

 **Genesis and Legacy of the Contemporary
History of Philosophy Teaching in Brazil (1996-2004)**

*Dalton José Alves**

Abstract: The following article aims to present, in a panoramic view, paths, among other possibilities, that may go through teachers, students, and researchers for the study and practice of the philosophy teaching based on its recent history. This study uses a descriptive and deductive methodology, based on a bibliographical review and investigation of the legislation on philosophy teaching. Part of contemporary history of philosophy teaching in Brazil begins with the LDB/1996. The ambiguous and contradictory way in which the teaching of philosophy appears in this Law, will result in a reaction from professionals in this area for its revision. This resulted in the resumption of studies, publications, movements and national congresses on philosophy and its teaching. The main movements and productions that took place between 1996 and 2004 are described. With emphasis on the advent of historic statute of teaching of Philosophy as a field of Philosophy knowledge, that is, as a sub-area of philosophical research, beyond the Pedagogy field. Due to the richness of new perspectives and scientific productions that marked this period, the great potential of Philosophy to think about its own teaching was perceived. This led several fronts to advocate: theoretical, political, pedagogical, which continues to the present day.

Keywords: Philosophy of Philosophy Teaching; History of Philosophy Teaching-Brazil; Curriculum-Philosophy-Discipline; Legislation-Philosophy-Teaching; LDB-1996-Philosophy Teaching.

* PhD in Education from the Universidade Estadual de Campinas (UNICAMP). Professor at Universidade Federal do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (UNIRIO). E-mail: dalton.alves@unirio.br. Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/4537608671958896>. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2036-4069>.

Gênese e legado da história contemporânea do ensino de Filosofia no Brasil (1996-2004)

Resumo: O presente artigo tem como objetivo apresentar, numa visão panorâmica, trilhas, dentre outras possíveis, que possam percorrer docentes, estudantes e pesquisadores para o estudo e a prática do ensino de filosofia com base em sua história recente. Utiliza metodologia descritiva e dedutiva, baseada em revisão bibliográfica e na investigação da legislação sobre o ensino de filosofia. Parte da história contemporânea do ensino de filosofia no Brasil, que principia com a LDB/1996. Devido à forma ambígua e contraditória que o ensino da filosofia aparece nessa lei, isso provocará uma reação dos profissionais da área por sua revisão, o que resultou na retomada dos estudos, publicações, movimentos e congressos nacionais sobre a filosofia e seu ensino. Descreve-se as principais ações e produções que se deram no período de 1996 a 2004, com destaque para o surgimento do *estatuto histórico do ensino de filosofia como campo do conhecimento da Filosofia*, isto é, como subárea de pesquisa filosófica, para além da pedagogia. Devido à riqueza dos novos olhares e produções que marcaram esse período, percebeu-se o grande potencial da Filosofia para pensar seu próprio ensino. Isso impulsionou diversas frentes de lutas: *teóricas, políticas, pedagógicas*, que vêm até os dias atuais.

Palavras-chave: Filosofia do Ensino de Filosofia; História do Ensino de Filosofia-Brasil; Currículo-Filosofia-Disciplina; Legislação-Filosofia-Ensino; LDB-1996-Ensino de Filosofia.

Génesis y Legado de la Historia Contemporánea de la Enseñanza de la Filosofía en Brasil (1996-2004)

Resumen: Este artículo tiene como objetivo presentar, en una mirada panorámica, los caminos, entre otros posibles, que pueden seguir profesores, estudiantes e investigadores para el estudio y la práctica de la enseñanza de la filosofía a partir de su historia reciente. Utiliza una metodología descriptiva y deductiva, basada en una revisión bibliográfica y en la investigación de la legislación sobre la enseñanza de la filosofía. Parte de la historia contemporánea de la enseñanza de la filosofía en Brasil, que comienza con la LDB/1996. Debido a la forma ambigua y contradictoria en que aparece la enseñanza de la filosofía

en esta Ley, esto provocará una reacción de los profesionales del área para su revisión. Esto resultó en la reanudación de estudios, publicaciones, movimientos y congresos nacionales sobre filosofía y su enseñanza. Se describen las principales acciones y producciones que tuvieron lugar entre 1996 y 2004. Con énfasis en el surgimiento del estatus histórico de la enseñanza de la filosofía como campo de conocimiento de la Filosofía, es decir, como subárea de la investigación filosófica, más allá pedagogía. Debido a la riqueza de nuevas miradas y producciones que marcaron este período, se percibió el gran potencial de la Filosofía para pensar su propia enseñanza. Esto impulsó varios frentes de lucha: teórico, político, pedagógico, que llega hasta nuestros días.

Palabras clave: Filosofía de la Enseñanza de la Filosofía; Historia de la Enseñanza de la Filosofía-Brasil; Currículo-Filosofía-Disciplina; Legislación-Filosofía-Enseñanza; LDB-1996-Enseñanza de la Filosofía.

Introduction

The aim of this text is to present a brief guide for research on the teaching of philosophy in contemporary Brazil, which began at the end of 1996, following the enactment of the National Education Guidelines and Framework Law (Lei de Diretrizes e Base da Educação Nacional, LDBEN), Law No. 9,394/96 (Brazil, 1996). The article provides a brief historical overview, along with indications of research agendas, texts, and key authors who address various topics related to the demands of philosophy teaching, particularly in basic education. It may help philosophy teachers at the secondary level to organize their lesson plans and/or classroom activities, according to each teacher's interests and context, as well as for undergraduate philosophy students who wish to learn about the history of their future field of teaching practice. This work is also intended to support researchers interested in analyzing and debating the history of Philosophy as a subject in the secondary school curriculum, as well as its approaches, themes, teaching methodologies, educational materials, and so forth. The article is divided into three parts, in addition

to the introduction and final considerations. The first section examines why LDB/96 is seen as the starting point of the contemporary history of philosophy teaching in Brazil, both for historical and contextual reasons and for theoretical considerations. Section 2 deals with the resumption of studies, research, and publications (dissertations, theses, articles, and books) on philosophy teaching, which in most cases focus on analyzing the role of philosophy in the LDB/96 as a subject within the basic education curriculum, along with its political and didactic-methodological implications. Section 3 first addresses the rearticulation of national movements advocating for the inclusion of philosophy as a mandatory subject in upper-secondary education, through support for proposed laws seeking to amend the LDB/96 to explicitly state this requirement. It then discusses the revival of national meetings and events on philosophy teaching and, finally, in section 3.1, briefly presents and comments on some of the publications from that period as a way of illustrating the thematic diversity debated in these events.

In the final considerations, the text returns to the central idea underlying the events and publications discussed, namely, the recognition of the need for the field of Philosophy itself to take on the task of reflecting on its own teaching; that is, *to philosophize on philosophy teaching*. Comenta-se brevemente sobre o final dessa primeira fase da história contemporânea do ensino de filosofia, que se deu com a promulgação, em 2008, da Lei que tornou a filosofia e a sociologia disciplinas obrigatórias nos três anos do ensino médio. The article concludes by addressing the issue of the curricular reform of the new upper-secondary education model, which has practically rendered the inclusion of philosophy unfeasible by restructuring the curriculum by areas of knowledge rather than individual subjects. At the same time, it underscores that, despite these adverse conditions, proactive initiatives related to philosophy teaching have not been interrupted. These efforts have continued through investments in research and in the creation of new materials that are essential for reflecting on and practicing Philosophy and its teaching.

Principle of the contemporary history of philosophy teaching in Brazil (Law No. 9,394/1996 – LDBEN)

The National Education Guidelines and Framework Law (Law No. 9,394) enacted on December 20, 1996,¹ may be considered as the starting point of the contemporary history of philosophy teaching in Brazil for political and contextual reasons, but more significantly due to a theoretical consideration.

The political and contextual reasons stem from the fact that philosophical studies and activities—events, publications on philosophy teaching, and especially the advocacy movements defending the mandatory inclusion of the subject in the curriculum—had largely subsided. In a broader sense, scholars and professionals in the field did not anticipate the direction ultimately taken. It had generally been expected that the 1996 LDB would, at the legislative level, acknowledge the importance of philosophical knowledge in the formation of upper-secondary students, and many assumed that this recognition had in fact occurred. A more careful examination, however, revealed that it had not, owing to the ambiguous and contradictory way the LDB addressed the incorporation of philosophy into upper-secondary education (Alves, 2002).

Although the LDB explicitly stated that students should demonstrate, upon completing upper-secondary education, “Mastery of the philosophical and sociological knowledge necessary for the exercise of citizenship” (Law No. 9,394/96, Art. 36, §1, III), it did not specify that these fields were to be offered as mandatory subjects. What was mandatory was the development of such knowledge; the means through which this objective would be achieved—whether through formal subjects or alternative curricular arrangements—was left to the discretion of the State Departments of Education. These bodies, therefore, were responsible for determining whether this educational process would take place through subjects, cross-cutting themes, projects, or other formats.

¹ Hereinafter referred to as LDB/96.

The immediate practical consequence was the emergence of conflicting interpretations, resulting from the Law’s ambiguity and imprecision. In some sections, the LDB appeared to indicate the inclusion of certain curricular components as compulsory subjects, while in others it granted states the authority to legislate autonomously on the matter. This is precisely what occurred with Philosophy and Sociology. The table that follows demonstrates how clear and explicit the legislation is regarding the compulsory inclusion of areas such as modern foreign language, arts education, and physical education —and how, by contrast, philosophy and sociology appear in a generic and vague manner.

According to Alves (2002):

TABLE 1

LAW	ARTICLES		
National Education Guidelines and Framework Law (Law No. 9,394/96)	Art. 26, §2 nd – Instruction in the arts shall constitute a mandatory curricular component... §3 rd – Physical education, integrated into the school’s pedagogical plan, is a curricular component of basic education...	Art. 36, Item III – A modern foreign language shall be included as a mandatory subject, selected by the school community...	§1 st – The content, methodologies, and assessment procedures shall be organized in such a way that, upon completing upper-secondary education, students demonstrate: Item III – mastery of the philosophical and sociological knowledge necessary for the exercise of citizenship.
National Curriculum Guidelines for Upper-Secondary Education (Resolution CEB No. 3/98)	Art. 10, Item III, §2 nd – The pedagogical proposals of schools shall ensure interdisciplinary and contextualized approaches to:	subparagraph a: Physical Education and Art, as mandatory curricular components;	subparagraph b: Knowledge of Philosophy and Sociology necessary for the exercise of citizenship.

Source: Alves (2002, p. 103, emphasis on the original).

It is evident that the 1996 LDB, in this regard, adopted differentiated treatment regarding which areas should be considered subjects, and which should not. Although it acknowledged that knowledge of philosophy and sociology is “necessary,” and therefore significant for the education of young people—in other words, although it represented progress in federal legislation on this matter—it ultimately proved ineffective, as it did not ensure the enforceability of its own provision. No mechanisms were created to support the implementation of this new law, which at the time revealed a limited degree of commitment on the part of the Public Authorities to enforcing the very norms they had enacted, given that the means through which students would gain access to this content were neither clearly defined nor explicitly articulated.

It was argued that such matters did not fall within the scope of the National Education Guidelines and Framework Law itself, but rather of subsequent complementary legislation, which is, in principle, correct. However, those complementary laws—namely, the National Curriculum Guidelines (Brazil, 1998) and the National Curriculum Parameters for Upper-Secondary Education (Brazil, 2000a/b)—also failed to provide clear definitions on the issue. In certain instances, they merely reproduced, almost verbatim, the vague and ambiguous wording already present in the 1996 LDB. This is evident in the aforementioned table, particularly in the case of Resolution No. 3/1998.

In some cases, the documents state explicitly that, ultimately, no subject is mandatory within the curriculum:²

The fact that these Curriculum Parameters have been organized, within each area, by potential subjects does not mean that these *subjects are mandatory or even recommended*. What is mandatory, according to the LDB or Resolution No. 03/98, are the bodies of knowledge delineated by these subjects and the competencies and skills associated with them, as

² All translations of quoted material were made by the translator of this article, unless otherwise noted.

indicated in the aforementioned documents. (Brazil, 2000a, p. 18, emphasis added)³

Curiously, only Philosophy and Sociology were not incorporated, in general terms, as subjects. There is no evidence of any attempt to treat mathematics, Portuguese, physics, history, or geography as cross-cutting themes. As far as is known, these and other areas regarded as “classical” continued to be offered as subjects. The logic underlying the discourse of cross-cutting approaches to the curriculum is therefore not applied uniformly across areas; it is, in fact, a substantial *fallacy*.

This issue immediately drew the attention of specialists in the field, as the history of philosophy education in Brazil makes it clear that, whenever the inclusion of Philosophy as a subject was left as optional — now reframed under the label of “cross-cutting”—the prevailing decision, in most cases, was non-inclusion (Alves, 2002).

The issue of how students were expected to gain access to philosophical knowledge is thus particularly significant, because as noted by Alves (2002, p. 104, emphasis added)

It is not in just any manner that one attains satisfactory and substantive access to philosophical knowledge; *its learning requires a specific method of teaching*, one that cannot be encompassed by common sense. Therefore, if it is considered necessary that students demonstrate mastery of philosophical knowledge at the end of basic education (*sic*), then at the very least one should expect that they be afforded the opportunity to gain adequate access to such knowledge; otherwise, philosophy will appear in secondary education

³ Original: “O fato de estes Parâmetros Curriculares terem sido organizados em cada uma das áreas por disciplinas potenciais não significa que estas são obrigatórias ou mesmo recomendadas. O que é obrigatório pela LDB ou pela Resolução nº 03/98 são os conhecimentos que estas disciplinas recortam e as competências e habilidades a eles referidos e mencionados nos citados documentos.”

merely as an ornament, an accessory, rather than as an essential component of this level of schooling.⁴

The inclusion of philosophy as a subject was justified in that context (as it still is today), for the simple reason that the school curriculum, in practice, remained thoroughly subject-based. For a cross-cutting treatment of philosophy to be pedagogically consistent, the curriculum in its entirety would have to be organized according to the same cross-cutting logic—yet this was demonstrably not the situation.

Furthermore:

The term ‘subject’ should not be understood here as a negation of integrative or dialogical approaches, as something rigid or detached from the other areas that make up the curriculum, but rather as the guarantee of a *specific instructional space, with its own allotted hours and professionals qualified in philosophy*. Nothing, however, prevents collaborative and context-oriented work from taking place within this space. (Alves, 2002, p. 105, emphasis on the original)⁵

However, for such a teacher to carry out interdisciplinary or cross-cutting work, they must necessarily be present in the school. *Philosophy cannot be taught in schools based on presumed or informal expertise.*

⁴ Original: “Não é de qualquer forma que se tem um acesso satisfatório, substancial, aos conhecimentos de filosofia; seu aprendizado demanda um método próprio de ensino, que o senso comum não dá conta de abarcar. Portanto, se é considerado necessário que os educandos demonstrem domínio dos conhecimentos de filosofia ao final da educação básica (sic), então, o mínimo que se espera é que se ofereça a oportunidade de eles terem um acesso adequado a esses conhecimentos, caso contrário, a filosofia aparecerá na educação secundária mais a título de um adorno, adereço, não constituindo parte essencial deste nível de ensino.”

⁵ Original: “O termo ‘disciplina’ não deve ser entendido aqui como uma negação da interdisciplinaridade, algo estanque e sem relação com as outras áreas que compõem o currículo, e sim, como a garantia de um espaço específico de aula, com carga horária própria e profissionais habilitados em filosofia; nada impede, contudo, que se trabalhe nesse espaço de forma interdisciplinar e contextualizada.”

Philosophical education in the school environment must be guided by a professional properly trained in *the art of teaching philosophy*—that is, by someone holding the appropriate degree to do so.

Nevertheless, while the way philosophy is referenced in the 1996 LDB is hardly surprising to those familiar with the history of philosophy teaching in Brazil—since it merely confirms the longstanding neglect shown by the Legislative Branch, and especially by the Executive Branch, toward the inclusion of philosophy in schools—this is not what characterizes the beginning of its “contemporary” phase. What defines this new phase is that, in the 1996 LDB, the issue appears in a substantially different and unprecedented way.

It is justified to say that this marks a new, contemporary phase, due to its supposedly cross-cutting conception, which stands in opposition to the disciplinary paradigm—something that had not even been considered in previous decades. Earlier debates revolved around whether the subject should be mandatory, elective, or even removed from the curriculum. From 1996 onward, however, the very existence of any subjects began to be questioned as outdated and obsolete. This is the new and unprecedented fact in this debate.

This new curriculum conception introduces a radical shift in the underlying *curriculum philosophy* of the Basic Education, which becomes sustained in a cross-cutting framework rather than the traditional subject-structured model. Hence, in this text, such a shift is what arguably authorizes identifying the post-LDB/1996 period as the starting point of the contemporary history of *philosophy within Brazil's curriculum*.

This turning point shaped educational policy formulations in the subsequent decades, generally reinforcing the growing defense of the cross-cutting paradigm as the new *curriculum philosophy*, to the detriment of the traditional subject-based model. It became a new kind of common sense—especially among legislators and executive authorities at the federal, state, and municipal levels—which particularly affected the inclusion of *philosophy within Brazil's curriculum*, often serving as a justification for excluding it as a subject, let alone as a compulsory one.

Resumption of large-scale studies and publications on philosophy education (books, dissertations, and theses)

With the aim of understanding what was unfolding, master's and doctoral research, articles, and books resurfaced with renewed force, taking the 1996 LDB as their primary object of analysis. The initial purpose was to investigate and clarify how the LDB referred to the inclusion of philosophy in upper-secondary education, given the contradictory interpretations circulating at the time. Some celebrated the supposed return of philosophy to school curricula, while State Departments of Education simultaneously removed the subject where it already existed, arguing precisely that the new LDB indicated that philosophy should permeate the curriculum rather than appear as a concrete, standalone subject—or, as others interpreted it, that the decision to include it as a subject was left to each Department, and in some cases even to each individual school. Moreover, as previously noted, many philosophy teachers themselves believed that philosophy had returned as a mandatory subject. These early studies thus sought, in a certain sense, to uncover the ambiguities and contradictions present in both the “letter” and the “spirit” of the law.

This led to a series of studies (master's and doctoral research), conferences, and publications aimed at analyzing, interpreting, and critiquing the political and philosophical-pedagogical conditions that shaped the possibilities for philosophy's inclusion in the national upper-secondary curriculum after the promulgation of the LDB—a body of work that continues to this day.

There was, therefore, a renewed and intensified production of studies, publications, and events on philosophy education, which had, to some extent, diminished since the Society of Philosophical Studies and Activities (*Sociedade de Estudos e Atividades Filosóficas*, SEAF) ended its national activities in 1985 (Carminati, 1997). Even so, it may be said that at least some level of research and publication was maintained up to

1996, expressing an ongoing reference point for the field of philosophy education, such as, among others, the works listed below:

PANEL 1 — Publications on philosophy teaching (1990-1996)

ARANTES, Paulo *et al.* *A filosofia e seu ensino*. Petrópolis: Vozes; EDUC, 1995.

BRANCATTI, Paulo Roberto. *O ensino de filosofia no segundo grau: uma necessidade de leitura do cotidiano*. 1993. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Universidade Metodista de Piracicaba, Piracicaba, 1993.

CUNHA, José Auri. *Filosofia: iniciação à investigação filosófica*. São Paulo: Atual, 1992.

EITERER, Carmen Lúcia. *Filosofia e leitura: estudo de uma experiência didática em uma escola pública paulistana no período noturno*. 1996. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 1996.

GIANNOTTI, José Arthur. *Filosofia no II grau. Folha de São Paulo*, São Paulo, 1 de maio de 1994.

NUNES, Cesar Aparecido. *A construção de uma nova identidade para a filosofia no segundo grau: contradições e perspectivas*. 1990. 191 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Faculdade de Educação da Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 1990.

NUNES, Cesar Aparecido. *Aprendendo filosofia*. 4. ed. Campinas: Papirus, 1992.

SILVA, Franklin Leopoldo. Por que filosofia no segundo grau. *Estudos Avançados*, São Paulo, n. 14, p. 157-166, 1992.

SILVEIRA, Renê José Trentin. *Ensino de filosofia no segundo grau: em busca de um sentido*. 1991, 612 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Faculdade de Educação da Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 1991.

SOUZA, Sônia Maria Ribeiro. *Por que filosofia? Uma abordagem histórico-didática do ensino de filosofia no segundo grau*. 1992. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 1992.

Source: created by the autor.

From 1997 onward, however, the emergence of postgraduate research projects (master's and doctoral), along with book and article publications on philosophy teaching, gained renewed momentum. These studies would multiply nationwide in the years that followed, both in number and in thematic scope, seeking to encompass all that philosophy

teaching entails from philosophical, pedagogical, and political-educational perspectives, among others.

Some of the earliest works in this renewed cycle included, for instance:

PANEL 2 — Publications on philosophy teaching (1997-2001)

ALVES, Dalton José. *O espaço da filosofia no currículo do ensino médio a partir da nova LDB (Lei nº 9.394/1996): análises e reflexões*. 2000. 146 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Faculdade de Educação da Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 2000.⁶

CARMINATI, Celso. *O ensino de filosofia no II grau: do seu afastamento ao movimento pela sua reintrodução – A Sociedade de Estudos e Atividades Filosóficas/SEAF*. 1997. 179 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, 1997.

CERLETTI, Alejandro. *A filosofia no ensino médio: caminhos para pensar seu sentido*. Brasília: Editora UnB, 1999.

GALLINA, Simone Freitas da Silva. *Ensino de Filosofia e o Segundo Grau. Educação*, Santa Maria, v. 22, p. 55-68, 1997.

GRETER, Francisco Paulo. *A especificidade do ensino de filosofia no currículo e na prática pedagógica do 2º grau: educar para a inteligibilidade mediante a apropriação de uma linguagem de segurança*. 1997. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Faculdade de Educação da Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 1997.

KOHAN, Walter Omar; LEAL, Bernardina (Orgs.). *Filosofia para crianças em debate*. vol. IV. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1999.

MATOS, Junot Cornélio. *Em toda parte e em nenhum lugar: a formação pedagógica do professor de filosofia*. 1999. 282 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 1999.

PECHULA, Marli Aparecida. *A filosofia no ensino médio: da importância anunciada à descaracterização praticada*. 2001. 147 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Faculdade de Educação da Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 2001.

SEVERINO, Antônio Joaquim. Os embates da cidadania: ensaio de uma abordagem filosófica da nova LDB. In: BRZEZINSKI, Iria (Org.). *LDB interpretada: diversos olhares se entrecruzam*. 2.ed. revisada. São Paulo: Cortez, 1998. p. 57-68.

Source: created by the author.

⁶ Trata-se de um dos primeiros, se não o primeiro, trabalho de pesquisa que teve como objeto o ensino de filosofia na LDB/96. Dissertação de mestrado, sob a orientação do Prof. Dr. Silvio Gallo (Unicamp), posteriormente publicada em livro (Alves, 2002).

The list of titles is extremely extensive and would therefore be inappropriate to reproduce in full here—and at this moment, the complete information on all such publications is not available.

Rearticulation of National Movements and the Resurgence of Major Events in Defense of Philosophy Education (1997-2004)

Almost simultaneously with the enactment of the LDB on December 20, 1996, the following year saw the rearticulation of national movements in response to the LDB, aimed at advocating for clear legislation that explicitly established the need to introduce philosophy into the curriculum as a mandatory subject throughout all three years of upper-secondary education.

The landmark of the beginning of these movements occurred on April 28, 1997, when the first bill was filed in the Chamber of Deputies, PL No. 3,178/97, elaborated by Deputy Padre Roque Zimmermann (PT/PR), proposing a reformulation of the aforementioned Article 36, §1, item III of LDB/96, with a clearer and more explicit wording regarding the necessity for educational systems to introduce Philosophy and Sociology as mandatory subjects in upper-secondary education.

This bill proceeded through the National Congress, both the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate, for four years, being approved by the Chamber's Constitution and Justice Committee on September 22, 1999, with favorable reports from all committees. It was then forwarded to the Senate as a bill originating from the Chamber, PLC No. 9, dated January 18, 2000, and approved by the Senate on September 18, 2001. However, unlike in the Chamber of Deputies, there were fierce disputes in the Senate; the result was approval, but

by forty votes in favor and twenty against, in a turbulent session and after several postponements orchestrated by the government leadership, thus only needing to be sanctioned by the Executive Branch to become law. However, on October 8, 2001, President Fernando Henrique Cardoso, a sociologist, following the “advice” of the Minister of Education and the Secretary of Secondary and Technological Education, *vetoed the proposed law*. (Alves, 2002, p. 140, emphasis on the original)⁷

This process mobilized many philosophy departments and professors across the country, as well as individuals from other fields who recognized the importance of students at the basic education level appropriating philosophical knowledge and methodologies, and therefore also advocated for philosophy education to be included in the curriculum as a mandatory subject.

This situation would only be resolved legislatively in 2008, with the approval and enactment of Law No. 11,684, on June 2, 2008 (Brazil, 2008), passed by the National Congress and sanctioned by the acting President José Alencar, without any vetoes. This law amended Article 36 of Law No. 9,394/96 and established the national education guidelines and framework *to include Philosophy and Sociology as mandatory subjects in upper-secondary education curricula*. Its legislative process began with the submission of a bill by Deputy Dr. Ribamar Alves (PSB-MA) on August 17, 2003. The approval of this law was a historic and unprecedented event in the Brazilian republican period and marks the beginning of the second phase in the contemporary history of philosophy teaching in Brazil. This point will be revisited and discussed in the final considerations of this text as one of the legacies left by the resurgence of

⁷ Original: “Por quarenta votos a favor e vinte contra, numa sessão conturbada e após vários adiamentos manobrados pela liderança do governo, faltando assim apenas ser sancionado pelo Poder Executivo para tornar-se lei. Todavia, dia oito de outubro de 2001, o presidente Fernando Henrique Cardoso, sociólogo, acatando o ‘conselho’ do ministro da Educação e da Secretaria de Educação Média e Tecnológica, vetou o projeto”.

events and movements initiated after the enactment of LDB/96, in defense of philosophy teaching in Brazilian schools.

Regarding the resurgence of academic—regional and national meetings and conferences on philosophy and philosophy education—this movement began, concretely, in 1999. The term “resurgence” is appropriate because the last national events on philosophy in upper-secondary education had taken place between 1976 and 1985, promoted and organized by the SEAF. They represented the first major national movement—unprecedented and original in the history of Brazilian education—in defense of philosophy education in schools (Carminati, 1997).

The national philosophical community (professors, students, and researchers), along with educators from various fields, became aware of the problems and implications posed by LDB/96 for the field of philosophy education, especially after Deputy Roque Zimmermann submitted the bill proposing an amendment to LDB/96 that would make Philosophy and Sociology mandatory subjects in the upper-secondary education curriculum.

The mobilization around the approval of this bill—including the customary and necessary pressure on legislators through letters, motions of support, public hearings, petitions, newspaper articles, and similar actions—triggered the resurgence of events and academic conferences as spaces for analyzing, understanding, and critically addressing, at that historical moment, the situation of philosophy education following the enactment of LDB/96.

However, the resurgence of these academic events at the national level unfolded in a somewhat different manner from the SEAF period. Whereas SEAF had previously organized events through university philosophy departments—namely *Encontros Nacionais de Departamentos de Filosofia*, ENDEF [National Meetings of Philosophy Departments] whose principal editions were: I ENDEF, Rio de Janeiro/1981 and the *Documento de Brasília* [Brasília Document]; II ENDEF, Goiânia/1982; III ENDEF, Santos/1983; IV ENDEF, Cuiabá/1984; and V ENDEF, Vitória/1985 (Silveira, 1991, pp. 216–270), after LDB/96, the initiatives were first undertaken by graduate programs in Philosophy of Education in

the Center-West region and in São Paulo's interior regions, as well as by some Philosophy programs in southern Brazil.

The initiative to organize the *Fóruns sobre o ensino de filosofia* [Forums on philosophy education], as they would later be called, began at an international congress on philosophy for children held in Brasília in July 1999. This was the *Congresso Internacional de Filosofia com Crianças e Jovens* [International Congress on Philosophy with Children and Youth], the *IX Encontro do ICPIC – 30 anos de Filosofia para Crianças em Debate* [IX ICPIC⁸ Meeting, “30 Years of Philosophy for Children Under Discussion”], organized by the University of Brasília, Faculty of Education (UnB/FE), from July 4 to 9, 1999, at the “Ulysses Guimarães” Convention Center in Brasília, Federal District.

At this congress, a meeting was held at a certain point to address philosophy education in Brazil's upper-secondary education. Many participants attended from various regions and states of the country, along with several congressmembers from other Latin American nations, particularly Uruguay and Argentina.

The debates led to the shared understanding that it was necessary to deepen the knowledge about philosophy and philosophy education from the widest possible range of perspectives—not only from the standpoint of educational policy and legislation, though these were strategic and essential, but insufficient on their own. It was also necessary to demonstrate to society in what ways and to what extent philosophy education can effectively contribute to the education of young people. From this emerged a variety of themes that required clearer understanding and feasible proposals for implementation, such as those concerning the specific methodology/didactics of philosophy education, the training of philosophy teachers, the production of new didactic and supplementary materials, as well as the development of a

⁸ International Council for Philosophical Inquiry with Children (Conselho Internacional para Investigação Filosófica com Crianças, ICPIC.)

philosophical perspective on philosophy education itself, beyond the purely pedagogical viewpoint.

In this context, the proposal was made to organize a national congress of philosophy teachers to further this discussion. Concretely, it was agreed that Professor Dr. Sílvio Gallo (Unimep/Unicamp) would create an online discussion list (via email), later titled *Rede Latino-Americana de Professores de Filosofia* [Latin American Network of Philosophy Teachers], and would also explore the possibility of hosting this first national meeting in the year 2000 at Unimep, in Piracicaba, São Paulo—which ultimately took place in November of that year. This was the *Congresso Brasileiro de Professores de Filosofia – Filosofia da legislação à sala de aula* (Brazilian Congress of Philosophy Teachers – *Philosophy: From Legislation to the Classroom*), held from November 5 to 8, 2000, at the Methodist University of Piracicaba (Unimep).

This was the first national congress on philosophy education specifically designed to address the Brazilian context following LDB/96. The 1999 event had been international, with its primary focus on Matthew Lipman’s Philosophy for Children program. Nevertheless, it is considered the seed of the national meetings that would later emerge, since it was during that event that the organizers of the Piracicaba congress agreed that it was essential to consider, among other themes, the constitution of philosophy education as a genuinely philosophical subject matter, beyond the pedagogical dimension—namely, “Thinking philosophically about philosophy teaching.” (Gallo, 2004, p. 10)⁹

Furthermore, as Sílvio Gallo (2004, p. 11) states:

It was from this event, attended by Philosophy teachers from various Brazilian states and several countries, that we began to exchange impressions and experiences, and that we started to engage more rigorously with the topic of philosophy education. These efforts led to the Brazilian Congress of Philosophy Teachers (Piracicaba, 2000); the

⁹ Original: “*Pensar filosoficamente o ensino da filosofia.*”

meetings of the Southern Forum of Philosophy Programs (Passo Fundo, 2001; Ijuí, 2002; Curitiba, 2003); the meetings of the Center-West Forum on Philosophy Teaching and Research (Brasília, 2001; Goiânia, 2002); as well as a range of other local, regional, and national events dedicated specifically to reflecting on philosophy education.¹⁰

As noted by Gallo, a significant initiative took place as early as September 1999, in southern Brazil, during a meeting held at University of Santa Cruz do Sul (UNISC) in Santa Cruz do Sul, Rio Grande do Sul: the creation of an inter-institutional body aimed at discussing philosophy education in the state, titled *Fórum dos Cursos de Filosofia do Rio Grande do Sul para o Ensino da Filosofia* [Forum of Philosophy Programs of Rio Grande do Sul for Philosophy Education]. As discussions progressed and the Forum became more structured, it gradually expanded to include all the states of the Southern Region, incorporating Paraná and Santa Catarina, thereby leading to the *Fórum Sul de Filosofia* (Southern Forum on Philosophy.)

The *Fórum Sul de Ensino de Filosofia* (Southern Forum on Philosophy Education) organized several events, such as:

- *I Simpósio Sul-Brasileiro sobre o Ensino de Filosofia* [I Southern Brazilian Symposium on Philosophy Education] (UPF, Passo Fundo/RS, April 2001);

¹⁰ Original: “Foi a partir desse evento, no qual compareceram professores de Filosofia de diversos estados brasileiros e de vários países, que principiamos a trocar impressões e experiências, que começamos a nos debruçar com mais rigor sobre o tema do ensino da Filosofia. E a partir dele vieram o Congresso Brasileiro de Professores de Filosofia (Piracicaba, 2000); os encontros do Fórum Sul de Cursos de Filosofia (Passo Fundo, 2001; Ijuí, 2002; Curitiba, 2003); os encontros do Fórum Centro-Oeste sobre Ensino e Pesquisa em Filosofia (Brasília, 2001; Goiânia, 2002); além de uma série de outros eventos de caráter local, regional e nacional, dedicados a pensar especificamente o tema do ensino de filosofia.”

▪ *II Simpósio Sul-Brasileiro sobre o Ensino de Filosofia* [II Southern Brazilian Symposium on Philosophy Education] (UNIJUÍ, Ijuí/RS, April 2002);

▪ *III Simpósio Sul-Brasileiro sobre o Ensino de Filosofia* [III Southern Brazilian Symposium on Philosophy Education] (PUCPR, Curitiba/PR, April 2003);

▪ *IV Simpósio Sul-Brasileiro sobre o Ensino de Filosofia* [IV Southern Brazilian Symposium on Philosophy Education] (UNISINOS, São Leopoldo/RS, May 2004).

These events also generated a series of publications on philosophy education, contributing to the expansion and strengthening of debate and research in the field, as the main lectures delivered at these congresses were later published in book form. Regarding the congresses organized by the Southern Forum on Philosophy, the resulting publications include: Fávero, Rauber, Kohan (2002a); Piovesan (2002); Rolla, Santos Neto, Queiroz (2003); and Candido and Carbonara (2004).

Among its notable achievements is the fact that it hosted, in Brasília/DF, the 1999 meeting from which the proposal to establish the philosophical forums on philosophy education first emerged. The following events were organized:

▪ *I Fórum de Ensino de Filosofia do Centro-Oeste. I Encontro Internacional de Filosofia e Educação* [I Forum of Philosophy Education in the Center-West region. I International Meeting on Philosophy and Education] (UnB, Brasília/DF, June 2001);

▪ *II Fórum do Centro-Oeste sobre Ensino e Pesquisa em Filosofia* [II Center-West Forum on Philosophy Teaching and Research] (UCG, Goiânia/GO, July 2002);

▪ *III Fórum do Centro-Oeste de Ensino de Filosofia* [III Center-West Forum on Philosophy Education] (UnB, Brasília/DF, November 2003);

▪ *IV Encontro do Fórum Centro-Oeste de Ensino de Filosofia – Filosofia: Currículo e Formação de Professores* [IV Meeting of the

Center-West Forum on Philosophy Education – Philosophy: Curriculum and Teacher Education] (UFG, Goiânia/GO, October 2004).

There are records of two publications that resulted from these meetings: one concerning the 1999 International Congress and another concerning the Forum held in 2001, both in Brasília/DF. These are: Kohan and Leal (1999); Kohan (2002a).

Regarding the Southeast Region, although it concentrates the largest number of undergraduate programs in philosophy—including those with the strongest traditions in philosophy teaching and research nationwide—inter-institutional organization and exchange among the region’s philosophy programs were still incipient. Nonetheless, several initiatives gradually emerged, and over time these difficulties were overcome, leading to significant results.

In the state of São Paulo, the participation of the philosophy program at Unimep stands out, both for organizing two meetings on this theme and for promoting other regional events. Unimep was also responsible for creating and managing the electronic discussion list, the “*Rede Latino-Americana de Professores de Filosofia*” [Latin American Network of Philosophy Teachers], established with the aim of preventing the isolation of teachers and researchers in the field and of electronically bringing these professionals into closer dialogue.

USP and Unicamp also contributed to these discussions and to the organization of events and debates through faculty members from their respective Faculties of Education, FE-USP and FE-Unicamp.

In the case of the states of Rio de Janeiro, Minas Gerais, and Espírito Santo, two events were organized in Belo Horizonte by the Department of Philosophy at PUC-Minas in 2003 and 2004, entitled Minas Colloquia.

Rio de Janeiro hosted the *II Fórum Sudeste de Ensino de Filosofia* [II Southeast Forum on Philosophy Education], held jointly with the *II Encontro Internacional de Filosofia e Educação* [II International Meeting on Philosophy and Education], in 2004. There is

no record of the state of Espírito Santo having hosted any of the Forums between 1999 and 2004.

Summary of the Meetings and Forums Held in the Southeast Region:

- *Congresso Nacional de Professores de Filosofia – Da legislação à sala de aula* [Brazilian Congress of Philosophy Teachers – From Legislation to the Classroom] (Unimep, Piracicaba/SP, November 2000);

- *I Fórum Sudeste de Ensino de Filosofia* [I Southeast Forum on Philosophy Education] (Unimep, Piracicaba/SP, October 2001);

- *I Colóquios de Minas* [I Minas Colloquia] (PUC-Minas, Belo Horizonte/MG, May 2003);

- *II Colóquios de Minas* [II Minas Colloquia] (PUC-Minas, Belo Horizonte/MG, June 2004);

- *II Fórum Sudeste de Ensino de Filosofia. II Encontro Internacional de Filosofia e Educação: Políticas do Ensino de Filosofia* [II Southeast Forum on Philosophy Education. II International Meeting on Philosophy and Education: Policies of Philosophy Education] (UERJ, Rio de Janeiro/RJ, September 2004).

The publications released during this period—excluding the *Colóquios de Minas*—resulted from the meetings mentioned above, namely: Gallo, Cornelli, Danelon (2003); Gallo, Danelon, Cornelli (2004); Kohan (2004a; 2004b; 2004c).

Regarding the Northern and Northeastern regions of Brazil, there is limited material and information. Based on what could be gathered, there were some efforts to establish a Forum on Philosophy Education in these regions. However, given adverse conditions—such as long distances, the small number of existing programs, and the limited resources available for organizing an event of national scope—very little could be accomplished, according to reports from professors in those regions.

Despite the difficulties identified, the following meetings were held:

Northern Region

- *I Fórum Norte de Filosofia da Educação* [I Northern Forum on Philosophy Education] (Belém/PA, June 2004);

Northeastern Region

- *I Encontro de Filosofia da Educação* [I Meeting on Philosophy of Education] (UFBA, Salvador/BA, June 2003);

- *II Encontro de Filosofia da Educação* [II Meeting on Philosophy of Education] (UFBA, Salvador/BA, July 2004).

There are no known publications related to these events. Examples of the types of publications resulting from these meetings and forums are presented below.

These works illustrate the thematic diversity and richness explored in the meetings. In this section, only a portion of the material produced during the national meetings and forums held between 1999 and 2004 will be examined. They correspond to the main lectures and/or special sessions presented at these events. However, in parallel—as is customary—hundreds of papers, communications, extended abstracts, posters, and other contributions were also presented, all of which significantly enriched and deepened the debates that took place. Given the constraints of this text, it was not possible to reference these additional contributions, which appear in the proceedings of the meetings and forums.

The central theme, that is—that is, the issue around which philosophy and education programs, professors, students, and researchers were mobilized—was fundamentally the following: Is philosophy education a genuinely philosophical topic? Why? To what extent is it possible, appropriate, and philosophically relevant to *philosophize on philosophy teaching*? What does it mean to engage in philosophical reflection on philosophy education?

For example, according to Gallo and Kohan (2000, p. 8):

Throughout its history, philosophy has revealed itself as an essentially educational undertaking [...] Thus, when one turns to the history of philosophy,

in our view, the choice of philosophy education, or the “pedagogy of philosophy”, as a strictly philosophical topic is fully justified.¹¹

The approaches to this issue across the National Forums on Philosophy Education, taken as a whole, argue in favor of that possibility. In this regard, how was the discussion addressed in the various national, regional, and state forums held up to 2004? Which perspectives were put forward? What limitations were identified? To support this debate, a concise survey of the publications released during the period—based on the forums held and containing the main keynote lectures—is presented below. The events and their derived publications are organized chronologically according to the year of the event; however, not all publications follow that chronology. For various reasons beyond the scope of this text, some books were published two or three years after the meeting or forum to which they are linked.

Central Theme and Publications of the Meetings and Forums

The topics most frequently addressed, directly or indirectly, in the forums and in their respective publications included: philosophy and education; the possibility of philosophizing about the teaching of Philosophy; the teaching of Philosophy as a philosophical issue rather than merely a pedagogical one; learning philosophy and/or learning to philosophize; the history, legislation, and policies of Philosophy and its teaching; Philosophy in primary education, secondary education, and higher education; Philosophy in university entrance examinations; philosophical-didactic approaches; methods for teaching Philosophy; Philosophy for/with children; Philosophy and childhood; non-formal

¹¹ Original: “*A filosofia mostra-se, ao longo de sua história, como um empreendimento essencialmente educativo [...] De forma que, se se trata de olhar para a história da filosofia, ao nosso ver, se justifica, plenamente, a eleição do ensino da filosofia, ou da ‘pedagogia da filosofia’, como um tema estritamente filosófico.*”

spaces for the study of Philosophy, clinical philosophy, philosophical cafés, philosophy study groups held “in the living room,” among others.

1999

International Congress on Philosophy with Children and Youth, 9th ICPIC Meeting, *30 anos de Filosofia para Crianças em Debate* [30 Years of Philosophy for Children Under Discussion], held from July 4 to 9, 1999, at the Ulysses Guimarães Convention Center in Brasília, Brazil, organized by the University of Brasília – Faculty of Education (UnB/FE) and the International Council for Philosophical Inquiry with Children (ICPIC).

Event publication: KOHAN, Walter; LEAL, Bernardina (Eds.). *Filosofia para crianças em debate*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 1999.

The main objective of this event and its resulting publication was the study of philosophy for children (P4C), a perspective created by Matthew Lipman (USA), but it also includes studies on other topics related to philosophy and its teaching.

Parts I and II present the pedagogical and philosophical foundations of P4C, respectively, with contributions by Brazilian authors such as Moacir Gadotti and Marcos Lorieri, as well as international scholars, including Matthew Lipman. *Part III* is devoted to the relationship between philosophy and literature in children’s education, featuring texts by Teresa de La Garza (Mexico), Jorge Larrosa (Spain), among others. *Part IV* moves beyond the topic of P4C and offers a broader, international perspective on philosophy in secondary education, with analyses focusing on Argentina (Alejandro Cerletti), France (François Galichet), Brazil (Sílvio Gallo), and Uruguay (Maurício Langón). These studies offer valuable material for comparative education research on the teaching of philosophy, revealing more convergences than divergences in how philosophy and its teaching are understood internationally. *Part V* returns to the P4C debate, presenting how and where P4C initiatives were organized and active in Brazil at the time. Finally, *Part VI* compiles the special theoretical–practical sessions addressing a wide range of themes, such as “philosophy and freedom”;

“Philosophy for Children adapted to mathematics”; “assessment guidelines in P4C”; “philosophy in the education of students with special needs”; “logic in schools as an aspect of philosophy in the curriculum”; “on the distinction between ‘philosophy for children,’ ‘philosophy with children,’ and ‘the philosophy of childhood’”; “early childhood education and philosophy”; “the role of philosophy in secondary education”; “pedagogy, theater, and action: a space for reflection”; “philosophy and reflective education: Lipman, Dewey, and Habermas”; “the mirror of an aesthetic education: philosophy looks at art and art looks at philosophy”; “ethical foundations of human rights and P4C”; and “who is the philosophy teacher?”.

This was the first large-scale national event/publication after the enactment of the LDB/96, as it marked the beginning of an extensive process of philosophical research on the teaching of philosophy—one that expanded significantly and has since generated a remarkably rich body of national philosophical work. Although it was not an event specifically devoted to philosophy in Brazilian upper-secondary education, it played a singular role in inspiring much of the scholarship and many of the events developed from the year 2000 onward, especially the creation of the National Forums on Philosophy Education, which took shape in 2001.

2000

Congresso Brasileiro de Professores de Filosofia – Filosofia: da legislação à sala de aula [Brazilian Congress of Philosophy Teachers – *Philosophy: from Legislation to the Classroom*], held in Piracicaba/SP, from November 5 to 8, 2000, at the Methodist University of Piracicaba (UNIMEP).

Event publication: GALLO, Sívio; CORNELLI, Gabriele; DANELON, Márcio (Eds.). *Filosofia do ensino de filosofia*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2003.

The central focus of this publication reflects the core of the Piracicaba Congress (November 2000), particularly Part II of the book, “The Philosophy of Philosophy Education.” At that moment, the aim was

to consider how to bring questions concerning the teaching of philosophy into the philosophical field itself—beyond pedagogy. Gabriele Cornelli summarizes this in the book’s preface when outlining the objectives of the event that resulted in the publication:

Thus, with the goals of philosophically *exploring the didactics of teaching philosophy* at its various levels, creating spaces for the exchange of experiences among teachers from across the country, and investigating new theoretical and methodological possibilities for conceiving and practicing the teaching of philosophy, the Congress discussed the impasses and challenges faced by philosophy within the contemporary Brazilian educational system. It also sought to consolidate a space of intervention in philosophy teaching for teachers across the country, while reflecting on the current public spaces of philosophy in Brazil. (Cornelli, 2003, p. 9, emphasis added)¹²

If one thesis summarizes what began at that Congress, it is that “Reflecting on the teaching of philosophy is also the work of philosophy.” (Cornelli, 2003, p. 10)¹³ According to Cornelli

It goes beyond merely claiming a place within philosophy from which to reflect on its teaching; the aim is to develop a new understanding of that very space. (Cornelli, 2003, p. 10)¹⁴

¹² Original: “Assim, com os objetivos de *explorar, filosoficamente, a didática do ensino de filosofia em seus vários níveis, gerar espaços para a troca de experiências entre professores atuantes em todo o país e explorar novas possibilidades teóricas e metodológicas para pensar e praticar o ensino de filosofia*, o Congresso discutiu os impasses e desafios da filosofia no sistema de ensino brasileiro contemporâneo, tentou consolidar um espaço de intervenção sobre o ensino de filosofia para professores atuantes em todo o país, chegando também a pensar os atuais espaços públicos da filosofia no Brasil.”

¹³ Original: “Refletir sobre o ensino de filosofia é também ofício da filosofia.”

¹⁴ Original: “lugar de uma simples reivindicação de um espaço dentro da filosofia para pensar o seu ensino [pretende-se] [...] elaborar uma nova compreensão deste mesmo espaço.”

Out of this discussion emerges the central axis of many subsequent events, publications, and studies that also largely inspired the current proposal expressed in the letter “Manifesto in Defense of the Philosophy of Philosophy Education as a Subfield of Philosophical Research” which constitutes the guiding purpose of the dossier to which this article is linked.

The book is organized into three parts. Part I – “The Philosophy That Begins” presents the opening lecture delivered by Stéphane Douaillier (Université de Paris VIII), on the “challenges for philosophy education in the next millennium.” The title is justified insofar as it derives from the lecture he presented at the Congress, held in November 2000. Part II – “Philosophy of the Teaching of Philosophy,” which forms the core of the event, brings together contributions by Walter Kohan, Antônio J. Severino, Alejandro Cerletti (Argentina), Sílvio Gallo, Maurício Langón (Uruguay), and Paulo Ghiraldelli Jr. Among these, the texts that addressed the theme most directly were those by Cerletti (“Teaching Philosophy and the Philosophy of Philosophical Teaching”) and Langón (“Philosophy of the Teaching of Philosophy”). Part III – “Practices of the Teaching of Philosophy” includes contributions by Guillermo Obiols (Argentina) (“The Teaching of Philosophy in Argentina”); Enzo Ruffaldi (Italy) (“The Teaching of Philosophy in Italy”); Danilo Almeida (“Philosophy, the University, and Its Possibilities: On Politics and the Market”); and Junot Matos (“The Teaching of Philosophy and Teacher Education”). The publication concludes with the appended publication of the “Letter from Piracicaba,” drafted and approved at the Congress, which requested that the Deputies approve Bill No. 3178/97, by Deputy Roque Zimmerman, which dealt with the introduction of Philosophy as a compulsory subject in secondary education.

2001

In 2001, two events were held (one in April, in Passo Fundo/RS, and another in June, in Brasília/DF) and, consequently, it turned into two publications.

2001a (April) – *Simpósio Sul-Brasileiro sobre o Ensino de Filosofia* [I Southern Brazilian Symposium on Philosophy Education] and the *III Encontro dos Cursos de Filosofia do Sul do Brasil* [III Meeting of Philosophy Programs of Southern Brazil], held in April 2001 in Passo Fundo/RS, organized by the Department of Philosophy at University of Passo Fundo (Universidade de Passo Fundo, UPF).

Event publication: FÁVERO, Altair; RAUBER, Jaime; KOHAN, Walter (Eds.). *Um olhar sobre o ensino de filosofia*. Ijuí: UNIJUÍ, 2002a.

The four sections of the book reflect the line of studies and debates developed in previous congresses, especially the theme *philosophy of the teaching of philosophy*, which reaffirms the predominant focus of most of the National Forums from the year 2000 onward. This is the opening theme of the publication. The second section addresses *philosophy and childhood*. The third focuses on *philosophy in upper-secondary education*, concluding with a discussion of *the education of philosophy teachers*.

The importance of “to philosophize on philosophy teaching” and, in that process, the need for an unavoidable examination of how philosophy is taught in schools also entails considering the training of the teachers who will take on the role of developing this philosophical education with children and young people in basic education. In this perspective the editors of the volume state

That it is important and necessary to create strategies for debate so that the discussion on the teaching of philosophy may leave behind anonymity, spontaneity, didacticism, and pedagogism, and come to occupy a central place in the reflection carried out within undergraduate

programs in philosophy. (Fávero; Rauber; Kohan, 2002b, p. 9, emphasis added)¹⁵

Moreover, the editors go further and outline a suggestive roadmap of what should be undertaken:

It is necessary to have the courage to examine the very practices of the programs, the profile of the students currently enrolled, these students' engagement in schools, the kind of philosophy that is being taught in schools, the receptivity philosophy has been receiving, the philosophy textbooks and the ways in which they are used. It is necessary to have the courage to leave behind the 'protective' structures of university departments and competently undertake the task of bringing philosophy closer to the broad mass of students [...]. (Fávero; Rauber; Kohan, 2002b, p. 9)¹⁶

This "statement" was made twenty years ago; yet, despite some noticeable improvements, it still resonates with a certain degree of contemporary relevance. For this reason, we ask the reader's indulgence for one more extended quotation. The authors highlight the problem that it is of little use to fight for the compulsory inclusion of the discipline in the curriculum if philosophy programs do not assume responsibility for the education of their future teachers—if they do not establish "a policy for the education of philosophy teachers." Nor is it sufficient, they argue, to simply introduce pedagogical courses such as didactics and teaching

¹⁵ Original: "*De que é importante e necessário criar estratégias de debate para que a discussão sobre o ensino de filosofia deixe o anonimato, o espontaneísmo, o didatismo, o pedagogismo e ocupe um lugar central na reflexão dos cursos de licenciatura de filosofia.*"

¹⁶ Original: "*É necessário a coragem de olhar a própria prática dos cursos, o perfil de alunos que estão frequentando seus cursos, a inserção desses alunos nas escolas, o tipo de filosofia que está sendo trabalhada nas escolas, a receptividade que a filosofia está tendo, os livros didáticos de filosofia e o seu uso. É necessária a coragem de sair das estruturas 'protetoras' dos departamentos das universidades e assumir com competência o trabalho de tornar a filosofia mais próxima da grande massa de alunos [...].*"

practice “if there is no consistent reflection on the *specificity of the teaching of philosophy*.” (Fávero; Rauber; Kohan, 2002b, p. 10, author’s emphasis)¹⁷ The authors state that:

To think about the philosophy teacher is not simply to equip them with didactic and pedagogical tools; it is necessary to educate them on more solid foundations. This requires research, study groups, working groups, exchanges of experiences, outreach activities, continuing education, records, reflections on one’s own practice, investigations of the educational phenomenon, understanding of current economic, political, and social contexts, articulation with schools, in short, policies for the teaching of philosophy. (Fávero; Rauber; Kohan, 2002b, p. 9)¹⁸

The teaching of philosophy, especially in basic education, is not merely a problem that each philosophy teacher must confront individually within their own classroom. It is also a responsibility of their educators, that is, of philosophy teacher-education programs themselves. Such preparation must be philosophical, and not merely pedagogical. For this reason, there has been a call for the establishment of *Philosophy of the Teaching of Philosophy* as a field of knowledge and a subarea of philosophical research in Brazil.

2001b (June) – *Encontro Internacional “Filosofia e Educação”* [International Meeting “Philosophy and Education”]. *I Fórum de Ensino de Filosofia do Centro-Oeste* [I Central-West Forum on Philosophy

¹⁷ Original: “Se não houver uma reflexão consistente sobre a especificidade do ensino de filosofia.”

¹⁸ Original: “Pensar o professor de filosofia não é, simplesmente, instrumentalizá-lo didática e pedagogicamente; é preciso formá-lo em bases mais sólidas. Isto requer pesquisa, grupos de estudo, grupos de trabalho, trocas de experiências, atividades de extensão, formação continuada, registros, reflexões da própria prática, investigações do fenômeno educacional, compreensão das atuais conjunturas econômicas, políticas e sociais, articulação com as escolas, enfim, políticas do ensino de filosofia.”

Education], held in June 2001 in Brasília/DF, organized by the School of Education of the University of Brasília (UnB).

Event publication: KOHAN, Walter (Org.). *Ensino de Filosofia: perspectivas*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2002a.

The focus of the event—and, consequently, of the volume associated with it—differs from the April meeting in Passo Fundo/RS in that it does not directly address the theme of the “philosophy of the teaching of philosophy,” although it does so indirectly. The central concern of the Brasília/DF event lies in a broader approach to the relationship among philosophy, education, and politics.

This event took place amid the highly contentious debates surrounding Bill 009/2001, proposed by Deputy Roque Zimmermann, which was under consideration in the Senate after having been “approved by a wide majority” in the National Congress, yet would eventually be vetoed in October of that same year by President Fernando Henrique Cardoso. Throughout 2001, the discussions regarding the compulsory inclusion of the subject in the curriculum intensified. Opinions were divided between those who opposed it on technical and financial grounds—arguing that budgetary restrictions would prevent the hiring of the teachers required by such a mandate—and those who supported it. Among the arguments in favor, one recurrent position was a corporative defense of compulsory status as a means of creating and securing a job market for licensed philosophy teachers. While legitimate and necessary, this line of reasoning became problematic when

The corporative defense abstracts and glorifies philosophy as if it were, and under any circumstances, something wonderful. As if it were synonymous with critical thinking, citizenship,

democracy. As if these themes had an obvious, natural, self-evident meaning. (Kohan, 2002b, p. 8)¹⁹

It is often forgotten that the objections and the very veto that would occur at the end of 2001 against making the subject mandatory were ultimately grounded in philosophical principles of utilitarianism, pragmatism, and a certain pedagogical positivism and technicism. In other words, not all teaching of the subject of Philosophy is critical and transformative, as is sometimes naively (and thus non-philosophically) assumed. For this reason, once again, the urgency of “philosophize on philosophy teaching” arises, to arrive at a radical, foundational, understanding of school educational practice and of the politics of philosophy teaching beyond appearances, to overcome the common sense underlying these debates.

Por outro lado, esse livro, afirma o organizador, o professor Walter Kohan, (2002b, pp. 8-9, emphasis added)

seeks to shift the teaching of Philosophy away from that controversy. What matters to us is to discuss the type of philosophy that will be taught and its educational meanings: which philosophy should be taught? For what purpose? We do not place the emphasis on offering conclusive answers in favor of or against philosophy. On the contrary, we seek to change the relation to a truth that is merely affirmative or negative, apologetic or condemnatory. This book aims to consider different ways of conceiving philosophy and a plurality of meanings

¹⁹ Original: “*A defesa corporativa abstrai e enaltece a filosofia como se ela fosse por si mesma e em qualquer circunstância algo maravilhoso. Como se ela fosse sinônimo de pensamento crítico, cidadania, democracia. Como se estes temas tivessem um sentido óbvio, natural, evidente.*”

for teaching it. *These are perspectives for thinking about the teaching of the subject of Philosophy.*²⁰

The book is organized into six parts that complement one another with the aim of showing the plurality of possible approaches to reflecting on philosophy and education, the teaching of philosophy and politics, and other perspectives. Part I – *Politics, Philosophy, Education*; Part II – *Philosophy and the University*; Part III – *Teaching Philosophy*; Part IV – *Philosophy with/for Children*; Part V – *Philosophy, Childhood, Youth*; Part VI – *Philosophy of Education*.

2002

In this year, two major events were also held, in April in Ijuí/RS and in November in Piracicaba/SP.

2002a (April) – *II Simpósio Sul-Brasileiro Sobre o Ensino de Filosofia* [II Southern Brazilian Symposium on Philosophy Education], with the theme “Philosophy and Teaching in Debate: Teaching, Research, and Outreach”, held from April 24 to 26, 2002, at the Regional University of the Northwest of the State of Rio Grande do Sul, in Ijuí/RS, and promoted by the Southern Forum of Philosophy Programs.

Event publication: PIOVESAN, Américo (Ed.). *Filosofia e ensino em debate*. Ijuí: UNIJUÍ, 2002.

This publication reunites 33 articles of varied themes written by speakers and lecturers who took part in the Symposium; given its breadth, only the main topics addressed are indicated here, so that the reader may have a general idea of the content of this publication. This edition includes articles that seek to reflect on philosophy and its

²⁰ Original: “*Procura deslocar o ensino de filosofia dessa polêmica. Importa-nos discutir o tipo de filosofia que vai se ensinar e os seus sentidos educacionais: qual filosofia ensinar? Para que fazê-lo? Não colocamos a ênfase em propiciar respostas conclusivas a favor ou contra a filosofia. Ao contrário, buscamos mudar a relação com uma verdade apenas afirmativa ou negativa, apologética ou condenatória. Este livro busca pensar diversas formas de conceber a filosofia e uma pluralidade de sentidos para ensiná-la. São perspectivas para pensar o ensino de filosofia.*”

teaching from the perspective of specific philosophers, such as Plato, Deleuze, Edgar Morin, Sartre, Wittgenstein, Fiori, and Hannah Arendt. Overall, the topics addressed include: moral education; philosophy and the university; freedom and power; subjectivity and society; the relationship between philosophy and education; hermeneutics, teaching, and the concept of alterity; teaching and learning philosophy; what philosophy is and what it is for; philosophizing and teaching to philosophize; politics, legislation, and the teaching of the subject of Philosophy; conceptions of the university, professionalization, research, etc.; philosophy in university entrance exams; the history of philosophy programs in Rio Grande do Sul; the teaching of logic; the training of philosophy teachers; the history of the teaching of philosophy in Brazil; and philosophy for children.

2002b (November) – *I Simpósio sobre o Ensino de Filosofia da Região Sudeste* [I Southeastern Symposium on Philosophy Education], held from November 29 to December 1, 2002, in Piracicaba/SP, at the Methodist University (UNIMEP), organized by the *Grupo de Estudos sobre o Ensino de Filosofia* (GESEF) [Study Group on Philosophy Teaching] and by the *Fórum da Região Sudeste de Ensino de Filosofia* [Southeastern Forum on the Philosophy Education].

Event publication: GALLO, Sílvio; DANELON, Márcio; CORNELLI, Gabriele (Eds.). *Ensino de filosofia: teoria e prática*. Ijuí: UNIJUÍ, 2004.

This publication corresponds to the first national event of the *Fórum Sudeste de Ensino de Filosofia* [Southeastern Forum on Philosophy Education], which finally brought the most populous region of the country into the circuit of national events on philosophy and its teaching; events that had been held in the Center-West and Southern regions of Brazil since 1999. Although isolated events had taken place, as previously mentioned in this text, those were organized through private initiatives by individual professors and universities. This 2002 Symposium, despite being held in the interior of the state of São Paulo, in Piracicaba, was an initiative of the *Fórum Sudeste de Ensino de Filosofia* [Southeastern Forum on Philosophy

Education], bringing together people and groups from the states of São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Minas Gerais, and Espírito Santo. The central axis of the event was, once again, the debate on “philosophically thinking the teaching of the subject of Philosophy”

A movement through which philosophers have taken upon themselves the responsibility of reflecting on teaching practice at its various levels. A movement aimed at granting citizenship, within the territory of Philosophy, to the issues of teaching, which until now found refuge only within the field of education. Is this about taking away from education something that properly belongs to it? Is it about disregarding the contributions that education specialists can offer to the teaching of Philosophy? I do not think so. Any contribution is more than welcome. On the other hand, however, we cannot shy away from these concerns. (Gallo, 2004, p. 10)²¹

The publication is divided into four parts. In Part I – Teaching the Subject of Philosophy: History and Brazilian Legislation, the authors develop reflections on the history of philosophical education and the teaching of philosophy; literature and philosophy; challenges of transdisciplinarity and cross-cutting themes in philosophy teaching; and the relationship between philosophy and autonomy. In Part II – Theoretical Didactics of Philosophy, the discussion turns to Kant’s proposition that one does not teach philosophy but rather learns to philosophize—an idea that is almost common sense among teachers of Philosophy, and one that many adopt uncritically, even though it is, in fact, a false controversy. The section also addresses the nature of

²¹ Original: “Um movimento em que os filósofos têm tomado para si a responsabilidade de pensar a prática docente, em seus vários níveis. Um movimento de dar cidadania, no território da Filosofia, à problemática do ensino que, até aqui, só encontrava asilo no território da educação. Trata-se de tirar da área da educação algo que lhe é próprio? Trata-se de prescindir das contribuições que os especialistas em educação podem trazer para o ensino da Filosofia? Penso que não. Toda contribuição é mais do que bem-vinda. Por outro lado, contudo, não podemos nos furtar a essas preocupações.”

philosophy through the idea of its eminently formative character in order to reflect on its teaching; the development of an internal, conceptual inquiry into philosophy and its teaching, including critiques of Socrates as a model of a certain authoritarian legacy in Philosophy and of the master as the center of knowledge; as well as further reflections on teaching philosophy to/with children and the enigma of childhood. In Part III – Practical Didactics of Philosophy, topics such as art and the teaching of philosophy are addressed; the debate surrounding the teaching of philosophy in the National Curriculum Parameters (Parâmetros Curriculares Nacionais, PCNs) is discussed, as well as the importance of the classics and the history of philosophy in the classroom. In Part IV – *Culture, Aesthetics, and Philosophy Teaching*, two analyses are developed: one concerning the “beautiful” and the “aesthetic dimension” in Marcuse’s thought on education, and another drawn from an in-depth study of themes related to love and childhood in contemporary thought.

2003

III Simpósio Sul-Brasileiro Sobre o Ensino de Filosofia [III Southern Brazilian Symposium on Philosophy Education], with the theme “Philosophy and Teaching: possibilities and challenges” held from April 23 to 25, 2003, at the Pontifical Catholic University of Paraná (PUC-PR), in Curitiba/PR, promoted by the Southern Forum of Philosophy Programs.

Event publication: ROLLA, Aline; SANTOS NETO, Antônio; QUEIROZ, Ivo. *Filosofia e ensino: possibilidades e desafios*. Ijuí: UNIJUÍ, 2003.

The articles in this edition broadly reflect the themes of previous meetings and publications while introducing new approaches that had not yet been explored. The volume includes studies on the teaching of the subject of Philosophy—customarily, within primary education—which engage with both proponents and critics of teaching philosophy to/with children; analyses of politics, legislation, and the teaching of Philosophy

in the context of the post-LDB/96 period and the demands for making the subject mandatory in the curriculum; studies that examine philosophy and its teaching through the lens of a specific philosophical tradition, such as those proposed by Deleuze, Socrates, and Karl Popper, along with references to Plato, Husserl, Lévinas, Gadamer, and many others. Recurring themes include philosophy and literature; philosophy and childhood; living and thinking; ethics and subjectivity; text, context, and the teaching of philosophy. There are also case studies on philosophy and its teaching in schools, such as within the public education policies of the state of Paraná in the 1990s, at PUC-PR, and at CEFET-PR, the latter noteworthy for addressing the teaching of philosophy in a vocational institution, a theme not widely examined until then. Finally, the volume discusses an issue that is highly contemporary —though already emerging at that time—which is the use of new information technologies, digital and online, in the continuing education of teachers of Philosophy.

2004

Two events were also held this year, in May in São Leopoldo/RS and in September in Rio de Janeiro.

2004a (May) – IV Simpósio Sul-Braisleiro sobre o Ensino de Filosofia [IV Southern Brazilian Symposium on Philosophy Education], held in May 2004 in São Leopoldo/RS, at UNISINOS, promoted by the Southern Forum of Philosophy Programs and coordinated by the Philosophy Programs of the University of Vale do Rio dos Sinos (UNISINOS) and the University of Caxias do Sul (UCS).

Event publication: CANDIDO, Celso; CARBONARA, Vanderlei (Orgs.). *Filosofia e ensino: um diálogo transdisciplinar*. Ijuí: UNIJUÍ, 2004.

The central focus of this publication revolves around the philosophical approach to formal education, particularly regarding its transdisciplinary implications, considering also the presence of Philosophy as one of the subjects in the curriculum. At the same time, it engages in a debate on philosophy itself and on its teaching.

The publication is divided into three parts. The first, “Philosophy in Dialogue with Formal Education,” addresses themes such as the place of philosophy within the curriculum; Rousseau and Condorcet and the secular ideal of schooling in a republic; the dialogue between adults and children in the teaching of philosophy; the trans- and cross-cutting aspects of teaching philosophy in basic education; the “formative role” of philosophy from the perspective of Adorno and Habermas; the educational process in the political thought of John Locke; the need to rethink philosophy in upper secondary education; the experience of philosophizing from a cross-cutting perspective; and the nature, characteristics, and methods of philosophical study. Next, in “Philosophy in Dialogue with Its Teaching,” the themes discussed include audiovisual culture and its challenges for the teaching of philosophy; argumentation theory; epistemology and hermeneutics in Richard Rorty; the inseparability of philosophy and its teaching; the origin of philosophy and its teaching as emancipation; justice and responsibility in Lévinas; the movement from the academic sphere to life; philosophy and its teaching as ways of reading philosophy itself and the world; and philosophical formation and the preparation of philosophy teachers (both the B.A. and the licentiate), their challenges and risks.

Finally, “Interfaces of Philosophical Dialogue” includes articles on psychoanalysis and education; debates on scientific paradigms; intercultural philosophy, culture, and power; philosophy of science and the teaching of science; Marx, philosophy as interpretation and transformation of the world; ethics and politics; hermeneutic philosophical reading, ethical practice, political power; and communicative ethics.

2004b (September) – *II Fórum Sudeste de Ensino de Filosofia* [II Southeastern Forum on Philosophy Education]. II International Meeting on Philosophy and Education: Policies of the Teaching of Philosophy, held in September 2004 in Rio de Janeiro/RJ, at the Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (UERJ).

Event publication: This event produced three specific volumes, based on the conference proceedings: KOHAN, Walter (Org.). *Políticas do ensino de filosofia*. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A, 2004a.

The first publication, divided into three parts, addresses *Policies of Education*, which examines topics such as teaching and learning in philosophy through the lens of Jacques Rancière; a pedagogy of oppression that leads to indifference regarding oppression; a critique of the belief in the emancipatory role of the school grounded in Althusser and Foucault; and an analysis of two master-disciple models in Rousseau and Nietzsche. In *Philosophy, Culture, and Society*, drawing on Negri and Deleuze, the volume addresses intelligence, immaterial labor, and the teaching of philosophy; along the same theoretical lines, a study on the aesthetic dimension of pedagogical intervention, or applied aesthetics; a Marxist-inspired analysis of the concepts of critique, emancipation, and what it means to politicize; and a reflection on the place of philosophy teaching in the culture of the Amazon region. In *On the Relationship between Philosophy and Education*, the discussions include the passion for education, for knowledge, and for the meaning of educating; possibilities for a “popular philosophy” based on Gramsci and Althusser, grounded in questioning the separation between common sense and philosophical knowledge; the meanings of a philosophical education; and the limits of placing philosophy at the service of citizenship.

KOHAN, Walter (Org.). *Lugares da infância: filosofia*. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A, 2004b.

The second publication addresses “Childhood Between Literature and Philosophy”, which offers several readings of childhood based on the poetry of Manoel de Barros; the memory of childhood in the educational experience; literary portrayals and philosophical questions for educators; as well as reflections on becoming a child, childhood, and education. In “Literature and the Teaching of Philosophy”, the philosophical content and its literary form acquired over time are analyzed, expressing the tradition of what is considered philosophical writing; the use of literary texts in philosophical work is

examined—including cases such as Cervantes, Conan Doyle, and George Orwell; stories to philosophize with children; stories for thinking; and contemporary approaches to philosophy and children’s literature. “Philosophy for Children” generally presents the shared experiences of authors long involved with studies and practices of teaching philosophy to/with children.

KOHAN, Walter (Org.). *Filosofia: caminhos para seu ensino*. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A, 2004c.

The third publication discusses “On the Conditions of Teaching Philosophy,” which includes studies on methodology in the philosophy teaching; on its relationship with the culture in which the teaching of philosophy takes place; on the conditions of possibility for teaching philosophy; and on the place of the subject Philosophy in upper-secondary education within the country’s social and cultural context. In “From Upper-Secondary to Higher Education”, themes such as the limits of cross-cutting in the philosophy teaching are addressed; the problem of fragmentation in philosophical training between the bachelor’s degree and the teacher-training degree; philosophy in university entrance examinations; and the relations among philosophy, culture, and education amid the current crisis of paradigms. Finally, “Other Names and Places for Philosophy?” deals with themes such as “heterodox,” non-university philosophical practices, including “philosophical cafés,” “clinical philosophy,” courses in museums, NGOs, companies, and informal groups—including at home—as well as philosophical Olympiads.

Other publications related to the topic under discussion were also released, written by professors who participated in the Forums, and it is relevant to mention them here:

GALLO, Sílvia & KOHAN, Walter (Orgs.). *Filosofia no ensino médio*. Vol. VI. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2000.

OBIOLS, Guillermo. *Uma introdução ao ensino da filosofia*. Translated by Sílvia Gallo. Ijuí: UNIJUÍ, 2002.

Final considerations: Legacy

From these events and publications emerged a wide range of studies, publications, and events on the teaching of philosophy, encompassing diverse themes. Relying on the richness of these new perspectives and productions, the great potential of philosophy to reflect on its own teaching became evident. Hence, to echo Matos (1999, p. 210), arose the idea of bringing the matter of philosophy teaching into the complex and solid field of philosophy itself. The result was the recognition of the need to establish Philosophy Teaching as an area of philosophical knowledge beyond Pedagogy, that is, as a subfield of philosophical research, which came to be understood as the defense to “Philosophize on Philosophy Teaching.”

According to Gallo (2002, p. 203, emphasis added):

Philosophy teaching cannot be encompassed by general didactics, nor can it be reduced solely to a pedagogical issue, because there is something specific to philosophy. There is something that constitutes philosophy as such, distinguishing it from science, from religion, and from mere opinion, and it is this very element that demands that the teaching of philosophy also receive a philosophical treatment, specific didactics *that surpasses any strictly pedagogical concern*.²²

These considerations would inaugurate, in the years that followed, as previously noted, a new phase in the revival of studies and research on philosophy and its teaching: in the rearticulation of teacher movements defending the mandatory inclusion of Philosophy in the

²² Original: “O ensino de filosofia não pode ser abarcado por uma didática geral, não pode ser equacionado unicamente como uma questão pedagógica porque há algo de específico na filosofia. Há algo que faz com que a filosofia seja filosofia, e não ciência, e não religião, e não opinião, e é esse algo que faz com que o ensino de filosofia careça também de um tratamento filosófico, de uma didática específica, para além de toda e qualquer questão estritamente pedagógica.”

curriculum and in the creation of the Forums on Philosophy Teaching. Taken together, these initiatives propelled, as their legacy, several fronts of struggle: *theoretical* (dissertations, theses, publications, academic conferences); *political* (bills at federal and state levels, movements, demonstrations); and *pedagogical* (the PNLD, the Professional Master's in Philosophy, new conceptions of methodology for teaching philosophy, analyses of the role of the philosophy teaching degree in the training of philosophy teachers etc.)

And perhaps the greatest achievement of all was the creation, in 2006, of Anpof's *GT Filosofar e Ensinar a Filosofar* [Working Group "Philosophizing and Teaching to Philosophize"] within the National Association of Graduate Studies in Philosophy (Associação Nacional de Pós-Graduação em Filosofia). This group came to occupy the spaces previously established by the National Forums on Philosophy Teaching—both in terms of theoretical-philosophical production on the teaching of philosophy and in terms of political mobilization and advocacy for the inclusion of philosophy in the curriculum as a mandatory subject.

This was the venue found to unify the movement, since the initial idea of creating a national association of philosophy teachers had not materialized. By welcoming upper-secondary philosophy teachers and creating this political and academic space, Anpof fulfills a historically significant role, taking upon itself the matter of philosophy teaching in order to address its demands across the different domains of Philosophy and its Teaching.

However, the history of the creation and functioning of Anpof's Working Group "Philosophizing and Teaching to Philosophize" will not be examined in this text, as it has already been the object of a detailed and well-documented analysis by Professor Dr. Patrícia Velasco, published as a book in 2020 under the title *Filosofar e Ensinar a Filosofar: Registros do GT da ANPOF 2006-2018* (Velasco, 2020). For this reason, the scope of this article is limited to the period from 1996 to 2004, understood as the initial phase of the rearticulation of movements, events, and publications that make up the contemporary history of the teaching of philosophy. From that point onward, readers are referred to Velasco's study.

The first phase of the contemporary history of the teaching of philosophy in Brazil came to an end in 2008, after the field achieved its major goal: the establishment of philosophy as a mandatory subject in the curriculum through Law No. 11,684 of June 2, 2008 (Brazil, 2008). This had been the central demand up to that point. From then on, a new phase began, one in which support was gained from federal legislation in favor of introducing philosophy as a compulsory subject in the upper-secondary school curriculum, for the first time in the history of the Brazilian Republic—although this phase would not last long. But that is another story.

It may be stated, briefly, that the mandatory inclusion of philosophy as a subject across all three years of upper secondary education gradually redirected the movements, publications, and master's and doctoral research toward a more intensive focus on thinking about philosophy teaching in schools: the didactics of philosophy, methodological questions concerning philosophy and its teaching, and the development of philosophical-pedagogical frameworks for philosophical education in schools, rather than prioritizing the defense of the subject's mere introduction or presence in the curriculum. Thus, a shift took place, from a predominantly reactive stance, responding to the constant attacks on philosophy education, to a new, more *creative* and *propositional*, explicitly *philosophical* phase, centered on how philosophy teaching should be carried out in schools. Efforts were increasingly channeled into philosophical reflection on the teaching of philosophy.

In this sense, the idea to “philosophize on philosophy teaching,” which had emerged during the National Philosophy Forums beginning in 1999, made concrete advances.

This momentum also led to the creation of new undergraduate programs in philosophy education (licentiate degree) in most Brazilian universities, providing empirical evidence that the mandatory inclusion of the subject would gradually solve the problem of the shortage of qualified philosophy teachers to meet the increasing demand. Undergraduate programs in philosophy multiplied rapidly, as did continuing education programs, PIBID (Programa Institucional de Bolsas de Iniciação à

Docência) [Scholarship Program for Teaching Initiation] initiatives, professional master's degrees in philosophy, and the publication of didactic and supplementary materials, among many other efforts.

After 2016, however, this trajectory suffered a significant setback. Legislation once again turned against philosophy education, and studies and movements returned to the reactive posture that was typical of the pre-2008 period, due to the curricular reform that created the “New Upper-Secondary Education Model” (Brazil, 2017) and determined the organization of the curriculum by areas of knowledge rather than by individual subjects—an arrangement that has made the effective presence and teaching of philosophy in schools nearly unfeasible.

At the same time—and somewhat paradoxically—initiatives of a propositional, rather than merely reactive, nature continue to emerge in support of philosophy education, expressing a sustained stance of resistance and counter-hegemonic engagement. These include the PROF-FILO programs, university extension projects, a growing body of publications, research at the master's and doctoral levels, undergraduate monographs, capstone projects, research fellowships, and the creation of philosophy-teaching laboratories, among many other endeavors. May such efforts continue.

References

ALVES, Dalton José. *A filosofia no ensino médio: ambiguidades e contradições na LDB*. Prefácio de Sílvio Gallo. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2002.

BRASIL. CEB. *Resolução CEB nº 3*. Diretrizes curriculares para o ensino médio. Brasília: MEC/CNE, 1998. Disponível em: http://portal.mec.gov.br/cne/arquivos/pdf/rceb03_98.pdf. Acesso em: 16 nov. 2022.

BRASIL. *Lei nº 11.684, de 2 de junho de 2008*. Altera o art. 36 da Lei n. 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996, que estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional, para incluir a Filosofia e a Sociologia como disciplinas obrigatórias nos currículos do ensino médio. Brasília: Planalto, Casa Civil,

2008. Disponível em: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2007-2010/2008/lei/111684.htm. Acesso em: 16 nov. 2022.

BRASIL. *Lei nº 13.415, de 16 de fevereiro de 2017*. Altera as Leis n. 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996 e institui a Política de Fomento à Implementação de Escolas de Ensino Médio em Tempo Integral. Brasília: Planalto, Casa Civil, 2017. Disponível em: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2015-2018/2017/lei/113415.htm. Acesso em: 16 nov.2022.

BRASIL. *Lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996*. Estabelece as Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional. Brasília: Diário Oficial da União, 1996. Disponível em: <https://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/lei/1996/lei-9394-20-dezembro-1996-362578-publicacaooriginal-1-pl.html>. Acesso em: 15 nov. 2022.

BRASIL. SEMTEC. *Parâmetros curriculares nacionais para o ensino médio*: Parte I – Bases Legais. Brasília: MEC/SEMTEC, 2000a. Disponível em: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/seb/arquivos/pdf/blegais.pdf>. Acesso em: 16 nov. 2022.

BRASIL. SEMTEC. *Parâmetros curriculares nacionais para o ensino médio*: Parte IV – Ciências Humanas e suas Tecnologias. Brasília: MEC/SEMTEC, 2000b. Disponível em: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/seb/arquivos/pdf/cienciah.pdf>. Acesso em: 16 nov. 2022.

CANDIDO, Celso; CARBONARA, Vanderlei (Orgs.). *Filosofia e ensino*: um diálogo transdisciplinar. Ijuí: Unijuí, 2004.

CARMINATI, Celso. *O ensino de filosofia no II grau*: do seu afastamento ao movimento pela sua reintrodução – A Sociedade de Estudos e Atividades Filosóficos/SEAF. 1997. 179 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, 1997.

CORNELLI, Gabriele. Apresentação. In: GALLO, Sílvio; CORNELLI, Gabriele; DANELON, Márcio (Orgs.). *Filosofia do ensino de filosofia*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2003. p. 9-14.

FÁVERO, Altair; RAUBER, Jaime; KOHAN, Walter. Apresentação. In: FÁVERO, Altair; RAUBER, Jaime; KOHAN, Walter (Orgs.). *Um olhar sobre o ensino de filosofia*. Ijuí: Unijuí, 2002b. p. 9-18.

FÁVERO, Altair; RAUBER, Jaime; KOHAN, Walter (Orgs.). *Um olhar sobre o ensino de filosofia*. Ijuí: Unijuí, 2002a.

GALLO, Sílvio; CORNELLI, Gabriele; DANELON, Márcio (Orgs.). *Filosofia do ensino de filosofia*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2003.

- GALLO, Sílvio; DANELON, Márcio; CORNELLI, Gabriele (Orgs.). *Ensino de filosofia: teoria e prática*. Ijuí: Unijuí, 2004.
- GALLO, Sílvio; KOHAN, Walter (Orgs.). *Filosofia no ensino médio*. vol. VI. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2000a.
- GALLO, Sílvio; KOHAN, Walter. Apresentação. In: GALLO, Sílvio; KOHAN, Walter (Orgs.). *Filosofia no ensino médio*. vol. VI. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2000b. p. 7-10.
- GALLO, Sílvio. A especificidade do ensino de filosofia: em torno dos conceitos. In: PIOVESAN, Américo (Org.). *Filosofia e ensino em debate*. Ijuí: Unijuí, 2002. p. 193-209.
- GALLO, Sílvio. Apresentação. In: GALLO, Sílvio; DANELON, Márcio; CORNELLI, Gabriele (Orgs.). *Ensino de filosofia: teoria e prática*. Ijuí: Unijuí, 2004. p. 9-12.
- KOHAN, Walter (Org.). *Ensino de Filosofia: perspectivas*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2002a.
- KOHAN, Walter (Org.). *Filosofia: caminhos para seu ensino*. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A, 2004c.
- KOHAN, Walter (Org.). *Lugares da infância: filosofia*. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A, 2004b.
- KOHAN, Walter (Org.). *Políticas do ensino de filosofia*. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A, 2004a.
- KOHAN, Walter; LEAL, Bernardina (Orgs.). *Filosofia para crianças em debate*. vol. IV. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1999.
- KOHAN, Walter. Apresentação. In: KOHAN, Walter (Org.). *Ensino de Filosofia: perspectivas*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2002b. p. 7-10.
- MATOS, Junot Cornélio. *Em toda parte e em nenhum lugar: a formação pedagógica do professor de filosofia*. 1999. 282 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 1999.
- OBIOLS, Guillermo. *Uma introdução ao ensino da filosofia*. Trad. Sílvio Gallo. Ijuí: Unijuí, 2002.
- PIOVESAN, Américo (Org.). *Filosofia e ensino em debate*. Ijuí: Unijuí, 2002.
- ROLLA, Aline; SANTOS NETO, Antônio; QUEIROZ, Ivo (Orgs.). *Filosofia e ensino: possibilidades e desafios*. Ijuí: Unijuí, 2003.

SILVEIRA, Renê J. T. *Ensino de filosofia no segundo grau: em busca de um sentido*. 1991. 612 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 1991.

VELASCO, Patrícia Del Nero. *Filosofar e ensinar a filosofar: registros do GT da ANPOF 2006-2018*. Rio de Janeiro: NEFI, 2020. Disponível em: <http://filoeduc.org/nefiedicoes/colecoes.php?#livros>. Acesso em: 20 nov. 2022.

Data de registro: 23/01/2023

Data de aceite: 23/08/2023