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ABSTRACT: Normative educational documents took the position of influencing school cultures in consequence of an educational system arrangement based on the pyramid of macropolitics. In such condition, a school culture consisted of a homogenizing practice towards the human differences was inserted. Inclusive Education is an area that aims to, above all, recognize the multiplicity in the classroom, and then, provide an educational process befitting with each student’s singularity. Therefore, this article sought to analyze the normative documents of Education and the formation of the professional qualified to care upon the singularities of the people that face the greatest difficulties in teaching: the pedagogue. The content analysis to which these documents were subjected is based on the Critical Theory of Adorno and the Deleuze’s Philosophy of Difference. Through the Deleuzian study, it was possible to identify a movement that strengthen the inclusive practices as the documents assumed a micropolitical feature.
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A FORMAÇÃO DO PEDAGOGO EM UMA PERSPECTIVA INCLUSIVA: ANÁLISE DOCUMENTAL

RESUMO: Diante da construção de um sistema educacional baseado na pirâmide da macropolítica, os documentos normativos educacionais assumiram a posição de influenciar culturas escolares. Neste contexto se insere uma cultura escolar que configura uma prática homogeneizadora das diferenças humanas. A Educação Inclusiva é uma área educacional que visa, antes de tudo, reconhecer a multiplicidade existente na sala de aula e, assim, proporcionar um processo educacional condizente com a singularidade de cada estudante. Perante essa problemática, este artigo visa analisar os documentos normativos que regem a Educação e a formação do profissional habilitado a atender as singularidades das pessoas que enfrentam as maiores dificuldades de aprendizagem: o pedagogo. A análise de conteúdo a que esses documentos foram submetidos se fundamenta na Teoria Crítica de Adorno e na Filosofia da Diferença de Deleuze. Por meio do estudo deleuziano, foi possível identificar um movimento de fortalecimento das práticas inclusivas conforme os documentos assumiam um caráter micropolítico.
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RESÚMEN: Frente a la construcción de un sistema educativo basado en la pirámide de macropolíticas, los documentos educativos normativos tomaron la posición de influir en las culturas escolares. En este contexto, se inserta una cultura escolar que constituye una práctica homogeneizadora de las diferencias humanas. La educación inclusiva es un área educativa que tiene como objetivo, sobre todo, reconocer la multiplicidad existente en las clases y, por lo tanto, proporcionar un proceso educativo coherente con la singularidad de cada alumno. Frente a este problema, este artículo pretende analizar los documentos normativos de la Educación y la formación del profesional calificado a dar la atención especializada a las personas que enfrentan las mayores dificultades de aprendizaje: el pedagogo. El análisis de contenido a que fueron sometidos estos documentos se basa en la Teoría Crítica de Adorno y la Filosofía de la Diferencia de Deleuze. A través del estudio Deleuzian, fue posible identificar un movimiento para fortalecer las prácticas inclusivas ya que los documentos asumieron un carácter micropolítico.
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INTRODUCTION

This article sought to identify how normative texts on the education of pedagogues approach inclusion. The study, from which this article is originated, is based on the work of the International Observatory for Inclusion, Interculturality and Pedagogical Innovation (OIIIIPe).

The current discussion on inclusion, and, consequently, teacher education, results from the incompatibility of conservative, and somewhat progressive, perspectives with the cultural diversity in the classroom due to a historical evolution. Perrenoud (2000) introduces the subject when dealing with the homogenization movement present in the traditional currents of inclusion:

The school system tries to homogenize each class in it by grouping students of the same age. This results in a very relative homogeneity due to disparities at the same age in developmental levels and types of family socialization. (PERRENOUD, 2000, p. 57)

However, human diversity is not inherent in the classroom; it concerns any social environment and is part of human nature. Accepting human diversity, which is not only a biological, but also a sociological fact, directs the reflection to the philosophy of difference. The concept of difference supports the reflection upon the meaning of Inclusion. However, the history of philosophy provides different visions of difference, enabling to think different ways of regulating it through State’s action.

Education, as a public and fundamental human right, is regulated by the State due to its interference. Different visions of how to work human difference can be observed based on the normative context of the State on Education. Besides describing the State’s response to this issue, understanding these details in the normative documents allows to evaluate the development of Inclusive Education.

The documentary analysis proposed in this article focuses on pedagogue education, considering that in the Pedagogy course that professionals are trained to deal with the differences that cause the biggest difficulties in learning: students with specialized educational needs. The Pedagogy course includes the greatest theoretical load on the teaching-learning process, preparing the pedagogue to adapt to any formative context.

However, grounding the several perceptions of the difference, and how to deal with it, is necessary before analyzing the normative documents. The history of philosophy is a scientific field that allows to trace how the concept of difference has been defined over the centuries, and how it has influenced the way of thinking the human being and even the role of Education in society. Thus, we initially outline the philosophies of difference throughout the history of philosophy.

PHILOSOPHY OF DIFFERENCE

Rocha (2006) shows clearly the constitution of two strands of thought in Greek culture that initiate the discussion on the concept of difference in the history of philosophy:

The two broad strands of thought structured in Greek culture in the 5th and 4th centuries BC are polarized and constitute the strands of sedentary reason and nomadic thinking. [...] The idea of a thought resulting from a living and active body and action from affirmative thinking [nomadic thinking] clashes directly with the Socratic perspective that thought must move away from the sensible world and the body itself to judge life and find truth. (ROCHA, 2006, p. 63)

The rationalism created by Socrates, Plato and Aristotle is the hegemonic basis of philosophical thought. “The laws, morals and reason constituted from Socrates and Plato bring the religious world of the new state” (ROCHA, 2006, p. 61). This thought supports a conception of difference on which many of the public policies of inclusion of the modern state are based. Plato’s Cave Myth, in which the diversity of shadows is based on the true form of being, explains this conception of
difference very well. Thus, “hierarchy is established from the value of beings, defined by the degree of similarity between ephemeral matter and eternal idea” (ROCHA, 2006, p. 61).

Plato’s thinking would enable figuring human diversity as a failure, and inclusion would be a way of approximating the different to an ideal.

In Plato, the copy is similarly linking to the idea of something. The model is the idea, and the copy is based on an internal resemblance to the identity of the idea linked to the world of heights. According to Deleuze (1974), the motivation that exists in the Platonic process that creates representation is the exclusion of copies without similarity. (ROCHA, 2006, p. 62)

This form of thinking is strengthened in the Enlightenment with the positive philosophy. The Enlightenment, as a rescue movement of Greek classicism, has the mission of taking all humanity out of the cave. An extremely complex and contradictory philosophical and sociological system is created based on Augusto Comte’s positive philosophy, on which the modern state was established. The Platonic dialectic persists in positive philosophy because it is structured in the defense of human development from economic development, which is important to define a philosophy of difference in our article.

The contradiction between the modern stage of technical mastery over nature, which should theoretically mean a promise of freedom, and the widening of the most diverse forms of barbarism within technical civilization, have rather witnessed the failure of the Enlightenment reason as a means of expanding autonomy. human nature, than its full realization. (BUENO, 2015, p. 151)

Chronologically, the next to formulate a philosophical system consistent enough to resonate with a new way of thinking about difference is Hegel. Although Hegelian thought is a critique of Platonic dialectic, two opposite currents agree when the illusionism of Hegel’s dialectic is unmasked. Adorno and Horkheimer introduce the concept of Halbbildung (pseudo-formation), which is a critique of the spirit formation in the Enlightenment. According to Hegel: “Spirit formation is complete. But in the end, it turns out that the spirit would never, in completing itself, be what it promised. It gives a formation, but it is a pseudo-formation” (GHIRALDELLI JR., 2010, p. 25). Deleuze, a much more radical critic than Adorno and Horkheimer, states that “Hegelian audacity is the last and most powerful tribute given to the old principle” (BUENO, 2015, p. 153). The affirmation of difference through the denial of identity is, for Deleuze, nothing more than to “betray and denature the difference in its pure state” (BUENO, 2015, p. 154).

In practice, this philosophy translates into the welfare policies of inclusion that instituted a special educational formation, separated, however, from regular Education. This policy, which is based essentially on the National Education Guidelines and Framework Law of 1971, was defined based on the common thinking that students with different educational needs must be separated from those with potential to pursue their studies simultaneously to the others. On the other hand, the attempt to homogenize the classroom is a positivist practice focused on the productivity of educational formation, which also denies the differences of those that most closely resemble the ideal student. Thus, not only the student with special needs is excluded, but also the most subtle differences of those who attend regular education are repressed.

Finally, the philosophy of difference based on Platonic idealism crumbles into the “Kafkian nightmare”. After the two great tragedies of the twentieth century, one notices the failure of the system to recognize and respect human diversity. A number of international and national documents emerge reaffirming respect for diversity based on the perspective of an idealized, equal human being, which states that “all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights” (UNITED NATIONS, 1948).
In the same light of response to the Kafkaian nightmare arises the philosophical movements of the Frankfurt School and poststructuralism, which have, as the most notable thinkers of difference, Adorno and Horkheimer on the one hand and Deleuze on the other. The works of both movements initially disagree; however, they agree on points, to which this article give prominence to compose a vision of difference based on reality.

ADORNO AND DELEUZE TO THINK OF AN INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

The critique of the totalitarianism of Cartesian and positivist reason is the main point of agreement. Bueno (2015), seeking to confront the theories of Adorno and Deleuze, points out two serious consequences of totalitarian thinking:

First, under the imperative of eliminating the immeasurable, not only are qualities and differences dissolved by identifying thought, but also men themselves forced into equivalence dictated by exchange value in the marketplace. [...] Secondly, in the face of technical and scientific progress, presided over by Cartesian and positivist epistemology, all differences, all that “do not submit to the criteria of calculability and utility become suspect for Enlightenment”. (BUENO, 2015, p. 155)

In an interview for the GloboNews show Milênio, in 2015, Edgar Morin reports the barbarities of knowledge based on calculation:

First of all, we must understand that we are increasingly threatened by two barbarities. The first barbarity we know comes from the dawn of history, which includes cruelty, domination, subservience, torture, all of that. The second is a cold form of barbarity, the economic calculation. Because when there is a thought based exclusively on calculation, we no longer see human beings. What we see are statistics, products. Essentially, calculation, which is useful only as an instrument, turns into a means of knowledge, but of false knowledge, masking human reality.

Essentially, as soon as the calculation comes in, humans are treated as objects. And with the current mastery of power and money, with the mastery of the bureaucratic world, all this is the realm of cold barbarity. If you prefer, you need to rethink politics and we are in the prehistory of that moment. One needs to know if the negative forces, the negative current will be stronger than the positive forces that are trying to rise today in the world and are still very scattered. (MORIN, 2015)

This study was directed towards the perspectives that understand the multiple reality of human diversity considering all the criticisms that show totalitarian thought as exclusionary, without performing an overly identity process that consequently implies exclusion.

Deleuze disagrees with Adorno when he believes that dialectics differentiates human being through negativity, without pointing to a synthesis. The intense conflict between universality and the uniqueness of the body preserves the difference.

Deleuze’s thought adamantly refused any possibility of thinking the difference with integrity within the negative mediation frames of the object [...], while Adorno’s thought remained faithful to the consistency of the dialectical method as a resource capable of preserving the possible affinities between the object and its concept. (BUENO, 2015, p. 156)

Based on Adorno’s thought, it is possible to think of an emancipatory Inclusive Education, in which there is the identity of the subject, not as subject to its concept, but only using it to discover its true self. The practice of subject differentiation is a self-reflexive process.

For Deleuze, however, using universality to make a difference can imprison the body in a false reality. Based on Deleuze’s critique, it can be observed, for example, the development of a diseased society based on an aesthetic and social standard that promises false realization as a human being. The differences, which are pure and real, are discriminated in search of a false and imaginary representation. Deleuze’s critique, therefore, is for any form of dialectic.

Alain Badiou characterized the Deleuzian method as an anti-dialectic and a “singular form of intuition”. Anti-dialectic due to a refusal to think by categories and mediations. Deleuze criticized the philosophy that is produced by divisions in being, proceeding by analogies, which has been dominant throughout history. (GALLO, 2017, p. 32)
Thinking of an Inclusive Education based on Deleuze leads to a radical transformation of the individual perception of difference, and even Education itself. However, this change of attitude is required in Inclusive Education. “Inclusive school implies changes in the attitude with which we view it, which can determine the success or failure of students” (SILVA, 2012, p. 121). The change in thinking of those involved in the child formation results in practical fight against exclusion, which is embedded in the formation of the social system.

Inclusion, therefore, would result from the change in thinking of individuals who would recognize the pure difference in themselves. The very identity formation of the individual would be compromised because the movement in Deleuze is so intense that it does not allow the individual to identify its uniqueness based on the constant differences that exist in his own being.

Based on the idea that what constitutes the essence of force is the relation with other forces or that it is in the relation that the force acquires its essence or quality, Deleuze defines a body as a multiple phenomenon, composed of a plurality of irreducible forces in force. Struggle, in which some forces are dominant, and others dominated. (ROCK, 2006, p. 65)

The identity of the subject is weak because one lives in constant change. “We can define the concept, based on French philosophers, as an adventure of thought that institutes an event, which allows a point of view [about] the world, about the lived” (GALLO, 2017, p. 38). The formation of a self-concept is circumstantial, personal, and historical. This thinking helps in the understand of human diversity by respecting the difference in the other and counteracting the formulation of a hierarchy between differences that results in unconscious or even conscious discrimination.

Understanding that the inclusion process requires a change of thinking of all involved. Inclusive Education only occurs if it is aimed at all students, not just those who are judged to be more different or more prone to exclusion. Thus, the teacher must be able to deal with any kind of difference, knowing to overcome the learning challenges the difference imposes.

Some differences result in greater challenges, but, since each individual is unique, learning is also unique and can lead to unusual places beyond the teacher’s supposed control. The teacher’s role is to help students to overcome their developmental and learning barriers, whether larger or smaller, and provide a stimulating environment.

THE OMNILETIC PERSPECTIVE FOR UNDERSTANDING INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

The omniletic perspective created by Santos (2013) seeks to change the analysis of social phenomena that circumscribe the educational environment. Recognizing both the multiplicity and the contradiction of these phenomena, Santos (2013, p. 16) propose that dialectical and complex methods should be integrated in the search for an analysis that “[understands] social phenomena in their visible integrality and potentiality”.

By omniletics I mean, then, a relational perception of diversity, of what is different, a difference that can be both shown and hidden at the same time and in different time-spaces. It is a totalizing manner of perceiving social phenomena, which comprise in themselves possibilities for dialectically infinite variations that are not always immediately perceptible, visible or imaginable, but not absent or impossible because their relational character, referential and participatory (in the sense of being a part) makes what is perceived of the phenomenon both its instituted part and its instituting part. (SANTOS, 2013, p. 15)

The author recognizes the methodological conflict of this perspective. As discussed earlier, dialectics and multiplicity are different visions of reality. Despite this intrinsic opposition, dialectics changed based on the Marxist thinking, which allowed dialectics to view reality as a complex phenomenon (JUSTINO, 2014). The analysis of the social phenomenon becomes contextual and singular when complexity enters dialectical thinking, a synthesis is no longer sought.

After all, dialectics – a way of thinking based on the need to recognize the constant emergence of the new in human reality – would refuse itself if it crystallized or coagulated its syntheses, refusing to review them even in face of changed situations. (KONDER, 1981, p. 39 apud SANTOS, 2013, p. 16)

Santos (2013) compares the concept of wholeness showed above with the Morinian idea of complexity to enable an approximation between materialist dialectic and complexity. “In complex
thinking ‘a system is a whole that takes shape at the same time that its elements are transformed’” (MORIN, 1987, p. 111 apud SANTOS, 2013, 2). Thus, the totality in the omniletic perspective is flexible because it considers the context of the phenomenon, the individuals involved, historical evolution and even political geography.

The omniletic perspective also includes the dimensions of analysis of school phenomena developed by Booth and Ainscow (SANTOS, 2013). This creates a concern for specific fields that interconnect in the analysis of a social phenomenon of inclusion: cultures, policies and practices.

However, the dimension “creating inclusive cultures” is placed, deliberately, along the base of the triangle. At times, too little attention has been given to the potential for school cultures to support or undermine developments in teaching and learning. Yet they are at the heart of school improvement. The development of shared inclusive values and collaborative relationships may lead to changes in the other dimensions. It is through inclusive school cultures, that changes in policies and practices can be sustained by new staff and students. (BOOTH; AINSCOW, 2002, p. 8)

The omniletic perspective, having as dimensions the dialectical and complex analysis together with the analysis of cultures, policies and educational practices, guides not only in a critical look at the exclusionary reality of the educational system, but also proposes the development of cultures, inclusive policies and practices through a contextualized, participatory and never static process. “An inclusive school is one that is on the move” (BOOTH; AINSCOW, 2002, p. 3).

THE DOCUMENTARY STUDY

Considering the advances in the conceptualization of difference and its potential in the perspective of Inclusive Education, we analyze the documents seeking to evaluate the advances and regressions in educational legislation, from the Constitution to the Pedagogical Political Project of the Pedagogy course.

A documentary study, based on the studies by Andre and Ludke (1986, p. 37), “can be a valuable technique for approaching qualitative data, either by complementing the information obtained by other techniques or by unveiling new aspects of a theme or problem”. Thus, the national laws, guidelines, projects and plans were selected for this study.

We reiterate that this article sought to identify how the normative texts on the pedagogue education approach the inclusion. This objective is evidenced by the documents, in which inclusive education is based on Adorno, Deleuze and the omniletic perspective of Santos (2013). Thus, for this study the following documents were selected:

a) Federal Constitution (1988);
b) National Education Guidelines and Framework Law (1996);
c) National Curriculum Guidelines for the Undergraduate Pedagogy course (2006);
d) National Education Plan (2014);
e) National Curriculum Framework for teacher education (2015);
f) Pedagogical Project of the UFGD Pedagogy course (2017).

All documents were read and thematic units regarding the subject difference in the classroom were pointed out, either specialized care or simply the individualized learning process.

Regarding the content analysis of documents, we emphasize that:

it should not be extremely tied to the text or technique, in an excessive formalism that impairs the researcher’s creativity and intuitive capacity, and therefore not so subjective, leading to imposing his own ideas or values, in which the text passes merely functioning as a confirmir of these. (CAMPOS, 2004, p. 613)

The omniletic perspective as a tool for documentary study, especially in its political dimension, helps to think about normatizations as result of cultural influences that cause conscious or

---

3 The history by its Marxist approach and the geography by its Deleuzian approach.
unconscious practices of exclusion or inclusion. Thus, the philosophies of difference mentioned are used as categories for content analysis.

RESULTS

The main aspects about inclusion addressed in the documents were identified and the thematic units that will contribute to the discussion with the analysis were pointed out.

The Federal Constitution of 1988 was a historical milestone for Brazilian Education regarding the insurance of access to education as a subjective public right. The chapter on education is found in the eighth title of the Magna Carta, called Social Order. The whole title is ruled by the general provision, article 193, which establishes work as the primacy of the social order, always aiming at welfare and justice (BRASIL, 1988).

When the Constitution establishes citizenship as a principle of the Federative Republic of Brazil, it is ordering that the State, in its normative and factual actions, promote social inclusion and, therefore, combat social exclusion and marginalization. Of course, work is a decisive factor in social inclusion. Lack of work, voluntary unemployment, promotes social exclusion and marginalization. (STEINMETZ; SCHUCH, 2006 apud PINHO, 2011, para. 9)

The Constitution, while valuing work, makes use of Education to promote social inclusion. “The fundamental right to work means the right to an Education that qualifies the person for work [...]” (STEINMETZ; SCHUCH, 2006, apud PINHO, 2011, para. 10). Inclusion, therefore, happens through work, in which the worker can “culturally and economically” consider an imagined quality of life. The greater the effectiveness of the educational process of empowering people to excel in the labor market, the greater the achievement of welfare and social justice goals.

The policy of including Education for work as a means of achieving social justice addresses the problems described above. The logic of the market is antagonistic to the inclusive process because it is based on economic calculation, which aims at productivity, as already explained by Morin (2015).

Difference institutes a production process that differs temporally in each individual. Productivity aims at suppressing this human temporal variation to a productive pattern. Based on this incongruity, it can be concluded that the educational process as a means of achieving professional qualification results in a teaching methodology that strengthens the students’ homogenization movement.

To implement the project of Education for all, in some of its articles, the Constitution establishes inclusive mechanisms for those who faces greater barriers to access and to educational development. For the disabled, the Constitution establishes in the third paragraph of article 208 that it is the duty of the State to guarantee specialized care, and to “adjust the conditions of the student”. In the sixth paragraph of the same article, it establishes that it is the duty of the State to offer evening classes. Regarding the minimum curriculum, in the second paragraph of article 210, the right is guaranteed to the indigenous to have teaching given in their mother tongue.

These mechanisms, first, are a milestone in the recognition of differences in the educational space. For example, Article 208, third paragraph, was the first to allow the student with special needs to enter the conventional classroom, which was not allowed since the National Education Guidelines and Framework Law (LDB) of 1971.

In addition to the data obtained from the Brazilian Federal Constitution, we seek further information in other legislation that currently governs educational standards. In Law no. 9.394/96, the LDB of 1996, education has more humanistic principles such as freedom and solidarity. As an inclusive practice, to meet the specificities of certain groups, the LDB regulates different teaching modalities that supplement or complement regular education. Considering the principle of “equal conditions for access and permanence in school” (BRASIL, 1996), several parts of the text approach the adequacy of the education system to enhance or recover those without regular education. Items III to VII of the fourth article exemplify the attempt to provide access and quality for all:

Article 4. The duty of the State with public school education shall be effected by the guarantee of:

[...];
III - free specialized educational assistance to students with disabilities, global developmental disorders and high skills or giftedness, across all levels, stages and modalities, preferably in the regular school system;

IV - free public access to primary and secondary education for all who have not completed them at their own age;

V - access to the highest levels of education, research and artistic creation, according to one’s capacity;

VI - offer of regular evening education, appropriate to the conditions of the student;

VII - provision of regular school education for young people and adults, with characteristics and modalities appropriate to their needs and availability, guaranteeing to those who are workers the conditions of access and permanence in school;

[...].

(BRAZIL, 1996)

Generally, LDB has discrepancies in its approaches due to several revisions over the past two decades. By analyzing the separation of teaching into several modalities, it can be observed an attempt to simplify differences by categorizing the similar needs of certain groups. This attempt persists in Brazilian education because it is the only way found so far to meet the needs of an unequal society.

The separation of Education into teaching modalities enables the specialization of educational care and the teacher’s pedagogical work, who would otherwise have to rethink the homogenizing teaching methodology.

Regarding the teacher education for Basic Education, we think it is evident that the granting of medium level courses for teacher training had a transitory character in the LDB of 1996. However, teacher may deal with special needs in the classroom with only a mid-level course in the normal mode.

The National Education Plan (PNE) for the 2014-2024 decade is the last political-administrative document we analyzed. The PNE is a state policy that defines goals and strategies for the development of National Education. Following the same scheme of the Constitution and the LDB, its starting point is the development of teaching modalities aiming at providing access to quality Education for everyone. Therefore, these goals seek to reduce inequality through social inclusion mechanisms for groups prone to exclusion.

In Goal 2, which refers to the progress of Elementary School, the third strategy defines the “creation of mechanisms for the individualized monitoring of elementary school students” (BRASIL, 2014). This strategy agrees with Deleuze’s philosophy of multiplicity, when it recognizes that while some students may face more difficult than others, only the perception that everyone is uniquely different hinders the institutionalization of exclusion in classifications of students in teaching modalities. Individualized monitoring is a mechanism for preventing exclusion, adapting teaching to different types of learning. The strategy itself is consistent with the National Curriculum Guidelines for Teacher Education, which defines that it is an aptitude of the undergraduate student to “conduct study that provides knowledge about students and their sociocultural reality, [...]” (BRASIL, 2015).

The documents of the National Council of Education, which defines the National Curriculum Guidelines (DCNs), represent norms of a different order to those showed in this article. These documents have a pedagogical, not just administrative, character. Inclusion, therefore, also assumes new facets, mainly based on the different principles of these documents. Education, in this context, ceases to have the primacy of work and reflects on its complexity, especially valuing citizenship. Education aims no longer at worker’s qualification, who across the world would have the opportunity for inclusion in society and is turned into a means for “the emancipation of individuals and social groups” (BRASIL, 2015).

Based on the principle of emancipation, teacher education leads the egress to “a broader view of the formative process” that recognizes “its different rhythms, times and spaces, considering the psychosocial, historical, cultural, affective, relational and interactive dimensions that permeate the pedagogical action” (BRAZIL, 2015, p. 6). Consequently, a complex attitude towards the pedagogical action is perceived, enabling to notice the differences in each teaching-learning process. This view directs this analysis to the only normative unit of the documents analyzed in this study that uses the term Inclusive Education. Likewise, teacher education leads the egress “to the consolidation of inclusive education through respect for differences, recognizing and valuing ethnic-racial, gender, sexual, religious, generational diversity, among others” (BRAZIL, 2015, p. 6).
When the DCN of undergraduate degrees institutes emancipation as an educational purpose, it is based on the perspective of Adorno and Horkheimer’s Critical Theory. However, given our previous philosophical discussion, some problems can be observed. [...] the idea of knowledge as emancipation is also problematic for Kohan, since nobody emancipates anyone. The person emancipates himself. Thus, the idea of an emancipating education, which comes from the knowledge passed on by the teacher, learned by the student and responsible for the elevation of their rationality is totally arbitrary. Education does not emancipate, since emancipation is an individual act. Education that aims at the emancipation of the other actually makes the other dull. What education can do is enabling the other to emancipate himself. (MARIN, 2014, p. 136)

When Marinho centralizes the problem of the intransference of knowledge in the discussion about the emancipating Education of Critical Theory, he speaks about an environment in which knowledge must be managed through the individual, and the teacher’s functionality is maintained in the space where this development happens.

Deleuzian thinking is inserted in this perspective. “The postmodern proposal deconstructs the idea of emancipation as something that can be taught or passed on and affirms the notion of creativity and micro universe” (MARINHO, 2014, p. 126). This article considers impossible to think of an Inclusive Education that does not start in the micro student universe.

The education of pedagogues has a propensity for Deleuzian thinking, since it has a much more intense contact with the learning process, unlike other undergraduate courses. The study of the formation processes, individualized to the different contexts, is inherent to the Pedagogy course. The educator, therefore, through his formation, must be able to develop adaptive teaching processes that enable the right to quality education for any individual, regardless their medical, social or psychological condition, ethnic origin and/or their religious belief, political orientation or gender identity.

In the National Curriculum Guidelines for the Undergraduate Course in Pedagogy, the Nacioanl Council of Education (CNE) defines that pedagogues can “identify sociocultural and educational problems with an investigative, integrative and purposeful stance in the face of complex realities, to contribute to overcoming social, ethnic and social exclusion – racial, economic, cultural, religious, political and other” (BRAZIL, 2006, p. 2).

The Pedagogy course at the Federal University of Great Dourados, in the city of Dourados, in the state of Mato Grosso do Sul, Brazil, was the object of analysis of work training of educators. In Opinion no. 05/2005/CNE/CP, that guides the DCNs of the course, the training of educators is understood as follows:

It is understood that the education of the graduate in Pedagogy is based on the pedagogical work carried out in school and non-school spaces, which is based on teaching. In this perspective, teaching is understood as an educational action and methodical and intentional pedagogical process, built on social, ethnic-racial and productive relations, which influence concepts, principles and objectives of Pedagogy. Thus, teaching, both in school and non-school educational processes, is not confused with the use of supposedly pedagogical methods and techniques, detached from specific historical realities. It is the confluence of knowledge from different cultural traditions and sciences, as well as values, attitudes and ethical attitudes, aesthetic, playful, and work manifestations. (BRAZIL, 2016 apud UFGD, 2017)

The Pedagogy course at UFGD, therefore, is based on the essential studies of Education to guide the methodological studies of teaching practice (UFGD, 2017, p. 13-14). For these studies, the course has a series of disciplines that seek to “raise awareness of diversity” (BRASIL, 2006, p. 2), thus promoting studies on teaching-learning processes that are contextualized with the reality of the individual, aiming at “ensuring the training of the pedagogue to identify the special educational needs of all students” (UFGD, 2017, p. 14).

SOME CONSIDERATIONS

During the documentary study, in the posterior categorization process, content analysis of normative documents made the possible to avoid the term “category”, the perception of a movement. Documents of the highest normative jurisdiction were selected such as the Federal Constitution, and also pedagogical documents such as the Pedagogical Project of the UFGD Pedagogy course (PPP). The
observed movement showed the inability of administrative documents (CF, LDB and PNE) to regulate something that happened in the pedagogical scope and were treated with more theoretical affinity with Inclusive Education by DCNs and the PPP analyzed.

This movement reinforces Gallo’s (2017) thesis on minor Education, which also describes a resistance movement.

The officiality, the planning, the public policies, the machine of control and subjectivation, etc., which characterize the higher education, must be countered by the lower education, in a movement of a machine of war, resistance, singularity production, possibility of the emergence of the unusual in learning. (MARIN, 2014, p. 137)

The pedagogue, therefore, situated in a micropolitics, collectively constructs the normative educational orientation, in a movement of inversion of the macropolitical pyramid. The high contextualization of the collective construction of inclusive mechanisms enables greater adaptation to local differences.

It is also possible to build the student learning process by removing the figure of the “teacher-prophet”, enabling a privileged transferability of knowledge, in which the student’s creativity in the construction of his own knowledge is valued.
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