REFLECTIONS ON INTERCULTURAL AND INCLUSIVE TEACHING IN THE LIGHT OF THE EPISTEMOLOGIES OF FREIRE AND MATURANA

REFLEXÕES SOBRE A DOCÊNCIA INTERCULTURAL E INCLUSIVA À LUZ DAS EPISTEMOLOGIAS DE FREIRE E MATURANA

REFLEXIONES SOBRE LA DOCENCIA INTERCULTURAL E INCLUSIVA A LA LUZ DE LAS EPISTEMOLOGÍAS DE FREIRE Y MATURANA

Luiz Antonio Botelho ANDRADE[1]
e-mail: labauff@yahoo.com.br

Adriana CAMPANI[2]
e-mail: adriana_campani@uvanet.br

Felipe XAVIER NETO[3]
e-mail: felipexavier@id.uff.br

Editor: Prof. Dr. Sebastião de Souza Lemes
Deputy Executive Editor: Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

---

[1] Fluminense Federal University (UFF), Rio de Janeiro – RJ – Brazil. Professor, Department of Immunobiology. Coordinator of the Scientific Audiovisual Laboratory. PhD in Immunobiology, Institut Pasteur/Paris VI, França).
[2] State University of Vale do Acaraú (UVA), Sobral – CE – Brazil. Associate Professor of the Center for Philosophy, Letters and Education. Leader of the Study and Research Group on University Pedagogy, certified by CNPq. Post-doctorate in Curriculum Development (UMinho/Portugal).
[3] Fluminense Federal University (UFF), Rio de Janeiro – RJ – Brazil. PhD student of the Postgraduate Course in Sciences, Technology and Inclusion, PGCTIn, UFF.

ABSTRACT: In this essay we will discuss intercultural and inclusive teaching in the light of the epistemologies of Freire and Maturana. As a Methodology, we will follow a course of theoretical construction and semantic approximations of the concepts of interculturality and inclusion, as a contribution to the discussion on teacher education. Continuing, we will show that both culture and interculturality can be thought of as linguistic networks in which language and emotion are intertwined. The concept of inclusion will be discussed in the more general scope of ethical issues, as we believe that acceptance of the other, while legitim other, in coexistence, is more an emotional issue than a rational one. Emphasizing emotions and, within these, love and ethics, as a concern with the consequences of our actions on other human beings, is fundamental for our analysis, particularly in this moment of resurgence of the culture of hate and clashes in the field of human rights, including education.

KEYWORDS: Teacher education. Inclusion. Interculturality. Paulo Freire. Humberto Maturana.

RESUMO: Neste ensaio discutiremos docência intercultural e inclusiva à luz das epistemologias de Freire e Maturana. Como Metodologia, seguiremos um percurso de construção teórica e aproximações semânticas dos conceitos de interculturalidade e de inclusão, como uma contribuição à discussão sobre formação docente. Na continuidade, mostraremos que tanto a cultura, quanto a interculturalidade podem ser pensadas como redes linguísticas nas quais estão entrelaçadas o linguajar e o emocionar. O conceito de inclusão será discutido no âmbito mais geral das questões éticas, por acreditarmos que a aceitação do outro, enquanto legitimo outro, na convivência, é mais uma questão emocional do que racional. O realce às emoções e, no âmbito destas, o amor e a ética, enquanto preocupação com as consequências de nosso atuar sobre outros seres humanos, é fundamental para nossa análise, particularmente neste momento de ressurgimento da cultura do ódio e dos embates no campo dos direitos humanos e da educação inclusiva.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Formação de professores. Inclusão. Interculturalidade. Paulo Freire. Humberto Maturana.

RESUMEN: En este ensayo discutiremos la enseñanza intercultural e inclusiva a la luz de las epistemologías de Freire y Maturana. Como metodología, seguiremos un curso de construcción teórica y aproximaciones semánticas de los conceptos de interculturalidad e inclusión, como aporte a la discusión sobre la formación docente. A continuación, mostraremos que tanto la cultura como la interculturalidad pueden ser pensadas como redes lingüísticas en las que se entrelazan lenguaje y emoción. El concepto de inclusión será discutido en el ámbito más general de las cuestiones éticas, ya que creemos que la aceptación del otro, siendo otro legítimo, en la convivencia, es más una cuestión emocional que racional. Enfatizar las emociones y, dentro de ellas, el amor y la ética, como preocupación por las consecuencias de nuestras acciones sobre otros seres humanos, es fundamental para nuestro análisis, particularmente en este momento de resurgimiento de la cultura del odio y de los enfrentamientos en el campo de los derechos humanos, incluida la educación.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Formación de profesores. Inclusión. Interculturalidade. Paulo Freire. Humberto Maturana.

Introduction

Education, for Maturana (1997), is the opening of a space of coexistence where students and educators, in the broad sense of these terms, become the historical becoming of their recurrent interactions, in language. For Freire (2002, p. 25, our translation), in its dialectical orality, to educate is:

> The task of those who know that they know little – for this reason they know that they know something and can thus come to know more – in dialogue with those who almost always think that they know nothing, so that these, transforming their thinking that they know nothing into knowing that they know little, can also know more.

In addition to the dialogical character of the pedagogical relationship, Freire (1996) emphasizes that education is also a way of intervening in the world, enhancing the connections between the different cultural experiences of the subjects involved in the process. In this perspective, in addition to the construction of knowledge inherent to the educational process, the emancipatory vocation of education should be emphasized, especially in societies where structural inequalities try to legitimize social injustices and exclusion. In these contexts of denial of rights and social exclusion, education is never neutral and, therefore, it is up to the educator to position himself critically and make education a practice of freedom (FREIRE, 1974). The author understood, however, the limits of education to operate the process of change in very unfavorable objective conditions, which is why he directed his attention to two important focuses: conflict and hope (FREIRE, 1987, 1992).

In a series of radio interviews with Paulo Freire, Blois (2005) produced a beautiful tapestry from speech clippings of the patron of Brazilian education, Paulo Freire. Among these clippings, the quote below explains the articulation between politics, culture, education and language: "The more the popular masses participate in politics, in the politics of production, the more it will be possible to reinvent Culture, reinvent Education, reinvent Language" (BLOIS, 2005, p. 41, our translation).

For Paulo Freire, "it is not possible for you to understand social life outside the existence of antagonisms, outside the existence of conflicts" (BLOIS, 2005, p. 44, our translation). It is possible to assume a broad meaning for the term conflict and incorporate into it the notion of problem, of problematic or challenging situation. That said, it can be said that, for Freire, "there is no life without conflicts" and, in the human sphere, it is the conflicts and problems that, by challenging man in his relationship with the world, trigger in him what we connote as

consciousness and, to the process by which awareness occurs, of awareness – one of the conceptual landscapes of Paulo Freire's work (ANDRADE, 2021).

Although Maturana's humanism and the repercussion of the results of his scientific work and epistemological reflections have been increasingly appropriated and discussed by the area of education, his professional trajectory and field of interest was very different from that pursued by Paulo Freire. Apart from this, we find many consonances between both, especially with regard to ethical conduct, humanism, loving-kindness, as well as the results of their respective reflections of an epistemological nature (ANDRADE; SILVA, 2005).

Freire, unlike Maturana, was influenced by the dialectics of Hegel and Marx and always acted on the side of the "ragged of the world". As an educator, he has been involved in different problematic situations of oppression and social exclusion in Brazil, Chile, Guinea-Bissau and in various other intercultural contexts (HADDAD, 2019). Interested that we are in the work and legacy of both authors - Freire and Maturana - and engaged in issues of inclusion and interculturality that commit us today, as educators, we decided to carry out a semantic approach and theoretical construction of these concepts, from the epistemologies of Freire and Maturana to then reflect on intercultural and inclusive teaching and its challenges for teacher education.

Semantic approximations and proposition of the concept of interculturality

Starting our path through the concept of interculturality, we call attention to the lexical composition of the term, in its prefixal and suffix derivation from the radical culture, or cultural adjective. Thus, the term interculturality is composed of three parts: a base (cultural), which is juxtaposed with the prefix (inter–) and the suffix (– ade, or -age)[4]. The prefix (– inter) gives us ideas of space, relation, interaction, mediation and confluence, as occurs in the words international, interrelation, interaction, interconnection and exchange. As for the suffix -ade, although it does not have a semantic load, its morphological derivation for "age" indicates the state of affairs or relations, and, in this case, interculturality evokes relations between cultures, themselves understood as processes, as instituting processual(age) and not real (age) instituted.

Having analyzed the compound term – interculturality – we will now approach the radical – culture – by the hands and genius of Bosi (1992). Thus, for the aforementioned author, the words culture, cult and colonization derive from the same Latin verb *colo*, whose past participle is *cultus* and the future participle is *culturus*. Colo meant, in Old Latin, I live, I occupy

---

[4] This refers to the Portuguese equivalent of interculturality, *interculturalidade.*

the land and, by extension, I cultivate the field. Bosi (1992), in his beautiful argumentation, points out that *cultus* did not bring to the fore only the recursive action of cultivating through time, but also the result of this labor - the cultivated. The word embodies both the product and the process. If *cultus* referred to what was worked on the earth – cultivated – that same participle also referred to what was worked under the earth – the dead – who must now be worshipped. Continuing the analysis presented by Bosi (1992), the future participle - *culturus* - means "what one will work" or "what one wants to cultivate". The term, in its substantive form, applies both to work in the soil – agriculture – and that which is observed in the human becoming in the world – culture (BOSI, 1992). Thus, when we encounter the question about culture, in everyday life, we usually refer to the set of behaviors of a human group in the face of the world. It is important to emphasize that the reference made is always a comment of an observer (MATURANA, 2000) and that different observers have produced, throughout history, different comments, thus constituting the historicity of this concept. Some of these comments express the different meanings evoked by the word culture.

A proposition formulated by Tylor (1871) conceives culture as the totality of human doing - knowledge, beliefs, art, morals, law, customs, habits and the other skills acquired by a given human society. Several authors have emphasized the acquired character of culture and emphasized the importance of the educational process and the historical experience of man in his relationship with the world. A cognitivist formulation was proposed by Goodenough (1957), for whom culture is a system of knowledge, patterns of perception, beliefs, action and evaluation. For this last author, culture implies the actions of knowing and operating of the human being in an appropriate way in a context and, at the same time, that of being accepted as a member of a society. If the concepts can be compared to the cognitive lens, the concept of culture is a "kaleidoscopic lens" that, depending on the point of view of the observer, the observed phenomena present themselves with different patterns and hues. Thus, as pointed out by Kluckhohn (1953), culture can be seen as a way of life, social legacy, way of thinking, feeling, believing and others.

Although all these conceptions can be accepted, in this essay we would like to highlight the contributions contributed by the Biology of Knowing, formulated by the Chilean neurobiologist Maturana (1992), especially with regard to the importance of language as a fundamental process of engendering culture and all its manifestations and adjectives.

Thus, for the Biology of Knowing, all human construction, ideal and material, takes place with and in language. The latter – language – arises in the history of our ancestors, in the

coordination of consensual conductive coordination that were established as a way of living. It is worth mentioning that, for this conception, the objects appear as linguistic distinctions, or rather, as distinctions of linguistic distinctions, although in this process the coordinated actions become obscured (MATURANA, 1992). Although our distinctions are necessary conditions to separate phenomena, systems and objects, the operation of distinction becomes so automatic and transparent in our daily lives that we become blind to our condition as observers, in language (MATURANA, 2000).

In view of the importance of language and distinctions for our argumentation, we will make an important warning to the reader, namely, that we cannot observe things for which we do not have a distinction. So, for example, if a person enters a forest, without knowing the biodiversity of its flora, all he can see are trees, without any specificity. It should be noted that even a tree is only a tree, in language. That is, every entity results from a linguistic distinction that highlights this unity of an environment. It follows that although we can see with our eyes, we can only observe through our distinctions. Thus, we humans, as observers, having different sets of distinctions, live in different cultures and even in different worlds of realities. In a broad sense, both man and world constitute a reference to each other. It is with this understanding that we are making this effort to reconstruct the concept of culture to then advance in the proposition of a concept for interculturality (MATURANA, 1997).

The initial basis of our analysis is found in everyday observations. Thus, when we encounter the question about culture, in everyday life, we usually refer to the set of behaviors of a human group (ethnicity, people, society) before the world. The group - as a cut made by the observer - emerges as a distinction, in language. In the same way, the world (ideal and material) also arises as an operation of distinction from the observer.

It is important to note that, from this relationship, the observer can only have access to the conducts and it is precisely these that, in the final analysis, as a cut of the whole, is called culture. The idea of "cutting out", or simply cutting, brings us back to the observer and his act of observing and making distinctions, because there are different ways of cutting and cutting the world in all or in totalities. As a totality, a system does not exist by itself, it exists to the extent that the observer specifies a boundary, physical or abstract, and, in specifying it, the system emerges, detaching itself from a medium, as a totality. Thus, it is the observer who points out the border where a collection of elements preferentially interacts with each other, bringing to the fore the pointed system and its surroundings (environment), consisting of elements with which the system can eventually interact.

If we accept that culture can be understood as a system, we would ask ourselves immediately afterwards, what elements preferentially interact with each other in a cultural system? How does the interaction of the elements of a cultural system specify a boundary in the eyes of an observer?

If what we have said so far has been accepted by the reader, we can now make a simple deduction to answer all the questions formulated earlier: a cultural system is produced by interpersonal relationships, that is, what preferentially interacts with each other, as basic elements of a culture, are human beings and this interaction is intermediated, essentially, by language. Thus, a culture is characterized by a linguistic network, that is, by a network of conversations.

In this perspective and according to our argument, if a human group maintains, recurrently, a network of conversations relatively durable in time, we will be facing a culture. As conversation implies both language and emotion, Maturana (1997) included emotions in the definition of culture. Thus, for the aforementioned author, culture is:

> a network of conversations that defines a way of living, a way of being oriented in existing, a way of growing in acting and in moving. One grows up in a culture living in it as a particular type of human being in the network of conversations that defines it (MATURANA, 1997, p. 177, our translation).

There is no contradiction in imagining that culture, as a system, can contain subsystems, or be contained in a broader system, having as its limit the totality of human culture. A metaphorical image for this understanding would be that constituted by the Russian dolls - "Matrioskas" - in which some can be placed, successively, within the others.

So, for example, when a human group holds conversations around food, recipes, eating practices, table ritual, group food preferences vis-à-vis other groups, what we connote as food culture arises. From the example of food culture, we can identify and/or configure other networks of conversations around: beliefs (mythical culture, religious culture); aesthetic achievements (architectural culture, artistic culture, film culture), knowledge systems (philosophical culture, scientific culture, university culture), ethnic reference (indigenous culture, Afro culture), interpersonal conduct (culture of peace, culture of violence), normative regulation of behavior (legal culture), set of techniques (artisanal culture, professional culture), man/place relationship (local culture, regional culture, national culture) and even interethnic tension and friction (cultural invasion, dominant culture, hegemonic culture, counterculture, acculturation).

Thus, in the context that we are discussing in this essay, language precedes and engenders all the characteristics previously pointed out as founders and/or indicators of culture – language, beliefs, conceptions, knowledge systems, norms, habits, customs, practices, actions, art, body-territory, objects and symbols. Thus, we advocate that it - language - is the generator of these same. To make our argument clearer, it suffices to show that language is part of the mechanism that generates beliefs, conceptions, and knowledge systems. It follows that language is a *sine qua non* for the creation of beliefs, conceptions, and whatever the system of knowledge—mythology, religion, philosophy, science, and art. In addition to its descriptive power, language is also an action and generator of actions. That is, with language we can describe things, but also make things happen, intervening in the course of events (EICHEVERIA, 1994). Thus, more broadly and in a more conclusive tone, language is the generator of any and all cultural phenomena.

Although the complexity of human cultural phenomena is not restricted to language, there is no place outside of language from which we can observe our existence and point to culture. It is precisely through the mechanism of linguistic reconstruction that we can have access to the non-linguistic phenomena of our existence (EICHEVERIA, 1994).

If we accept that a culture is a linguistic network, how can we differentiate between two interconnected or intertwined cultural systems?

Following the line of our reasoning, to differentiate two cultural systems, both constituted, essentially, as linguistic networks, it is enough for us to differentiate the networks of conversations. Although the same words can participate in multiple networks of conversations, the restriction on the use of some and the recurrence of others can singularize a particular linguistic network and even a culture. Beyond words, we must take into account the emotion of the group in its language and conduct in the face of the world. The interweaving of conversion networks can be studied in all domains of culture, such as religion (religious syncretism), linguistics (formation of jargon and creole) and others. We humans exist in language, and so all human affairs occur, therefore, in conversation – the result of the intertwining of emotion with language. Human existence makes any human occupation happen as a specific network of conversations. This is defined in its specificity by the emotion, which in turn defines the actions that are coordinated in it (MATURANA, 1997).

Thus, we conceive of interculturality as the process of interweaving two or more networks of conversations occurring, spontaneously or contingently, in a given geographical

space, with significant linguistic, cognitive and emotional exchanges, effected over a relatively prolonged temporal drift.

Education and Inclusion

To educate, in the intercultural context, is to include people from different cultures, some of whom have been historically excluded. If we take into account the teachings of Maturana we could affirm, in a generic way, that every educational act is an inclusive, ethical and loving act, since it is an act of acceptance of the other, while legitimate other, in coexistence. Freire would add the political dimension since social achievements cannot be seen, nor understood, as gifts.

In the social sphere, the concept of inclusion alludes to the act of including, for the level of full citizenship, people or groups that are in social vulnerability or marginalized for economic reasons, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, educational level or with some marker of functional diversity more exacerbated, or outside of what is considered "normal". Thus, inclusion actions try to ensure that all individuals in a given society have the right to integrate and participate in all dimensions of social life, without suffering any kind of discrimination and prejudice and, in addition, to enjoy the full exercise of citizenship. We have already had the opportunity to conceptualize citizenship in other texts (LIMA *et al.*, 2016; ANDRADE, 2019; ECKHARDT; ANDRADE, 2021) but it is worth reaffirming it here. Thus, citizenship is:

> the process by which an individual of a given society, as a political subject, bearer of rights and duties, fully and egalitarian exercises all the social achievements of his fellow citizens and, together with them, can conquer new rights (ECKHARDT; ANDRADE, 2021, p. 111, our translation).

Currently, the concept of inclusion has been receiving several adjectives – social, digital, school – depending on the look, the place and the point of the observer to a certain sociocultural dimension. Broadly, inclusion should be the norm of ethical conduct and public policies of every supposedly egalitarian society. Unfortunately, in class society, inclusion is always partial and marked by advances and setbacks, since it is the result of a permanent struggle of competing interests and classes. Seen in this way, even when one reaches a level of constitutional guarantees, one cannot let one's guard down to the conservative, retrograde, classist, elitist and racist groups on duty.

In this permanent struggle in favor of inclusion, it is urgent to produce arguments, conducts and academic productions of technical-operational, socio-political and ethical-

aesthetic order, in all areas of knowledge, with a view to guaranteeing, to the maximum, the inalienable right to the dignity of the human person, regardless of creed, color of the epidermis or functional diversity (PEREIRA, 2009).

The other side of inclusion is exclusion - a term used to synthesize the difficulty, or impediment, of people and groups to enjoy the cultural assets of the society to which they belong. Exclusion, as a process, can be indirect or direct, subtle or explicit, sublinear or violent, but it always manifests itself by denying rights.

The reverse process - inclusion - democratizes opportunities regarding public services, leisure, education, work, income and decent housing (LIMA *et al*., 2016). The juxtaposition of qualitative (digital, social, school) to the concept of inclusion specifies the domain over which we can observe and ask ourselves if all individuals in a given society, which calls itself democratic, enjoy the same rights and the same opportunities. Thus, for example, in modern democracies, in addition to basic rights, the right to information is intrinsically linked to digital inclusion, since information is increasingly conveyed by the internet. Attention must be paid, however, to the new phenomenon that threatens modern democracies – *Fake News*. This is because, if on the one hand the internet has facilitated the rapid circulation of information, outside the control of large corporations, on the other hand, with the advent of *Fake News* driven by robots, the effective value of information now depends on social control over these, but also on the ability of the subject to interpret it critically, a process by which education becomes fundamental. Without social and legal control to prevent the nefarious power of *Fake News* and without investment in education, all democracies will be threatened.

It must be understood, however, that exclusion/inclusion are facets of ongoing social processes, with the manifestation of conflicts between groups, parties and social classes. In this context, Freire's teachings on problematization and awareness gain meaning because, with them, "man is transformed, educated and reeducated" (BLOIS, 2005).

It is important to emphasize that awareness does not occur automatically, whenever the individual is facing a conflict. However, systematic problematization in the face of conflicts can facilitate "awareness" and, in the process, awareness.

> Awareness implies, therefore, that we go beyond the spontaneous sphere of apprehension of reality, to reach a critical sphere in which reality occurs as a knowable object and in which man assumes an epistemological position (FREIRE, 1980, p. 26, our translation).

This would explain Freire's insistence on the importance of educators-students to

predispose, together with their students-educators, to a systematic and permanent problematization, because, as he said: "problematization is to such a dialectical point that it would be impossible for someone to establish it without committing himself to its process" (FREIRE, 2002, p. 82, our translation).

Teacher education

From the epistemologies of Maturana and Freire we can deduce, and then suggest, that teacher education should be guided by the same principles with which it is expected that these same teachers can, in the future exercise of teaching, act together with their students. In this perspective, we highlight some of these principles extracted from the extensive work of Freire and Maturana: dialogism, loving-kindness, sensitivity, creativity, epistemic curiosity and criticality, all linked to ethical and inclusive guidelines and postures. We affirm this because, for both authors, the coherence between saying and doing is fundamental and the best examples are the behaviors experienced during the education process.

Many of the principles mentioned above, as well as the coherence between saying and doing, were addressed by Freire (1996), in a masterful way, in one of his classics - Pedagogy of autonomy: knowledge necessary for educational practice.

Thus, on coherence, Freire (1996, p. 62, our translation) states:

> Knowing that I owe respect to the autonomy, dignity and identity of the learner and, in practice, seeking coherence with this knowledge, leads me unappealingly to the creation of some virtues or qualities without which that knowledge becomes inauthentic, empty and inoperative verbiage.

We will now make some brief comments on some of the principles mentioned above, especially in the context of the intertwining of diverse cultures - interculturality.

Freire speaks of the need for teachers to respect the knowledge that their students bring to school, because they are socio-historical-cultural subjects, transforming their environment.

Regarding the formative process, Freire affirms that it is constant, permanent, both in the scientific and political aspects. That is: "it is necessary to know that all technical, scientific training is also political." To understand this, it is enough to ask oneself in favor of whom or in favor of what is investigated and practiced a certain knowledge?

With regard to the contents of the education process, it is important to provide future teachers with the exercise of dialogue and critical posture in the face of the themes to be discussed, including those inherent to teacher education itself. This exercise is important so that

educators-learners feel familiar with the discussion of significant topics of mutual interest. Although the content is fundamental and all the better if its mastery by the students is on a solid basis, we are convinced about the importance of guiding ethical issues as one of the themes to be treated permanently in teacher training. We highlight this because we believe that human development is not restricted to the domain of contents, whether technological, scientific or even philosophical. Thus, in the same way that the contents have to be learned and practiced during teacher training, ethics, cooperation and respect for each other should always be valued and experienced.

In this perspective, the University, as an institution of teacher education, must offer reflective spaces on the professional practice of students and, in this case, pedagogical practices must be enriched, based on respect for cultural and biological differences. Maturana underscores this when he states:

> The University is not a teaching center where one learns a profession as a mere practice [...] that is, the University disappears as an institution if its professional teaching does not take place so that the technical, scientific, artistic, historical or political knowledge is not concomitant with the practice of reflection and responsible action from an operating with social conscience, ethics and ecology (MATURANA, 1992, p. 218, our translation).

We will not stick to, nor make, comments on methodologies used in the formative process, not even on the "Method" Paulo Freire, because we believe it is a mistake to call the educational praxis of Paulo Freire as "Method", since this simplifying denomination covers the epistemological dimension and the strength of dialogue, through which the author conceived the mediation of the construction of knowledge by the learners-educators and educators-learners. Thus, dialogue, according to Paulo Freire, *is* "the loving encounter of men who, mediated by the world, pronounce and transform it and, in so doing, humanize the world for the humanization of all″ (FREIRE, 2002, p. 43, our translation). According to this conception, dialogue, in addition to including the ethical dimension of men's loving encounter, is able to delineate and cognitively explore the object of knowledge - the world - that challenges and mediates the interpersonal and communicative relationship. That is why the gnoseological relation, for Freire, does not find its end in the known object, since without the communicative relationship between subjects, around the knowable object, there would be no knowable act. It follows from this double function that none of the subjects of the dialogical relation can be objectified, reified or transformed into a mere depository of the content of the object on which one thinks. In this perspective, the intelligibility of the object and the communication between

subjects occur simultaneously and, therefore, the production of knowledge is not reduced to the pure relationship between the subject and the object of knowledge because, if it were, it would break the dialogical structure in which the presence of the other becomes ontologically necessary. Based on this understanding, Paulo Freire reiterated numerous times throughout his work the mistake in conceiving education as a mere act of transmission of information and/or knowledge of those who know to whom, silenced in educational action, is prevented from being more. From this understanding, he criticized the infantilization of adults and the mechanistic formalism of instructional practices that he called "banking education" (FREIRE, 1996).

In educational praxis, teaching is understood as an interpersonal, political, ethical, epistemological and pedagogical experience, built on the relationship between educator and learner, so there is no teaching without decency (FREIRE, 1996).

> Teaching is not transferring knowledge - not only does it need to be apprehended by it and by the students in their reasons for being - ontological, political, ethical, epistemological, pedagogical, but it also needs to be constantly witnessed, lived [...] I can't just talk pretty about the ontological, epistemological, and political reasons for the Theory. My discourse on the Theory must be the concrete, practical example of the theory. His incarnation. When talking about the construction of knowledge, criticizing its extension, I must already be involved in it, and in it, the construction, be involving the students (FREIRE, 1996, p. 27, our translation).

Freire calls for an autonomous teaching, self-aware, dignified, capable of negotiating and creating knowledge that engenders different cultures, in the context of educational relations.

> One of the most important tasks of the educational-critical practice is to provide the conditions in which the students in relation to each other and all with the teacher or the teacher rehearse the profound experience of assuming themselves. To assume oneself as a social and historical being, as a thinking, communicating, transformative, creator, dream maker, capable of having anger because capable of loving (FREIRE, 1996, p. 23, our translation).

Freire states that the "assumption of ourselves" and the "knowing more" does not mean the exclusion of others. Thus, "the otherness of not I, or of you, makes me assume the radicality of myself" (FREIRE, 1996, p. 23, our translation). In this sense, interculturality, as a process of intertwining networks of conversations, is the recognition of the existence of the other in what affects us, provokes, destabilizes, contradicts and provokes conflicts, but also in what diminishes the impetus of our arrogance in relation to knowledge, which relativizes and challenges us cognitively, thus justifying that there is no instruction or transfer of communications from the educator to the learner, although the learning of both, educator and

educating, is inevitable (VIANNA; ANDRADE; VAZ, 2021).

The emphasis on a special attention and even sensitivity of the teacher to the diversity of the cultures with which he works, including the linguistic expressions of the participants, should be used as research material for the production of didactic sequences and problematizations that, when elaborated, can be very fruitful, but, if necessary, can be changed, depending on the course and the context experienced in the educational praxis.

Final remarks

We present, in this essay, the theoretical construction of a proposition for the concept of interculturality, based on the concept of culture proposed by Humberto Maturana and semantic approaches. Thus, we propose that interculturality is the process of intertwining of two or more networks of conversations occurring, spontaneously or not, in a given geographical space, with significant linguistic, cognitive and emotional exchanges, effected along a relatively prolonged temporal drift. Aware of the limit of this text to address a whole discussion about cultural diversity in the context of a country like Brazil, or any other, knowing that the multicultural, pluricultural, intercultural and even transcultural debate involves theoretical issues but also political disputes around land, differentiated education and identity safeguards, as in the case of the indigenous peoples of Brazil. In this context, we opted for a theoretical approach, which emphasizes the generative role of language in the emergence, maintenance and engendering of culture. Aware of the incompleteness of our analysis, we do not want to end this debate here and we already propose to discuss the concept of interculturality proposed here vis-à-vis others such as pluriculturalism and transculturalism in concrete educational situations, in progress, such as indigenous differentiated education. We believe that the starting point of political action should be, firstly, the awareness of the existence of cultural diversity represented by indigenous peoples, migratory groups and even historically excluded populations.

Regarding the process of exclusion/inclusion presented here, we affirm, based on the epistemologies of Freire and Maturana, that every genuinely educational act is an inclusive act, since, for these authors, educating is the opening of a space of coexistence where educators-students are transformed into the dialogism provided by the recursions of language, that is, in the recursions of language and emotion. The emphasis on loving-kindness and love comes from our learning from these same authors - Freire and Maturana. The first affirms that love is essential to the educational act and the second extends the power of this emotion by affirming that love is essential to every social phenomenon, including, therefore, education.

With regard to teacher education, we corroborate with the authors with whom we dialogue in this essay – Freire and Maturana – when they teach us about the importance of dialogism, loving-kindness, sensitivity, creativity, epistemic curiosity and criticality. Considering that ethical concerns are more emotional than rational, we advocate that ethics should be a strong point of teacher education, as an experience and not as a discourse. This is particularly important in this historical moment of resurgence of the culture of hatred and clashes in the field of human rights and inclusive education in Brazil. The ideals of building a democratic society necessarily involve the awareness of the existence of cultural diversity, but also of the protective role that the Brazilian State, as a Democratic State of Law, exercises against the threats posed by ideologies that preach any kind of "ethnic-cultural purity" and any kind of discrimination of an economic nature.

REFERENCES

ANDRADE, L. A. B. Paisagem conceitual: construção teórica e o seu uso na educação. **RevistAleph**, v. 32, p. 178-199, 2019. Available: https://periodicos.uff.br/revistaleph/article/view/39313. Access: 10 June 2022.

ANDRADE, L. A. B.; SILVA, E. P. Dialética, diálogo e conversa: consonâncias e dissonâncias epistemológicas entre Freire e Maturana. **Revista Educação Brasileira**, n. 55, v. 27, p. 51-77, 2005. Available: http://www.biolinguagem.com/ling_cog_cult/andrade_silva_2005_dialetica_dialogo_convers a.pdf. Access: 10 June 2021.

BOSI, A. **A Dialética da Colonização**. São Paulo: Cia. das Letras, 1992.

BLOIS, M. M. **Reencontros com Paulo Freire e seus amigos**. Niterói, RJ: Fundação Euclides da Cunha, 2005.

ECKHARDT, K.; ANDRADE, L. A. B. **Um olhar sobre a inclusão sociodigital de pessoas da terceira idade a partir do Telecentro Helena Tibau**. 7. ed. Niterói, RJ: Pontos de Vista, 2021.

EICHEVERRIA, R. **La ontologia del lenguage.** Santiago: Dólmen ediciones, 1994.

FREIRE, P. **Educação como prática da liberdade**. 4. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1974.

FREIRE, P. **Conscientização**: teoria e prática da libertação. São Paulo: Ed Moraes, 1980.

FREIRE, P. **Pedagogia do oprimido**. 18. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1987.

FREIRE, P. **Pedagogia da esperança**: Um reencontro com a pedagogia do oprimido. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1992.

FREIRE, P. **Pedagogia da autonomia**: saberes necessários à prática educativa. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1996.

FREIRE, P. **Extensão ou comunicação?** 12. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 2002.

GOODENOUGH, W. H. **Cultural Anthropology and Linguistics**, Bobbs-Merrill Reprint, Series in Language and Linguistics, L 29, 1957.

HADDAD, S. **O educador**: um perfil de Paulo Freire. São Paulo: Editora Todavia, 2019.

KLUCKHOHN, C. K. **Universal Categories of Culture, in Anthropology Today**. Chicago, 1953.

LIMA, A. N. B. *et al*. Inclusão sociodigital e formação humana: caminhos para a construção de uma política pública em Niterói. **RevistAleph**, ano 13, n. 26, p. 14-28, 2016. Available: https://periodicos.uff.br/revistaleph/article/view/39147/22584. Access: 12 Aug. 2022.

MATURANA, H. **El sentido de lo humano**. Santiago: Ediciones Pedagógicas Chilenas,1992.

MATURANA, H. **A ontologia da realidade**. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 1997.

MATURANA, H. O que se observa depende do observador. *In*: THOMPSON, W. (org.). **Gaia – Uma teoria do conhecimento**. São Paulo: Editora Gaia, 2000.

PEREIRA, R. Diversidade funcional: a diferença e o histórico modelo de homem-padrão. **Hist. cienc. saúde-Manguinhos**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 16, n. 3, p. 715-728, 2009. Available: https://www.scielo.br/j/hcsm/a/9d7FrYfH46n8V9JPwGcQVTf/?lang=pt. Access: 12 June 2022.

TYLOR, E. B. **Primitive Culture**. London: John Murray, 1871.

VIANNA, B.; ANDRADE, L. A. B.; VAZ, N. M. Ensinar é impossível, e aprender, inevitável: comentários sobre a epistemologia de Humberto Maturana. **HELIUS**, v. 3, p. 1183-1227, 2020. Available: https://helius.uvanet.br/index.php/helius/article/view/158. Access: 10 June 2022.

CRediT Author Statement

Processing and editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação.
Proofreading, formatting, standardization and translation.