. For example, the questioning of logframitis' by some NGOs focusses on the discussion with cooperation agencies on the types of projects they support, but does not address the political consequences that the logic of the logical framework has on social transformations. This way of approaching the debate avoids the ethical and political consequences of the project-centric logic in the construction of alliances that promote processes of political and social transformation.

It is not my intention to polemicise either with development projects or any other type of project, or with those who demand greater clarity from donors and NGOs in the use of certain instruments such as the theory of change or the theory of action, or even with those who assume an advisory role to governments and organisations by contributing novel forms of intervention. In analysing the logic underlying the implementation of projects, I try to add a different perspective to help us analyse whether projects contribute to or limit the social and political transformations to which Paulo Freire invites us when he states that "change is difficult, but it is possible" (Freire 2000).

NGOs and cooperation agencies are often not sufficiently concerned with differentiating the different from the antagonistic, thus contributing, consciously or unconsciously, to emptying the social struggle of its political content. The reflection I propose starts by analysing how the logic of the logical framework is functional to a project-centric logic which, by focusing on the changes promoted by projects, depoliticises the debate on the profound transformations promoted by the struggles of social organisations and movements.

The concern that NGOs and funding agencies have for improving implementation is not the same as that of organisations and social movements, even those that use the language of development projects. Paulo Freire's thought and practice invite us to think about change from a perspective of profound social and political transformations, for which it is necessary to read the world in a different way than those who implement projects.

By separating projects from processes of change and, above all, from the social subjects that promote them, the logic of logical framework has been efficient in reinforcing forms of domination based on self-exploitation. It is increasingly common for us to look for the culprits of the problems in people, starting with ourselves, instead of in the injustices and inequalities that determine these problems. Let us remember that a project that overflows the creative action of society is usually viewed with unease and, to those who promote it, with a certain amount of suspicion.

Unlike projects, processes comprise a set of events (expected and unexpected) that occur dialogically over a time without spatio-temporal limits, involving a broad and undefined set of actors, in a territory that is connected in an inter-scalar way to other territories, to living beings, and to the different ecosystems and natural and built environments. Processes articulate, at the same time, individuals and communities. And although I do not believe that processes are magical or infallible, I am convinced that actions that combine individual and collective change are the ones that have the potential to transform the world. That is why I defend the idea of *subversion* as a way of disrupting, of inverting, established power, of generating processes that allow the excluded to occupy a place on this side of that abysmal line that, although imaginary, separates us more than does a wall.

Both the logical framework and the theory of change share a *project-centric view of the world* that sustains and is sustained by the *logic of the logical framework*. This logic, by focusing on the individuals who implement projects, is detached from the individuals who promote processes and, therefore, from the role that these have in the struggles that precede and follow the projects. To be implemented, projects do not need to build a shared vision of the world as a previous prerequisite for the reading of the word that guides the actions that seek to transform the world. And this is because projects do not seek to transform the world. At most, they aim to achieve specific changes that, in practice, are not connected to the processes that run along their own path.

These lines seek to contribute to a debate that helps us to replace a project-centric vision of the world with a shared vision of the world that guides us to transformative action. In the words of Paulo Freire, changing the world is difficult, but it is possible. In the following pages, I discuss the ethical and political consequences of the *logic of the logical framework* and the *project-centric view of the world* for the construction of a *shared vision of the world* that dialogues with the processes of change, individual and collective, thereby articulating the different to confront the antagonists.

2. The project-centric view of the world and the logic of the logical framework

Since the mid-twentieth century, projects have become the most common form of intervention in administration, research institutions, development cooperation and social work, amongst others. Increasingly, we seek to plan what we do with the assumption that, if we do it well, we will achieve the expected results. For the classical approach, planning “analyzes the existing situation to create a vision of the desired situation and select the strategies that will be applied to achieve it” (Ortegón/Pacheco/Prieto 2005: 15). This way of viewing an intervention may seem logical and even reasonable, but it is not the only one or necessarily the best. Conceiving planning as the “path to follow” contrasts with the idea that “planning refers to making paths to move towards the future, but not to predicting the future” (Carlos Matus interviewed by Huertas 1996). This

aspect is especially important in order to understand the differences that exist when building a narrative from a *Project-centric vision* that guides an intervention and from a *Shared vision of the world* that guides transformative action.

We can question the approach, the direction that guides the intervention, and even the ethical and political consequences of the actions that are implemented, but no one questions the projects themselves and the logic that sustains them. Initially, the projects sought to organise the interventions promoted by international cooperation, facilitating the implementation of activities and the administrative-financial control of resources. The reports that were made to the financiers were in narrative form, they related the advances and setbacks, they told stories. The project and the process were merged into one, and each change that occurred as a result of the interventions modified both.

Over time, development cooperation agencies began to implement a set of tools to have greater administrative and financial control over projects. These tools were organised into what is known as the *Logical Framework*, which became operational with the *Logical Framework Matrix*. Emerging in the United States in the 1970s, the logical framework was promoted by USAID (the United States Agency for International Development) as a tool for the design, implementation and evaluation of projects and, subsequently, development programmes. Other international cooperation agencies and the United Nations quickly embraced the methodology. The use of the logical framework has become a mandatory tool for designing projects and programmes, as well as planning the activities that appear in the operational plans and results-based budgets implemented by governments (Aldunate/Córdoba 2011; MEF-DGPP/GIZ 2014; Ortegón et al. 2005).

The theory of change, very popular these days, has made an effort and to a certain extent has succeeded in this regard – to improve the way in which projects are implemented, incorporating a set of criteria and steps that seek to assess actions, review success assumptions and the route that must be followed to achieve the expected results (Grant Craft 2014; Retolaza-Eguren 2010; Rogers 2014). However, the theory of change questions neither the project-centric vision, nor the certainty that is held regarding the achievement of results, nor the idea that the results

must be objectively verifiable, nor the way in which the knowledge that is created with each intervention is managed. That is why it does not escape the logic of the logical framework. Consequently, therefore, it reinforces a narrative which is useful for projects, but which is not always equally useful for the processes that take place in the territories. It is as if, from a long timeline, we only focus on one point, but give it the status of a general narrative.

Rapidly, the projects formed the idea that it is possible to build a path of results with a high certainty of success that depends on the way we intervene, and not on the construction of a shared vision that considers the situation in which we intervene. The logic of the logical framework generalised the idea that it is possible to imagine a desired future, plan specific activities, and achieve the expected results according to plan, without the need to connect the interventions with the processes that were already underway in the territories, or with the previous narratives, or with the actors who, over the years, implemented actions seeking to transform the world (Santandreu/Betancourt 2019).

In reality, the projects are not guilty of anything. They are an instrument like any other that comes to life in the hands of those who use it. The hammer and chisel can sculpt a masterpiece or serve as instruments to mutilate it. The problem is not the projects but the project-centric vision that has led us to have, in recent decades and in the same territories, a succession of sectoral interventions, stripped of any link with the processes of change that were already underway.

The project-centric vision, which is sustained and sustained by the logic of the logical framework, is narcotic; it excites those who implement it because it constructs a narrative centred on intervention that frees those who implement the projects from the need to listen and, above all, from the obligation to take part in the processes and to commit to change. This idea is reinforced when projects cause the problems and solutions to fall on isolated subjects, regardless of the actions of collective subjects. In practice, it is not necessary for the project to dialogue with either the context or the background that justified the project (and express the vision of the situation prior to the project), but rather to implement the activities foreseen in the logical framework matrix. As a result, by defining the boundaries of intervention as a barrier, projects divorce themselves from everything

that is outside their objectives and their spatio-temporal limits, becoming responsible exclusively for the activities that are implemented as part of the project design.

The formulation of a project is, therefore, the first moment of separation of interventions from processes and trajectories of change (Santandreu/Betancourt 2019). The logical framework matrix forces us to define, *a priori*, many aspects of the intervention without even a sufficient understanding of the consequences that these may have for communities and their own processes. And, at the same time, the logic of the logical framework means that we dedicate a substantial amount of time to the design of the instruments, which end up being defined by the experts without entering into a true dialogue with the communities and their processes.

This excessively instrumental view has led us to forget that the main function of instruments is to allow us to express the other in their identity and in their contradictions (González-Rey 2007). We care a lot about designing and implementing these instruments, but little about understanding how they can support us to strengthen the political and social processes that already existed before our intervention and that will remain there when we leave. Let's not forget that a map of actors can help us both to know whom we should invite to participate in the activities and to identify those who are different from the antagonists, and establish (with the former) operational alliances with greater chances of success.

Who are these antagonists I'm talking about? Paulo Freire writes about the opposition between the oppressed and the oppressors. Even if there is a dialectical relationship between them, Freire's thinking is clearly partisan. His concept of dialogue applies to the oppressed, not the oppressors – unless they are willing to change. With my argument, I would like to recall this opposition, which can be found in differences of race, class and gender. There are antagonisms here, and these should not be simply talked away.

Something similar happens when problems are identified and prioritised, which then end up being defined by experts and, in the best of cases, 'validated' with (and not by) communities; when, in reality, it should be the organisations, movements and institutions that work in the territories, in dialogue with other actors, among which of course are experts and technicians external to them, who should declare the problems as a malaise that can be prevented through collective action (Matus 1998).

By making the subjects as individuals responsible for the changes, technicians and experts take on the leading role, but not without imposing a disproportionate pressure on their own work. With this, neoliberal capitalism in its current phase of global accumulation achieves two things. On the one hand, it prevents us from focussing on structures and determinants, thus diluting the responsibility for solving problems of individuals. And, on the other, it places experts and consultants as the new bearers of truth, the new messiahs that we must listen to if we want to achieve the expected results.

The excessive concern for the instruments and the defence of the evaluative neutrality of those who implement them crystallises a kind of blindness that simplifies interventions and is disconnected from the transformations that, by definition, go beyond the expected changes in the project. It is what Edgar Morín calls “the blind intelligence” of the paradigm of simplicity (Morin 2007). This vision ends up distancing projects from social processes and the transformations they seek to achieve. It is a sort of *Epistemic Adiaphora* in which our actions (and the learning associated with them) are detached from the ethical and political consequences of what we do (Bauman/Donskis 2015). Bauman uses the concept of “adiaphora” (from Greek ἀδιάφορα “undifferentiated things”, “middle things”) that are, according to the understanding of Stoic philosophy as well as being found in Christian theology, things that are neutral in ethical terms, i.e. that cannot be classified as good or evil.

With this (conscious or unconscious) way of intervening, we end up breaking the ties that united us to the processes of change and that, in everyday life, unite subjects with each other, with social structures and with nature. In practice, we limit our ability to identify the antagonists and curtail our possibilities of building alliances with those who are different, that is, with those with whom we have the potential to work together to transform the world.

The positivist view of the world in which we live proposes that there is only one reality that is objectively verifiable, and which is expressed as context or background and objectified in objectives. However, instead of thinking that there is a single objectively verifiable and measurable reality we should consider that there are *situations* defined from the multiple perspectives of reality that the various actors with whom we intervene have,

which are put in dialogue at the time of configuring reality, but which do not represent reality itself (Williams 2017).

This idea is subversive, because it directs us to read the world before the word, as a previous step to the construction of a shared vision of the world that guides the actions that will transform the world. We vindicate the notion of subversion (from the Latin verb *subvertere*: to overthrow, to turn upside down) of knowledge and power as that “telos or purpose of transformation” (Fals-Borda 2010) that recognises and promotes the action, trajectories and struggles of social movements and organisations that seek to “make visible the forms of knowledge produced by those who are supposedly the »objects« of development so that they can be transformed into subjects and agents” (Escobar 2005: 20) of change.

The project-centric vision and the logic of the logical framework dissuade us from understanding the contradictions that determine the problems, preventing us from getting involved in the social and political dynamics of those who suffer from these problems and struggle to solve them.

3. Building a shared vision of the world

For Paulo Freire, the construction of a shared vision of the world begins with a critical re-reading of the world that precedes the reading and writing of the word, “hence the subsequent reading of the latter cannot dispense with the continuity of the reading of the former. Language and reality are dynamically linked. The comprehension of the text to be achieved by its critical reading implies the perception of the relations between the text and the context” (Freire 1989: 9).

The aim is a critical re-reading of the world that values and recognises forgotten syntax and semantics, reflecting a culture of resistance typical of those who, throughout history, have been subjected to oblivion (Freire 1993). This critical reading of the world is expressed in a narrative of its own that, starting from the daily life of our local world, initiates a process that articulates consciousness, practice and theory, the reading of the world and of the word, the context and, finally, the text. For all these reasons, the world initially built by each and every one of us is the first approximation

to that broader world that we want to transform (Freire 1993). And this narrative, being individual, is the germ of a common narrative, thinking-feeling, felt with thinking and thought with feelings (note of the translator: The author used here an untranslatable, but wonderful specific Spanish formulation, joining feeling and thinking: “sentipensante y sentipensada”), which orients us to collective action.

The Royal Spanish Academy defines memory, at the same time, as “a memory that is made of something past”, the “exposition of facts, data or motives relating to a certain matter” and the “relation of some particular events, which are described to illustrate history”. Maurice Halbwachs coined a term to recognise and value the memories that are treasured in a society. The *Collective Memory* it is, for Halbwachs, a different way of telling history, one that focuses on people and their practices rather than retelling facts, dates and data (Halbwachs 2004). Data that, on the other hand, only have the virtue of standardising reality in order to be able to compare to an assumption of generalisation that simplifies, but does not explain (Han 2013, 2022).

Our positivist, indolent way of seeing the world has led us to rely more on data than on stories (Santandreu 2019). For this reason, experiences, for global neoliberalism, are replaced by appearances that help us to simplify and understand an increasingly complex world (Han 2017b). Jerome Bruner rightly tells us that there are two ways of constructing reality, complementary but irreducible to each other: a good story and a well-constructed plot. While the plot convinces with its logic, the story does so because of its resemblance to life (Bruner 2004).

As part of the positivist vision of science – in tune with the logic of the logical framework that sustains the project-centric vision of the world – we have become specialists in elaborating good arguments, leaving aside the construction of our own stories. It is imperative to resume the path we abandoned and begin to build our narrative. But, to do so, we need to value the struggles that have been forgotten and the subjects that have been marginalised by official history. Let us remember that, for Freire, history is a time of possibilities and not of determinations (Freire 1993).

We need a narrative that has the capacity to build bridges with those who are different to confront the antagonists. We do not need a memory built only on reason, a *thinking memory*. We need to build a *thinking-*

feeling memory (Spanish original: “*memoria sentipensante*”), a memory of the forgotten, of the pariahs, a memory that does not forget those who are on the other side of the abyssal line.

4. Bringing together the different to confront the antagonists

For Paulo Freire “The world is not. The world is being” (Freire 2000: 36; Port original, also untranslatable: “*O mundo não é. O mundo está sendo*”). If this statement is correct, the responsibility of organising and fighting remains, fortunately, in our hands. It is, so to speak, our sole responsibility. But we cannot fight alone. In a society that is increasingly complex, contradictory and difficult to understand, we need to build a shared vision of the world that allows us to “live with those who are different in order to fight against those who are antagonistic” (Freire 1993: 36).

The society of the same only accepts differences that are functional to the system. It accepts ‘the diverse’ but denies ‘the antagonistic’, recognises that there are inequalities, but avoids mentioning injustices, avoiding the conflict that is seen as a waste of time, as a brake on the circulation of capital, as a stumbling block to the achievement of individual freedom and progress, as something negative that threatens the positivist world-view. We live in a world in which excess positivism totalises the way we see, understand and explain the world (Han 2017b). The excess of positivity, by eliminating what is different, generates a fictitious world of equals who inhabit a time and space that is increasingly virtual and, therefore, ephemeral. In this global world, we do not need to debate, or oppose others; when someone thinks differently it is enough to remove them from our social networks, from our circle of friends, from our meetings and activities and, consequently, from our lives.

The conservative right, much more than liberal technocracy or left-wing progressivism, has been able to interpret these times by combining fears and frustrations with the management of virtuality for the construction of a conservative narrative, and this even long before the recent global development of virtual tools and dynamics in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. As a result, we have a history of the world that has connected

with the fears and desires of many who have been forgotten by sustaining repressive policies and anti-democratic practices. Trump, Salvini, Orban, Le Pen and Bolsonaro – with the support of conservative networks and sites that spread *fake news* such as QAnon (Roose 2020) and political operators such as the American Steve Bannon, the Russian Alexander Dugin and the Brazilian Olavo de Carvalho – have been able to describe on social networks a version of history that combines traditional values, conservative religious support and citizens willing to defend them on the streets (Magnani 2020). On the other hand, the excluded, the social pariahs, the marginalised located on the edges of the system, lacking a common vision of the world, continue not to be able to distinguish the different from the antagonistic.

For Byung-Chul Han, “in disciplinary and industrial society the power of preservation was repressive and there was a concrete opponent, a visible enemy and one could offer resistance” (Han 2019). However, the system of neoliberal domination is completely different: “now the power of preservation of the system no longer works through repression, but through seduction. It is no longer visible, as was the case under the discipline regime. Now, there is no longer a concrete opponent, no enemy suppresses the freedom that one can resist.” (Han 2019)

When we simplify the world in this way, we run several risks. If we build a narrative that does not distinguish the different from the antagonistic, we limit our ability to build strategic alliances, thereby dynamiting our capacity for transformation. In practice, this is expressed in a dilution of contradictions, in the cultural normalisation of injustices, in the timidity with which we approach antagonistic positions, in the ignorance of the consequences of our actions, and in the renunciation of the social and political struggle that is, effectively, a renunciation of the transformation of the world.

The excess of positivist thinking has led us not to recognise those who are different and to deny those who are antagonistic. The *neoliberal imperative of performance and efficiency* has transcended the world of work to invade culture, knowledge and life itself (Han 2017a). We no longer antagonise; at most, we expose our differences, so avoiding confrontation with others. We waste no time engaging in polemics. Excess positivity leads

us to reduce our horizon of experiences more and more, which leads us to relate almost exclusively to our peers. By reducing the diversity of relationships to contacts with equals, we lose the ability to narrate, because narrating means opposing one view to another, one vision of the world to another, and taking sides. Agreeing with Paulo Freire, I hold that “The consciousness of the world, which makes the consciousness of me possible, makes the immutability of the world unfeasible”²¹ (Freire 2000: 20). That is why I believe that we have the ethical and political imperative to build alternatives for change with those who are different in order to be able to confront, with a certain probability of success, the antagonists.

5. From utopias to diatopias to overcome retropias

The *Transitivity of consciousness* leads men to establish dialogues with other men, who open themselves to new ways of perceiving the world (Freire 1974). It promotes paths towards a possible (albeit uncertain and distant) utopia anchored in a *Diatopic hermeneutics* (de Souza-Santos 2003) that defends the subversive value of reading the world, rejecting the idea that “all past times were better”, an attitude typical of retropias (Bauman 2017).

The notion of *Diatopic hermeneutics* proposed by Boaventura de Souza-Santos teaches us that communion between cultures is transformative by recognising that needs, aspirations and practices “in a given culture can become understandable and intelligible to another culture” (de Souza-Santos 2003, p. 37). This statement reinforces the idea that it is possible to build bridges and generate dialogues that recognise and bring together the diverse (including those who belong to different cultures) to oppose the antagonists.

Zygmunt Bauman uses the notion of retropia to refer to the “ideal worlds located in a lost/stolen/abandoned past that has nevertheless resisted dying. And not in that future yet to be born (and therefore non-existent) to which utopia was linked” (Bauman 2017: 14). The strength of retropias as a conservative concept lies in their ability to combine the

notion of freedom with that of security. Therefore, retropias only tolerate changes that are predictable, safe, and, so, far from the creative overflows of the social processes that seek to transform the world (Rodríguez-Villasanté 2006: 144).

We must confront what Pierre Bourdieu calls the *Habitus*, understood as the “past that survives in the present and that tends to perpetuate itself in the future” (Bourdieu 2007: 89), knowing that, in this merciless struggle, the utopias allied with diatopias move us towards transformations, while retropias anchored in security/freedom try to slow us down. Nevertheless, we are always the ones who have the opportunity to read a world in a different way and to fight to make it possible.

The passage of the *perceived featured* to the *untested feasibility* (Span. original: “*percibido destacado*” to the “*inédito viable*”) is neither simple nor bloodless. On the contrary, it is full of comings and goings, of tastes and disappointments, of achievements and failures. Paulo Freire defines what *Perceived Featured* as “an unprecedented thing, not yet known and clearly lived but already dreamed of that, when it becomes ‘perceived as highlighted’ by those who think utopically, they know that it is no longer a dream and that it can come true” (Freire, 1993: 195).

Awareness of possible change makes conscious human beings „reflect and act to break down the *extreme situations* that force them, “*to be less*” because, in reality, “they are those barriers, those *extreme situations* those that, even when they do not prevent some from dreaming their dream, prohibit the majority from the realization of humanization and the realization of BEING-MORE” (Freire 1993: 195, the emphasis are the author’s).

For Paulo Freire, human beings are *in* and *with* the world. And, as it is *in* and *with*, the world thinks and feels because we are sentient thinking beings who establish sentient thinking relationships that have the transformative potential to change the world (Freire 1974). But to transform the world we must distinguish, and in distinguishing, we build the ability to come to terms with those who think differently. This distinction allows us to identify, with some clarity, with whom we will never be able to reach agreements, because they represent interests contrary to ours, because they are our antagonists.

6. (Provisional) conclusion

The project-centric vision of the world anchored in the logic of the logical framework has led us to believe that it is sufficient to properly execute a set of actions in order to produce changes; when in reality, most of the time, we are only changing something so as not to transform anything. By disassociating ourselves from the transformation processes that precede and transcend projects, we reinforce the instrumental belief that in order to promote change, it is enough to implement projects efficiently. However, without a shared vision of the world anchored in a critical reading of the world, we walk blindly, like Alice in Wonderland.²

If we understand that a *situation* is configured in a dialogue that relates multiple perspectives and if we define a *problem* as a discomfort declared by someone as being avoidable through collective action, we must build a narrative that constructs reality by reflecting the polysemy of those who are different and, therefore, therefore allows us to reach agreements for action, since this is the first step to advancing towards transformations, to changing the world.

One of the main characteristics of global neoliberalism in its current phase of capitalist accumulation is the simplification of contradictions. Luis Buñel's *Los Olvidados*, filmed in Mexico in the 1950s, Héctor Badenco's *Peixote*, filmed in Brazil in the early 1980s and the Korean movie *Parasite*, from 2019, tell stories in which the central characters are marginalised, oppressed or are social pariahs who struggle to be recognised as social subjects bearers of their own narrative. They show us, in their own bodies, the expression of contradictions.

Excess positivity organizes a world in which there is no room for antagonists. A *shopping mall*, a *fast food outlet*, a *resort*, and *tours* are the same everywhere (even the names for them are the same). The world has become so simplified that we only share an interest in consumption, displacing the vital and non-transferable experiences of life. There is no other possible story or comparison other than that of the price paid in relation to the quality of the service received. Most of us humans experience experiences through referencing ourselves. And, at the end of the day, most people only treasure photos and videos that they take with their Smartphone, without having paid much attention to sounds, smells, tastes and faces;

and this applies both when they explore other people's places and when they explore their everyday world.

This daily way of approaching situations and problems prevents people from building a shared vision of the world that allows for clearly distinguishing the different from the antagonistic as a preliminary step for the construction of a shared narrative that guides people to action.

Having achieved the circulation of people and capital, neoliberal capitalism needs a positivist world that accelerates the circulation of knowledge, a world in which interventions do not generate resistance, a homogeneous world that, while tolerating diversity, does not affect the very essence of the system. Unfortunately, most of the projects meet these requirements, meaning that they change something so as not to transform anything, unlike the processes that the communities sustain with their struggle. If we continue to implement this type of project, we will continue to strengthen a positivistic world in which there is no room for reflective criticism, or for antagonisms.

In *Pedagogy of indignation*, his posthumous work, Paulo Freire conveys to us his certainty that “change is difficult, but it is possible”³ (Freire 2000) and with this affirmation, it reinforces its call to action, to the construction of a shared vision of the world as a preliminary step for its transformation. We share these certainties and take on these challenges. It is up to us to achieve it.

- 1 Port. original: “A consciência do mundo, que viabiliza a consciência de mim, inviabiliza a imutabilidade do mundo” (Freire 2000: 20).
- 2 “What path should I follow?” Alice asked the cat, who replied “it depends on where you want to go”, dialogue between Alice and the cat in a passage of Alice in Wonderland.
- 3 Port. original: “Mudar é difícil, mas é possível” (Freire 2000).

References

- Aldunate, Eduardo/Córdoba, Julio (2011): Formulación de programas con la metodología de marco lógico. In: Serie Manuales-CEPAL, <https://repositorio.cepal.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/3a461d89-8650-4dcd-acb9-127fa65bc97f/content>, 30.9.2024.

- Bauman, Zygmunt (2017): *Retrotopía*. Paidós. [Engl.: Bauman, Zygmunt (2017): *Retrotopia*. Cambridge: Polity Press.]
- Bauman, Zygmunt/Donskis, Leonidas (2015): *Ceguera moral. La pérdida de sensibilidad en la modernidad líquida*. Paidós. [Engl.: Bauman, Zygmunt/Donskis, Leonidas. (2015): *Moral blindness. The loss of sensitivity in liquid modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.]
- Bourdieu, Pierre (2007): *El sentido práctico*. Siglo XX Editores Argentina. [Engl.: Bourdieu, Pierre (1990): *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.]
- Bruner, Jerome (2004): *Realidad mental y mundos posibles*. Editorial Gedisa. [Engl.: Bruner, Jerome (1986): *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674029019>]
- de Souza-Santos, Boaventura (2003): *La caída del angelus novus*. ILSA. [www.boaventuradesousasantos.pt/media/La caída del angelus novus_ILSA.pdf](http://www.boaventuradesousasantos.pt/media/La%20caída%20del%20angelus%20novus_ILSA.pdf), 12.12.2024. [Engl.: de Sousa Santos, Boaventura (1998): *The Fall of the Angelus Novus: Beyond the Modern Game of Roots and Options*. In: *Current Sociology*, 46 (2), 81-118. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392198046002007>]
- Escobar, Arturo (2005): *El “postdesarrollo” como concepto y práctica social*. In *Políticas de economía, ambiente y sociedad en tiempos de globalización*. 17-31. Facultad de Ciencias Económicas y Sociales, Universidad Central de Venezuela. [http://cedum.umanizales.edu.co/mds/ch4/dsh/unidad1/pdf/El postdesarrollo como concepto.pdf](http://cedum.umanizales.edu.co/mds/ch4/dsh/unidad1/pdf/El%20postdesarrollo%20como%20concepto.pdf), 22.4.2024. [Engl.: Escobar, Arturo (2007): “Post-development” as a concept and social practice. In: Ziai, Aram: *Exploring Post-Development. Theory and Practice, Problems and Perspectives*. London: Routledge, 18-32.]
- Fals-Borda, Orlando (2010): *La investigación-acción participativa: política y epistemología*. In: *Antología Orlando Fals-Borda*. Bogotá: National University of Colombia, 205-214. [Engl.: Fals-Borda, Orlando (2010): *Participatory action research: politics and epistemology*. In: *Antología Orlando Fals-Borda*. Bogotá: National University of Colombia, 205-214.]
- Freire, Paulo (1974): *La educación como práctica de la libertad*. Siglo XXI Editores. [Engl.: Freire, Paulo (1974): *Education: The Practice of Freedom*. London: Writers and Readers Ltd.]
- Freire, Paulo (1989): *A importância do ato de ler em três artigos que se completam*. Autores Associados, Cortez Editora. [Engl.: Freire, Paulo (1983): *The Importance of the Act of Reading*. *Journal of Education* 165 (1), 5-11.]
- Freire, Paulo (1993): *Pedagogía de la esperanza: un reencuentro con la pedagogía del oprimido*. XXI Siglo Veintiuno Editores. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004> [Engl.: Freire, Paulo (1993): *Pedagogy of Hope: Reliving Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. With notes by Ana Maria Araújo Freire. Transl. by Robert R. Barr. New York: Continuum.]
- Freire, Paulo (2000): *Pedagogia da indignação: cartas pedagógicas e outros escritos*. Editora da UNESP. [Engl.: Freire, Paulo (2004): *Pedagogy of Indignation*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.]

- González Rey, Fernando (1997): Investigación cualitativa y subjetividad. Los procesos de construcción de la información. São Paulo: Editora da PUC-SP.
- Grant Craft (2014): Planificando el cambio: Usando una teoría de cambio para guiar la planificación y evaluación. GrantCraft, Foundation Center. https://learningforfunders.candid.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2018/12/theory_translated.pdf, 19.12.2024. [Engl.: Grant Craft (2014): Planning for change: Using a theory of change to guide planning and evaluation. GrantCraft, Foundation Center.]
- Halbwachs, Maurice (2004): La memoria colectiva. Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza. [Engl.: Halbwachs, Maurice (1992): On collective memory. Chicago: Chicago University Press.]
- Han, Byung-Chul (2013): En el enjambre (1a ed.). Herder. [Engl.: Han, Byung-Chul (2017): In the Swarm: Digital Prospects. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.]
- Han, Byung-Chul (2017a): La expulsión de lo distinto (1st-5 impr ed.). Herder. [Engl.: Han, Byung-Chul (2018): The Expulsion of the Other: Society, Perception and Communication Today. New York: Polity Press.]
- Han, Byung-Chul (2017b): La sociedad del cansancio. Herder. [Engl.: Han, Byung-Chul (2015): The Burnout Society. Stanford: Stanford University Press.]
- Han, Byung-Chul (2019): ¿Por qué la revolución ya no es posible? Bloghemia. www.bloghemia.com/2019/11/por-que-la-revolucion-ya-no-es-posible.html?m=1&fbclid=IwAR2iCKGllwrqtjoofgxr43EKcOoMfvft4R5aLo5JyVgo-ysEYUU9ltrGyHk, 19.12.2024.
- Han, Byung-Chul (2022): Infocracia. La digitalización y la crisis de la democracia (1a ed.). Taurus. [Engl.: Han, Byung-Chul (2022): Infocracy: Digitalization and the Crisis of Democracy. Cambridge: Polity Press.]
- Han, Byung-Chul (2019): ¿Por qué la revolución ya no es posible? www.bloghemia.com/2019/11/por-que-la-revolucion-ya-no-es-posible.html?m=1&fbclid=IwAR2iCKGllwrqtjoofgxr43EKcOoMfvft4R5aLo5JyVgo-ysEYUU9ltrGyHk, 30.9.2024.
- Huertas, Franco (1996): El metodo PES - Planificación Estratégica Situacional (entrevista a Carlos Matus) (Primera). CEREB, ALTADIR.
- Mackinnon, Anne/Amott, Natasha (2006): Grantcraft: Using a Theory of Change. https://learningforfunders.candid.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2018/12/theory_change.pdf, 30.9.2024.
- Magnani, Esteban (2020): Radiografía de la derecha «bannonista». Nueva Sociedad. <https://nuso.org/articulo/por-que-avanza-la-extrema-derecha/?fbclid=IwAR0iWV2Eob8zNwV7HQ55D-ww7pmGALMd7KVCrFuQAhCY-DU6P6r6bL6bOPso>, 30.9.2024.
- Matus, Carlos (1998): Adiós señor presidente. Santiago: LOM Ediciones.
- MEF-DGPP y GIZ (2014): Programas presupuestales. Diseño, Revisión y Articulación Territorial (Primera): Ministerio de Economía y Finanzas / Dirección General de Presupuesto Público y Cooperación Alemana al Desarrollo.
- Morin, Edgar (2007). Introducción al pensamiento complejo (Novena). Editorial Gedisa. [Engl.: Morin, Edgar (2007): On complexity. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.]

- Ortegón, Edgar/Pacheco, Juan Francisco/Prieto, Adriana (2005): Metodología del marco lógico para la planificación, el seguimiento y la evaluación de proyectos y programas (Primera). InsILPES, CEPAL. www.mef.gob.pe/contenidos/pol_econ/documentos/ILPES_CEPAL_Marco_Logico_Metodologia.pdf, 22.4.2024.
- Retolaza-Eguren, Íñigo (2010): Teoría de cambio. Un enfoque de pensamiento-acción para navegar en la complejidad de los procesos de cambio social. Guatemala and The Hague: PNUD and Hivos.
- Rodríguez-Villasante, Tomás (2006): Desbordes creativos. Estilos y estrategias para la transformación social. Madrid: La Catarata.
- Rogers, P. (2014): La teoría del cambio. In Centro de Investigaciones de UNICEF. UNICEF. [Engl.: Rogers, Patricia (2014): Theory of Change, Methodological Briefs: Impact Evaluation 2, UNICEF Office.]
- Roose, Kevin (2020): ¿Qué es QAnon, la teoría de conspiración viral pro-Trump? The New York Times. www.nytimes.com/es/2020/08/21/espanol/qanon-que-es.html?campaign_id=42&emc=edit_bn_20200825&instance_id=21577&nl=el-times®i_id=81740574&segment_id=36874&te=1&user_id=919f26612dac6dfa4792a9327dd1ed37, 30.9.2024.
- Santandreu, Alain (2019): Entre la subversión, la subvención y la tentación de Procusto. La investigación militante como piedra de toque de la IAP indolente. In: Paño, Pablo/Rébola, Romina/Suárez, Mariano (eds.): Procesos y Metodologías Participativas Reflexiones y experiencias para la transformación social. CLACSO, UDELAR, 42-56. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvtxw3sz.6>
- Santandreu, Alain/Betancourt, Oscar (2019): Trayectorias de Cambio. La gestión del conocimiento para el aprendizaje y el cambio en la práctica. Quito: Ediciones Abya Yala.
- Scott, C. (2023): The Project in International Development. Theory and Practice. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429427411>
- Williams, Bob (2017): Uso de los conceptos de sistemas en el diseño de una evaluación. Documento de Trabajo. Lima: ECOSAD. www.evalperu.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Libro-Bob-Williams.pdf, 19.12.2024.

ABSTRACT Dieser Artikel befasst sich mit der problematischen Dominanz der Projektilogik in gegenwärtigen Gesellschaften, die seit Jahrzehnten zu beobachten ist. Der Autor bezieht sich insbesondere auf Entwicklungsprojekte, die seiner Ansicht nach darauf abzielen, die Kämpfe der Menschen zu demotivieren, zu trennen und zu lähmen, indem sie deren selbstbestimmten Wege zur Veränderung nicht anerkennen. Die Projekte basieren auf dem, was der Autor „die Logik des logischen Rahmens“ – die „Logiframitis“ – nennt. Der

Autor kritisiert die projektzentrierte, letztlich positivistische Sicht der Welt, die durch diesen Ansatz entsteht. In Anlehnung an Paulo Freire plädiert er für einen politischen Ansatz, der soziale und politische Prozesse anstelle von Projekten anerkennt und Konflikte nicht beschönigt. Der Artikel plädiert für die Subversion, weil es wichtig ist, an einem gemeinsamen Weltbild zu arbeiten, wie Freire im vierten Kapitel der Pädagogik der Unterdrückten erklärt.

Alain Santandreu

Consorcio por la Salud Ambiente y Desarrollo (ECOSAD)

alain_santandreu@yahoo.com