

International Journal of Human Sciences Research

Acceptance date: 31/10/2024

EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF LIBERATION ETHICS. THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF ENRIQUE DUSSEL AND PAULO FREIRE

J. Loreto Salvador Benítez

Research Professor attached to the
Institute of University Studies Universidad
Autónoma del Estado de México

Yakeline Ruiz Gil

D. in Humanities. Social ethics
Autonomous University of
the State of Mexico

All content in this magazine is
licensed under a Creative Com-
mons Attribution License. Attri-
bution-Non-Commercial-Non-
Derivatives 4.0 International (CC
BY-NC-ND 4.0).



Abstract: Education is a political fact that reveals interests and tendencies; from philosophy and pedagogy the implications underlying it have been unraveled and criticized, in a sense of individual and social order-control, from the culture and formation historically speaking. In view of this, the idea and possibility of an education that contributes to liberation, requires changing the ways in which it has been taking place at present; it allows reflection to transcend those ways of how the world and society are conceived in the evolution of humanity; listening to its demands. The contributions of Enrique Dussel and Paulo Freire, around an education thought from the ethics of liberation, is a different perspective where listening to others is vindicated and in this proposal, to guide thinking about how to promote life and its reproduction. It is also a critique of neo-liberal education that regulates and transmits educational forms to the interests of the neo-liberal system, where what matters is to increase the rate of profit and compete with others to expand spaces. The reflection that is made from the ethics of liberation, is that the subjects can prioritize a world where for any action, life is always encouraged towards a praxis of liberation.

Keywords: education, ethics, philosophy, liberation, pedagogical.

INTRODUCTION

The education thought from the ethics of liberation is a new way of seeing the subject in its formation from the listening. It consists of listening, looking at the other as a person and relating to each other; that is to say, of service to the other that goes beyond the institution, where the liberating praxis will be found, because in this liberating ethic is found the praxis. It is the action that will lead people to the discovery of others and to try to do good to them; it could be said that they do good to themselves. To think education from the

ethics of liberation is to give a turn to what is being done today in educational institutions; since it is to see the agents of education as people, and not as subjects in the process of learning where only the capabilities are what matters. It is to look at the students' contexts of origin, what experiences and knowledge they have, and not only what the schools can provide them with.

The education thought from the ethics of liberation, is critical to the system in which we are living, in which we become aware of the reality with the hope that this will go towards a change for the good of all. It is evident and necessary an education with a perspective in the ethics of liberation, since humanity and Latin America in particular, are in conditions of change, in a crisis that involves all aspects of human life, and especially those involving environmental and social problems linked to the capitalist system, for example, water shortages, polluted environments, viral diseases, alienated societies, among other human ailments, which do not contribute to the production, reproduction and development of a good and healthy human life in harmony with nature.

Therefore, what is on the table for discussion is: Why education, being one of the vital exercises of society, has not been a fundamental point of governments? Why education has not functioned so far as a form of cohesion in society? These are pertinent questions in the light of the current reality. An education thought from the ethical and pedagogical point of view is relevant because it helps to see its importance in the thoughts of Enrique Dussel and Paulo Freire.

To think of education in terms of both is to make visible the poor, all those who find themselves in a situation of domination. An education that seeks the relationship between subjects, as well as freedom through awareness. It is under these premises that

an education is sought from the pedagogy proposed by Dussel; a way of educating *face to face*. In this relationship of an educational act, it is a looking at each other and listening to each other every time we look at each other.

For his part, Freire (2013), understands education as a way of decolonizing with respect to the ways of looking at and perceiving the world, as traditionally done in schools, objects (students) to thinking subjects. Education is fundamental to create beings who are conscious and free to make their own decisions; otherwise they would only reproduce the already established structures. That is why education, in the ethics of liberation, is a change that allows to see society from the human perspective; where the subjects through reflection tend to liberation. These subjects understand the situations they live and through reflection, they act towards the pertinent change. No longer that the educational institutions turn them into objects of the system, like pieces on the board, but that they become creators of transforming the conditions that prevent them from being free.

Another important element to rescue is the need for an inclusive education of decolonial character, because in this new educational process, we could see the attempts to change the neoliberal and colonizing education. Now we are already on a path that could liberate the minds of the students, but it is a difficult path, although we are already on it, one could say on the right path. The education of liberation would start from the real conditions of Latin American society, it would be critical; it would include the dialogue between diverse cultures, where there is not only a universalist, hierarchical vision, but a pluriversalist, horizontal one; not an unvicarious imposition of reality, but a symmetrical dialogue. Asymmetries occur when one culture wants to impose itself on another; something that happened with imperialism, and now with neoliberalism, because they are asymmetries that dominate

from the global and are particularized at the local level, through the governments in office who allow these policies to be internalized in the subjectivities of the students.

APPROACH

The educational phenomenon implies the commitment of adult generations, with beliefs and certainties that give shape and meaning to their ways of living their existence in community, in relation to their natural environments and in consideration of their historical contexts. It is a pre-occupation with sharing experiences and knowledge with the new generations; in this there is intention and content in accordance with the aims and purposes of each era, culture and society. To educate is to form in word and praxis; through the language and culture of the teaching processes. Education encourages and strengthens the spirit of the individuals who participate in it, making it possible to understand the universe of ideas and their theoretical references, in the sciences, and practices in the trades and professions. An educated person is situated in a specific here and now, in a moral context (normalized through uses, customs and traditions). Here we highlight the idea of freedom from an individual, historical and social consciousness that in the framework of education, it is feasible to lead to a liberation as an understanding of the socio-cultural, local and global contexts that control, alienate, exclude and marginalize others politically and economically. The possibility of liberation from an epistemically, historically, modern and religiously imposed vision that justifies an unequal and unjust state of affairs is a committed action in which the philosopher Enrique Dussel and the pedagogue Paulo Freire coincide, although in different ways. In the current global circumstances, the contributions of both thinkers, which we highlight from the perspective of education and ethics, are relevant.

OBJECTIVES

To recover the arguments that propose a (moral) philosophy of liberation, in the context of educational processes and systems. To vindicate education as a possibility of liberation, by learning and recognizing the socio-cultural, historical-economic conditions of common existence.

RELEVANCE

These are two contemporary Latin American thinkers whose contributions in the fields of education and ethics must be recognized. The validity of their assertions and theses are relevant for the analysis and criticism of the local, regional and global circumstances that condition the noble, altruistic and humanistic educational work of men and women committed to the processes of change and transformation that take place in societies.

METHODOLOGY AND ANALYSIS

This is a research work in the context of the Graduate Program in Humanities. Social Ethics (Master and Doctorate), of the Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México through the Faculty of the same name, which assumed the purpose of studying and investigating, analytically and critically, the contributions of the approach of the philosophy of liberation in the context of ethics and education. Although Dussel's work constitutes the framework and starting point, this work shows certain convergences in the philosophical, moral and pedagogical visions with the contributions of Paulo Freire. We have then a first link between both authors in the notions of ethics and education, which are theoretically and practically binding and not mutually exclusive.

PEDAGOGICAL THOUGHT OF ENRIQUE DUSSEL

Pedagogy implies the relationship between subjects; it studies the process of teaching someone willing to learn. Pedagogy at this point should not be confused with pedagogy, the latter refers to the science of teaching or learning; on the contrary, to speak of pedagogy is to refer to a part of philosophy that thinks of the relationship between subjects, face-to-face (Dussel, 1980). The subject is related to another, for example, parent and child, teacher and disciple, doctor-patient, politician and citizen, among others; which means that it indicates a relationship where one receives from another, an educational act.

Pedagogy (parent-child relationship) is an ethical way of thinking, that is, it is a matter of uniting erotics (male-female relationship) with politics (person-person relationship), that is, that the boy or girl educated in schools will one day be parents as well as responsible citizens. Pedagogy is a passage from erotics to politics (Dussel, 1980), because it is the path that every subject will follow. In this complex concept of pedagogy we will see that it is not the same as pedagogy; in fact, the latter concept is very limited and is applied only in school spaces. On the other hand, pedagogy has in its beginnings the relations that had in the conquest, which was a pedagogy of domination, because the conqueror exercised his control over the Indian; likewise, the political process took place when the Spanish encomendero violated the native and thus began the indoctrination of the conquest, with the culture of Hispanic-European Christianity, having cut the ties of their Amerindian culture and denied their indigenous imaginary. It was at that moment that the domination of Hispanic pedagogy was born, an ideological domination that created a mestizo culture, which was introduced from catechisms, schools and universities and created an imperial

European culture in the imaginary of another culture, popular and mestizo, a way of seeing the colonized as a lazy, ignorant subject and thus, consequently, to give them a just punishment.

Modern pedagogy sees the child as an orphan who wants to educate, in this case that child would be the people who have been torn from the arms of their mother (the Amerindian culture, the Earth) to be educated as a being who has no conditions, because if they had them, their dominating action would have oppositions. The new subjects seen from the *tabula rasa* as Rousseau maintained, without popular culture, are orphans, without a dominating father and without a denied mother, hence the father would be replaced by the father-State; that is to say, the pedagogical domination, which kills all culture and installs in the minds of the son-people a bureaucratic ideology, which is, as Dussel explained it, a *filicide*, when the son is killed, or the death of the people as a *plebicide*¹ (Dussel, 1980), therefore, the State fulfills the function of the parents through the teacher who would occupy the role of the parents, because they could damage the minds of the children and thus make up for the weaknesses that these provoke; Thus was born the modern pedagogical institution, the school of the imperial State, to later pass to the neocolonial institution that always denied the different of the subjects, that is to say, the other culture, the autochthonous or indigenous.

So, it produces this orphan of modern pedagogy or domination. They seek in those children of the peripheries, neocolonial orphans, to mold their thoughts to their image and likeness of domination and now does it through television and social networks, where the new generations are learning that the greatest value is measured in dollars, that the most important thing is money and generate

1. This term used by Dussel applies when the people are exterminated, just as in *filicide* the child is murdered; or in *ecocide*, the diversity of life in ecosystems is attacked.

capital to be happy, which is still happening in educational institutions, where that thinking abounds with the discourse of entrepreneurs, when they say that any subject graduated from an educational institution can create a company.

To overcome this pedagogy of domination or pedagogical ontology is, with a pedagogy of liberation, because the first considers the child-disciple as an entity in which knowledge, attitudes, capacities must be deposited from the teacher. In this framework, domination encloses the child within this totality and alienates him to the dominating discourse, that is to say, to “the same” of what the father is, of the teacher or of the system that he already is. On the contrary, the project of the pedagogy of liberation is to open up to a beyond this ontological project in force, a transmodernity, where the Other is the child who opens up beyond this ontological being and constitutes another world and another man or better: the Other. The son who is different, not different, someone new who is no longer an orphan as in Rousseau’s *Emile*, of the current pedagogy, but is the Other of the pedagogy of liberation and who relieves himself against the other dominant pedagogies where the sons are sons of nothingness; This Other does have a mother who is the native Indian, the popular culture that was born from her and has a father, colonized or oppressed and murdered by the Spanish, it also has a memory, which helps to reflect on its situation, because it has origins, not like the Emilio who has everything taken away from him, his father, his mother and his culture.

Therefore, the pedagogy that is the face-to-face, implies respect for the Other; it is the different original creation, that Dussel would call “different” never “the same”, it is different in its sense of historical novelty (Dussel, 1980), that does not return to him what

once dominated him, ontology or totality. That Other is going to be a new son that overcame the death of Parmenides' ontology when he affirms that, "being is, non-being is not" (Dussel, 1974). When it is said that the Other is something new, it means that he has overcome that totality that had dominated him and that makes him believe, through the father or the teacher or the State, that everything it provides him is good for him, but without critical conscience, that is to say, that it imposes its ideology through a pedagogical ideal of the liberal neocolonial State, which would be of an imperial universal type.

The disciple, the child or the new Other, who is the other son of the father and mother, was the being of the anti-Emilio, that is to say, that this child is not an orphan, but has a father and a mother, although this father is a repressor. It is necessary to recognize that this world was colonial, that it was a people of Christendom, that we were and are children of that dark history. By accepting our origins and by forgiving our parents, we could be a new Other, different, by assuming this force of the new Other, a renewed hope could begin, because in that assuming all the stories of that colonial life could liberate the Other, the son, the people.

In education from the perspective of the ethics of liberation, the teacher's duty is to listen to the Other-disciple's word; to listen to him to the point of exhaustion, to help and liberate him, to believe in the faith of his word (Dussel, 1980). Such pedagogy goes beyond the teacher-disciple relationship, as it encompasses all relationships between subjects. They are pedagogical relationships, where the voice of the Other is heard and not only seeks its own benefit, its own personal project, as for example in the doctor, who seeks in his domineering discourse to promote his knowledge through the exploitation of the disease, forgetting that his essence is that the

sick person recovers his health. Therefore, the proposed education, although it would be given in school spaces, goes beyond it, because the students will someday go out and face real life, where this type of education with an ethical perspective and liberation, will be more relevant and supportive.

Pedagogy seeks in its essence, the service to the other, to the needy; that its knowledge helps the Other, from its listening, no longer from the personal project, but from its silence to liberate him. However, in these times where the heritage of history has not been good with the Other, with the disciple, he is confronted with a society that manifests corruption, insecurity, oppression of some classes over others, but among these there are young people who carry out studies on these situations. For this reason, these young conscious subjects are the ones that generate the universities, because it is there where the social criticism could begin, where these new generations are born that are going to question this system, which in its dominant pedagogy will try to silence and suppress, with disappearances, assassinations or tortures .

Now, the Other who is the teacher, could speak to announce the critical path to the disciple; that is to say, from his questioning voice to show him his own reality in order to lead him towards the future. In this sense, the master seeks to give the disciple, student, young person, new forms, critical processes; new refers to what the disciple, student, young person already was. What the teacher will propose in this new path is the critical sense through pedagogy, because it will help him/her to discern what the dominating system has put in his/her head and denies it as something new, and because in this alienation they affirm themselves as the Same of the dominating system.

To understand what the teacher can give to the student, disciple or people, which is to discern between what the dominating system has given for more than a hundred years to a colonized person, putting masks on a beautiful and autochthonous face, to the Other, and to show him distance, to make him see that Alterity should be valued and that is the task of the teacher (Dussel, 1980). In this sense, the teacher does not seek a pedagogical contract as in *Emilio*, in which the student should obey him; here it is about listening to the student from what he already is, because he has a culture, the culture that the mother has given him and is unique as Other; a new history, which through pedagogy will be remembered and will be defined as something different from its particularity and that had been denied and repressed. Latin American pedagogy, by listening to the voice and feelings of all, the others, intends to attend, to pay attention to those who are in a situation of exclusion and marginalization, who wish to speak from their suffering with the hope of being heard.

THE CRITICAL ANALYTIC MOMENT IN LIBERATION ETHICS

The critical analytic moment is achieved by human freedom, by that peculiarity it possesses, in which it contributes a history, a culture from its freedom. Analectic indicates the real human fact and is situated in that beyond (*aná*) of the horizon of Totality, which goes beyond dialectics, because this goes from the same to the same, passage from one totality to another totality (Dussel, 1974). On the other hand, the analytic moment opens to the Other from exteriority, that is to say, that Other that is outside totality, therefore, it is a new path, that of the exteriority of the other. It is a method because it is practical and not only theoretical and in this sense, it is ethics (Dussel, 1974, p. 181) what makes it human, because it possesses freedom, which

in the praxis of liberation has the conditions to understand the interpellation of the other through which it accesses this exteriority and this is also a critical condition.

In order to analyze what the analytic moment consists of, it is necessary to indicate that it will now be an essential method in all philosophy and ethics of liberation. The best known and most used method in philosophy and science is the dialectical or ontological method, which speaks precisely about the horizon of the world, the understanding of being and more properly the essential Heideggerian thinking or also called the identity of the concept in and for itself as absolute idea in Hegel: “the thinking that thinks thinking” (Dussel, 1973b, p. 156). The meaning of the Hegelian dialectic is that it shows itself as a passage from one totality to another totality. But in order to think beyond the ontological dialectic, the Identity or Totality, it is intended to move towards an anthropological moment in which it allows to affirm a philosophical, meta-physical, ethical or alterative thinking.

Between the thinking of the Heideggerian or Hegelian totality, in which one mentions the finitude and the other the absolute, as well as the positive revelation of God in the theological word, that is, of faith, we want to show that faith can be an anthropological position, a thinking in which one could affirm the discovery of the other, the face-to-face anthropologically, that is, between subjects, for example: the erotic in relationship of male and female, of the pedagogical relationship of parents and children, and that of the political relationship of brother/sister to brother/sister or person to person, and therefore there is a philosophy in revelation and anthropological faith, this is between the dialectical ontology of totality and the theology of supernatural faith.

At this moment we would be speaking of a pedagogical liberation analectic, of an anthropological ethics or a historical meta-physics in Dussel's words; which would no longer be an ontology of Identity or Totality, but rather that people are different. There have been criticisms to the Hegelian dialectic, such as those of Feuerbach, Marx and Kierkegaard, as well as to the Heideggerian ontology as was E. Lévinas; but Dussel looks for the way to overcome them from Latin America, and states that they "are the pre-history of Latin American philosophy" (Dussel, 1973b, p.156), since we could not count on the European thought of Kant, Hegel or Heidegger because they saw us as objects or things in their world, and neither could we count on the imitative thought of the thinkers of America because their philosophy was inauthentic, and what can we say of the Latin American critics of Hegel who were also inauthentic (Dussel, 1973b).

According to Dussel, who was one of those who proposed this new analytical method, the only authentic critics of the dominant thought were Europeans, and those born in the historical movements of liberation in Latin America. As a consequence of the above, for example, we have it in Dussel's overcoming of the dialectical ontology of the Identity of being and thinking through the possibility of listening to the provocative word of the Other, the Latin American oppressed in the Totality (as a political-ideological system); and in this way Latin American philosophy is born, which will be analogical (Dussel, 1973a).

Therefore, existence is perceived and not thought, that is reality and that reality is a man for another man, because its essence is community, a community where an I and a you can dialogue, that is real existence. At this point the young Marx described it not only as "the sensible" and beyond reason, but as "what is produced" (Dussel, 1973b) beyond mere sensibility, that is, that reality is not what is

given, but that it must be produced, that is, by man and for it to be given, it must be worked.

In this sense, the overcoming will lie in re-thinking everything from Latin America and from the analogy. Lévinas with his work *Totality and Infinity*, in the face-to-face, in which the face of the other is the one that interpellates him, where man reveals himself and speaks; this is the anthropological moment and is beyond thinking, beyond *logos* or beyond the foundation, beyond identity; However, it is here where Dussel sees the limitation of Lévinas, and it is that this Other is "absolutely" other, then this tends to equivocity, because as they are thoughts of different worlds they could not communicate, nevertheless, this Other could be an Indian, a woman, a wage earner, an Afro-Mexican or a Latin American with respect to the European Totality and that with time could come to communicate.

When the analectic claims to speak of the Other, it does not refer to a single man, but refers to a community, a family, a people, or humanity, beyond the absolute Other, because this face of the Other Dussel called it an *aná-logos*, which indicates that, "he is already the first and supreme *word*, he is the essential signifying gesture, he is the content of all possible signification in act" (Dussel, 1973b, p. 162). When Dussel speaks of the anthropological significance of the Other, it is there where his Latin American contribution is found, the face of the poor, the dominated Indian, the oppressed mestizo, the mestizo oppressed, salaried by the capitalist system; this is the theme of Latin American philosophy. The analytic thinking is the thinking of the oppressed, the thinking of the Other who is outside the system of totality and has the possibility of creating the new.

To speak of analogy is to speak of many universes and thoughts, that is, pluriversity; and it is in the analogy that Dussel describes that diversity that exists between universalist

univocity and pluriversalist analogy. The universalist univocity alludes to identity/difference and the pluriversality of the analogy to similarity/distinction, the latter seeking a dialogue with other cultures and that each of them has that claim to truth and with it the validity so much sought by the groups or communities that are in discussion so that they can reach agreements, through consensus in conditions of symmetry, that is, that each of the members have the same conditions and opportunities for argumentation.

In this case, it is not that there are many truths, but that each arguer or member of that communication community has different similar interpretations, common among the members, but never identical in that reality that the members of that community live. This is why education from this referential framework helps to understand why it is necessary to listen to all students, teachers and all those who are in educational institutions, because there are many thoughts, a pluriverse of worlds, with distinctions in their thinking, but by talking and dialoguing we could reach agreements that always allow to improve education and therefore, social situations.

ANALOGY AS A METHOD OF LIBERATION IN EDUCATION

Although we have already mentioned in the previous section the analectical moment of the ethics of liberation, it has been considered important to analyze the middle point of univocity and equivocity, and that is analogy as language, which could be present in education. Analogy acts between two terms; that which is similar, but not identical, and in something that is different, but not different. There are three concepts that, according to Dussel, must be reflected upon: difference, which refers to univocal identity; distinction, which alludes to analogical similarity; and diversity, which indicates the unequal nature

of the aforementioned concepts. When the concept of difference is affirmed, which corresponds to that of identity, it could be said that it does not exist in people who can think identically, but by similarity, in the sense of what is spoken, because in the world of the subjects they could have different meanings and, therefore, similar and this could lead them to the understanding of what is said during the time of dialogue.

Thus univocity, supposes the reduction of what is said and equivocity is rather ambiguous, that is to say, that it does not have common meanings, this is why analogy will give balance to these two concepts and will make possible within the communication between people a greater flexibility and richness in the dialogues between worlds and human realities that occur over time, That is to say, that when these dialogues occur over time they will expand and the common or similar will grow, therefore the dialogue and the meaning of the words will open up towards the Other, that is, towards the subjects that had never been heard before.

Neither the univocity of identity that specifies differences, nor the incomprehensibility of equivocity, but rather, the polysemic language of analogy that approaches people under the similarity and allows a consensus with respect and tolerance of their analogical distinctions from the Other.

In this sense, the logic that has led Totality with univocal identity/difference is confronted with the logic of otherness of analogical similarity/distinction, which is expressed in all inter-human dialogue, and it is that the univocal reason of modernity will be confronted with the analogical reason that seeks a dialogue between cultures . With the latter, there could be possibilities of a human and ethical dialogue within educational institutions where communication and participation of educational actors is the basis for liberation.

For this reason, it is necessary to think of this logic of analogy as the method of the philosophy and ethics of liberation, which is proper to speak of it as Enrique Dussel has been enunciating since the end of the sixties, with his critique of totality and with it, of identity that we have been expressing throughout these paragraphs. "Identity is given as totality of internal differences" (Dussel, 2020, p. 61) that is, that totality as identity has in it the differences, and that these differences will never recognize the otherness of the other with respect to identity, because for the latter it will always be the same as for the differences.

Then, the elements identity/difference would be those that compose univocity as the signified whole (Dussel, 2020); on the other hand, for similarity/distinction it would be the commonality of analogy. In the logic of univocity, being is "the same" and entities are its distinctions, different ways of predicating "the same" or being, which are identity, although this has also been given throughout the ontologies of native peoples of America, in the Hindustani and Chinese cultures as univocal traditions (Dussel, 2020).

Thinking from analogy as a method to solve problems and in this case the educational and ethical ones, it is necessary to think in this culture of liberation through the analogical; it can make use of the dialogue between diverse worlds, with subjects of various cultures and enter into communication; since as people we find ourselves in different cultures, families, communities and countries. Analogy could help to think the diversity of thoughts. Identity is rather a monosemic form, which goes in a single meaning, in a single sense, different case that among people of different cultures it

2. A critique as an overcoming of Heideggerian thought can be read in Franco Berardi (Bifo), who finds a nucleus in "the reactionary hyperhumanist tradition that starts with Schopenhauer, passes through Nietzsche and finds its definitive form in Heidegger. [...] [the latter, says Berardi]...a black magician, a bad alchemist who distills poisonous conceptual substances and injects them into cultural perception. [...] ...His perspective reduces humanity to the authentic, and all he manages to see is the decline of authenticity, the dissolution of that small world in which he developed his own life experience." *Futurability. La era de la impotencia y el horizonte de la posibilidad*; Caja Negra, Bs. , 2019, pp. 69,70.

is difficult to think in a single meaning.

The analogy is no longer touched within the canons of philosophy, until the philosophy of liberation takes it up again from the otherness and speaks to us of the Other, which goes beyond the totality of the current world of Heidegger and Hegel; it goes towards the world that E. Levinas proposes with his work *Totality and Infinity. Essay on exteriority*, which transcends the world of Heidegger² and ontology.

Although this work of Levinas seems to be situated beyond Heidegger's being, it encounters the infinite distance of incommunicability, when the humans of a culture could not communicate with other humans for being, as Levinas says, "absolutely other", this fact will serve Dussel and he will go in search of the logic of analogy, which would help him to interpret and qualify the absolutely other, and to understand through analogy those similarities that could be found in the saying of the Other; because in this sense, the saying in the word, and the listening, is where the beginning of alterity is given, and this alter speaks to us of the Other that goes beyond the totality of the world in the Heideggerian sense.

This is why the analogy that Dussel speaks of is that what is said is understood, that is, that the one who questions with words can reach the listener and that the listener can interpret it by similarity with what is said by the Other, according to the experiences of the listener. In the Other their meanings can or have distinctions with the words of the listener, however, thanks to the analogy this dialogue can approach the meaning by resemblance with the mutual dialogue and reach the common. In this meaning is what Dussel called the analogy of the word or

analogy verbi (2020), because in each group of dialogues between different participants and from different fields of action, dialogues can be established and there we see the analogy and not the univocal identity (Dussel, 2020).

Gadamer also called this, quoted in Dussel, “fusion of horizons” (Dussel, 2020), which is nothing more than the process of *growth of similarity*, which begins at the beginning with less communicability and as the dialogue takes place, the similarity or commonality of the different worlds increases, but there will never be full identity among the participants, because they will always remain analogically different, that is to say, that in this community of dialoguers of different worlds they will gradually become a community in similarity, in a pluriverse world, in the limits of the equivocity of the indifference of the Other and the domination of identity, because in this identity/difference circle the dialoguers are subsumed by the dominator who imposes his identical, univocal truth with a claim to universality (Dussel, 2020).

For all these reasons, analogy is necessary in the circles of dialogues in any space of human experiences, and especially in the educational field, because it is there where many different thoughts coexist, since it is in this field where this problem is developed, and it is necessary to give the opportunity to students who are different and that in the time of these dialogues of similarity can sprout ideas that support their liberation. On the idea of freedom and its practical possibilities, in and from education, another thinker of great importance is Paulo Freire for his undeniable contributions to the understanding and realization of the educational phenomenon. It is of interest here to highlight part of his pedagogical work, encouraging an epistemic dialogue with Dussel.

LATIN AMERICAN PEDAGOGY: PAULO FREIRE

One of the most emblematic pedagogies in Latin America is undoubtedly that of Paulo Reglus Neves Freire, better known as Paulo Freire. His contributions are mostly in the educational practice, because he always insisted on the need for people to assume a critical attitude towards life and thus be able to transform it. Freire dedicated his life to education and for this he is recognized in the field of human and social sciences.

One of his most outstanding works is *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, dedicated to the poor, to those who fight against domination. A thinker who was committed to life and in it he understood that education is “human praxis” (2005); that is, that we educate each other, in a liberating education, which is humanizing and essentially political; it is about relationships that are established in the context of the community and the world, which are the opening to the reality of these relationships, what Freire calls, being with the world (Freire, 1997a); but from a critical perspective, of being aware of the reality of his time and his world that is historical.

Man and his relations with the world are historical, as is knowledge (Freire, 1997c); and for this it is necessary to educate him, to make him aware of his reality in order to lead him to self-reflection on his time and from where he is located; that is, the space where he speaks and lives. To seek in liberating education his awareness would imply politicizing him and inserting him in history as a protagonist of it.

The education proposed by Freire is an education for freedom (Freire, 1997a). But this form of education threatens the privileges of the dominators who see the human being as an object, never as a subject, and who will seek any instrument against this conscientization that would allow man to think for himself and in relation to his immediate and historical

environment. For Freire, this part of conscientization or conscientization is provoked internally in the subject, where his conscience and self-consciousness lie, and that this would be found among other subjects.

That is why Freire had envisioned an education in line with his time and his reality and that would greatly help to reflect, to make men and women more critical through existential debates in training groups. Hence the urgency of doing education differently, in the sense that it could insert people into their reality, situate them, and move from a society of naive transitivity to a critical one (Freire, 1997a).

Freire's liberating education is a starting point that could be relevant to these times of ecological, economic, social, political and especially educational crises, because we need a critical thinking in our schools, a dialogical and reflective education that could be against the dominant ideological impositions. That forms students capable of thinking for themselves, of thinking about their reality so that they can transform their contexts from a critical conscience. In which both teachers and students assume their responsibilities with what they have to do, with a reflective and self-critical attitude of their actions in front of the context in which they live.

It is in this sense that Freire proposes an education for liberation, that provokes in his students the awareness that it is not only being in the world but with the world (1990); it is necessary to be with the world so that they can transform their environments. Constantly questioning their existence, reflecting on what they live in common; their reality, their socio-cultural contexts to become active subjects in a changing world, in order to improve their conditions, committed to the transformation of their realities. Change, then, is the demand of liberating education.

On the other hand, Freire seeks with education for liberation, that this could be

carried out through the dialogical method, in which the student participates or that allows the existence of a "horizontal relationship, which is born from a critical matrix and generates criticism" (1997a, p.104). When certain values are combined, it is when certain values are combined, that one can reach sympathy within social groups and be critical. For Freire, dialogue is vital for personal and social life; it is the fact of believing in human beings and their possibilities, affirming "the belief that I only become myself when others also become themselves" (Freire, 1997a, p. 104). In this sense, the dialogue he refers to is the one that communicates something, not the one that was used in a vertical way during the Brazilian historical-cultural formation prior to the transition, which was the one that only communicated.

The importance of dialogue for education is a relationship between subjects, a critical dialogue, which seeks the liberation of oppressed men and women from praxis, an action largely full of reflection. If there is no dialogue there is no human relationship. Dialogue is a coming and going of the word, but, they can fall into the anti-dialogue, that is, only give communicated, which would lead to the "domestication" (Freire, 2005), an act that makes humans objects, because they do not reflect and only tell them what to do and how to do it, which turns them into manageable mass.

Domestication is the result of "banking" education as Freire calls it "an act of depositing, of transferring, of transmitting values, knowledge, this overcoming is not verified, nor can it be verified" (Freire, 2005); it is a way of not thinking about their reality, but rather, that these subjects adapt, are passive, spectators of reality, do not change their contexts and this is very useful to the oppressive system, which seeks to annul the power that the subjects have, and that they do not realize they have.

This “banking” education seeks in students a “culture of silence”; to remain silent while the experts speak, to adapt to those who claim to know. It is to make students mere objects that are never thought of as historical subjects, but as spectators of history. Banking” education cannot be thought of as a way for students to reach a sense of awareness, since thinking and becoming aware is a problem for the oppressive system, besides the fact that it would be dangerous.

The “banking” educator who lives or is close to overcoming the contradiction of this duality would be in a position to no longer domesticate the learners, but rather, through this horizontal dialogue would experience the humanization of both and with it their process of liberation. But if, on the other hand, the educator’s way of thinking is to give elaborated things to the learners, that is, to fill the consciousness of the learners with contents, to deposit in them those communications, it is already thinking that these learners are beings that are there to be adapted to the world and would be educating from that banking conception. Under this frame of reference, the educational practice that is made from this “banking” conception for the oppressors is adequate because it would be forming human beings convenient to the world and not conscious of the world, adapted to the purposes of the dominant minorities.

In the pedagogy of the oppressed it can only be provided by those who find themselves in oppression, since it is an instrument of criticism of the dominating system. The reflection of the oppressed, contrary to the “banking” education would be the problematizing education, a dialogic education, which would allow to search for the essence of the human, its conscience that thinks about itself); that is, as Jaspers affirmed about that conscience that is, “split” that implies a self-consciousness, which “is conscience of conscience” (Freire, 2005). Under this precept is undoubtedly that

the problematizing education is an act of consciousness between subjects, subjects that are growing together, that is, the educator-educatee with educatee-educator through dialogue in which the world would be the mediator.

This education is liberating because the educator no longer deposits knowledge in the learners, but rather the educator and the learner build each other through dialogue, in a reflective education of action, subjects in constant construction and in the process of liberation. The problematization that the educator seeks in the learners is that the latter situate themselves in a historical moment and that they in turn become involved in their relations with the world and with the subjects of their world so that they can transform it.

But if, on the contrary, the conception of “banking” education persists, where there is no dialogue between the educator and the student, but rather vertical relationships, where the educator is the one who proposes the contents and deposits them on the students, the educator is the one who sees the learner as an object to be filled and the one who will memorize the world elaborated by the educator, there is no act of criticality, much less a reflective act on the part of the learners, who are increasingly detached from the world in which they live and in which they are given a mythical form of reality and lack of creativity.

All this in favor of domination and “domestication”, keeping the subjects numb and naive, and what it is all about is to give the learners criticality, awareness of things, of the world and of their humanization. To detach oneself from “banking” education is a challenge, since nowadays it is necessary to look for ways to dissociate oneself from this type of education, and in this sense, schools and universities should epistemologically decolonize themselves, as E. Dussel argued, to stop following the line of imperial groups and give way to the knowledge of Others (De Sousa Santos, 2009).

To provide a problematizing education, as proposed by Freire, is to seek in the reality of the students' environment the problems that afflict them and their community, so that they are aware of their reality and reflect to propose solutions among all, both educator and students. This will allow them to be sensitive, since by being aware both learners and educators will be able to transform their environments. Because this problematizing education is a liberating praxis, on the one hand, they reflect on their realities and on the other hand, they seek actions that transform these realities, overcoming difficulties.

Those difficulties that are expressed in reality, in the lived experience, that which involves people and makes them change. That is why the difficulties at the abstract level do not have clear connections with the difficulties that occur in reality, in the concrete, and that is why they are not understood, that is why it is necessary to think about reality, those conditions in which the educator and the learner are immersed so that they can be understood and transformed. In this educational dialogue that seeks to liberate and raise their own awareness.

The problematizing education has to be ethical and responsible with human dignity, because it has to do with human beings and their history, "What happens is that ethics or the ethical quality of the liberating educational practice comes from the very entrails of the human phenomenon, from human *nature* constituting itself in history, as a *vocation* for being more" (Freire, 1997b, p. 102). Therefore, education is only for humans and to humanize them, which seems to be something so simple and straightforward, however, it is a very complex task, hence dialogue is very important in this task, as it will allow to build learning, both by learners and educators; It is all about educating to liberate; that both subjects (student-teacher)

of education assume themselves as conscious protagonists, that they reflect and act for the change of themselves and their environments, that they become more human .

That is why Freire states that education is not neutral (1997b), because it goes beyond itself, because it pursues dreams. He argued that education is political in nature (Freire, 1997b), since it is not only about the dreams of the learners, but also of the educators (Freire, 1997b); because it goes beyond the school itself. It is necessary to fight for those dreams of a society that is more just and democratic; where it is necessary to respect the learners in their thinking and give them reasons to think and argue. The thoughts of both, even if they are opposed, help to liberation, if they are respected. At all times the educator must respect how the students think and feel and not impose their ideas, beliefs and subjectivities.

A non-neutral education is one where the thoughts of all are respected, and an ethical and democratic education is possible; however, it should not be thought that by respecting the thoughts of the students the educator would lose his authority, on the contrary, he would establish limits, something healthy in the time of dialogue between the two, would be to have authority in dialogue and responsibility, which would allow progress in tasks that help both learners and educators. The education proposed by Paulo Freire when he says that pedagogy is also political and vice versa (1987), refers to the fact that one discipline cannot be reduced to the other, but that they are interrelated; on the one hand pedagogy has in its essence to make something known, to convince with a series of activities, and on the other hand it is political because it has intentions, that is, it has purposes, where it wants to go and why. A clear example of this is what former President Andres Manuel López Obrador (2018-2024) did with his mornings, in an institutional scenario he used pedagogy

to illustrate political history and convince the Mexican people. Therefore, pedagogy is a way of convincing the other, and the political seeks the liberation of people.

CONCLUSIONS

For all these reasons, education urgently needs a transformation. Transformation in the educational practice, in the thoughts of educators and in the listening of learners, their families, communities and society, transforming the dominating praxis into a liberating praxis, changing the meaning of education from an imposition to a sense of respect: respect for the experiences of students, the meaning it has for the environment where they come from, respect for the dignity of each member of the educational community.

Praxis in liberating education goes in the sense of a coherence of reflection and action and vice versa, that is, in this coherence it is about unveiling truths that have been hidden by domesticating, oppressive, banking, and anti-dialogical education, which sought to alter and hide the truths of their realities. Now it is about transforming that education by considering all the actors of education as human persons, with dignity, historical, capable of changing their methods that allow them to liberate themselves with others in community, and that by analyzing their realities they can seek the pertinent changes that will improve their environments.

In this sense, the liberation of the oppressed from the perspective of Dussel and Freire is a call to critique the oppressive system in order to position oneself, on the one hand, in listening to the other, an analytical moment, that which is found in the exteriority

and which can be seen in the poor, the indigenous, the black, the woman and the people exploited under capitalism, etc., and in which a different path in favor of the poor is made possible, and in which a different path in favor of the poor people is made possible; and on the other hand, conscientization, that task that corresponds to the oppressed to reflect, to think their situation allows them to see themselves as they are, and to overcome that system that has domesticated them in order to go towards liberation. One of the guidelines that would make this intention possible is education, because it is there where one can help to understand and reflect, as far as possible, to overcome oppressions of different kinds. The educational phenomenon, which is pedagogical and political in essence, among other disciplinary interrelations, implies the commitment of adult and empowered generations in the search for concrete alternatives and scenarios from the present.

In short, both thoughts of the recent Latin American past, from moral philosophy and liberation pedagogy, are more current and relevant than ever, in the face of the onslaught of political and economic neoliberalism that still prevails in the world and in the regions. Rethinking these theoretical proposals is a moral imperative in the face of the predominance of the 2030 Agenda, in particular goal four, which refers to education, and the recent Unesco proposal for a “New social contract for education”. At this juncture, it is propitious to recover philosophical and pedagogical thought from the works of Dussel and Freire, which, as has been explained, are epistemologically enlightening and revolutionary in educational praxis.

REFERENCES

- Berardi, Franco (2029). *Futurabilidad. La era de la impotencia y el horizonte de la posibilidad*; Caja Negra, Bs.As.
- De Sousa Santos, B. (2017). *Justicia entre saberes: Epistemologías del sur contra el epistemicidio*. Madrid: Morata.
- De Sousa Santos, B. (2009). *Epistemologías del sur: La reinención del conocimiento y la emancipación social*. México: Siglo XXI-CLACSO.
- De Sousa Santos, B. (2019). *El fin del imperio cognitivo. La afirmación de las epistemologías del Sur*. Madrid, Trotta.
- Dussel, E. (1980). *La pedagógica latinoamericana*. Bogotá: Nueva América.
- Dussel, E. (2012). *Erótica y pedagógica: Para una ética de la liberación latinoamericana*. Buenos Aires: Docencia.
- Dussel, E. (1973a) *Para una ética de liberación latinoamericana, tomo I*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI.
- Dussel, E. (1973b). *Para una ética de liberación latinoamericana, tomo II*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI.
- Dussel, E. (1974). *Método para una filosofía de la liberación. Superación analéctica de la dialéctica hegeliana*. Salamanca: Sígueme.
- Dussel, E. (1996). *Filosofía de la liberación*. Bogotá: Nueva América.
- Dussel, E. (1995) *Introducción a la filosofía de la liberación*. Bogotá: Nueva américa.
- Dussel, E. (2020). *Siete ensayos de filosofía de la liberación: Hacia una fundamentación del giro decolonial*. Madrid: Trotta.
- Dussel, E. (1975) *Liberación latinoamericana y Manuel Levinas*. Buenos Aires: Bonum.
- Dussel, E. (1984). *Filosofía de la producción*. Bogotá: Nueva américa.
- Dussel, E. (1993). *Las metáforas teológicas de Marx*. España: Verbo Divino.
- Dussel, E. (1998). *Ética de la liberación: En la edad de la globalización y de la exclusión*. Madrid: Trotta.
- Dussel, E. (1994). *1492 El encubrimiento del Otro, Hacia el origen del "mito de la Modernidad"*. Bolivia: Plural.
- Freire, P. Gadotti, M. Guimaraes, S. Y Hernández, I. (1987). *Pedagogía: Diálogo y conflicto*. Argentina: Cinco.
- Freire, P. (1990). *La naturaleza política de la educación: Cultura, poder y liberación*. España: Paidós.
- Freire, P. (1997a). *La Educación como práctica de la libertad*. México: Siglo XXI.
- Freire, P. (1997b). *Política y educación*. México: Siglo XXI.
- Freire, P. (1997c). *Pedagogía de la autonomía: Saberes necesarios para la práctica educativa*. México: Siglo XXI.
- Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogía del oprimido*. México: Siglo XXI.
- Freire, P. (2013). *Por una pedagogía de la pregunta: Crítica a una educación basada en respuestas a preguntas inexistentes*. México: Siglo XXI.