

# Freire's Pedagogy in Dialogue with the Epistemologies of the South: is a New Education Possible?

*Pedagogia de Freire Em Diálogo Com As Epistemologias do Sul: Uma Nova Educação É Possível?*

*La Pedagogía de Freire en Diálogo con las Epistemologías del Sur: ¿Es Posible Una Nueva Educación?*

GUADALUPE CORRÊA MOTA<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidade Católica de Santos

**ABSTRACT:** This article in essay form has as its object the Critical-Humanist Pedagogy of Paulo Freire and as a general objective to problematize the possibilities and limits of the pedagogical praxis proposed by Freire in the context of contemporary neoliberal society under the hermeneutical analysis of Southern Epistemologies formulated by Boaventura de Sousa Santos. It seeks to answer the following question: what are the possibilities and contexts necessary for the practice of humanistic pedagogy in neoliberal society at the beginning of the 21st century? To answer the objective of this essay, using authors such as Cambi, Saviani, Scocuglia, Dardot and Laval, Franco, Charlot, Pleger, a brief overview of the anthropological ideas that led to the development of the concept of "humanism" and "person" as a heritage of Greek, Latin and Judeo-Christian cultures. It points out some elements that configure Freire's ontology and that justify the humanizing task of pedagogy; the notion of criticality is discussed as an epistemological foundation of Freire's pedagogy and ontology. In answering the proposed question, the need for structural changes in social institutions that enable a new educational pact is reaffirmed, in which insurgent/ resistant, revolutionary epistemologies are consensualized that consign education to its public, secular character for all, and not as product of neoliberal mercantilist logic.

**HUMANISM. CRITICAL PEDAGOGY. EPISTEMOLOGIES OF THE SOUTH.**

**RESUMEN:** Este artículo en forma de ensayo tiene como objeto la Pedagogía Crítico-Humanista de Paulo Freire y como objetivo general problematizar las posibilidades y límites de la praxis pedagógica propuesta por Freire en el contexto de la sociedad neoliberal contemporánea, a la luz de las Epistemologías del Sur formuladas por Boaventura de Sousa Santos. Se busca dar respuesta a la siguiente pregunta: ¿cuáles son las posibilidades y contextos necesarios para la práctica de la pedagogía humanista en la sociedad neoliberal de principios del siglo XXI? Para responder al objetivo de este ensayo, se utiliza autores como Cambi, Saviani, Scocuglia, Dardot y Laval, Franco, Charlot, Pleger, e presenta-se una breve reseña de las ideas antropológicas que llevaron al desarrollo del concepto de "humanismo" y "Persona", como herencia de las culturas griega, latina y judeocristiana; Se señalan algunos elementos que configuran la ontología de Freire y que justifican la tarea humanizadora de la pedagogía. Se discute, entonces, la noción de criticidad como fundamento epistemológico de la pedagogía y la ontología de Freire. Al responder a la pregunta propuesta, se reafirma la necesidad de cambios estructurales en las instituciones sociales que posibiliten un nuevo pacto educativo, en el que se consensualicen epistemologías insurgentes / resistentes, revolucionarias que consignan la educación a su carácter público, laico para todos, y no como producto de la lógica mercantilista neoliberal.

**HUMANISMO. PEDAGOGÍA CRÍTICA. EPISTEMOLOGÍAS DEL SUR.**

**RESUMO:** Este artigo em forma de ensaio tem como objeto a Pedagogia Crítico-Humanista de Paulo Freire e como objetivo geral problematizar as possibilidades e limites da práxis pedagógica proposta por Freire no contexto da sociedade neoliberal à luz das Epistemologias do Sul formuladas por Boaventura de Sousa Santos. Procura-se responder à seguinte questão: quais as possibilidades e contextos necessários à prática de uma pedagogia humanista na sociedade neoliberal deste início de século XXI? Para responder ao objetivo deste ensaio, lançando-se mão de autores como Cambi, Saviani, Scocuglia, Dardot/Laval, Franco, Charlot, Pleger, apresenta-se um panorama das ideias antropológicas que levaram ao desenvolvimento do conceito de “humanismo” e de “pessoa”, como herança das culturas grega, latina e judaico-cristã; aponta-se alguns elementos que configuram a ontologia freireana e que justificam a tarefa humanizadora da pedagogia; discute-se a noção de criticidade. Ao responder à questão proposta, reafirma-se a necessidade de alterações estruturais nas instituições que possibilitem um novo pacto educativo, em que seja consensuado epistemologias revolucionárias que consignem à educação seu caráter público, laico, para todos, e não como produto da lógica mercantilista neoliberal.

**HUMANISMO. PEDAGOGIA CRÍTICA. EPISTEMOLOGIAS DO SUL.**

## Introduction

*“Education cannot be seen except as a human what-to-do. What-to-do, therefore, that occurs in time and space, among the men, one to each other. It follows that the consideration about education as a human phenomenon sends us to an analysis of the man, even though a summary one” (Paulo Freire, 1967)*

The question posed by Freire to a group of women, in 1967, in Chile, remains current. And it is up to teachers, and to the society as a whole, to think about this issue, at a time when, in Brazil, the Covid-19 pandemic exposed all the precarious conditions of public education, especially in relation to technological infrastructure for remote access to classes, which has led to thousands of students dropping out of school across the country. Teachers, students, families, agents that are part of the field of Education were left, by the State, at the mercy of their own effort, to handle this task that, since immemorial ages, has been a pact assumed by all the social entities as a necessity culturally relevant and as an expression of civilizing progress (Cambi, 1999; Franco, 2008; Saviani, 2012; Streck, Redin, & Zitzoski (Org.), 2018; Charlot, 2020).

The recent Brazilian socio-political context has placed the field of Education in an arena of disputes between governments, society, students and educators, almost making the conditions of the ethical imperative of education for humanization unfeasible, as advocated by Freire. Freire reverberates throughout his work - he affirms and reaffirms - that the starting point for the epistemological dimension of his pedagogical proposal is the verification of the asymmetric relations of power (of knowledge and being) between oppressors and oppressed in a particular society, resulting in dehumanization, of the oppressed and of the oppressors, from where the inseparability between the epistemological politics of pedagogy, education as a political act, and educators as beings politically committed to the cause of humanization/liberation/emancipation of the human and the world: "To achieve the goal of humanization, which cannot be achieved without the disappearance of dehumanizing oppression, it is essential to overcome the "limit situations" in which men find themselves as things". (Freire, 2017, p. 131).

In this way, Boaventura de Sousa Santos, when proposing principles for other pedagogical epistemologies in situations marked by 'abyssal relations' between oppressors and oppressed (one of Freire's 'limit situations', which Santos updates and makes explicit in the configuration of colonizers and colonized still present in societies at the beginning of the 21st century), presents as a starting point the claim of a cognitive justice that restores the character of validity, rigor and legitimacy to the knowledge, know-how and actions produced by those who were systematically excluded from the pantheon of valid knowledge of science, as a rule, colonized peoples in the countries of the Global South, also inferior in their ontological condition together with their knowledge and their ways of producing that knowledge (Santos, 2019). Hence, also, the impossibility of humanizing and/or emancipatory processes in pedagogical practices based on techno-scientificist (and now neoliberal) epistemic logics, which do not recognize and invalidate the knowledge constructed in other areas of life out of the field of science:

The crucial difference between abyssal and non-abyssal exclusion lies in the fact that the former is based on the idea that the victim, or the target, suffers from an ontological *capitis diminutio* because it is not entirely human, because it is a kind of human fatally degraded. It is therefore considered

unacceptable or even unimaginable that the same victim, or target, can be treated as a human being as 'we are'. Therefore, the resistance against the abyssal exclusion encompasses an ontological dimension. (Santos, 2019, p. 46. Emphasis added)

In view of this problem, this article as an essay - whose theme is part of an ongoing PhD research in Education - aims at Freire's Critical-Humanist Pedagogy and as a general objective to problematize the possibilities and limits of the pedagogical praxis proposed by Freire in the context of contemporary neoliberal society in the light of Epistemologies of the South formulated by Boaventura de Sousa Santos. It's tried to answer the following question: which are the requested possibilities and contexts to the practice of a humanist pedagogy in the neoliberal society in the beginning of the 21st Century?

Despite the adverse conditions of the current historical times, marked by polarizations of different natures (ideological, political, ethnic, religious, cultural, etc.), I believe in the validity and relevance of Freire's pedagogical proposal as a possibility of building a humanizing education, which extrapolates the field of formal education to the education of children, teenagers and adults. I also believe that the epistemological principles systematized by Boaventura de Sousa Santos, in other historical times and in other social conditions of those experienced by Freire can bring additions and new points of inflection to the Critical-Humanist Pedagogy, making it more dialogable with men and women imbued with rationalities and subjectivities different from those with which Freire lived and for whom he thought "some aspects of a pedagogy", a pedagogy not closed in the classroom, but as a logic of a solidary, liberating, emancipatory coexistence, this is, humanizing - "However, with the incessant challenge of dehumanization, as a distortion of that vocation" (Freire, 1993, p. 12) -, extended to the whole society and to the set of non-human living beings.

To answer the objective of this work, I present, initially, a brief overview of anthropological ideas that led, among others, to the development of the concept of "humanism" and "person", present in Brazilian society, in the historical-cultural-philosophical anthropological perspective, as a legacy of Greek, Latin and Judeo-Christian cultures; I point out some elements that configure Freire's ontology and that justify the humanizing task of pedagogy; I discuss the notion of criticality as an epistemological foundation for Freire's pedagogy and ontology. In the end, I cast, as a brief provocation, not a conclusion, some assumptions for thinking about other epistemological principles for Freire's Critical-Humanist Pedagogy at the beginning of this century. An exercise of imagination, daring and hope, as Sousa Santos claims, to overcome the "indolent reason" that has left us cynical, pessimistic and uncommitted facing the processes of dehumanization in our time. Also in the field of Education.

## 1 Humanism / humanization: what are we talking about?

*"There cannot be a pedagogical theory, which implies the ends and means of educational action, which is exempt from a concept of man and world" (Paulo Freire).*

In order to be clear about which concept of "man and world" Freire is referring to - a central concept in the development of his pedagogical proposal, which will be further developed in the next topic -, it is important to emphasize that Freire presents, in his theoretical trajectory, diverse understandings about the concept of humanism and person, therefore, of humanization, incorporating different influences from Christian theology, through personalist/existentialist philosophy and dialectical historical materialism. These conceptions move from idealistic to existentialist-historical-cultural philosophy, projecting a concept of human and person not as abstract concepts, *a priori*, idealized outside the historical-social context, but as a result of their experience of life and concrete engagement in the struggles of the men and women he encountered along the way, and which demanded the man Paulo Freire - lawyer, teacher, Christian, militant in social causes, father, husband, friend, colleague - an ethical-political stance of commitment with the other, constituting a constant exercise of making and remaking, consistent with his radical conception of the human as "inconclusive being", always in search of "being more" human (Freire, 1993; Scocuglia, 2019).

Below, I present a brief overview of the ideas that helped to construct the concepts of "humanism" and "person" present in Western culture, from the perspective of historical-cultural and philosophical anthropology, although without going into the merit of the underlying ontologies. It is about having a perspective view to show that, what seems to be 'natural', 'common sense', an unquestionable 'ethical imperative' - the primacy of 'humanization' and 'person' as epistemological, ontological principles,

axiological, pedagogical and political aspects of educational praxis - it is far from being so evident or consensual. This is because, as the history of anthropological ideas shows us, the definitions and ontologies that were established from these conceptions forged societies, economic models, political, cultural, religious options throughout human history, permeating it with tensions, ambivalences, contradictions that have engendered, at all times, 'civilizing projects' other than the 'humanization of man and world'. The barbaric stories are present to remind us of this fragile option for humanization (Charlot, 2020). And as will be shown, the field of education - even with all the goodwill and right intentionality of its agents, anchored in different understandings of man and world - has become a fertile ground for processes of dehumanization of man and world, since also, in this field, permeate anthropological conceptions that naturalize the existence of "a fatally degraded type of human being" (Santos, 2019, p. 46)

The idea of humanism and person in Western culture can find its polysemic origin (philosophical, theological and, later, scientific) in the philosophical schools of Ancient Greece, in Palestine before the Christian Era, extends through the long Middle Ages (homogenized and condensed by Catholic theology), to rediscover its plural matrix, from the 15th century onwards, in the new philosophies and the new sciences, reaching us with the old and new questions about the nature, the condition, the possibility of which means to be human, humanity, humanization, being, subject, individual, citizen, me, self, transhuman, post-human and their antipodes.

Also along this trajectory is the development of the concept of "person", which sometimes is in line with the concept of "humanism", and now there seems to be no epistemological, ontological or axiological relationship, as occurred during the period of rediscovery of the humanist ideals in the 16th century: Europeans, whites, Catholics, emerging capitalist bourgeois claim for themselves the supremacy of reason (and no longer the divine) as a founding ontological structure of human beings (differentiating them from animals), and the concept of 'person' as the rights holder since birth. However, considering absolutely normal, natural - of the nature's order and also the divine, in this case as an instrumentalization of the religious speech, - the existence of human beings who do not have this same structuring ontology, therefore 'human-non-people', classified as barbarians, primitive, savages, liable, therefore, to be treated as things, objects, possessions, goods, goods without rights, or creatures to be civilized, submitted to a process of 'evolution' according to criteria and under the terms of the colonizers (Santos, 2019). Subsistent logic in contemporary times.

What are the main epistemological inheritances left by these matrices for the conception of humanism/humanization and of people in Brazilian culture and education?

Heir to three great traditions, the Greek, the Latin and the biblical-Christian, Humanism owes to the Greek tradition the concept of rational and spiritual interiority, the notion of intelligence open to transcendent realities and the definition of the human being as an adequate rational nature, for the reason, to the knowledge of the being in its universality. From the Latin tradition he inherited the concept of *humanitas*, which defines the human race, and the expression *studia humanitatis*, which designates the studies that formed in the youth the qualities of *humanitas*, and the understanding of the objective structure of Law in building the political society. From the Biblical-Christian tradition, he welcomed the comprehension of the divine transcendence, in relation to the covenant with creation, in which the human being occupies a central place, for it was created as freedom in the image and likeness of God. Of this triple heritage, three dimensions shape the Western thought: the metaphysics, the ethical-legal and the religious ones. (Jesuit Faculty of Philosophy and Theology - FAJE Symposium, 2019. Original griffins).

From these three dimensions, the concept of Humanism largely shaped philosophical, anthropological, scientific, social, cultural, political, legal, religious Western thinking, in which the human/person, with different emphasis, gained relevance, centrality, also resulting in extremes, such as the predatory anthropocentrism, necrophilic of the human and other ecosystems, putting at risk the basic conditions of existence itself. These three dimensions are also found, in different nuances, in the pedagogical ideas that were adopted in *Terra Brasilis* from the beginnings of colonization to the present time, as will be seen below.

It is noteworthy that the presentation of this panoramic view of great anthropological ideas does not fit into a determined historical perspective, limited to watertight historical periods. These ideals, although they were created in precise historical contexts, dated, became part of the heritage of the knowledge of humanity. Thus, at the beginning of the 21st Century anthropological conceptions with mythical

characteristics or consonants to the ideas of Greek philosophers of Ancient Greece, medieval Catholic theology, 20th-century philosophy or the avant-garde, under construction can be found.

Indeed, some definitions have a prehistory, but they have become a fundamental anthropological concept only in a certain era. These are the cases of the concept of subject and also of individual. Finally, also the concept of person [...] after having developed their central anthropological meaning, they can never be abstracted from the spectrum of the anthropological definitions. (Pleger, 2019, p. 17).

In large lines, these dimensions - metaphysical, ethical-legal and religious - can be identified in the different anthropological conceptions developed throughout history, according to Pleger's organization. They are:

*Ancient and biblical mythology:* both Greek myths and the biblical myth of the Judeo-Christian tradition present man as a creature of gods (Greek) and Yahweh (biblical god), enclosed in a destiny of pain and suffering. However, the biblical text presents a second report of the creation of the human being that puts him in another position: that of image and likeness of God, capable of redemption and liberation from suffering. And this theological conception of a person created in the "image and likeness of God" will generate the status of the "dignity of the human person", opening real horizons of civilizing-emancipatory projects and the defense of human rights in different fields of action (Pleger, 2019, p. 13).

Among the authors who systematized the mythical and theological narratives can be highlighted: Homer, Hesiod, Sophocles, Thomas Aquinas and St. Augustine.

*Dualism and Monoism:* In Dualism, not only the human is made up of two distinct ontological domains, but the whole physical world. For Greek Antiquity, these are the domains of *psiche* (soul) and *sum* (body) (Plato); *res extensiva* (extended thing) and *res cogitans* (thing that think) (Descartes), and *mundus sensibilis* (sensitive world) and *mundus intelligibilis* (intelligible world) (Kant). In Monoism there is only one ontological domain, the unity of nature, being the man structured by this same condition of uniqueness, because it is part of nature. Representatives are Marcus Aurelius (the human being in the cosmos), Spinoza (pantheism) and Maturana (*autopoiesis*, the self-creation of living systems). (Pleger, 2019, p. 14).

*Culture and history:* Under the conception of Culture, we seek to define the human being as an incomplete, unfinished being – because of structural biological need – and that is always in the search, daily, to compensate this need through the development of different technologies. And it does so through the "offices, arts, science, reason and freedom, in short, through culture" (Pleger, 2019, p. 14), social organization, since it cannot handle this task alone. Situated as a historical being, the human confronts the fact that he is part of a humanity that began before him and that will continue after. Thereby, it is not only the resolution of the immediate problems that affects him – at least it should not – but, it must put on the horizon of his choices the humans who have not yet been born.

These conceptions were developed by Plato (myths of Eros, Prometheus and Hermes: myth of the human needs); Gehlen (culture as compensation for natural deficiencies); Herder and the first freed from creation; Kant proposes an objective for universal history, in which there would be the "model of progress in history", which would result in a "confederation of nations", guided by the human reason. (Pleger, 2019, p. 154); Dilthey defends the historical unpredictability, "as well as the human being's view of history is also subject to constant changes." (Pleger, 2019, p. 154); and Heidegger, when discussing the fate of the human being, finds in the "narrative of the decline" of ancient myths the tragic identification with the "forgetfulness of being" in the present time, seduced by the technique. However, he still hopes of a return to the origins, proposing a "fundamental ontology [...] under new bases" (Pleger, 2019, p. 172).

Another way of understanding the human being and the person can be identified in the conceptions organized around the *models of degrees and development*:

The degree layer is sometimes referred to as the layer model. It has a static character and hierarchical articulation. With it, four degrees of being are designated. This is about the inorganic being, the vegetable, the animal and the human being. As opposed to that, the genetic model unites the degrees with each other through the thought of development. This means that the scopes of superior beings also represent late degrees of development. This model reaches its highest point with Darwin's Theory of Evolution (Pleger, 2019, p. 15).

The representatives of the degree model are: Aristotle (inorganic, vegetable, animal, human); Scheler (the range of being: from impulse to spirit); Plessner (the staggered structure of life); and representatives of

genetic models: Darwin (the evolution of the human being); Freud (the development and strengthening of I); Portman (the constitution of the form).

*Individual and Person:* With the concept of individual it is intended to affirm the indivisible and has its origin in Greek Antiquity. To affirm the individual before the universal Aristotle is used. Leibniz uses this concept (individual) to characterize the singularity and serves both humans and any being. The concept of Person has different meanings: in common language it is attributed only to individual humans (never to things, animals, vegetables or inanimate beings); in Law, it serves to designate institutions (corporations, 'legal entity'); in the field of Theology, it has a central meaning for the understanding of the Christian God who is Trinity, Three-People. In this sense, the Latin concept of *persona* is the translation of the Greek word *prosopon*, which designated the mask that the actor wore in the theatrical performances, in order to represent the feeling, the state of mind or the social function of the character. Hence the concept of *person* has a multiple meaning: role (as in theater) or social function, legal subject, personal pronoun and self-awareness. (Pleger, 2019, p. 15).

They represent these conceptions: Leibniz (individual as Monad/singularity), Humboldt (the formation – *bildung* - of individuality), Nietzsche (the individual as "will of power"); Cicero (the human being as a person), Locke (the identity of the person), Kant (the person as an end in itself).

And there are also the currents that derive from an *anthropological materialist* conception, having as its central axis the issue of freedom. It thematizes the relationship between freedom (subjectivity) and materiality (objectivity, external material conditions) to the subject. There are records of this conception already in Greek Antiquity, but in modernity (18th century) gains consistency with the "theory of atoms" and the development of "mechanistic thinking". It is organized (with different accents) in mechanical, dialectical and historical materialism and has as a common element the idea that the results of an action determine its existence. As a counterpoint, the *philosophy of subjectivity* that was formed in Modernity attributes to the subject total autonomy in relation to himself, to his existence, to the world. If before, in medieval theology, the "absolute subject" it was attributed to the Christian God, in Modernity, this absolute is claimed by the "human subject", objectified in relation to material, concrete, historical and social contingencies (Pleger, 2019, p. 16).

They are part of materialistic anthropology: La Mattie (the machine man), Engels (materialistic dialectic), Marx (historical materialism); and the absolute I (conception of subjectivity): Fichte (I and non-I), Husserl (transcendental self and natural self), Sartre (the freedom of the subject).

I believe that the diagnosis presented by Dardot and Laval (2016) about the hegemonic rationality/subjectivity neoliberal is an acute and tragic expression of this materialistic anthropology in the present time:

[...] (neoliberalism, as hegemonic social normativity) imposes on each of us who live in a universe of widespread competition, summons wage earners and populations to enter into economic struggle against each other, orders the social relationships according to the market model, forces to justify inequalities increasingly profound, changes up to individual, who is urged to conceive himself and behave as a company. For almost a third of a century, this norm of life has governed public policies, commands the world economic relations, transforms society, *reshapes subjectivity*, (forging the emergence) of a *new subject* [...]; and, furthermore, far from being limited to the economic sphere, it tends towards totalization, that is, to "make the world" by its power of integration of all dimensions of human existence. (Dardot & Laval (2016, p. 16. Emphasis added).

Charlot (2020) further updates this list of anthropological conceptions, bringing the discoveries and research of the 21st Century in the neurosciences, in bioengineering (genetic manipulation), in Computer Science, with the advent of transhumanism, the post-human or even the end of the human, requiring the formulation of new questions and the search for new answers with the consequent repercussions for the field of education. After all, says Charlot, it is about the realization of the old dream of building an autonomous, singular, thinking "human machine" and perhaps raised to the condition, if not of being a "citizen", with all the consequences and repercussions for the field of education. It is imperative to ask (and find answers): are there still humans to be educated? Will there still be education? Education for what?

And bringing the discussion to the specific field of education, the author provokes:

Without it being necessary to invoke extreme cases, implicit anthropological discrimination structures apparently banal and normal situations: the school practices are based on the same representation of human beings, their possibilities and rights, in a school in the city, which educates

middle class children, or at a school in an “immigrant” suburb in Paris or in a slum in Rio de Janeiro? (Charlot, 2020, pp. 12-13).

## 2 Freire: education to humanize the human and the world

In all of his work, Freire leaves no doubt about an epistemology that contemplates the humanizing task of education and, therefore, what human beings refer to when presenting their pedagogical principles radically anchored in anthropology. In his wanderings across the five continents, the contact with different intellectuals of different matrices, made him know, update, incorporate new elements in his anthropological conception (he challenged himself to reinvent himself continuously as a consequence of his ontology of being inconclusive and conscious of this finitude), at the same time as he was reaffirming his position of opposition and uncompromising struggle against conceptions that legitimized situations of denial of the inalienable value of human dignity, of oppression, of dehumanization. Whether in his reflection in 1967, exiled in Chile:

There cannot be a pedagogical theory, which implies in ends and means of the educational action, which is exempt from a concept of man and world." In this sense, there is no neutral education. If, for some, man is a being of adaptation to the world (taking the world not only in a natural, but structural, historical-cultural sense), his educational action, his methods, his objectives, will adapt to this conception. If, for others, man is a being of transformation in the world, his educational task follows a different path. If we face it as a “thing”, our educational action takes place in mechanistic terms, resulting in an increasing domestication of man. If we look at him as a person, our what-to-do will be more and more liberating. (Freire, 1967, p. 125).

In his reflection in 1992 (almost at the end of his trajectory in *Política e Educação*), Freire affirmed and reaffirmed his onto-anthropological stance underlying the “pedagogical what-to-do”, never as a concept *a priori*, but as a result of his concrete struggle, of his existence compromised with the oppressed:

Ontological certainties, socially and historically founded. *That is why the concern with human nature is so present in my reflections.* With human nature constituting itself in History and not before or outside of it [...] A being that, with a vocation to be more, may, historically, however, lose its address and, distorting its vocation, dehumanize itself. Dehumanization, for this very reason, is not a vocation, but a distortion of the vocation to be more. (Freire, 1993, p. 8. Emphasis added).

In the text “Permanent education and educational cities”, from the book *Politics and Education*, Freire ‘asks permission’ to - before going into the main theme he had been invited to discuss - to weave “some first reflections on the human being (that) open the way for *the understanding of education as a permanent practice*”. (Freire, 1993, p. 11. Emphasis added):

We initially emphasize its condition of *historical-social being*, continually experiencing the tension of *being* in order to be and to be being not only what it inherits, but also what it acquires and not mechanically. This means that the human being, while historical, is a finite, limited, inconclusive being, but *aware of its inconclusion*. Therefore, a being in continuous search, naturally in process. (Freire, 1993, p. 12. Emphasis added).

And he continues to present his conception of the human, in which education is an anthropological condition *sine qua non* that enables him to enter, to be part of the human world, to enjoy the cultural heritage built by its predecessors but, at the same time, to make it responsible to the permanent humanizing task of itself and the world, in view of the generations that will succeed it:

(...) the “being programmed to learn”, conditioned but not determined, the imagination, the desires, the fears, the fantasies, the attraction to the mystery, all of this inserts us, as educable beings, in the permanent search process of which I spoke. What I mean is that education, as graduation, as a process of knowledge, teaching, learning, has become, throughout the adventure in the world of human beings, a connotation of its nature, taking shape in history, as the vocation for humanization that I speak of in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and in *Pedagogy of Hope*, a reunion with *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. In other words and perhaps repeatedly, it is not possible to be a person without, in this or that way, finding yourself ingrained in a certain educational practice. It is ingrained not in provisional

terms, but in a lifetime terms. *The human being never stops educating itself.* (Freire, 1993, p. 13. Emphasis by the author and mine).

In “education and community participation”, in the same book, Freire draws attention to the dialectical dimension of his ontological conception, and to the reality, as the driving force for the possibilities of liberation from the fatalistic and naive consciousness that maintains (in many situations for the sake of convenience of the oppressed themselves when introjecting the 'oppressor' inside themselves) men and women in a state of subhumanity:

It was *reinventing itself*, experiencing or suffering the tense relationship between what it inherits and what it receives or acquires from the social context that it creates and recreates it, that the human being has become this being that, to be, it has to be. *This historical and cultural being that cannot be explained only by the biology or the genetics, nor just by the culture.* That it cannot be explained only by its conscience as if it, instead of having constituted itself socially and transformed its body into a *conscious body*, it had been the almighty creator of the world around it, nor can it be explained as a pure result of the transformations that took place in this world. This being that lives, in itself, the dialectic between the social, without what could not be and the individual, without what would be dissolved in the pure social, without brand and without profile. (Freire, 1993, p. 34. Emphasis added).

In “no one is born done: it is experiencing us in the world that we make ourselves” (Freire, 1993, pp. 40-43), Freire presents a memorial of his personal life - family tradition, axiologies, experiences lived in different fields - configuring his professional life, or better saying, the memorial of man, Christian, son, father, brother, husband, friend, co-worker, professional, political, social history, politically, ethically, pedagogically situated and in constant search of making and remaking himself, whose “dialogical practice with my parents prepared me to continue to live it with my students”.

Right at the beginning, it's possible to observe the critique to the modern scientific logic, with instrumental reason and dualistic anthropology (*mundus sensibilis* and *mundus intelligibilis* by Kant), which ended up colonizing, not only the episteme, but the being, the knowledge and the power of the peoples of the Global South, which can be identified as a point of contact with Santos' critical perspective (2019).

Sometimes, or almost always, regrettably, when we think or ask ourselves about our professional trajectory, the exclusive center of the references is in the courses taken, the academic training and the experience lived in the professional area. *Our presence in the world is left out as something unimportant.* It is as if the professional activity of men and women has nothing to do with their experiences of boy, as a young man, with his desires, with his dreams, with his well-being for the world or with his lack of love for life. With his joy or with his discomfort while the days and years go by. *In fact, it is not possible for me to separate what is in me as a professional from what I have been as a man.* (Freire, 1993, p. 40. Emphasis added).

And throughout the text, he describes experiences, dreams, feelings, discomforts, concerns, discoveries, learnings, teachings, the choices made, the coexistence with intellectuals of the most diverse lines of thought, even if he does not agree with certain positions, or with the boys from slums on the hill, having as main reference the desire for the ontological realization of being more, the humanization of the man and the world, and the struggle so the knowledge generated in the very context of life to be recognized and validated in its specificity, returning the condition of 'authorship' (knowing how to read itself and the world, pronouncing one's word) to every man and woman in the context of their existence in order to be able to transform them from themselves and in their own terms, not as violent adherence to external culture, alienated and alienating:

[...] From what I was a boy from Recife, born in the 20s, in a middle class family, affected by the crisis of 1929. An early boy challenged by social injustices as early becoming angry against racial and social prejudices to which he would later add another anger, the anger of prejudices around sex and women [...] *Some radical options, which move me as an educator, therefore, as a politician, they started to gestate in that distant time.* (Freire, 1993, p. 40. Emphasis added).

And he leaves no doubt about the starting point of the constitution of his political-pedagogical proposal, which has guided him throughout his life: the option in favor of the oppressed human:



*The Pedagogy of the oppressed*, written long after those soccer matches beside Toinho Morango, Reginaldo, Gerson Macaco, Dourado, soon hit by tuberculosis, *it's related to the learning that was never interrupted, which I started at that time - the need for transformation, the reinvention of the world in favor of the oppressed classes.* (Freire, 1993, p. 40. Emphasis added)

For Freire, the human being is heir (conditioned, but not determined) of the humanity that preceded it and seed of humanity for those who are yet to come; it is a being of intentionalities, endowed with a conscious body, located in the world, unfinished, and aware of its finitude, located in a permanent state of search, of questions, answers, problem solvings; a being-with-the-world, a being of relationships (with itself, with the other, with the environment, with the transcendent in the religious sense as well), which makes it devoted to the permanent task of building, transforming itself and the world. It is essentially a being of praxis. Praxis that is based on the daily exercise of dialogue (communication between equals, without hierarchy of beings, knowledge, powers), of reflection and of the critical action of the human being on itself and on the world.

### 3 Critical pedagogy: without criticism there is no education and humanization

Several authors consider the pedagogy developed by Paulo Freire, during the 20th Century, as a rupture in relation to the pedagogical ideas developed in Brazil, and in a good part of the countries of the West. Heir to the Greek, Latin, Judeo-Christian tradition, the pedagogy developed in Brazil has been built, since the beginning of Portuguese colonization, by the tension between an idealistic philosophical perspective - understood as the reflection of the *ethical purpose* that guides the educational activity - , and for an “empirical and practical sense inherent in *paideia* understood as the *formation of the child for life*” (Saviani, 2012. Emphasis added), from where, as a hegemonic trend, both in public education as in private education (religious, confessional and, later, secular), the perspective of neutrality (sophism for uncriticality), positivist, pragmatic, technicist, scientist attributed to school and the formal processes of education instituted in the country, aimed at meeting the needs of interests of the dominant classes, currently organized on a world level, in the manner of the neoliberal globalization.

Franco (2008), when tracing the trajectory of the institution of Pedagogy as Science (since it was also understood as philosophy and as art), identifies three pedagogical approaches that have become dominant in the country, with different subtleties, but that have provoked “profound changes in its epistemology”. Although this is not the author's intention, these approaches (which coexist in greater or lesser emphasis today) leave explicit, from the philosophical matrix that support them, onto-anthropological conceptions closely related (and even dependent) with hegemonic social rationality current, which, in turn, explain expectations, desires, possibilities and limits for the human being to be 'built/educated', in a given time-space, in the socially legitimated educational process. Not always of a critical-emancipatory nature of the human and the world.

They are: *Philosophical pedagogy*, with a theoretical base anchored since Greek metaphysics, incorporating the different humanist, enlightenment traditions throughout history, arriving at the phenomenological-existentialist-hermeneutics of the 20th Century. This approach emphasizes the role of the subject, of subjectivity in the construction of knowledge, although it does not disconnect it from the practice and the existential context, in which the educational phenomenon takes place. “His perspective is the understanding of the “existential essences” with a view to understand the practice ... Educating means, for phenomenology, apprehension of meaning, so that existence can be lived with humanity. Concern with the subject's formation processes”. (Franco, 2008, pp. 64-65. Quotes from the author).

*Technical-scientific pedagogy*: the theoretical basis of this aspect is anchored in empiricist rationalism, positivism (with the task of secularizing education in a context marked by religious influence, and disseminating emerging bourgeois values); in evolutionism, in pragmatism (preparing the student for democratic life/Dewey, although without critical questioning about the bases of the construction of American democratic society, it marks a process of inhuman and epistemic colonization against the original peoples and against the Africans brought there as slaves), technicality, behaviorism and various cognitive theories that resulted in constructivist approaches (Ausubel, Piaget, Bruner, Vygotski, among others). It advocates, as a radical epistemological principle, the validity of knowledge acquired only through the experimental-mathematical method, emphasizing the role of experimentation, object and objectivity in the

educational process, excluding the metaphysical dimension, reflection and subjectivity, therefore, the subjects, as components inherent to the process of construction, acquisition or transmission of knowledge.

This conception starts from a mechanistic view of the world and a naturalist conception of man; seeks the researcher's neutrality and focuses on explaining the phenomena [...] issues that may be represented by the commitment to the formation of competences and skills, supporting a prerequisite for social participation and the policies of "quality in education", Seen as effective ways to guarantee social spaces (to those who can attend such quality spaces). (Franco, 2008, pp. 65-67. Quotes by the author).

*Critical-emancipatory pedagogy:* The main theorists who support this approach - from Heraclitus to Hegel, reaching Feuerbach, Marx and Engels, Lukács, Gramsci - emphasize the role of dialecticity and historicity in the (always collective) process of knowledge construction, in constant transformation, through interaction of multiple social, historical, political, cultural, technological, environmental determinations, etc. (Franco, 2008, p. 66). The objective of the pedagogical action, in these approaches,

will be to form individuals *in* and *for* praxis, aware of their role in shaping and transforming the socio-historical reality, always assuming a collective action, ideologically constituted, through which each subject becomes aware of what is possible and necessary, to each one, in the formation and control of the constitution of the collective way of life. It is a political, social and emancipatory task. Human formation is valued with regard to the conditions for overcoming oppression, submission and alienation, which from the historical, cultural or political point of view. (Franco, 2008, p. 67. Emphasis by the author).

What, then, is the place of Freire's Pedagogy in this panorama? And in what aspects does it present itself as a break for hegemonic pedagogical logics, in order to constitute a viable alternative to the construction of educational processes aimed at the humanization of the human and the world?

In the presentation of the book "education as a practice of freedom", Francisco C. Weffort, in the article "Education and politics - sociological reflections on a pedagogy of Liberty, pp. 3-26) presents the socio-historical panorama of the structural factors that shaped Brazilian society, from the beginning of the 20th Century until the 1960s, on which Paulo Freire launched the roots of his pedagogical proposal. In a context marked by the transition between ruralization (with the decline of the agrarian economy) and urbanization (with the rise of industrialization), with the winds of modernity and progress feeding the hopes of "better life" for all (which caused great rural exodus to the suburbs of large cities) this hope was strained by the possibility of expanding the democratic experience (with the rise and direct participation of new popular social actors in the urban sphere and politicians with progressive proposals, different from the proposals of the 14th Century oligarchies) and the impoverishment and illiteracy that left thousands of citizens out of democratic growth. But for the ruling elite,

the ignorants are not able to participate freely and critically in democracy, cannot vote or be voted for the public offices [...] They create a prejudiced image about rural workers and about all other marginalized sectors of the political process. They start to associate "ignorance" very easily, that is, the absence of formal culture in the style of the middle classes and oligarchies with "indolence" and "inertia". (Weffort, Francisco. Presentation of the book "education as a practice of freedom", 1983, p. 13)

And it is in this historical-existential-ontological amalgamation that the Freire man (at that time as an educator in a public university, in Recife, and engaged in popular education projects) forges his critical ethical-political-pedagogical conscience when he realizes that those men and women, illiterate adults from the Brazilian Northeast, impoverished, were living overwhelmed in their freedom, a 'limit situation' of 'ontological deviation' from the radical ontological vocation to 'being more' (Freire, 1993. 2017). Being illiterate (not 'reader', not 'writer' of words, not 'pronouncer' of himself and his world, annulled in his epistemic and cultural ontology) he was denied the right to vote, which constituted a public attestation that he was a "fatally degraded human being", unable to build himself as a human-citizen and, therefore, unable to participate in the construction of a democratic society, founded on the principles of equality, freedom and fraternity of the anthropological and philosophical ideas of the 18th Century European illuminists and humanists, in which the national elites endeavored to mimic. More in speech than in actions.

From this experience with the people comes the political dimension of their pedagogy, understood as the possibility of collective, conscious, free and critical action of the human in the world to humanize it. Education for humanization is a political act for the construction of men and women - in a dialogical, communicational, fraternal process - overcoming the naive conscience that legitimizes and maintains the unhumanizing unjust order to assume the critical conscience that analyzes, questions, problematizes the given reality, refuses to accept fatalism and assumes himself as an author, creator, transforming himself and the world. Humanization, which is the permanent task of learning (because reality is dynamic, not static) to pronounce its generated, created, discovered word, affirmed in everyday educational practice, and from the 'common vocabulary universe' of its cultural community, to reveal its authentic presence in the world:

[...] In fact, if we admitted that dehumanization (the limit situation) is the historical vocation of men, we would have nothing more to do, except to adopt a cynical or desperate attitude. The *struggle for humanization*, for free work, for disalienation, for the affirmation of men as people, as “beings for themselves”, it would have no meaning. This is only possible because *dehumanization, even if a concrete fact in history, it is not, however, given destiny*, but the result of an unfair “order” that generates the violence of oppressors and this, *is minus*. (Freire, 2017, p. 40. Emphasis in the author and mine)

Boaventura de Sousa Santos brings new light to these issues. By presenting the principles, foundations, methodologies and pedagogies advocated by the Epistemologies of the South - and which claims, among other issues, “a radical demand for the democratization of knowledge, a claim to cognitive democracy” (Santos, 2019, p. 419) manifests the place of Freire's pedagogical proposal, as one of the founding events: “At the intellectual level, they would not be possible without two proposals that revolutionized pedagogy and the social sciences in the late 1960s and throughout the 1970s: the pedagogy of the oppressed by Paulo Freire and the participatory action research (PAR) by Orlando Fals Borda”. (Santos, 2019, p. 355).

Santos highlights the aspects in which Freire's pedagogy of the oppressed is radically innovative, taking into account the context of civil-military turbulence that agitates the Latin American continent, especially with the crisis between Cuba and the United States, with an attempt to implement completely opposite social models, that is, socialism and capitalism, and the consequent military dictatorships that extended until the mid-90s (and from there with the consolidation of neoliberal policies also within the scope of public education) in a framework of extreme poverty, illiteracy, technological dependence in which most populations live, presents inflection points for the criticism of current pedagogies:

(Freire and Fals Borda) conceive *education and knowledge* as two *dimensions inseparable from the liberation policy*. Paulo Freire's starting point is the popular education [...], but Freire proposes a paradigmatic change inspired by the theology of liberation and Marxism: transforming education (starting with adult literacy itself) into an awareness process, through production and acquisition of relevant knowledge to identify critically the concrete conditions of life and transform them through a policy of liberation. (Santos, 2019, p. 357. Emphasis added).

Awareness through education, is not, for Freire, idealization, mentalization, reduction of reality to mental, naive, magical, subjective representational configurations of reality; it is an understanding of the social structures that, ideologically and concretely maintain, conform certain social conditions of life that generate and maintain domination and dehumanization and, as a rule, reinforced by educational institutions, public or private, merely reproducing epistemic contents, in tune with the logic of the elites.

Paulo's project contains an *epistemological proposal for the construction and appropriation of knowledge based on the existential experience of literacy students*. The dialogical character of education implies the conception of knowledge as a construction [...] Hence its radical critique of the dominant education policies, which it calls “banking education”, which, by polarizing the distinction between educator and student, eliminates dialogue and promotes the passivity of the student. In a society divided between oppressors and oppressed, banking education aims to promote the passivity of the oppressed. Therefore, *Freire's project, in addition to the educational and epistemological proposal, also contains a political proposal*, in the broadest sense of the term. (Santos, 2019, pp. 357-358. Emphasis added. Quotes from the author).

From the beginning, Freire made clear his understanding of education as a humanizing task (of man and of the world), and presented a holistic, integral, multidimensional view of the “human to be educated”.

It has as its starting point for the elaboration of its pedagogical proposal the concrete human, of flesh, bone, transcendence, composed of dreams, desires, emotions, feelings, hopes, hopelessness, victories, failures, in a permanent search to realize the “being more”, the being-in-the-world as a fundamental ontological vocation. Task that, as long as there is a situation of oppression, it will not be finished.

*There is no education outside human societies and there is no man in the void [...] From the outset, any search for an answer to these challenges (those of education) would necessarily imply an option. Option for that yesterday, which meant a society without people, commanded by an "elite" superimposed on its world, alienated, in which the simple man, minimized and without awareness of this minimization, was more "thing" than a real man, or option for Tomorrow. For a new society, which, being a subject of itself, it had in man and people subjects of their story [...] option for a society that "decolonized" more and more. (Freire, 1993, pp. 35-36. Quotes from the author. Emphasis added).*

Task radically hampered by the new social, political, economic, cultural conditions that are taking shape at the beginning of this century, exacerbated by the hyperconnectivity that creates the illusion of modernity, of 'communication', 'dialogue', 'belonging' among the visitors of *web* (actually, dominated by the directive logic of algorithmization that regulates information flows and the perceptions and subjectivities resulting from this excluding logic), but already listened to by Freire in the last decade of the 20th Century:

*The fatalistic, immobilizing ideology that animates the neoliberal discourse is loose in the world. With an air of post-modernity, he insists on convincing us that we cannot do anything against the social reality that, from historical and cultural, becomes or renders "almost natural" [...] from the point of view of such ideology, there is only one way out of educational practice: adapting the student to this reality that cannot be changed [...] The book with which I return to readers is a decisive not to this ideology that denies and threatens us as people. (Freire, 2018, p. 21. Author's quotes. Emphasis added).*

This human to whom Freire refers to - and with whom he has been in contact throughout all his life and forged a pedagogical proposal - throughout his life has a very clear ontology: he is the oppressed human, situated in a condition of non-being, of non-people, prevented or hindered from materialize their ontological vocation to 'be more', fully human, autonomously capable (either through formal education or other instances) of becoming an author-of-self and author-of-the-world that surrounds him. Autonomy - which is an expression of freedom, of the free, emancipated human - built in the process of literacy, in which he becomes aware of the possibilities (and the limits) to 'read itself', to 'read the world'. However, more than that: literacy is becoming able to think the world critically, judge the world critically, act critically on the world, transform the world critically, critically pronouncing the word about itself and its world in its own terms: “Expelling this shadow through awareness is one of the fundamental tasks of an education that is truly liberating and therefore respectful of man as a person” (Freire, 1993, p. 37).

For that, it is necessary both an epistemological rupture of the official, hegemonic, dominant pedagogy that normalizes and normatizes public policies in neoliberal capitalist societies, which leads us to a profound answer to the question 'education for what?' as an anthropological and political epistemological rupture that redirects the direction of our sociability (today between colonized and colonizers, between “them” and “us”) when answering the question: what kind of humans do we want to be? and What society do we want to build?

History has shown that the lack of critical awareness, the lack of clear and autonomous goals for human groups leaves men and women at the mercy of manipulation, domination, the maintenance of the state of violence and oppression, legitimizing “forms of sociability based on ethnic-cultural and even ontological inferiority of the other ” (Santos, 2019, p. 27). And even if the social objectives are clear - and conformed in a democratic, fair, egalitarian perspective, the 'limit situations' are lurking until they can, again, be configured in a dehumanizing existential condition. Also in the field of education.

Against the 'indolent reason' (Santos, 2019), against the submission, dependence, capitulation to the 'single neoliberal thought' imposed by elites, at all times, but now configured in the form of neoliberal commercialization of all dimensions of life - Santos advocates as one of the forms of reparation for cognitive injustice that imposed itself with the hegemony of eurocentric scientific knowledge, raised to the status of “only rigorous, valid and universal knowledge”, the recognition also “of validity and rigor” to so many others epistemes, to so many other modes of knowledge production and the diffusion of that knowledge born in the small experiences of the daily struggles of all peoples: “[...] I call the non-scientific knowledge of *artisanal knowledge*. These are practical, empirical and popular knowledge, *vernacular knowledge* which are

very diverse, but which have a common characteristic: they were not produced separately, as a practice of knowledge separated from other social practices. (Santos, 2019, p. 73. Emphasis 1 by the author. Emphasis 2 by me).

Paulo Freire's method of adult literacy starts, exactly, from the identification of the 'vernacular universe' of the literacy students, composed by the words, the sounds, the most significant material forms for the community, which represent the proper sense of life, materialized in the behaviors, in attitudes, in desires, in dreams, in life itself.

It is from this universe of meaningful life for a given community - with the identification of universal themes, the generating words, the problematization of reality (yes, we must face/break with the pedagogical and political epistemology that naturalizes dehumanization, oppression, the ontological inferiority), the strangeness, the understanding, the analysis, the criticism and the awareness, the formulation of the new meaningful words for the life that men and women situated in a condition of ontological nullity discover themselves authors, builders, protagonists of themselves and of the world that surrounds them.

And they find themselves capable to pronounce their words, to write their words, to read their words and those of the world: "From one to one, they all go on" making "words with the possible combinations at their disposal [...] Finishing the oral exercises, *in which there was not only knowledge, but recognition, without which there is no true learning*, the man on the same first night (when he started to be literate) he started to write. (Freire, 1983, p. 118. Quotes from the author. Emphasis added).

### Final considerations

The existence of the abyssal line, stemming from the capitalist, colonial, patriarchal, scientist heritage that justifies the existence of "people" and "non-people" (*capitis diminutio* ontological), it is still supported, in the scope of education, by non-critical, pragmatic, positivist pedagogical matrices, and also socially endorsed by neoliberal rationalities that take reification, commercialization of natural resources, common goods, public institutions, human beings and all forms of life as definitive. In this context, I defend the urgency, the need and the recomposition of a critical pedagogy, such as that postulated by Paulo Freire, who becomes liberating in the collective construction of processes of emancipation of oppressed men and women, made invisible by the colonialist logics subsisting in our communities and in our relationships of being, of knowing, of power.

This educational task urgently requires the elaboration of new pedagogical epistemologies - also decolonized from the dictatorship of the neoliberal techno-scientific 'unique thought' - which contemplates (because it recognizes the rigor and validity) the knowledge legitimately constructed by the oppressed and invisible peoples of the Global Southern Hemisphere, as claimed by Boaventura de Sousa Santos, and as always defended by Paulo Freire.

Facing almost the impossibility of dialogue between the different social entities (governments, parliamentarians, legislators, social groups, educators, students), and of the formulation of emancipatory projects to be undertaken by collectives and for the common good, - as a consequence of the dissemination of rationality/subjectivity, business/competitive that takes over humans at the beginning of the 21st Century - progressive educators (heirs of the pedagogical tradition proposed by Freire) have a herculean task ahead of them: not just denouncing the social, political, economic, cultural conditions that underlies ontologies, epistemologies, policies and pedagogies that make the humanizing task unfeasible, but, above all, announce, propose, present pedagogical proposals capable of mobilizing the sensibilities and consciences of wounded humans, fragmented by hopelessness, by the lack of perspective on the real construction of a good future, and by submission to the dictatorship of the single thought: the thought that there is no way out of the neoliberal capitalist model.

To this end, I present, as a contribution to the construction of pedagogical alternatives that contemplate the humanization of the human, in a world in which all humans and non-humans fit, some epistemological principles inspired by the Epistemologies of the South to be contemplated in pedagogical proposals that propose the task of humanization, and that can be taken on in pedagogical projects at all levels - from childhood to adulthood:

1 - *Knowledge is always the result of the collective experience of human groups.* Whether it is built in the educational or extra-institutional instance, in the peoples' struggles for liberation, against any process of dominance of man by man, it can never be understood (and constructed) as an object of individual effort, capable of being transformed into merchandise, priced, a source of private profit, breaking with the

prevailing logic of the information society in which knowledge, information, education becomes a tradable commodity in the stock exchanges.

2 - True knowledge is that which is built on *recognition of non-hierarchical coexistence of knowledge*, and on the possibility of being communicated, shared, for the benefit of the community.

3 - All knowledge collectively constructed and shared is always *precarious, provisional, incomplete*, since it is conditioned to the multiple social and historical determinations of time-places and the human builders of that knowledge. For this reason, the indispensable recognition of *collective authorship of knowledge*, which circumscribes it in a given context. The validity of this production of knowledge can go beyond the place of origin, but it can never be considered a 'model', 'prototype', 'law', raised to the condition of 'superior knowledge' to other forms of knowledge.

4 - All knowledge, to be true, must be anchored in the *diatopic perspective*: denunciation/criticism of the conditions of dehumanization and announcement of the possibilities of humanization. We need to get out of the utopian immobility (of a never realizable future) in which we find ourselves, subjected to the dictatorship of neoliberal presentism, of laziness in imagining new worlds, new possibilities. The model of the 'ideal human' is not found in manuals or in the cosmetic advertisements of the media. We need to rescue the right to have the right to imagination, not to accept the 'ready, packed life given, distributed in the intermittent flow of digital screens.

5 - All *knowledge constructed in the struggle, in everyday life, in the here and now is valid* as a possibility of building emancipatory ways of collective life. The meaning of life is not reduced to what is attributed by the academy, by the specialists, by the scientists who stand as judges of the eternal and immutable truth: each human being must have autonomy to construct truths, to elaborate authorial, critical thoughts, capable to guide you in your personal and collective life choices. Able to determine their own humanization, collaborate with the humanization of their community and the world in which they live, in the liberation from conditions of oppression. Learn to read itself, the world, to pronounce its word, to build itself and its world as its and on its own terms.

6 - The *non-conformity* - the non-acceptance of any situation of passivity, silencing, dehumanization - must be the *basic intentionality of the construction of pedagogical knowledge*, in view of the achievement of the educational ethical imperative: the humanization of the man and the world. As Freire wished: "We thought of a literacy that would be an act of creation, capable of triggering other creative acts. In a literacy in which the man, because he was not his patient, his object, developed the *impatience, the vivacity, characteristic of the states of search, of invention and reinvention*. (Freire, 1983, p. 104. Emphasis added).

7 - Knowledge is for the *solidary coexistence* (and not competitive) between humans and non-humans, from the past, the present and those yet to come: "Opposing to a logic of competition is the negative aspect of contemporary anthropos pedagogy, the aspect of resistance. What is the positive aspect? First of all, of course, affirming a principle of solidarity, which is the opposite of competition: solidarity between members of the human species, between human populations and within those populations. (Charlot, 2020, pp. 311-312).


The possibility of achieving a humanistic pedagogy will not be achieved with concessions or superficial arrangements; it requires an educational context, such as a new social pact, in which it will be possible to develop resistant, insurgent, revolutionary pedagogical practices that produce new epistemological perspectives in everyone involved - and political ones in the broad sense - that rises to other reinterpretations of the sense of humanism for others lifestyles beyond the neoliberal techno-scientist capitalism: this results in the need for structural reforms in social institutions and a great collective effort in the commitment to a public, secular and for all education, and which vehemently refuses the commercialization of education.

## References

- Cambi, Franco. (1999). *História da Pedagogia*. São Paulo: UNESP.
- Charlot, Bernard. (2020). *Educação ou barbárie?* Kindle edition. São Paulo: Cortez Editora.
- Dardot, Pierre., & Laval, Christian. (2020). *The new way of the world: on neoliberal society*. Translation Mariana Echalar. 1st ed. 5th reimp. São Paulo: Boitempo.
- Franco, Maria Amélia Santoro. (2008). *Pedagogia como ciência da educação*. 2th ed. rev. e amp. São Paulo: Cortez.
- Freire, Paulo. (1967). *Papel da Educação na Humanização*. Paulo Freire Digital Collection. Available at: <http://www.acervo.paulofreire.org/handle/7891/1127>
- Freire, Paulo. (1983). *Education: The practice of freedom*. 14th ed. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.
- Freire, Paulo. (1993). *Política e educação*. São Paulo: Cortez.
- Freire, Paulo. (2017). *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Foreword by Ernani Maria Fiori. 63rd. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
- Freire, Paulo. (2018). *Pedagogia da autonomia: saberes necessários à prática educativa*. 56a ed. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.
- Pleger, Wolfgang. (2019). *Manual de Antropologia filosófica: os conceitos mais importantes de Homero a Sartre*. Translation by Diego Kosbiau Trevisan. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- Saviani, D. (2012). *A Pedagogia no Brasil – História e Teoria*. 2a ed. Campinas: Autores Associados.
- Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. (2019). *O fim do império cognitivo: a afirmação das epistemologias do Sul*. 1ed. 1. reimp. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica.
- Schmied-Kowarzik, W. (1983). *Pedagogia Dialética - de Aristóteles a Paulo Freire*. São Paulo: Brasiliense.
- Scocuglia, Afonso Celso. (2019). *A história das ideias de Paulo Freire e a atual crise de paradigmas*. 7a ed. João Pessoa: UFPB Publisher.
- Streck, Dr., & Redin, E. Zitzoski, J. (Org.). (2018). *Dicionário Paulo Freire*. 4a ed. rev. e amp. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica.
- Weffort, Francisco C. (1983). *Educação e Política – reflexões sociológicas sobre uma pedagogia da Liberdade*. In Freire, Paulo. *Educação como prática da liberdade*. 14a ed. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.

## About the Author

### GUADALUPE CORRÊA MOTA

 ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1333-1506>

Jornalista, Professora universitária (Universidade Católica de Santos), cursando o Doutorado em Educação na mesma universidade, sendo orientada pela Professora Doutora Maria Amélia do Rosário Santoro Franco. Participa do Grupo de Pesquisa: Pedagogia Crítica: Práticas e Formação. [guadalupe.mota@unisantos.br](mailto:guadalupe.mota@unisantos.br)

Submitted: Jan. 11, 2021.

Accepted: Mar. 4, 2021.