Políticas da amizade e infância. Dizer "sim" a quem chega: a possibilidade da hospitalidade na escola

Eduardo Rezende MELO[1]
Flávia Inês SCHILLING[2]
Maria José de REZENDE[3]

RESUMO

Partimos, neste artigo, da questão atual da inimizade, tal como discutida por Achille Mbembe, e seguiremos com Derrida, para compreender o que poderia ser e quais os dilemas e contradições – impasses – da ideia da hospitalidade. Haverá a tentativa de uma compreensão mais estrutural da questão, a partir do conceito de colonialismo interno (Pablo Gonzales Casanova) e externo, introduzindo autores latino-americanos (Rodolfo Stavenhagen, Orlando Fals Borda), em diálogo com clássicos, como Norbert Elias, Foucault, Derrida, Rancière e Simmel. E, por fim, concluiremos com o debate sobre a amizade e a imaginação (ou imaginações possíveis) institucionais, que poderiam responder – mesmo que provisoriamente – às questões da amizade, da hospitalidade, dos direitos humanos e da justiça.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Escola. Hospitalidade. Políticas da amizade. Solidariedade. Direitos Humanos.

[1] PhD in Law from the University of São Paulo in the area of Human Rights. Post-doctorate at the Faculty of Social and Human Sciences at the New University of Lisbon. Law Judge. Member of the Human Rights, Democracy and Memory Research Group. (GPDH/IEA/USP). ORCID: 0000-0003-3779-1814. E-mail: melo.eduardorezende@gmail.com

[2] PhD in Sociology from the University of São Paulo. Associate Professor at the Faculty of Education of the University of São Paulo. Member of the Human Rights, Democracy and Memory Research Group. (GPDH/IEA/USP). ORCID: 0000-0001-5126-8507. E-mail: flaviaischilling@gmail.com

[3] PhD in Sociology from the University of São Paulo. Associate Professor at the State University of Londrina (UEL). Member of the Human Rights, Democracy and Memory Research Group. (GPDH/IEA/USP). ORCID: 0000-0002- 3426-910X. E-mail: mjderezende@gmail.com

Policies of friendship and childhood. Saying "yes" to those who arrive: the possibility of hospitality in the school

Eduardo Rezende MELO
Flávia Inês SCHILLING
Maria José de REZENDE

ABSTRACT

This article examines the contemporary problem of enmity through the lenses of Achille Mbembe and Jacques Derrida, exploring the conceptual dilemmas and contradictions - the aporias - embedded in the notion of hospitality. We develop a structural analysis of the issue by engaging with the concept of internal colonialism (Pablo González Casanova) alongside external colonialism, bringing Latin American thinkers (Rodolfo Stavenhagen, Orlando Fals Borda) into dialogue with classical theorists such as Norbert Elias, Michel Foucault, Derrida, Jacques Rancière, and Georg Simmel. The discussion culminates in an exploration of friendship and institutional imagination (or possible imaginaries) as provisional responses to the enduring questions of friendship, hospitality, human rights, and justice.

KEYWORDS: School. Hospitality. Politics of friendship. Solidarity. Human rights.

La política de la amistad y la infancia. Decir "sí" a los que llegan: la posibilidad de la hospitalidad en la escuela

Eduardo Rezende MELO
Flávia Inês SCHILLING
Maria José de REZENDE

RESUMEN

Partimos, en este artículo, de los debates sobre la enemistad, tal como propuesto por Achille Mbembe. Seguiremos introduciendo Derrida, para aprender el concepto de hospitalidad y cuáles son sus dilemas, contradicciones e impases. Buscaremos, a seguir, una comprensión más estructural con el concepto de colonialismo interno (Pablo Gonzales Casanova) y externo con autores latinoamericanos (Rodolfo Stavenhagen, Orlando Fals Borda) en diálogo con clásicos como Norbert Elias, Foucault, Derrida, Rancière y Simmel. Finalmente, concluiremos con los conceptos de amistad e imaginación (o imaginaciones posibles) institucionales que podrían responder – aunque más no sea de forma provisoria – a los desafíos de la amistad, de la hospitalidad, de los derechos humanos y de la justicia.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Escuela. Hospitalidad. Política de la amistad. Solidaridad. Derechos Humanos.

Introduction

In this article, we begin initially by engaging in a dialogue with Achille Mbembe's (2017) Politics of Enmity. The categorization of certain population groups as enemies, intrusive, undesirable, and disposable lies at the core of the politics of enmity. Such labeling may result from both political and social actions and procedures. These classifications and labels permeate political and discursive practices, thereby producing and intensifying the enemy condition attributed to certain groups (Reis, 2020). Policies of enmity and hostility proliferate in such contexts, reinforcing subjugation, dehumanization, and injustice (Derrida, 2003a). Under such conditions, we are thus confronted with "an era of repopulation and globalization of the world under the aegis of militarism and capital and, as a final consequence, a time that fosters the exit from democracy (or its inversion)" (Mbembe, 2017, p. 21).

Is it possible to consider the opposite that is, the politics of friendship especially as a way to explore the possibilities, within school education, of engaging in other gestures, other dialogues, and other boundaries? We draw inspiration from Derrida (2003b, p. 69):

> Let us say yes to what arrives prior to any determination, before any anticipation, before any identification whether it be a foreigner, an immigrant, a guest, or an unexpected visitor; whether what arrives is or is not a citizen of another country, a human being, an animal or a divine entity, the living or the dead, male or female.

For Derrida, the politics of friendship are precisely those that do not arise from disparaging categorizations. They are constituted through social processes of interaction that dismantle the mechanisms of labeling that promote the subjugation and dehumanization of entire groups, subjecting them to processes of stigmatization and the increasing disregard of their rights. We will address the issue of the foreigner, the child, the one who has just arrived. The one who does not yet speak the language, who has not mastered it. Who violates the rules because they do not know them. How are we to understand this person? Who are they? Where do they come from? Who is the foreigner in the school? And what happens when the native, for lacking command of the language, is treated more inhumanely than the foreigner? What is tolerated in a so-called barbarian or foreigner that is not tolerated in the native?

This political relationship between childhood, freedom, alterity, and friendship calls on us to reflect on what can be done in school education. The school, as a social institution that reproduces the society in which it operates with all its possibilities for justice and injustice is often viewed as a machine in service of the status quo. As a social institution, it reproduces not only society but also its

contradictions, which can be observed in the ambiguous and ambivalent signals regarding both the possibilities and limits of schooling, as well as the promises of the universal right to learn a right that is, in practice, denied to certain groups living in conditions of extreme exclusion. There is no doubt that the school is also a space of hope for change, for freedom and emancipation, for the production of the new a place where the past is worked through with an eye to the future, anchored in the present. It carries within it both the reproduction and the potential overcoming of what we have today of current forms of injustice and inequality in a relation that is always tense and unpredictable (Schilling, 2013; Schilling & Angelucci, 2016).

What we wager is that, in the school, there are free individuals who work, mediate content and practices, and are capable of giving them new meanings. These are individuals who engage with knowledge—knowledge that is always open and revolutionary, constantly displacing us from our small world toward a larger one, enabling us to envision other ways of living and thinking. Access to education is a human right, and precisely because it is a human right, it inevitably brings with it numerous conflicts and tensions. Understanding the school as a social institution allows us to reflect on the tensions between reproduction and emancipation. And what would a just school be? Can a just school exist within an unjust society? (Schilling, 2018).

Based on these considerations, we will present the challenges of hospitality, care, and welcoming, asking whether it is possible to formulate politics of friendship. With this challenge, we continue to problematize what we have previously referred to as "political imaginations," which are essential for rethinking modes of action in a society marked by intolerance and inequality. New terms, new combinations of possibilities may allow us to begin imagining how we will live together, what alliances will enable us to overcome the current state of things of life, and of school as well (Melo; Schilling; Rezende, 2022).

Friendship and Resistance: How Can Hospitality, Childhood, and Education Be Connected?

Derrida (2021) teaches us that hospitality means the right of the foreigner, upon arriving on another's land, not to be treated as an enemy expressed as a right, a duty, an obligation, a law of welcoming. However, hospitality harbors a contradiction, for the one who offers it remains the host, the master of the house, the sovereign. On the one hand, the law of identity is affirmed; on the other, there is an essential relationship with the openness to what is yet to come hospitality thus remaining always at the threshold of itself. Our task is to reflect on the limits of this threshold, so that we may

Policies of friendship and childhood. Saying "yes" to those who arrive: the possibility of hospitality in the school extend openness to the foreigner without converting them into an enemy in an intentional experience that conveys to the other the sensation and the feeling of being an absolute stranger, an unknown, precisely where I know that I know nothing about them.

Just like the foreigner who symbolizes the one that raises the essential question of justice and the just (Derrida, 2021) the child also symbolizes, in the Arendtian principle of natality, the emergence of the new, of action as the essence of politics, the space in which the persistence of tradition and the fragility of creation come together (Arendt, 1991)[4].

Both unsettle the threatening dogmatism of the paternal *logos*, challenging the authority of the chief, the father, the teacher, the master of the household, the sovereign of hospitality (Derrida, 2021). Both represent the one who does not speak like the others, who speaks a strange language referring simultaneously to that which is ineffable and to that which is impersonal, shared by all human beings: the capacity for speech. And for that reason, not only can they aspire to a form of justice that borders on the divine (*fas*) (Benveniste, 2003), but they must also struggle to affirm themselves as political subjects within the realm of justice by subjectivizing the dispute in order to express the *injustice* (*tort*) of being deprived of *logos*, of not being counted as a speaking being (Rancière, 1995). We ask both to understand us, to speak our language in every sense of the word so that we may welcome them into our home. But if they did, would they still be a foreigner or a child? (Derrida, 2021).

Both, therefore, call upon us to address the other in the other's language, breaking with the idea of a general language that homogenizes everyone into a common tongue one that conditions the recognition of the Other as a speaking subject, unless they speak in ways that fit within our categories of thought and the frameworks we deem appropriate for decision-making (Derrida, 1994b). Both denounce the injustice of disregarding and devaluing those forms of political agency that emerge from domains deemed pre-political or extra-political, and that erupt into the sphere of appearance as if they came from the outside, as if they *were* the outside thus blurring the boundaries between inside and outside, between the private and the public (Butler, 2015).

---

[4] Childhood, freedom, and friendship are terms that intertwine throughout the history of language. Benveniste (2003) teaches us that both the Latin term liberi, meaning children, and the Greek expression παῖδες γνήσιοι refer to legitimate birth, which serves as the foundation of freedom. This etymological path leads to the later German derivation of frei (free) from the participle frijonds, which eventually gives rise to Freund (friend), thus revealing the connection between birth, friendship, and belonging to close-knit groups such as peers. After all, from the Homeric origin of the term φίλος , meaning friend as a designation for a possession (including children), grounded in a relational value based on respect or reverence (aidṓs), which calls forth a sense of collective consciousness, the term soon extends to the foreigner: to the one who, being outside their place of origin, is deprived of rights, protection, and means of subsistence, and who, for their protection, requires a pact of reciprocity and hospitality from those who receive them.

Both seek to resist and challenge the threshold of hospitality, aiming to denounce injustice, reclaim their environment, and say "no!" A "no!" that may not be verbalized, yet must not therefore be dismissed as mere noise rather than as speech (Boltanski, 2011) a "no" that expresses the minimal form of resistance (Foucault, 1994), such as sticking out the tongue or displaying displeasure through facial expressions that, in order to be perceived, demand proximity, as opposed to the distance required by objective discourse (Sloterdijk, 2012).

Both seek not merely to prove inequality, but to challenge us to verify equality as a potential equality inscribed in the legal-political order (Rancière, 2012).

This constitutes a challenge to create a dialogical and egalitarian relationship, breaking with the myth of pedagogy, the parable of a world divided between wise and ignorant minds, capable and incapable individuals, as a condition for thinking about the possibility of community (Rancière, 1987).

It is thus a challenge to demand that power relations change and change across all spheres of social life. And if they are to change, it is because they call for, on the part of the listener, a demand for courage from the interlocutor (be they a politician, a manager, a judge, an educator, etc.) to make an ethical distinction marked by creativity and innovation, by openness to the Other, and by the problematization of one's own identity (Foucault, 1994, p. 358).

Such openness must break with the ethical solitude and injustice that arise when listening is framed solely around what we want to hear, rather than opening ourselves up to hear something different from what we expected even when it threatens what we believe placing upon us the responsibility to invent new responses (Stauffer, 2015).

This problematization demands a rethinking of the limits of power as lord, as master of the house, as adult and teacher, and calls on us to conduct ourselves in accordance with that truth (Foucault, 2011).

It requires the elaboration of the hierarchies expressed in social life especially in relation to those deemed vulnerable so that we may problematize what, in shared experience, exposes us all to vulnerability, and to the ways of supposedly overcoming it (Butler, 2021).

For Mbembe (2016), care entails breaking with degeneration, cultivating interest in life; or, following Paul Preciado (2022), becoming aware, sharing, and struggling for change involves understanding that we are part of the very problem we seek to resolve that we are implicated in the relationships that shape us, even those to which we stand in opposition recognizing the importance of the resistant body, articulating heterogeneous differences without totalizing them, without unifying

them into identities or ideologies, and instead becoming a group of passionate intensity through which the desire to change everything flows.

Against the naturalization of subjection relations which are not demands of nature, neither for children in relation to parents or teachers, nor, even less so, for the "newcomers" (non-Western peoples) in relation to conquerors, who, if given the choice between servitude and freedom, would choose to be free what is at stake is reclaiming, with La Boétie (1986), the meaning of friendship as non-servitude (Chaui, 1986).

It is a matter of privileging the friend over the ideal of friendship itself (Passetti, 2003), of cultivating our capacity for mutual recognition, rejecting grand ideals and their idealized interventions in the name of bonds, associations, and concrete, potent connections that might be nurtured with the foreigner and the child alike.

This requires reclaiming the immanent bond between paideia (παιδεία) that is, formation or culture and the notion of paidía (παιδιά), play, whose root is pais (παῖς), child, from which derives paidía (παιδία), childhood (Benveniste, 2003).

This immanence and horizontality recognize that politics is a matter of saying, not of being (Cassin, 1995); thus, every measure of justice must be debated as a "better for" situated and contextualized in a comparative mode, in which each one must endure being métron (μέτρον), measure, criterion, requiring attentiveness both to plurality and to what is particular (Cassin, 2022).

Such attentiveness involves a resistant union with the suffering and injustice experienced by the other where taking a position grounded in alterity implies, at the same time, an exercise of friendship, of affection, of an intense bond with all of humankind, aligning care of the self with care for others (Foucault, 2011).

The militancy in the world and against the world, to which Foucault referred, is translated by Derrida (2011) as an engagement alongside the powerless, calling upon us to make a decision and to act.

Such engagement presupposes an awareness of the contingency of our communal foundations and a willingness to continually question their origins, without concealing or erasing their roots in violence, slavery, and the separation of those deemed dissimilar (Mbembe, 2019).

For Derrida (2011), the political sphere is the site of negotiation between the open set of present or presentable data and a regulative ideal as both promise and relationship with alterity, acknowledging the dissatisfaction inherent in the present and calling us toward openness to the event, the unforeseen, so that what is to come may truly be the arrival of the Other.

Is it possible to construct processes that promote friendship and hospitality, in relation to education, within societies diminished by internal colonialism?

If external colonialism gives rise to politics of enmity that intensify servitude, exploitation, violence, disregard for the life of the other, power imbalances, repulsion toward difference, and horror across all spheres of social and individual existence as Achille Mbembe (2017) warns this can also be observed in relation to internal colonialism[5] (Casanova, 2007, 2015), which likewise imposes modes of living that sustain all forms of exclusion, discrimination, prejudice, and violence. This undoubtedly affects every corner of social and educational life, from childhood through adulthood.

Authors such as Rodolfo Stavenhagen (1985, 1998, 2011), Aníbal Quijano (1988, 2005), and Orlando Fals Borda (2014, 2015, 2017) have dedicated themselves rigorously to understanding the challenges arising from the lack of solidarity and the deeply rooted structural violence that hinder the construction, in Latin America, of a "we-identity," in the words of Norbert Elias (1998).

The social, economic, political, and cultural structures that sustain both internal and external colonialisms express, according to Mbembe, the many forms of domination—"colonial, bureaucratic, patriarchal, authoritarian—that they carry with them. This is because social relations were forged within societies permeated by experiences of political violence and organized upon that legacy" (Reis, 2020, p. 254).

Armando Bartha (2015, 2017) emphasizes that internal colonialism, with its modes of domination, subjugation, and exploitation, reflects a close correlation between the grotesque form of capitalism prevailing in Latin America and global capitalism. The violence produced by inequality, and the brutalities stemming from misery, poverty, exclusion, and injustice—perpetuated by both internal and external colonialisms—fuel the machinery of dependent capitalism, as understood by Florestan Fernandes (1968, 1972), which ensures both the brutal exploitation of certain social groups and the extreme concentration of income, resources, and power in the hands of dominant sectors. For this reason, "external as well as internal colonialism can be studied through both rational and irrational elements" (Rezende, 2022, p. 31). Thus, the rational elements,

> are those that can be measured through a material and immaterial calculability grounded in profit, the exploitation of natural resources, the destruction of Indigenous and other original ways of life, the validation or invalidation of forms of knowledge, and the imposition of specific patterns of consumption, economic production, and the management of technologies

---

[5] "Se busca con ello destacar, en el interior de las fronteras políticas, un fenómeno que no sólo es internacional sino intranacional, y cuyo valor explicativo para los problemas de desarrollo quizá resulte cada vez más importante desde el punto de vista interno de las nuevas naciones […] donde existe una sociedad plural" (Casanova, 1969, p. 223-224).

Policies of friendship and childhood. Saying "yes" to those who arrive: the possibility of hospitality in the school of all kinds, among other factors (Rezende, 2022, p. 31).

Latin American thinkers (Casanova, Fals Borda, Stavenhagen), committed to uncovering the various faces of internal colonialism, have emphasized its emotional dimensions, as manifested in the actions and practices of different social groups.

> The irrational (or emotional) factors are composed of: various forms of fear, persistent feelings of superiority and revenge, desires to subjugate the other, prejudice, discrimination, ethnic and racial hatred, aversion to certain social groups, [...] an obsession with keeping entire peoples in conditions of social, educational, and political exclusion, an obstinate refusal to allow specific segments to participate in certain social or institutional spaces, impulses to reject certain identity groups, and urges to dismiss, marginalize, or render invisible individuals and communities (Rezende, 2022, p. 31).

Both types of colonialism external and internal produce societies plagued by lack of solidarity, inhospitality, animosity, hostility, and deep-seated resentment. These characteristics manifest in both objective factors (such as multidimensional poverty expressed in low levels of income, education, access to adequate housing, and healthcare services in general) and subjective factors (such as little or no expectation or prospect of reversing the material and symbolic violence embedded in all forms of destitution, authoritarianism, exclusion, and disregard for rights). Under the condition of internal colonialism, social life, in some of its dimensions, is anchored in various forms of irrationality (understood as emotional factors, as defined by Norbert Elias [1994a, 1994b, 1998]), expressed in forms of repulsion, hatred, contempt, and enmity "in which one [does not] see the world from the other's point of view" (Arendt, 1993, p. 99).

In Latin America, Africa, and Asia, prolonged processes of external colonialism gave rise to an imposing and recalcitrant internal colonialism a term that, according to Pablo González Casanova (2007), may have been used for the first time by sociologist Charles Wright Mills (1916–1962). However, Juan Vicente Iborra-Mallent and Daniel Montañez-Pico (2020, p. 1) challenge this claim and demonstrate that Harry Haywood (1898–1985), who understood racism as fundamentally an economic issue, had argued that the African American population was treated as an "internal colony." Thus, it was this Black American activist and thinker who first introduced the idea of internal colonialism—a fact overlooked by some social scientists.

The essential feature of internal colonialism is the production and reproduction of repulsion and contempt toward groups living in conditions of vulnerability due to ethnic, racial, economic, social, age-related, or cultural factors. Pablo González Casanova (1998, p. 45) asserts that Indigenous peoples, for instance, have their own "concepts of freedom, democracy, and justice," yet these notions are never truly considered in the design of policy prescriptions targeting these groups. And this

10

situation has not fundamentally changed, even when the most vulnerable segments of the population are legally recognized as rights-bearing subjects. Rodolfo Stavenhagen (2011, p. 179) notes that in Latin America it has been common for certain groups to be "subjects of rights, while [also being] objects of public policy," insofar as no effective spaces for citizen participation are created in the implementation of public policies and social programs.

Internal colonialism, like its external counterpart, sustains on a daily basis highly predatory, exploitative, and annihilating economic practices that target diverse groups. This occurs because the dominant segments both economically and politically lack any commitment to or empathy for a significant portion of the population, whether children or adults. Moreover, it perpetuates a sociopolitical process marked by the concentration of resources and power, which in turn hinders the development of channels of communication among different social segments. This situation results in nearly insurmountable obstacles to the formation of social and political institutions that are truly hospitable and welcoming to all groups in general, and to children in particular[6].

It can be said that such blockages potentially amplify the politics of enmity, grounded in both symbolic and non-symbolic violence (Mbembe, 2017). Friendship is understood here as a process of increasingly caring for others and for the collective, and as being rooted in solidarity conceived as an empathic construction (Gomes & Silva Júnior, 2007) toward those who are different regardless of their social, racial, ethnic, cultural, or age-related condition. This empathic condition, which should be cultivated through various means, including both formal and non-formal education, is almost always extremely difficult to achieve.Prejudice, discrimination, repulsion, and contempt render impossible and cause suffering for many children and adolescents, both in school and in other social settings, as they become stigmatized across multiple dimensions of life. This is because "internal colonialism corresponds to a structure of social relations of domination and exploitation between heterogeneous, distinct cultural groups" (Casanova, 2006, p. 241 *apud* Rosenmann, 2015, p. 40).

Norbert Elias (1998) argues that being empathetic toward people within our own group does not humanize us. The process of humanization occurs insofar as empathy is developed toward those who are different whether for economic, ethnic, racial, cultural, or other reasons.The lack of empathy intensifies the oppression and subjugation of entire groups; it is precisely here that lie "the roots of the dangers that human groups [represent] to one another" (Elias, 1998, p. 19).

---

[6] Norbert Elias (2006) warns that democracy can only exist when there is an effective process of power distribution. For this to happen, it is essential to open and expand channels of communication and political participation. Such channels tend to lead to "new balances of power" (Elias, 2006, p. 22).

The disregard for the knowledge and ways of knowing of diverse groups becomes a means of reinforcing feelings of superiority constructed by certain groups about themselves and of inferiority ascribed to other social, ethnic, age-based, or racial segments.This text will develop further into a focus on childhood, and for that reason, it is important to note that the knowledge, worldview, and perceptions of children are rarely taken into account in educational policies and school institutions.This neglect occurs not only in the school environment, but also across other spheres of policy and action directed toward children.

Rodolfo Stavenhagen and Pedagogical Pluralism as a Politics of Friendship, Hospitality, and Welcoming

First and foremost, it is important to highlight that the discussions developed by Rodolfo Stavenhagen (1932–2016) during the second half of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first on ethnodevelopment, subalternity, multicultural education, plural pedagogical practices, pedagogical pluralism, the welcoming of ethnic and cultural diversities, democratic integration, and a humanistic education aimed at demystifying internal colonialism make it possible to identify points of convergence with debates that emphasize the pursuit of politics of friendship, hospitality, and welcoming for children, youth, and adults.

According to Stavenhagen, the prevailing economic and educational systems in Latin America largely disregard ethnic, racial, and multicultural issues a situation that, since the time of external colonialism, has led to the perpetuation of a politics of enmity, as emphasized by Achille Mbembe (2017) in his book *Politics of Enmity*. In Latin America, policies of friendship have never been implemented for all social groups whether in the economic, social, cultural, or educational spheres. This clearly has direct impacts on the childhoods both inside and outside of school of those who belong to stigmatized ethnic and racial groups.

In light of this, Stavenhagen proposes guidelines for how to build political pathways that take the other the different into account, as collectivities that must be considered in every attempt to formulate inclusive national projects aimed at advancing social and educational justice. Broadly speaking, such projects could be understood as politics of friendship (Derrida, 2003a, 2003b)[7].

---

[7] "[...] The question of democracy leads to the question of the citizen or the subject as a countable singularity—and that of a "universal fraternity." There is no democracy without respect for irreducible singularities and alterities, but there is also no democracy without a "community of friends" (koínà tà tôn phílon), without the calculation of majorities, without subjects who are identifiable, stabilizable, and representable as equals. These two principles are irreducible to one another (Derrida, 1997, p. 22).

Given that centuries of external colonialism were in force, dismantling its consequences is a herculean task particularly as these consequences gave rise to internal colonialism, whose defining features are repulsion and contempt toward excluded groups of all ages, for reasons that are economic, educational, ethnic, racial, and more. It is evident in Stavenhagen's discussions (1985, 1998, 2011) that internal colonialism perpetuates inhospitable and unwelcoming policies toward various groups across Latin America, and that its impact on education is immense, given that the dominant educational model on the continent has long been based on the fiction of a nonexistent national homogeneity.

In this way, the assumption was solidified that schooling should develop the belief that the continent was formed by monoethnic nations a notion that served to "cover up the fact that these States, strictly speaking, ought to be considered ethnocratic States [...] [in which] only one dominant ethnic group imposes its vision of nationality" (Stavenhagen, 1998, p. 247). The essential point, therefore, is that "the social, cultural, and educational policies adopted by States in relation to the various peoples, nations, and ethnic groups living within their territories directly reflect these tensions" (Stavenhagen, 1998, p. 248), which reveal the inhospitality and exclusion faced by a significant portion of the population. The childhoods of those belonging to ignored and disdained groups are disrupted—and even destroyed by conflicts, hatreds, and inherited forms of contempt passed down from generation to generation.

Such education is inherently unjust, as it fosters, in daily school life, a conception of citizenship, justice, and law that constitutes what Elias (1994a, 1994b, 1998) referred to as a "fantasy of community", an imagined superiority of certain social, ethnic, and racial segments. Despite its fantastical nature, this conception inflicts profound individual and collective suffering on children from marginalized and devalued groups, effectively eliminating any real possibility of a just and inclusive school.

In his essay *Education for a Multicultural World*, Stavenhagen (1998) warns of the worsening of educational injustices in a globalized world, in which existing tensions and conflicts within educational systems are intensified by the ongoing denial of the specificities of entire ethnic and racial groups. This dynamic reinforces internal colonialism and its associated manifestations of repulsion, hatred, and contempt. Such "a highly complex situation represents a major challenge for [any] educational system" (Stavenhagen, 1998, p. 249) that seeks to expose the very tensions and conflicts that obstruct the construction even in the long term of educational justice. Achieving such justice

would require a break with homogenizing and mystifying educational perspectives imposed by dominant sectors and their practices.

"Democratic social integration" (Stavenhagen, 1998, p. 249) depends on an educational system that is receptive to pluriethnicity and the differences inherent in people's diverse living conditions. "Education in the twenty-first century must confront this challenge, and educational systems [...] must demonstrate flexibility and imagination" (Stavenhagen, 1998, p. 249) in order to find pathways that lead to the welcoming and hospitality of children from the most diverse social, economic, and racial backgrounds.

To make this possible, it is necessary to return to the following question: What "does it mean to educate and to be educated [...], to reshape the content and curricula of educational institutions" (Stavenhagen, 1998, p. 249) today? What are the challenges of "imagining new pedagogical methods and new educational processes"? (Stavenhagen, 1998, p. 249)? The author further deepens these inquiries by raising one of the most difficult questions to answer: How can we "encourage the emergence of new generations of teacher-students"? (Stavenhagen, 1998, p. 249).

The challenge is immense, since these new generations would have to be willing to confront all obstacles and setbacks in the struggle for educational justice and for a more just school so that pedagogical practices, daily school life, and the educational process as a whole might become more welcoming and hospitable for children who are stigmatized, disdained, and rejected for various ethnic, racial, and social reasons.

"A genuinely pluralistic education is based on a humanist philosophy that is, on an ethic that views, from a positive perspective, the social consequences of cultural pluralism" (Stavenhagen, 1998, p. 249).One thing is to support ethnic, racial, and cultural pluralism; another is to find the means to incorporate these elements into the educational process and pedagogical practice (Stavenhagen, 1998).There is a significant gap between the growing awareness in favor of pedagogical pluralism and its lasting and effective incorporation into school life."In fact, educational systems are themselves part of the game in these 'cultural wars' of our time" (Stavenhagen, 1998, p. 250).

"Sentipensante[8]" Knowledge and the Generation of an Alternative Cognition Grounded in Empathy: Pathways Toward a Politics of Friendship

Orlando Fals Borda (1925–2008) argues that the disqualification of entire social groups fosters the prevalence of an ethos rooted in stigmatization, defamation, and devaluation.

---

[8] An expression used by Orlando Fals Borda.

One may also suggest drawing a connection between Fals Borda's approach and that of Norbert Elias that such attitudes of rejection toward difference constitute a psychosocial condition anchored in narcissistic gratifications, which in turn sustain lack of solidarity, inhospitality, and politics of enmity.

How can such deeply inhospitable processes be undone? Among the possible political, social, economic, and cultural avenues, this section places central emphasis on the educational dimension.

Orlando Fals Borda (2014) offers a reflection on the urgent need to construct sentipensante knowledge, whose core lies in the inseparability of reason and emotion. Only in this way could educational processes take into account the diverse lived experiences that contribute to the "improvement of collective situations, especially [those of] the popular classes" (Fals Borda, 1998, p. 182, as cited in Suárez Fernández, 2017, p. XXX).

The combination of reason and emotion within the development of school-based knowledge would generate subjectivities (disposition, motivation, purpose, expectations, perspectives) capable of dismantling disqualifying conceptions of diverse forms of knowledge whether based on age, social status, ethnicity, or race.

This is because such knowledge would be grounded in the cultivation of a sense of regard for the other, the stranger, the different. The construction of school knowledge must therefore be guided by an understanding of the full range of experiences lived by the various groups and social segments present in the school environment, both individually and collectively.

Based on certain aspects raised by Derrida (2003a, 2003b) though without addressing all the demands he articulates a politics of friendship and hospitality in the field of education would be one that grants a place de facto, and not merely de jure, to the different[9], to the other. However, this place cannot be understood merely as a "hospitality of right." (Derrida, 2003b). To have a place is more than that it is to have the possibility of fully existing, both as an individual and as a collectivity.

The perspective of generating, through formal and non-formal education, a sentipensante form of knowledge capable of softening the deep scars left by internal colonialism has been compared by some scholars to the proposals of Paulo Freire. Both "provided fundamental tools for [...] questioning the persistence of coloniality in the domains of being, power, and thinking" (Mota Neto, 2018, p. 13).

---

[9] "In short, 'individualization' consists in transforming human 'identity' from a 'given' into a 'task' and assigning individuals the responsibility of carrying out that task and of bearing its consequences (as well as its side effects). In other words, it involves the establishment of a de jure autonomy (regardless of whether de facto autonomy has also been established)" (Bauman, 2001, p. 41).

A central element in political-pedagogical perspectives that seek to break with internal colonialism is the pursuit of emancipation. Education, as a cultural process, can reproduce both external and internal colonialism, as emphasized by Georges Balandier (2014) and Maria Isaura Pereira de Queiróz (2014). This is because education, when understood merely as instruction within a colonial setting, tends to reinforce modes of subordination of children and adults engaged in the educational process to dominant ideas, ideologies, and worldviews. As an antidote, schooling must find ways to engage with the cultural heritage of students as a pathway to constructing emancipation.

It is worth noting that Orlando Fals Borda and Rodolfo Stavenhagen, in their reflections on the construction of knowledge in the final decades of the twentieth century, expressed a belief in the possibility of devising emancipatory processes that would permeate the entire schooling experiencefrom childhood to adulthood.

One might ask whether such projects are achievable today. In his essay Has the Time of Emancipation Passed?, Jacques Rancière (2015) addresses an issue that has been repeatedly explored by social scientists such as Néstor García Canclini (1989), Heraclio Bonilla (2008), and Rodolfo Stavenhagen (2011): the issue of multitemporality. According to Rancière (2015, p. 89), "there is no single time, no singular temporality of the global process that subjects all rhythms of individual and collective life to its law. Emancipation occurs because there are multiple times within a time."

Latin American theorists have persistently reflected on multitemporal heterogeneities (Canclini, 1989) to demonstrate that, when it comes to the possibility of emancipation, there are both positive and negative elements. The positive aspect lies in the survival of a cultural heritage that may be mobilized, at different times, in favor of those groups bound by various forms of injustice. The negative aspect lies in the fact that this "juxtaposition of layers of reality, whose rationality refers to distinct temporalities" (Bonilla, 2008), carries with it authoritarian cultures and mentalities that are recycled and renewed over time. Throughout the historical process, such juxtapositions may gradually hinder the development of emancipatory projects something that is reflected across all spheres of social, political, and educational life.

Orlando Fals Borda and Rodolfo Stavenhagen appear to consider it possible even though Latin American societies are diminished by internal colonialism to develop political and educational processes capable of channeling part of social actions and practices toward the construction of a more just social organization[10].

---

[10] In the text *El campesino Cundi-Boyacense: conceptos sobre su pasividad*, Fals Borda (1956) offers a reflection on emancipation.

In the case of Fals Borda, this would be possible provided that participatory methodologies were developed ones in which those involved in educational processes (whether instructional or political) could, in fact, express their ideas and knowledge in such a way that these forms of knowledge would be regarded as the foundation of all meaningful action.Fostering the autonomy of children, youth, and adults amid the various hardships produced by extremely unjust and unequal societies is the path toward emancipation.However, this cannot be achieved without taking into account the social, economic, political, and cultural singularities of Latin American nations.

Fals Borda (2014, 2015) offers valuable insights for constructing an education that is meaningful to the various social and age groups often disregarded for their particular ways of being and sensing the world they inhabit. The construction of a just school would thus involve an educational process grounded in participatory action methodologies capable of engaging individuals in the co-construction of each moment of school life. Such an approach would need to be anchored in the culture, autonomy, personality, worldview, knowledge, and sensibilities of the diverse groups that share their experiences within the school environment from childhood to adulthood.

Questioning the role of diverse forms of knowledge both scientific and intuitive in the construction of more just educational, economic, political, and experiential worlds involves, according to Orlando Fals Borda (2014, p. 94), an appropriate reading "of concrete geographic, cultural, and historical contexts."Thus, universal knowledge must be combined with knowledges shaped by particular lived experiences, values, and cultures.What, then, would constitute context-based school knowledge? It would be knowledge that engages with multiethnic and multicultural conditions (Fals Borda, 2014, 2015).Theories, methods, and knowledge rooted in the social realities experienced by individuals would, in Fals Borda's view, more effectively facilitate encounters and convergences of different knowledges.Such approaches would help overcome both internal colonialism and intellectual colonialism, which discredit the use of diverse cultural heritages in the development of an education and a science that make sense to the children, youth, and adults involved in a given school system.

This does not mean disregarding the knowledge and wisdom accumulated by humanity over the course of history, but rather considering the multiple forms of knowledge, the various cultural heritages, and the diverse worldviews that are situated and contextualized according to each social and age group.

Drawing inspiration from the writings of Fals Borda, one can argue that creating the conditions for reading, understanding, observing, experimenting with, and unveiling the social circumstances in which individuals live may point to the path toward educational justice and a more just school for diverse social groups. And why is it possible to speak of a just school based on Orlando Fals Borda's reflections? Because such justice is only achievable through the dismantling of attitudes saturated with prejudice, repulsion, hatred, and contempt toward broad segments of society.Without a reconfiguration of the psychosocial framework one that can be reshaped through education it is not possible to prevent, within the school environment, the harmful effects of injustice experienced daily by children stigmatized for their social, geographic, ethnic, cultural, or racial belonging.

The *sentipensante* knowledge, which combines reason and emotion (heart and thought; reason and affect) of those involved in the act of knowing, is a promising key for envisioning policies of friendship in relation to childhood and schooling.This is because other dialogues and other possibilities may emerge, allowing the child to feel recognized, heard, and regarded as a subject within the educational process.Their experiences, perceptions, expectations, perspectives, and worldviews when taken into account can help redefine the school space as one capable of innovating in lifelong emancipation processe.

Friendship and Institutional Imagination

For Foucault, friendship invites us to imagine other ways of living ways of life that can be shared among individuals of different ages, statuses, and social roles, marked by a refusal of fixed identity traits.If the constitution of the subject is fundamentally ethical, then an understanding of ethics as politics implies that the ethical constitution of subjectivity may serve as an alternative to the subjectivizing practices of modern capitalist societies, even though such practices are not exclusive to these social arrangements.

However, while social institutions have, on the one hand, contributed to limiting the number of possible relationships since a society that allowed for the proliferation of such relationships would be more difficult to manage and control our challenge is also to imagine what kinds of institutions we wish to create, what forms of political creation and experimentation we can engage in (Foucault, 1994, p. 358), in pursuit of a new relational right that enables the expansion of possible types of relationships, rather than preventing or blocking them.

To think of justice and friendship in relation to childhood within the school space is to interrogate our ethical and political responsibility toward this other the child who stands before us.It is precisely because we are traversed by power relations and by the struggles of the present that friendship presents itself as a responsibility an almost aporetic one of attempting to decipher what is being said and to respond to the other, in a threefold dimension.

First, to respond for what is said, done, and what one is (Derrida, 1994a): in the case of children, this means recognizing them as a social construct that challenges the private, domestic, and voiceless sphere, affirming themselves as interpreting and world-creating subjects from the earliest ages (Corsaro, 2005). This also involves challenging power dynamics within adult–child relations, which serve as a structuring axis in class, gender, and race relations (the governance of populations through the governance of families, and the governance of families through modes of intervention regarding children) (Melo, 2021).

Second, to respond to the other to their question, to their demand thus assuming recognition as a matter of justice (Fraser; Honneth, 2003).

Finally, to respond before the law, before a tribunal, by assuming a political dimension that inscribes what is heard within the public and institutional political realm (Derrida, 1994a).

The discussion around friendship in relation to childhood thus calls upon us to pursue another way of doing justice (Derrida, 2014), another way of educating one that expands hospitality toward the other and toward difference. This implies accepting the challenge of finding intermediary frameworks capable of allowing the desire for and the law of absolute and just hospitality to effectively shape real transformations in law and politics, through revolutions and reforms, so that absolute hospitality may become as inhabitable as possible (Derrida, 2021).

Simmel stated that there is no thought, nor any politics, that is not anchored in sensibility (SIMMEL, 2016)[11], because society is an event marked by the dynamics of action and suffering which we shape and give form to (Simmel, 2008), through a process of division and differentiation, in which each release from integration processes leads to new forms of connection. In light of such a reading, Didi-Huberman (2021) challenges us by stating that those who resist and proclaim to the world that it is time for change cast gestures from heterogeneous, heretical times, capable of interrupting the normal course of things so that a new beginning may become possible.And to begin again is to imagine not as a denial of history, but as a way of problematizing historical objectivity, as if the

---

[11] The first edition of this work was published in 1892.

Policies of friendship and childhood. Saying "yes" to those who arrive: the possibility of hospitality in the school

"material" of history were the past, as if the past served merely to justify the present we inhabit a resigned present.Difference, the author teaches, only occurs if there is a gesture of imagination; and one only begins again because one imagines beginning again. There is no new beginning without allowing ourselves certain displacements displacements that offer distance, and a form of interaction that connects us to plurality and heterogeneity do agir (Didi-Huberman, 2021).

This effort to stretch the boundaries of hospitality and friendship is what leads us to the continuous challenge of life in democracy a democracy yet to come, indefinitely perfectible, and therefore always insufficient and future-oriented. It is an unpresentable concept that calls us to an experience of freedom and equality, one that offers a respectful test of this just friendship, beyond mere rights (Derrida, 1994), within a community that demands the ongoing experience of creating spaces for communication of singularities, which need to have timely moments for a just relationship (Agamben, 2013).

Final considerations

Hospitality, as emphasized in this article, is a responsibility that demands more than rational choices. As Mbembe teaches us, within societies that continuously multiply devices of separation and discrimination, the relationship of care has been replaced by a relationship without desire. However, there is no recognition without the reciprocal recognition of the face, the face of the Other not as identical, at least as close, in their capacity for refusal, in their capacity for struggle.Thus, the reconstruction of the common begins with the exchange of words and the breaking of silence, for it is there that creative intentions appear, with the disembodiment that allows us to make our environment strange, breaking with the given reality through the force of scandal (Mbembe, 2016).

We are, therefore, faced with an exercise in imagination, which is central to the challenges of moral theory, problematizing models of being and existing in the world and intuiting and imagining the possibility of being different (Mackenzie, 2000).If the oppressive institutional and relational context can limit people's capacity to imagine, emphasizing the possibility of imagination grounded in emotion, desire, and bodily sensations will provide the strength to rise psychically and address issues relationally, provoking recognition from others. As Didi-Huberman (2020, p. 10) notes,

> it was Hannah Arendt who recalled that setting the tone of time a question of beginning again, of freedom, and of sensibility was also fundamentally a question of imagination. Imagination, this common faculty, is necessary for time to become a poem or melody, a symphony or polyrhythm, so that it "recovers the color" by which it tends to assert its own tone (both tension and tone are, in fact, included in the Greek word tonos). Thus, imagination conceals this unique power of allowing the connection of different faculties, but also, in the social

space, of subjects with different thoughts or interests. It is, therefore, not only a condition for all knowledge or all aesthetic experience, but also for all ethical and political relationships.

By emphasizing the importance of political imagination in the processes of building justice, hospitality, and welcoming, we are not disregarding the brutality of the economic, social, and political relations in today's world, where conditions of exploitation, subjugation, and alienation (used in the sense of estrangement) are extreme.It is assumed that individuals, even under conditions of subjugation, can develop political imaginations capable of deciphering the many threads that make up economic and power relations.

In this context, the school could play a significant role in fostering political imaginations that challenge the many forms of subjugation shaping hopeless subjectivities regarding the possibility of even desiring a more just and less hostile world in terms of social, political, and economic life.A school that practices the politics of hospitality and welcoming would have profound effects on the lives of children, who could perceive possible paths toward another world not firmly based on rejection, subjugation, injustice, and fear.

References

AGAMBEN, G. **A comunidade que vem**. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2013.

ARENDT, H. **A condição humana**. 5. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 1991.

ARENDT, H. **A Dignidade da Política**: ensaios e conferências. Rio de Janeiro: Relume Dumará, 1993.

BALANDIER, G. A situação colonial: abordagem teórica. **Cadernos CERU**, São Paulo, v. 25, n. 1, p. 33-58, 2014. Disponível em: https://www.revistas.usp.br/ceru/article/view/89147. Acesso em: 19 abr. 2023.

BARTRA, A. **Tiempos turbulentos**: hacía subversión carnavalesca de un capitalismo grotesco. Trabalho apresentado na Conferência inaugural del 10º Congreso Ecuatoriano de Sociologia, Ecuador, 2015. Disponível em: www.biblioteca.clacso.edu.ar. Acesso em: 19 abr. 2023.

BARTRA, A. Capitalismo depredador. *In*: Barcellos, J. **Jornal Estado de Direito**, Porto Alegre, p. 1-6, 30 mar. 2017.

BAUMAN, Z. **Modernidade Líquida**. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 2001.

BENVENISTE, É. **Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes**: 1. economie, parenté, société. Paris: Les éditions de minuit, 2003.

BOLTANSKI, L. **L´amour et la justice comme compétences**. Paris: Gallimard, 2011.

BONILLA, H. La metodología histórica y las ciencias sociales. *In*: CADENA, C. (org.). **XX años de Ciencias Sociales**: memoria del coloquio Internacional. Ciudad de México: Colegio del México Ediciones, 2008. p. 196-203.

BUTLER, J. **Notes toward a performative theory of assembly**. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2015.

BUTLER, J. **A força da não-violência**. Lisboa: Edições 70, 2021.

CANCLINI, N. G. **Culturas híbridas**: estrategias para entrar y salir de la modernidad. Ciudad de México: Grijalbo, 1989.

CASANOVA, P. G. **Sociología de la explotación**. Ciudad de México: Siglo XXI, 1969.

CASANOVA, P. G. La formación de conceptos en los pueblos indios: el caso de Chiapas. **Nueva Sociedad**, Buenos Aires, n. 154, p. 42-57, mar./abr. 1998.

CASANOVA, P. G. **Sociología de la explotación**. Buenos Aires: Clacso, 2006.

CASANOVA, P. G. Colonialismo interno. *In*: GONZÁLEZ, S. *et al*. (org.). **Teoría marxista hoy**: problemas y perspectivas. Buenos Aires: Clacso, 2007. p. 431-456.

CASANOVA, P. G. **De la sociología del poder a la sociología de la explotación**. Ciudad de México: Siglo XXI; Buenos Aires: Clacso, 2015.

CASSIN, B. **L´effet sophistique**. Paris: Gallimard, 1995.

CASSIN, B. **Elogio da tradução**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2022.

CHAUI, M. Amizade, recusa do servir. *In*: LA BOÉTIE, É. de. **Discurso da servidão voluntária**. 3. ed. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1986. p. 173-239.

CORSARO, W. A. **The sociology of childhood**. 2. ed. London: Sage Publications, 2005.

DERRIDA, J. **Politiques de l´amitié**. Paris: Galilée, 1994a.

DERRIDA, J. **Force de loi**. Le 'fondement mystique de l´autorité'. Paris: Galilée, 1994b.

DERRIDA, J. **Politics of Friendship**. London/New York: Verso, 1997.

DERRIDA, J**. Políticas da amizade**. São Paulo: Campo das Letras, 2003a.

DERRIDA, J. Questão do estrangeiro: vinda do estrangeiro. *In*: DERRIDA, J.; DUFOURMANTELLE, A. (org.). **Anne Dufourmantelle convida Jaques Derrida a falar da Hospitalidade**. São Paulo: Escuta, 2003b. p. 5-65.

DERRIDA, J. **Politique et amitié**. Entretiens avec Michael Sprinker sur Marx et Althusser. Paris: Galilée, 2011.

DERRIDA, J. Justices. *In*: COHEN-LEVINAS, D.; MICHAUD, Ginette. **Appels de Jacques Derrida**. Paris: Hermann, 2014. p. 19-71.

DERRIDA, J. **L´hospitalité**. Séminaire (1995-1996). Paris: Seuil, 2021.

DIDI-HUBERMAN, G. La Imaginación, nuestra Comuna. **Theory Now: Journal of literature***, **critique and thought**, Granada, España, v. 3, n. 2, p. 5-21, jul./dic. 2020. Disponível em: https://revistaseug.ugr.es/index.php/TNJ/article/view/13931/pdf_1. Acesso em : 19 abr. 2023.

DIDI-HUBERMAN, G. **Imaginer, recommencer**. Ce qui nous soulève, 2. Paris : Les Éditions de Minuit, 2021.

ELIAS, N. **A sociedade dos indivíduos.** Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 1994a.

ELIAS, N. **Teoria simbólica**. Oeiras: Celta Editora, 1994b.

ELIAS, N. **Envolvimento e alienação**. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 1998.

ELIAS, N. Conceitos sociológicos fundamentais: civilização, figuração, processos. *In*: NEIBURG, F.; WAISBORT, L. (org.). **Escritos & Ensaios**. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 2006. p. 21-33.

FALS BORDA, O. El campesino Cundi-Boyacense: Conceptos sobre su pasividad. **Revista colombiana de Psicología**, Bogotá, Colombia, v. 1, n. 1, p. 74-83, 1956.

FALS BORDA, O. (comp.). **Participación Popular**: retos del futuro. Compilación y análisis de Orlando Fals Borda. Bogotá, Colombia: ICFES, IEPRI, Colciencias, 1998.

FALS BORDA, O. **Ciencia, compromiso y cambio social**: antología. Montevideo: Lanzas y Letras, 2014.

FALS BORDA, O. **Una sociología "sentipensante" para América Latina**: antología. Ciudad de México: Siglo XXI Editores; Buenos Aires: Clacso, 2015.

FALS BORDA, O. **Campesinos de los Andes y otros escritos antológicos**. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional, 2017.

FERNANDES, F. **Sociedade de classes e subdesenvolvimento**. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1968.

FERNANDES, F. **Capitalismo dependente e classes sociais na América Latina**. Rio de Janeiro : Zahar, 1972.

FOUCAULT, M. **Dits et écrits**. Paris: Gallimard, 1994. v. IV.

FOUCAULT, M. **A coragem da verdade**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2011.

FRASER, N.; HONNETH, A. **Redistribution or recognition?** A political exchange. New York: Verso, 2003.

GOMES, L. G. N.; SILVA JUNIOR, N. Experimentação, Política da Amizade: Alteridade e Solidariedade nas Classes Populares. **Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa**, Brasília, DF, v. 23, n. 2, p. 149-158, 2007. Disponível em: https://www.scielo.br/j/ptp/a/75c3B78sqgV9HypxRZM64Ss/?format=pdf&lang=pt. Acesso em: 19 abr. 2023.

IBORRA-MALLENT, J. V.; MONTAÑEZ-PICO, D. Los orígenes de la idea del «colonialismo interno» en el pensamiento crítico del comunista afroamericano Harry Haywood: crónica de una conversación con Gwendolyn Midlo Hall. **Tabula Rasa**, Bogotá, Colombia, n. 35, p. 89-114, 2020. Disponível em: https://www.revistatabularasa.org/numero-35/04-iborra.pdf. Acesso em: 19 abr. 2023.

LA BOÉTIE, É. de. **Discurso da servidão voluntária**. 3. ed. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1986.

MACKENZIE, C. Imagining Oneself Otherwise. *In*: MACKENZIE, C.; STOLJAR, N. **Relational autonomy**. Feminist perspectives on autonomy, agency and the social self. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. p. 124-150.

MBEMBE, A. NECROPOLÍTICA. Arte & Ensaios, Rio de Janeiro, n.32, p. 123-151, 2016. Disponível em: https://www.procomum.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/necropolitica.pdf . Acesso em: 21 out.2024

MBEMBE, A. **Política de Inimizade**. Lisboa: Antígona editores, 2017.

MBEMBE, A. **Politiques de l'inimité**. Paris : La Découverte, 2019.

MELO, E. R. ; SCHILLING, F. ; REZENDE, M. J. de. Imaginações políticas para um outro mundo possível. As contribuições de Sen, Fraser, Boltanski e Butler. **Lua Nova**, São Paulo, v. 117, p. 95-126, 2022.

MELO, E. R. **Direito ao desenvolvimento**. Arqueologia de um dispositivo na subjetivação de crianças e adolescentes. São Paulo: Intermeios, 2021.

MOTA NETO, J. C. Paulo Freire e Orlando Fals Borda na genealogia da pedagogia decolonial latino-americana. **Folios**, Bogotá, Colombia, n. 48, p. 3-13, 2018. Disponível em: http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/folios/n48/0123-4870-folios-48-00003.pdf. Acesso em: 19 abr. 2023.

PASSETTI, E. **Éticas dos amigos**. Invenções libertárias da vida. São Paulo: Imaginário, 2003.

PRECIADO, P. **Dysphoria mundi**. Le son du monde qui s'écroule. Paris: Bernard Grasset, 2022.

QUEIROZ, M. I. P. de. Educação como uma forma de colonialismo. **Cadernos CERU**, São Paulo, v. 25, n. 1, p. 19-32, 2014.

QUIJANO, A. **Modernidad, identidad y utopía en América Latina**. Lima: Sociedad y Política Ediciones, 1988.

QUIJANO, A. Colonialidade do poder, eurocentrismo e América Latina. *In*: QUIJANO, A. **A colonialidade do saber**: eurocentrismo e ciências sociais: Perspectivas latino-americanas. Buenos Aires : Clacso, 2005. p. 227-278.

RANCIÈRE, J. **Le maître ignorant**. Cinq leçons sur l´émancipation intellectuelle. Paris: Fayard, 1987.

RANCIÈRE, J. **La mésentente**. Politique et philosophie. Paris: Galilée, 1995.

RANCIÈRE, J. **Au bords du politique**. Paris: Gallimard, 2012.

RANCIÈRE, J. O tempo da emancipação já passou? *In*: SILVA, R.; NAZAR, L. (org.). **A República por vir**: arte, política e pensamento para o Século XXI**. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 2015. p. 73-100.

REIS, D. S. Políticas da inimizade, de Achille Mbembe. **Cadernos de ética e filosofia política**, São Paulo, v. 2, n. 37, p. 252-255, 2020. Disponível em: https://www.revistas.usp.br/cefp/issue/view/11855. Acesso em: 19 abr. 2023.

REZENDE, M. J. de. Los elementos racionales e irracionales del colonialismo interno en Casanova, Stavenhagen, Fals Borda y Elias. **Revista Central de Sociología**, Santiago, Chile, v. 14, p. 29-51, 2022. Disponível em: https://www.centraldesociologia.cl/index.php/rcs/article/view/127. Acesso em: 19 abr. 2023.

ROSENMANN, M. R. Pablo González Casanova: sociología del poder y sociología de la explotación. *In*: CASANOVA, P. G. **De la sociología del poder a la sociología de la explotación**. Ciudad de México: Siglo XXI; Buenos Aires: Clacso, 2015. p. 9-54. Disponível em: https://biblioteca.clacso.edu.ar/clacso/coediciones/20150112054546/01.pdf. Acesso em: 19 abr. 2023.

SCHILLING, F.; ANGELUCCI, C. B. Conflitos, violências, injustiças na escola? Caminhos possíveis para uma escola justa. **Cadernos de Pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 46, p. 694-715, 2016. Disponível em: https://www.scielo.br/j/cp/a/bxGqGm6PVSQWxzNKY94WFDn/#. Acesso em: 19 abr. 2023.

SCHILLING, F. Igualdade, desigualdade e diferenças: o que é uma escola justa? **Educação e Pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 39, n. 1, p. 31-48, 2013. Disponível em: https://www.scielo.br/j/ep/a/KxZpmcxqbSTc7QLCvw3cfVR/?format=pdf&lang=pt. Acesso em: 19 abr. 2023.

SCHILLING, F. Mediação de conflitos, justiça restaurativa: caminhos para uma escola mais justa? Dossiê Brasil/Portugal: possibilidade de uma escola justa e das artes de fazer o comum, coordenado por Flávia Schilling e José Manuel Resende. **ETD: Educação Temática Digital**, São Paulo, v. 20, n. 2, p. 325-342, 2018. Disponível em: https://periodicos.sbu.unicamp.br/ojs/index.php/etd/article/view/8650506/0. Acesso em: 19 abr.

Policies of friendship and childhood. Saying "yes" to those who arrive: the possibility of hospitality in the school 2023.

SIMMEL, G. **Individualismus der modernen Zeit und anderen soziologische Abhandlungen**. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2008.

SIMMEL, G. **Probleme der Geschichtsphilosophie**. Altenmünster, Jazzybee-verlag, 2016 [Livro digital]

SLOTERDIJK, P. **Crítica da razão cínica**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Estação Liberdade, 2012.

STAUFFER, J. **Ethical loneliness**: the injustice of not being heard. New York: Columbia University Press, 2015.

STAVENHAGEN, R. Etnodesenvolvimento: uma dimensão ignorada no pensamento desenvolvimentista. **Anuário Antropológico**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 9, n. 1, p. 11-44, 1985.

STAVENHAGEN, R. Educação para um mundo multicultural. *In*: DELORS, J. *et al*. **Educação um tesouro a descobrir**: Relatório para a Unesco da Comissão Internacional sobre educação para o século XXI. Brasília, DF: Unesco: MEC; São Paulo: Cortez, 1998. p. 246-256.

STAVENHAGEN, R. Repensar a América Latina desde a subalternidad: el desafío de Abya Yala. *In*: ARAVENA, F.; ÁLVAREZ-MARTIN, A. (ed.). **América Latina y el Caribe**: globalización y conocimiento. Repensar las Ciencias Sociales. Montevideo: Flacso, 2011. p. 167-185.

SUÁREZ FERNÁNDEZ, N. J. Coherencia e vigencia de la vida y obra del sociólogo Orlando Fals Borda. *In*: FALS BORDA, O. **Campesinos de los Andes y otros escritos antológicos**. Bogotá, Colombia: Universidad Nacional, 2017. p. XI-XLIV.

_____