



***Genius loci*: essay on the place of Difference in education for all**

Sílvia Ester Orrú^{1,2}

¹Universidade de Brasília, Campus Darcy Ribeiro, Asa Norte, 70910-900, Brasília, Distrito Federal, Brasil. ²Universidade Federal de Alfenas, Rodovia José Aurélio Vilela, BR-267, Km 533, 37715-400, Poços de Caldas, Minas Gerais, Brazil. E-mail: seorru7@gmail.com

ABSTRACT. In this essay, from the contributions of the Philosophy of Difference and the appropriation of the idea of *genius loci*, we discuss the text in order to inquire about the place of difference in education for all people, having difference and freedom as human values. In ancient Rome, it was thought that every independent being had a guardian spirit. A spirit that brought life to people and places, and that kept them company from birth until the final day. This same spirit also affirmed the nature and essence of people and places. This is the concept of *genius loci* that we have embraced for this article. The unique presence of the *genius loci* matters in event, movement and autonomy. The places are liable to change while the *genius loci* is not conditioned to change the place or disappear. In the revolutionary and hopeful horizon of those who choose to defend and fight for a liberating, democratic and inclusive education for all people, the '*genius* Difference' invites us to the resilience and empowerment of each educator to make a difference in the human constitution of those who arrive into your hands as your apprentices.

Keywords: difference; diversity; inclusion; inclusive education.

***Genius loci*: ensaio sobre o lugar da Diferença na educação para todos**

RESUMO. Neste ensaio, a partir das contribuições da Filosofia da Diferença e da apropriação da ideia de *genius loci*, construímos o texto com o objetivo de indagarmos acerca do lugar da diferença na educação para todas as pessoas, tendo a diferença e a liberdade como valores humanos. Na Roma antiga, pensava-se que todo ser independente, dispunha de um espírito guardião. Um espírito que brindava vida às pessoas e aos lugares, e que os fazia companhia desde o nascimento até o dia final. Esse mesmo espírito também afirmava a natureza e a essência das pessoas e dos lugares. Este é o conceito de *geni us loci* que acolhemos para este artigo. A presença singular do *genius loci* importa em acontecimento, movimento e autonomia. Os lugares são passíveis de transformações enquanto que o *genius loci* não se encontra condicionado a mudar do lugar ou desaparecer. No horizonte revolucionário e esperançoso dos que escolhem defender e lutar por uma educação libertadora, democrática e inclusiva para todas as pessoas, o '*genius* Diferença' nos convida à resiliência e ao empoderamento de cada educador para que faça a diferença na constituição humana daqueles que chegam às suas mãos como seus aprendizes.

Palavras-chave: diferença; diversidade; inclusão; educação inclusiva.

***Genius loci*: ensayo sobre el lugar de la Diferencia en la educación para todos**

RESUMEN. En este ensayo, a partir de las contribuciones de la Filosofía de la diferencia y la apropiación de la idea de *genius loci*, discutimos el texto para indagar sobre el lugar de diferencia en la educación para todas las personas, teniendo la diferencia y la libertad como valores humanos. En la antigua Roma, se pensaba que todo ser independiente tenía un espíritu guardián. Un espíritu que trajo vida a personas y lugares, y que les hizo compañía desde el nacimiento hasta el último día. Este mismo espíritu también afirmó la naturaleza y la esencia de las personas y los lugares. Este es el concepto de *genius loci* que hemos adoptado para este artículo. La presencia única del *genius loci* es importante en eventos, movimiento y autonomía. Los lugares están sujetos a cambios mientras el *genius loci* no está condicionado para moverse o desaparecer. En el horizonte revolucionario y esperanzador de aquellos que eligen defender y luchar por una educación liberadora, democrática e inclusiva para todas las personas, el '*genius* Diferencia' nos invita a la resiliencia y el empoderamiento de cada educador para marcar la diferencia en la constitución humana de los que llegan en tus manos como tus aprendices.

Palabras clave: diferencia; diversidad; inclusión; educación inclusiva.

Received on February 3, 2020.

Accepted on May 8, 2020.

Published in December 16, 2021.

Introduction

In ancient Rome, it was thought that every independent being had a guardian spirit. A spirit that brought people and places to life, and that kept them company from birth until the fatal final day. Even the gods had their own genius. This same spirit also affirmed the nature and essence of people and places. This is the concept of the *genius loci*.

Norberg-Schulz (1980), an important architect and theorist in the area, grasps this concept and explains that architecture materializes the (in)dispensability of human beings, so that they can inhabit and build relational ties with the place and, therefore, root existential. In this sense, the person's connection with their dwelling place generates feelings of belonging that imply the constitution of their identity, as it is in places that the most remarkable events take place. Places are constituted as starting points, scales and arrivals, countless times, not defined or definitive throughout life, but each one brings its own intensity of impressions on the subject. The places are full of senses and meanings built in the history and culture of humanity, but for each subject, based on their experiences and singularities, they are also re-signified.

The unique presence of the *genius loci* matters in event, movement and autonomy. However, according to Norberg-Schulz (1980), the structure of a place does not assume an immutable, lasting or endless condition. On the contrary, places are subject to transformations while the *genius loci* is not conditioned to change place or disappear, however, it appropriates a nature of plural movement and with a multiplicity of meanings and attributes in movement, belonging to groups unequal. The *genius loci* always exists, in one way or another, in all cultures and meets their social demands.

In a movement to appropriate the idea of *genius loci* present here, we ask: what is the place of difference in education for everyone? In this essay, from the contributions of Gilles Deleuze, main exponent of the Philosophy of Difference, in connection with the libertarian thought of Paulo Freire, we weave a possible dialogue about the place of difference in the education of all people in its most distinct and diverse singularities, understanding difference and freedom as human values essential to humanity.

Meanings of the difference

First, it is necessary to understand the meaning of the difference we are referring to. And in order to have this understanding, we need to generate a movement that forces us to think differently about difference. Thinking about difference requires that we do not have absolute and ready answers, forged in regimes of truth that are constructed in history and perpetuated by culture, as such regimes imprison us and colonize our thinking. Regimes of truth create truths that serve for social control through power maintenance strategies and, thus, also sustain the command of knowledge-power and the universalization of the truth (Foucault, 1987). However, the truth is always an interpretation while the image produced is never the reality in itself, only a distortion.

Difference has often been conceived in a distorted way, as an unpleasant, harmful, inferior element or a criterion of abnormality in people and, for this reason, there are those who defend its cessation, elimination and/or exclusion. Due to the existence of a social standard established by the dominant society throughout history, it has been common to compare different people in order to emphasize more the qualities of one in relation to the other or to the others. And in this vicious circle of events of comparison between different beings, there are many consequences resulting from acts of exclusion that extend to the most diverse and distinct social circumstances. And, at this crossroads, the repetition of exclusionary actions based on the hegemonic paradigm that highlights the supremacy of a group of people over other people or of a people over other people, is that, procedurally, we are going to trivialize all forms of social exclusion, in a way to crystallize our minds about the naturalization of social problems and, finally, to descend into an abysmal process of de-humanization.

Through cultural tradition, the sufferers do not even question the legitimacy of the presence of devices that annihilate their identity, their subjectivity, their autonomy, their freedom, their joy of living intensely. By decreeing and imposing hegemonic supremacy, the majority oppress social minorities, hunt and do not constrain to usurp what belongs to them by right and justice. Through the immeasurable desire for power and greed, as well as its maintenance, they seize indigenous lands, drive away outsiders, enslave indigents, exploit the poor workers, manufacture wars for oil from the stone, torture political prisoners, segregate people with disabilities, disqualify critical educators, ignore the hungry, slaughter beggars, boast of race and skin color. Due to the imperative custom of the patriarchy, they disregard women's rights through obstetric violence,

reap their pleasure through the nefarious mutilation, domesticate their bodies through religion, trivialize their image as an object, occupy their sex as property, despise their potential so that they do not emancipate themselves. Enchanted by power and greed, they (re)produce distorted images, cunning untruths, dogmatic slogans, plant hatred of differences and extol violence as a response to those who oppose them (Orrú, 2020).

However, since such malevolence between peers is incomprehensible due to the difference they bring with them, it is worth remembering the indignation of Paulo Freire at the death of the Pataxó Indian, Galdino Jesus dos Santos, in 1997, provoked by a group of young people from Brasília who set fire to his body while he slept,

The position of the poor, the beggar, the black, the woman, the peasant, the worker, the Indian in this way of thinking. I think of the materialist mentality of owning things, the disregard for decency, the fixation on pleasure, the disrespect for things of the spirit, considered of little or no value. I can guess the reinforcement of this thinking in many moments of the school experience in which the Indian remains minimized. I register the almightiness of their freedoms, exempt from any limit, freedoms turning into licentiousness, making fun of everything and everyone. I imagine the importance of easy living in the scale of its values in which the highest ethics, the one that governs people's daily relationships, will have almost completely lacked. In its place, the ethics of the market, of profit. People are worth what they earn in cash per month. Respect for the other, respect for the weakest, reverence for not only human but plant and animal life, taking care of things, taste for beauty, valuing feelings, all of which reduced to no or almost no importance. If none of this, in my opinion, reduces the responsibility of these agents of cruelty, the fact itself of this tragic transgression of ethics warns us of how urgent it is that we assume the duty to fight for the most fundamental ethical principles, such as respect for the lives of beings. humans, to the life of other animals, to the life of birds, to the life of rivers and forests. I don't believe in love between women and men, between human beings, if we don't become capable of loving the world. Ecology gains a fundamental importance at the end of the century. It has to be present in any educational practice of a radical, critical or liberating character. It is not possible to remake this country, democratize it, humanize it, make it serious, with teenagers playing at killing people, offending life, destroying dreams, making love impossible. If education alone does not transform society, without it, society will not change either (Freire, 2000, p. 65).

Now, if an astonishing naturalization of violence is already so common among us, it is certain that something very wrong has lingered on in our culture about the perception, and understanding of the meanings and the place of difference in the human race.

However, Gilles Deleuze (1988, p. 8), French philosopher, brings us a relevant contribution to another understanding of difference: "We want to think about difference in itself and the relationship between different and different, regardless of the forms of representation that lead them to the same and make them go through the negative". From this perspective, the difference is not the different, the diverse, the abnormality, the opposition to what appears to be the same. The difference is not a parameter for comparison or contraposition between normal and abnormal, rich and poor, men and women, Americans and South Americans, natives and foreigners, fixed and nomadic, healthy and sick, whites and blacks, Christians and atheists. The difference is not social representation, much less a parameter for marginalization and barbarism against minority groups.

Under this lens, in another example, the particularized and typified difference in individuals through medical diagnosis is an exclusionary action, as the difference as a category is not able to represent the person in all its complexity, just as the medical diagnosis does not define who is the apprentice. Although a particular set of symptoms or a genetic condition on the chromosome can repeat itself countless times, people do not repeat themselves, they are unique. In other words, autism, Down syndrome, deafness, blindness, deafblindness can be repeated in their event, but people never reprise themselves, they bring in themselves, diverse and distinct singularities that make them unique beings, for they are always different in their own difference.

In this conception, difference is not a trait that steadies people to a certain characteristic or to a certain grouping by categories, such as the group of the disabled, the special, those with learning difficulties, those who are not normal, the incapable or the who don't learn. However, the difference is understood as being a characteristic of the human species. The difference is present in all human beings, without distinction, so that we are not the same, but yes, we are all equally different! Therefore, the difference is not just those who deviate from the standard model established in our society with a hegemonic base, but the difference belongs to everyone, being the main, if not the only, legitimate identity of the Human Being. This is because other identities can be built from the involvement and (re)cognition of social movements fighting for rights. However, the difference has always constituted us, before we were in the womb, before we were born into the world.

Where, then, is the place of difference? The place of difference is in each one of us. It inhabits all of us, it constitutes each one in a unique way. Thus, the difference, according to Deleuze (1988) is, at the same time, 'singular, multiple and plural', and can never be restricted to a category of individuals or serving the larger policies for apartheid people or collectives. Just like the spirit of the place, the genius, which doesn't change, doesn't abandon and doesn't get lost, so is the difference that doesn't depart from us, nor can it be extirpated by ourselves or by others. Just as there is no place without a genius, there is no human being without the presence of difference in himself. Even if the difference is rejected by the subject himself or mistreated by the majority, it remains with its inexplicable presence.

Similar to the genius loci that "[...] gave life to people and places, accompanying them from birth to death, and determined their character and essence [...]" (Norberg-Schulz, 1980, p. 18), this is how difference is as much a condition as an attribute of human beings, it accompanies them from birth to death, it is what makes each one unique and singular. It is the part that detaches the human from the representations of fixed identities, because in the thinkable anthropological concept of multiplicity, "[...] everything is multiplicity, even the one, even the multiple" (Deleuze, 1988, p. 174).

The presence of the 'genius Difference' in human beings leads us to the understanding that there are no fixed or pre-established identities that can justify apartheid, humiliation, oppression, segregation, exclusion, persecution, imprisonment or the death of other human beings due to their differences, whether physical, cognitive, creed, birthplace, gender, sex, race, ethnicity or any other constitutive element of human subjectivity.

When difference is overlooked and feelings and acts of violence and denial of the other sparkle, the nature of our humanity is torn apart, whose pillars are supported by the conscious action of generosity, solidarity, benevolence, respect, acceptance of others and, consequently, love and freedom, so notorious in the work and legacy of Brazilian educator Paulo Freire who stated: "[...] I am an intellectual who is not afraid of being loving, I love people and I love the world. And it is because I love people and I love the world that I fight for social justice to be implemented before charity" (Freire, 2007, p. 1).

The 'genius Difference' demands a permanent ability and ability to look closely at ourselves and the social systems we have created, developed and nurtured throughout human history. We look not towards contemplation, but taken by the spirit of critical thinking that bothers us, constrains and awakens us to re-invent our ways of Being and being in the world, with the world and with others.

The difference that inhabits us and that constitutes us as a human species, destabilizes the ultra-conservative justifications for the subjugation of other human beings to the sinister exploits of a global system based on capitalism, colonialism and patriarchy, and these, as far as they are concerned, device dilators that serve as exclusion mechanisms often unnoticed and unknown by their victims, however, employed through biopower and biopolitics (Foucault, 2008).

Thus, once Difference is understood as a genius occupying and constituting all human beings, it is up to us to compel our thinking with a view to positioning ourselves entirely against all forms of oppression, violence, imprisonment and social exclusion based on difference. Therefore, it is urgent and urgent to know and understand the extent of the force disposed in the mechanisms produced for social exclusion, as well as about the historical and social inequalities and disadvantages that they (re)produce. Likewise, it is necessary to repudiate the colossal ambition brought about by the imperious culture of excessive profitability, the culture of colonial confiscation and patriarchal power that enveloped and shaped us according to the conservatism of its bases and that, even today, with different costumes, endures. Resisting hatred and the fatal indifference to the living conditions of other human beings, indifference as a product of the naturalization of social problems and an acute process of dehumanization, is only possible through the constitution of critical thinking and breaking with all the forms of support to the oppression of the less favored, therefore, a rupture with permissiveness and social omission. In this sense, in dark times, 'amor mundi' is a revolutionary act.

For me affection and love are essential. In fact, I have received a lot of criticism, especially from Latin America, because I talk a lot about love and love, according to these criticisms, it is a bourgeois concept. In the first place I would not admit that it was the bourgeois who invented love. They may own the factories, but not love. Love is a dimension of the living being and at the level of the human being it reaches a spectacular transcendence. In this sense, I say that revolution is an act of love (Ceccon, 1978, p. 11).

Science, technology and religion as creations of humanity, have not been sufficient to convince and transform all humans of their civilizations into highly loving people who strive for the well-being and dignity of all peoples

and care for difference and freedom as human values. This is because this important triad does not have the power or magic to ascend in humans to the source of human socialization, namely, love. When there is the absence of love, responsible for the love that wants the other to exist and live well in dignity and joy, therefore, there is no respect for their existence, nor is there a thirst for social justice for everyone, as it is the source of human socialization. In the words of Humberto Maturana,

Love is the source of human socialization, not the result of it, and anything that destroys love, anything that destroys the structural congruence it implies, destroys socialization. Socialization is the result of operating in love, and it occurs only in the domain where love occurs (Maturana, 1997, p. 185).

However, it is worth testing a possible conjugation between the 'genius Difference' and love as a source of human socialization. While the 'genius Difference' is in all human beings and constitutes them in a unique way, love, in turn, implies an individual choice. It is useful to emphasize that this connotation of love does not refer to feelings of romance or affection for those close to them, such as children, parents or siblings, much less to trivial feelings arising from commotions and consternations arising from sensationalisms. Without a doubt, it concerns the love that overflows to the human condition, love that commits itself to taking care of the world, clearly, taking care of freedoms, rights, human dignity. It is much more than wishing the other person is well, but unveiling so that the other person is well. It is also necessary to emphasize that this is not a willful choice, but one resulting from what forced us to think beyond the (un)truths established by systems of social control through the manipulation of the masses. A choice made from our process of awareness and formation of critical thinking about the human condition and the abysmal machinery of exclusion produced and reproduced in society. It is mainly decursive of a movement aware of what is our role in the society we are part of, in the world we live in and with the people with whom we share this same world, this Common Home of all of us, as enlightened by Leonardo Boff.

Taking care of the Earth is taking care of its best production, we are human beings, men and women, especially the most vulnerable. Taking care of the Earth is taking care of what it, through our genius, has produced in such diverse cultures, in such numerous languages, in art, in science, in religion, in cultural goods, especially in spirituality and religiosity through which we are aware of the presence of the Supreme Reality that underlies all beings and carries us in the palm of his hand. Taking care of the Earth is taking care of the dreams it arouses in us, from which material are born saints, sages, artists, people who are guided by the light and everything sacred and loving that emerged in history. Taking care of the Earth is, finally, taking care of the Sacred that burns in us and that convinces us that it is better to embrace the other than to reject him and that life is worth more than all the riches in this world. So it will in fact be the Common House of Being (Boff, 2015).

As long as the genius of the place (the Difference) does not move away from and is not lost from the human, love, in turn, can be suppressed, erased, ignored. Keeping it alive in us in times when the banalization of evil and the expressions of hatred for differences and freedoms gloat us, is to diverge, rising, so that the very fact that we remain existing is in itself a way of resisting to evil.

The place of difference in education for all

The term 'education' has been a synonym commonly linked to teaching, that is, to instruction, to didactics, to pedagogy. In view of this, it has been directly related to the school and university context. The word 'education' also refers to the habits, traditions and values that a community delivers to the generation to come. Nevertheless, it connotes the sense of civility, kindness, attention, courtesy, kindness, affability. It is a concept that contains the level of ability a person has to socialize with others in a courteous and good manner. Etymologically,

Education is the nominalized form of the verb to educate. [...] Educare, in Latin, was a verb that had the meaning of 'to raise (a child), to nurture, to make it grow'. Etymologically, we could say that education, from the verb to educate, means 'bringing the idea to light' or philosophically making the child move from power to act, from virtuality to reality (Martins, 2005, p. 33, emphasis added).

It is also valid for us to know the etymology of the word school,

This word was already used by the Greeks. In the language of the Hellenes, the word *Skholê*, *ês* meant 'rest, rest, leisure, free time; study; occupation of a man of leisure, free from servile work, who exercises a liberal profession, that is, a voluntary occupation of whom, being free, he is not obliged to; school, place of study'; for comments from the semantic point of view (Martins, 2005, p. 35, emphasis added).

Education, therefore, is tied to the idea of creating and nurturing as well as revealing to the learner what is beyond himself. While the word 'school' is accompanied by the notion of freedom. A freedom that embraces the understanding of being a free Being. In this etymological path, it would be possible to consider that a generation that cares and is dedicated to educating its children, its people, strengthened in the science of freedom, is a generation that strives for the permanent development of the ability to interrelate with others who they are in the world in liberating thought and action. In this perspective of educating unveiling and announcing to the learner what exists and lies beyond their micro context, seeing and understanding the other in its complexity in a friendly and caring way, (re)knowing him as his neighbor, constitutes a responsibility and tenacious commitment.

A nation that improves itself in offering and favoring the next generations an education based on the principles of freedom in which everyone has access to knowledge and the noblest values of civility in order to be free, is the progenitor of social rights and opportunities to access the world of work in social, economic, cultural and political contexts, with human dignity and democratic freedoms as the central parameter of their society. In this perspective, education is something very precious and liberating, because through it people reach the highest levels of education, not being slaves of ignorance, they are autonomous beings, they understand the totalitarian precepts that underlie a caudillo domain, they reject the absolutism that originates fascism, remain attentive to the oppressive movements that legitimize prejudice, discrimination and barbarism. And, most importantly, they preserve civility as the preeminent axis of the act of educating people to become humanized subjects, loving people who make a total difference in caring for other beings, human or not, caring for our Common Home.

From this angle, understanding and accepting difference as a constituent of human beings is crucial for the promotion of a liberating education, an act of educating that educates in and for freedom. A liberating education whose purpose is achieved in the freedom of free and critical participation of learners as historical subjects, based on the emergence of their own and different realities. An education committed to the social transformation of the individual and society itself so that they have social, political and economic possibilities oriented to freedom, so that the individual is not a mere spectator of many social events, however, is a protagonist of its history and of their struggles against all forms of oppression (Freire, 1967). The place of difference in liberating education is in each person who constitutes the social body and who, in turn, also constitute learning communities where education for all is understood as a fundamental and social right.

Wishing a better world for yourself and others is not enough for us to live and live together in this possible better world. Ignorances and brutalities practiced in our contemporaneity come to contract hearts that see themselves as hopeless and afraid of the future. Remarkable events of genocide, political and social conservatism movements, maintenance of colonial and patriarchal systems, generation of menial jobs with wages so miserable that they do not allow people to leave the poverty line, racism, misogyny, sectarianism, xenophobia, exploitation of child labor, pedophilia, domain of reason for the implantation of fear, are completely avoidable effects whose materialization occurs through the choice of those who incite and practice them as a form of social control and maintenance of hegemonic power. These are actions that are harmful to the social body and pivots in the widening of the abysses of social inequalities, the result of a regrettable process of de-humanization where indifference to the well-being of the other becomes something common and natural.

However, in the light of education as an action of freedom and from the principle of civility, that is, an education that moves away from the oppressive conceptions of liberalism and resists barbarism, it is possible for us to educate the present and future generations to be historical protagonists more loving and, therefore, better social subjects than we have been until then (Freire, 1967). An education that is possible, but one that demands that educational institutions themselves comply with the principles of national and international legislation and policies that protect human and social rights (United Nations [UN], 1948). And, not only that, but that they also (re)create possibilities for the perennial (re)existence of the inclusive education movement.

By highlighting the education movement from an inclusive perspective, we are not referring, for example, to simply placing the person with a disability into the school. Rather, welcoming people in their distinct and diverse singularities, all children, teenagers, young people, adults or the elderly, regardless of sex, gender, race, ethnicity, religion, people who are migrants or refugees. It is about much more than tolerating those who differ from us, yet accepting them in their differences. In this sense,

We even understand that tolerating differences is not the same thing as understanding and accepting differences. Tolerating, in Portuguese, in Brazilian culture, is more related to putting up with, conforming, feeling even suffering

from having to submit to a situation of compromise. Fully understanding that the difference belongs to everyone and not just to some, transcends the fragility of just tolerating the other with suffering or effort. Such conviction exceeds the acceptance of the other. I not only tolerate the other who is different from me, but I (re)know and accept him as a person. I understand him as being worthy of respect and consideration, as well as a citizen of social rights (Orrú, 2020, p. 84).

And yet, educating having freedom and civility as fundamental principles and difference as a human value, also implies understanding that, if people are different, they also have different capacities, intelligences and interests, therefore, they learn differently. So that the school and/or the university, this space to share knowledge and to create, nurture and strengthen the learning of being free, needs to be this place of reception and care of the 'genius Difference' with intense commitment and competence.

In this logic, it is necessary to (re)think about how educational institutions have been organized. If we elevate difference and freedom as human values and conceive education as a right of all people, without exception, in the same harmony, it is urgent that we re-invent ways of teaching. Otherwise, there is a contradiction in relation to what is desired and what is defended, namely, a liberating education, therefore, democratic and inclusive. In other words: it is not possible to educate for freedom and be coherent with the inclusive paradigm if we perpetuate a homogeneous teaching model in its entirety, based on an average standard of achievement for all students. It is necessary that all differences are enhanced, as well as all cultures are valued.

Therefore, the place of difference in education for all is also made from the (re)invention of inclusion itself from the (re)creation of new teaching methodologies, where knowledge can be shared by everyone, in a way that is understood that all learners have something to learn in the same way that everyone has something to teach. Valuing intercultural education and enhancing the learning possibilities of each one also translates into investing in methodologies that value the axes of interest of all students, so that not only some knowledge is overvalued at the expense of others, but all knowledge are (re)recognized as relevant to human formation.

It is to offer all learners the possibility of participating in their own learning plans, as well as in the construction of social norms and autonomy in their own carrying out actions, with the teacher as a mentor who will guide them in the learning process, but at the same time it will not determine or hinder it, a teacher with the apprentice and not a teacher designed for the student (Almeida & Orrú, 2020). It provides opportunities for the learner to choose what they want to learn, valuing their interests which, in general, are related to their skills to be increasingly developed, rather than being smothered by content practices predetermined by homogeneous teaching. It is to open up learning spaces where it is possible to weave knowledge in networks amidst inclusive, cooperative and solidary pillars, instead of competitive and selective ones. It is to promote the possibility of learning in common, learning WITH each other, being the most expert in a subject, helping your colleague to understand better within his own pace and possibility. It is to encourage learning to learn each person in their own way, considering their intelligence, capacity, ability, learning possibilities for the construction of concepts and production of scientific knowledge, and thus, being able to tell everyone how much they have learned. It is to understand that education and learning take place anywhere and at all times, so the classroom is not the only privileged place for this process to take place. In this perspective, the center of the learning process is neither the teacher nor the student, however, the center of the learning process is the social relationships between teachers and their apprentices, apprentices with their teachers, colleagues with their colleagues.

In the emergence of (re)thinking education for the (re)invention of its event under the bias of education for all, it is impossible to understand that: despite the traditional school continuing to train students from fragmented and predetermined content in inflexible curricula; continue performing rigid assessments that only observe what the teacher expects to verify, not taking into account the many other learnings constructed by the student; it is demanded by the current society and by the new generations of apprentices, other ways of learning, and learning more than what has been imposed by the school.

They need to learn to articulate knowledge, to know domains that cover the spheres of knowledge, a web of connected knowledge. Build their learning path together with the apprentice through projects that have their axes of interest as their roots; it is to enable the immersion of the learner in the individual and collective scope, the pleasure of learning. Similarly, it is to favor the exchange of experiences, the articulation of knowledge, the confrontation of ideas, curiosity, creativity in exposing what is being learned; cooperation; solidarity among colleagues and the development of different skills. [...] I think that the axes of interest are possible paths for all learners, in order to bring to learning spaces what gives joy in learning, which awakens endless curiosities, which can be infinitely more useful for those who are apprentices, and here are the student with his teacher, both apprentices. I think it is an alternative to mass teaching, handouts, to the contents imposed by a school that needs to rethink its practice, which needs to think about the demands of its learners and break with teaching

traditions based on repetition, memorization, competitiveness, logic market, in measuring what cannot be measurable, as knowledge and intelligence are not measured (Orrú, 2016, p. 167, p. 12).

Valuing spaces and learning moments opposed to the dominant proposal is to embrace the 'genius Difference' together with education for all. An education that turns out to be liberating not only for learners, but with equality, also for teachers who free themselves from the oppressive action of controlling and docile bodies, of shaping and shaping students within the hegemonic and homogeneous logic present in the social body. A democratic education that is built and constituted from respect for the differences of each one, from the ability to give birth to a sensitive listening and perception of the other, starting with the conscious act of welcoming the voice of the other in their own social contexts, without any overriding pretension to aspire to give voice to this other or to be its spokesperson, far from all forms of prejudice and discrimination. This is because the voice belongs to the other, the voice is the other. In Freire's words,

It is not difficult to see how there are so many qualities that legitimate listening demands from its subject. Qualities that are constituted in the democratic practice of listening. It should be part of our training to discuss what these essential qualities are, even knowing that they need to be created by us, in our practice, if our political-pedagogical option is democratic or progressive and if we are coherent with it. We need to know that, without certain qualities or virtues such as love, respect for others, tolerance, humility, taste for joy, taste for life, openness to the new, availability to change, persistence in the struggle, refusal to fatalism, identification with hope, openness to justice, the pedagogical-progressive practice is not possible, which is not done only with science and technique. Accepting and respecting the difference is one of those virtues without which listening cannot be done. If I discriminate against the poor boy or girl, the black girl or boy, the Indian boy, the rich girl; if I discriminate against women, peasants, and workers, I obviously cannot listen to them, and if I don't listen to them, I can't talk to them, but to them, from top to bottom. Above all, I forbid myself to understand them. If I feel superior to being different, no matter who it is, I refuse to listen to him or listen to him. What is different is not the other to deserve respect, it is a this or that, treatable or despicable (Freire, 2002, p. 45).

In the revolutionary and hopeful horizon of those who choose to defend and fight for a liberating education for all people, the 'genius Difference' invites us to the resilience and empowerment of each educator to make a difference in the human constitution of those who come into their hands as his apprentices. In this way,

It is necessary to reinvent education in order not to abort in the stagnation of tradition. It is necessary to re-invent inclusion in difference and for the sake of difference. It is urgent to re-invent oneself with science and with love. It is time (at all times) to re-invent ways of overcoming historical difficulties in the present time. It is vital to leave the ghettos and re-invent ways of life and popularize science in the community of Being and Being community. It is essential to prioritize the signifier and re-signify the meanings. It is time to break the shackles of fixed and immutable representations and identities, and reject the universal repetition of the same, as we are all different and people do not repeat themselves (Orrú, 2020, p. 110).

Make a difference so that what may be best in each pupil is not suffocated by the content-based obstinacy of traditional teaching, on the other hand, all of their capacity, intelligence and potential to learn to be, overflows in empathy, solidarity and love with others, as in a scientific knowledge for a better world, therefore, less and less exclusive.

Final considerations: considerations in the spirit of 'Genius Difference'

Finally, the purpose of every educator should be determined to transform the world into a better place for everyone to live, the cultivation of critical thinking and awareness of the importance of breaking with hegemonic and homogeneous practices in the educational institution and moving towards solid construction an education that enhances learning through dialogue between different cultures. That is, an intercultural education in favor of care, preservation, continuity and safeguarding democracy and respect for the life and dignity of every human being. An education where the power of knowledge is for the promotion of the common good to all, far from being a maneuver to exercise the power of tyranny and hierarchical oppression of the existence of the other. And not only that, but realizing that learning communities collectively build the materialization of their education, so that dialogical and genuine social relationships are the basis for the construction of interdependent processes of teaching and learning, as well as the exercise of democratic freedoms where the 'genius difference' is the very spirit of this place that in permanent movement enunciates: there are arms for an education for all!

Referências

- Almeida, A. C. O., & Orrú, S. E. (2020). Relações dialógicas e educação democrática: a experiência da EMEF Campos Salles. *Revista Tempos E Espaços Em Educação*, 13(32), 1-18.
- Boff, L. (2015). *Como cuidar de nossa Casa Comum*. Recuperado de <https://leonardoboff.wordpress.com/2015/08/22/como-cuidar-de-nossa-casa-comum/>
- Ceccon, C. (1978, 5 a 11 de maio). Paulo Freire, no exílio, ficou mais brasileiro ainda. *Pasquim*, p. 10-14. Recuperado de: <http://memoria.bn.br/docreader/DocReader.aspx?bib=124745&Pesq=1978&pagfis=16490>
- Deleuze, G. (1988). *Diferença e repetição* (L. Orlandi, & R. Machado, Trans.). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Graal.
- Foucault, M. (1987). *Vigiar e punir: nascimento da prisão* (27a ed.). Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.
- Foucault, M. (2008). *Nascimento da biopolítica: curso dado no College de France (1978-1979)* (E. Brandão, & C. Berliner, Trans.). São Paulo, SP: Martins Fontes.
- Freire, P. (1967). *Educação como prática da liberdade*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Paz e Terra.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogia da indignação*. São Paulo, SP: Unesp.
- Freire, P. (2002). *Pedagogia da autonomia: saberes necessários à prática educativa*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Paz e Terra.
- Freire, P. (2007). Dez anos da morte de Paulo Freire: entrevista com Mário Sérgio Cortella. *Revista do Professor*, 1(1), 1.
- Martins, E. S. (2005). A etimologia de alguns vocábulos referentes à educação. *Olhares e Trilhas*, Ano, 6(1), 31-36.
- Maturana, H. (1997). Reflexões sobre o amor. In H. Maturana, C. Magro, M. Graciano, & N. Vaz, *A ontologia da realidade* (p. 183-186). Belo Horizonte, MG: UFMG.
- Norberg-Schulz, C. (1980). *Genius loci: towards a phenomenology of architecture*. Nova York, NY: Rizzoli.
- Organização das Nações Unidas [ONU]. (1948). *Declaração universal dos direitos humanos*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: UNIC. Recuperado de <http://www.onu.org.br/img/2014/09/DUDH.pdf>
- Orrú, S. E. (2016). *Aprendizes com autismo: aprendizagem por eixos de interesse em espaços não excludentes*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Vozes.
- Orrú, S. E. (2020). *A inclusão menor e o paradigma da distorção*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Vozes.

INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Sílvia Ester Orrú: Doctor in Education. Professor at the University of Brasília and collaborator at the Federal University of Alfenas, Campus Poços de Caldas. Coordinator of the Study and Research Laboratory in Learning and Inclusion (LEPAI). Curriculum lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/0285349325152247>
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4672-0471>
E-mail: seorru7@gmail.com

NOTE:

The author was responsible for designing, analyzing and interpreting the data, writing and critically reviewing the manuscript content and also approving the final version to be published.