

Developmental Learning Theory (DLT): an interview with José Carlos Libâneo

Teoria da aprendizagem desenvolvimental (TAD): diálogo com José Carlos Libâneo

José Carlos Libâneo¹
Andréa Maturano Longarezi²
Roberto Valdés Puentes³

ABSTRACT

The interview establishes and addresses, based on a set of sixteen questions, the main moments in the academic, personal, professional, intellectual and political development of one of the most relevant educators, pedagogues and didactics of the second half of the 20th century and the first two decades of the 21st century. José Carlos Libâneo (1945-) is responsible for a vast and solid work nationally and internationally known, especially his book *Didactic* (1990), considered among the most cited in the educational field. An intellectual politically engaged in the education of children from the poorest classes in favor of a quality public school, with the learning of scientific content connected to the concrete historical and social conditions of the students' lives, Libâneo is an example for the new generations.

Keywords: José Carlos Libâneo. Developmental Education. V. V. Davydov.

RESUMO

A entrevista estabelece e aborda, a partir de um conjunto de dezesseis perguntas, os principais momentos no desenvolvimento acadêmico, pessoal, profissional, intelectual e político de um dos educadores, pedagogos e didatas mais relevantes da segunda metade do século XX e primeiras duas décadas do século XXI. José Carlos Libâneo (1945-) é responsável por uma obra vasta e sólida que é de domínio nacional e internacional, sobretudo seu livro *Didática* (1990), considerado na lista dos mais citados na área educacional. Intelectual politicamente engajado com a formação dos filhos das camadas mais pobres em favor de uma escola pública de qualidade, com a aprendizagem de conteúdos científicos vinculados às condições históricas e sociais concretas de vida dos alunos, Libâneo é um exemplo para as novas gerações.

Palavras-chave: José Carlos Libâneo. Ensino Desenvolvimental. V. V. Davydov.

¹ Post doctorate in Education from the University of Valladolid (Spain, 2005). Master's degree in Philosophy of Education (1984) and PhD in History and Philosophy of Education (1990) from the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo. Retired Full Professor at the Universidade Federal de Goiás. Currently Full Professor at the Pontifical Catholic University of Goiás. Lecturer in the Postgraduate Program at the Pontifical Catholic University of Goiás. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6821-5946>. Contact: libaneojc@uol.com.br.

² Postdoctoral degree in Education from Universidade de São Paulo (São Paulo, Brazil, 2018). PhD in Education from UNESP (Araraquara, Brazil, 2001). Associate Professor at the Faculty of Education, Universidade Federal de Uberlândia. Lecturer on graduate courses and the Postgraduate Program in Education at master's and doctoral levels. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5651-9333>. Contact: andrea.longarezi@gmail.com.

³ Post doctorate in Didactics from the University of Granada (Spain, 2013). PhD in Education from Unimep (Piracicaba, Brazil, 2003). Associate Professor at the Faculty of Education, Universidade Federal de Uberlândia. Lecturer on graduate courses and the Postgraduate Program in Education at master's and doctoral levels. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8936-9362>. Contact: robertovaldespuentes@gmail.com.

1 Introduction

This interview is part of the first international cycle of interviews with prominent figures in Developmental Learning Theory. This series aims to connect Brazilian researchers with Brazilian and international intellectuals and scientists who have been instrumental in developing Learning and Study Activity theories from 1960 to 2019. These individuals have made significant contributions to the establishment of various alternative developmental psychological and didactic systems, particularly the Elkonin-Davidov-Repkin system, in different countries and cities.

Contact will be facilitated through interviews that explore these theorists' specific work, its impact on consolidating systems and theories, the context in which their work was produced, and the specificities of each theoretical position. The interviews will also explore the reflections generated by this work after many years.

To cover the long development period of the systems and their resulting developmental learning concept, the interview cycle will include representatives from a wide range of proposals that meet the following criteria: (a) be linked to distinct moments, stages, or phases in the history of one of the alternative developmental, psychological, or didactic systems (Puentes & Longarezi, 2020); (b) be linked to different groups and variants within the various systems; and (c) be linked to diverse objects and fields within the theory, such as developmental psychology, educational psychology, didactics, and learning methodologies.; (d) be linked to important representatives of any of the systems; (e) be linked to different geographical regions (e.g., cities, republics, and countries); (f) be linked to current movements for the renewal and continuity of theory within groups, institutions, cities, republics, and/or countries where they live and/or work; and (g) be an intellectual and researcher of high standing in Brazilian and foreign academic circles, as evidenced by their extensive scientific output and solid membership in groups, networks, associations, and centers of recognized national and international prestige.

Where possible, interviews will be published in both languages (in their original language and in Portuguese). This initiative aims to intensify and consolidate knowledge about Developmental Learning Theory in Brazil and Latin America. The Study and Research Group on Developmental Didactics and Teacher Professionalization (Grupo de Estudos e Pesquisas em Didática Desenvolvimental e Profissionalização Docente - Gepedi) has played a leading role in this process, while strengthening ties with groups and researchers of recognized international prestige.

This interview is the fifth in the series and is with José Carlos Libâneo (1945-), a Brazilian philosopher, educator, pedagogue, and teacher. Due to the magnitude of his academic, teaching, intellectual, and political work in favor of a more just, equitable, inclusive, and higher-quality education, the professor needs little introduction in Brazil (LONGAREZI; PUENTES; SOUZA, 2020).

He worked with Brazilian intellectuals and researchers to develop a progressive approach to education, which was heavily influenced by European and Latin American Marxist philosophers. This approach emerged and developed in the political context of the 1970s and 1980s, which was characterized by numerous intense political movements for democratization and social transformation. Additionally, throughout his academic career, he took a critical stance against social inequality and proactively promoted transformation through education and school content (PUENTES; LONGAREZI, 2020).

J. C. Libâneo's intellectual activity spans five decades. His work is characterized by substantial, innovative, and extensive contributions to the field of education. Since the 1980s, his work has gained political and academic recognition and influence in Brazil and other Latin American countries. Libâneo is currently one of the most published and cited Brazilian authors. He is the author of works such as *Democratization of Public Schools: Critical Social Pedagogy of Content* (1985 [1996]), *Didactics* (1990 [2002]), *Organization and Management of Schools: Theory and Practice* (2000), and

Pedagogy and Pedagogues, for What? (2001a⁴), and *Goodbye Professor, Goodbye Teacher?* (2001b). He is on the list of Brazilian educators with the highest number of published and referenced books. His works include *Didactics* (1990) and *Pedagogy and pedagogues, for what?* (2001a, 2001b), are considered classics of Brazilian pedagogical literature. Other notable works include *School and Democracy* (1983) and *Historical-Critical Pedagogy: first approaches* (1991) by Dermeval Saviani (Longaresi & Puentes, 2020; Longaresi & Puentes, 2023).

As members and representatives of the Gepedi Study and Research Group on Developmental Didactics and Teacher Professionalization, we are delighted and honored to have built a friendship and partnership with Professor José Carlos Libâneo over the past fifteen years. We are also privileged to coordinate this interview, which will undoubtedly become a historically significant manuscript.

The interview consists of sixteen questions covering the author's personal, educational, professional, academic, and intellectual trajectory. Topics include his struggles during the dictatorship, political activism, involvement in the main national forums in the field of education, participation in the process of national redemocratization, and the development of critical-social didactic approaches with a historical-cultural focus.

Finally, we would like to thank Professor José Carlos Libâneo for his kindness in answering each question with his characteristic precision and wealth of detail. We would also like to thank him for his friendship and the affection he has always shown to Gepedi and the *Obutchénie* journal. We would also like to thank the Revista de Didática e Psicologia Pedagógica (Journal of Didactics and Educational Psychology) for the international events they have organized, for our partnership over the years, and, above all, for their enormous contribution to education, pedagogy, and didactics in Brazil.

⁴ The first edition of this work was published in 1998. In 2020, the book reached its 20th edition.

1) Andréa M. Longarezi (AML) and Roberto V. Puentes (RVP) — Dear Professor Libâneo, your recognition as an educator, researcher, and defender of pedagogy and didactics in Brazil is well known. To help readers better understand the path that led to the consolidation of your work, including your approach to the historical-cultural perspective and developmental didactics; please begin by presenting your educational, professional, and academic background.

José Carlos Libâneo (JCL) — First, I would like to thank you and *Obutchénie. Revista de Didática e Psicologia Pedagógica*, for this opportunity to share some of my personal and intellectual history. I am honored to be part of the dynamic, collective work you are doing at UFU to advance Historical-Cultural Theory studies and research, particularly in Developmental Didactics. To answer your first question, I will start by saying that I come from a rural background. I am the son of small farmers from a small municipality in the interior of São Paulo state, Angatuba. I spent my early years in primary school in a multi-grade classroom, experiencing the same challenges and benefits as many rural schools in this country. In the third year, I transferred to the city school. My parents were nearly illiterate, and we lived on a farm in a deprived area. However, we were in a context of strong Catholic influence and great religiosity. After completing the fourth grade, with my parents' consent, the city's parish priest sent me to the Diocesan Seminary of Sorocaba in 1955. Sorocaba is also in the state of São Paulo. I remained at this institution as a boarder for seven and a half years and completed my secondary education there. At the time, this included middle school and high school. After graduating from high school, I was sent to the Major Seminary of the Archdiocese of São Paulo in Aparecida do Norte, São Paulo, where I began my first year of philosophy studies in 1963. Important detail: these two institutions provided me with an environment entirely steeped in Jesuit pedagogy with strong traces of political and moral conservatism, but also with

a rigorous regime of study and discipline. At the end of that year, I left the Major Seminary and went on to study philosophy at the Faculty of Philosophy, Sciences, and Letters of São Bento, at the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo, where I graduated at the end of 1966 with a degree in philosophy.

My professional career began after I graduated. A job opportunity arose in my last year of college when I took a course on John Dewey's theory with Professor Joel Martins, a well-known psychologist and educator. Professor Martins provided educational consulting to an experimental public school in São Paulo called Grupo Experimental da Lapa and recommended me for the position of director of one of its units. I was 23 years old at the time. The school was authorized by the Department of Education and run by the renowned educator There disadvantaged students with age/grade gaps. There were four middle schools, and I was responsible for the one serving students with age/grade gaps, i.e., those over 14 years of age. These students came from pockets of poverty in middle-class neighborhoods in São Paulo. Thus, my first professional experience was with students who had a similar social background to my own. Up to that point, my professional career had two strong influences on my pedagogy learning: the Catholic seminary with Jesuit pedagogy and the experimental school with Escola Nova pedagogy. This combination was surprising and will be discussed further below.

I moved with my family to Goiânia in 1973 at the invitation of the State Department of Education of Goiás, initially to work as a technical consultant in education. At that time, Law 5692/71 (Brazil, 1971) was being implemented throughout Brazil, requiring states to develop a state plan for implementing reform. I came to Goiás to work on implementing this plan. Once the work was finished, I was invited to found and direct a Teacher Training and Education Center (Centro de Formação e Treinamento de Professores - CENTREFOR), which was still within the guidelines of Law 5692/71. I directed the center for three years, offering continuing education courses primarily for state professors. While working at the Secretariat, I took a public exam in March 1975 to become a professor at the UFG School of Education. A few months later, while waiting

to be hired, I was called to the university's personnel department, where I was informed of my dismissal from public service. I was dismissed for political reasons due to my student activism in my youth, as determined by the National Information Service (NIS), an agency of the military dictatorship. Once my "subversive" past was identified, the same process was repeated at the State Department of Education, where I was also dismissed.

I lost both jobs at once, leaving me unemployed with a five-year-old daughter and a three-year-old son. It was a very dark time in my life, but it also greatly strengthened my character. Since I had no chance of finding a job in the public sector, I worked for two years in the human resources department of a real estate credit company, where I provided training courses for employees, mainly in customer service and sales.

I left a job that wasn't right for me and joined a professor of education and a colleague with experience in financial matters to found a private school. We named it Colégio Vocacional after a well-known network of experimental schools in São Paulo in the 1960s. The school offered early childhood, primary, and junior high education. As principal, I applied the experience I gained at the Experimental da Lapa, a school based on the Escola Nova movement. I remained at the school until 1980, when I was readmitted to the Federal University of Goiás under the 1979 Amnesty Law.

By the end of 1980, I had obtained a license to pursue a Master's degree in the Philosophy of Education at PUC São Paulo. I completed this degree in 1984 and followed it with a Ph.D. in the History and Philosophy of Education, which I completed in 1990. Upon returning to the Faculty of Education at UFG, I taught various pedagogical subjects in the graduate pedagogy program, including Theories of Education, Didactics, Psychology of Education, and Organization of Pedagogical Work. I was a professor in the Master's program in Brazilian School Education at this institution, which was implemented in 1990. I was the coordinator of the program from 1992 to 1994.

After retiring from UFG, I was a visiting professor for one semester at both the Universidade Metodista de Piracicaba (UNIMEP, 1997) and the

Universidade Estadual Paulista Campus Marília (UNESP, 1999). In 1997, PUC Goiás hired me to teach courses in the pedagogy program, including Educational Psychology, Didactics, Theories of Education, Teaching and Curriculum, and History of Education. Together with my colleague Iria Brezsinski, I coordinated the implementation of the Postgraduate Program in Education at this institution, beginning in 1997 with the master's degree and then the doctorate. I served as vice coordinator of this program for three terms. Currently, I am a professor and researcher and I coordinate the Research Group on Educational Theories and Pedagogical Processes (CNPq) in the field of historical-cultural theory and pedagogical practices.

Throughout my professional career, I have participated in working groups and committees associated with the Ministry of Education. I would like to highlight three of these activities: The Working Group that created the guiding document for curriculum policies for teacher training courses, the Pedagogy Committee for the National Course Examination, and the National Commission for the Evaluation of Graduate Courses in Education (*Cursos de Pós- Graduação, área da Educação* - CAPES). I joined these commissions due to my involvement in the lengthy debate that occurred in the education field in the 2000s regarding the teacher training system. I participated because I was part of a group of education professionals who opposed the National Association for Teacher Training's (*Associação Nacional pela Formação de Professores* - ANFOPE) position on the curriculum guidelines for a degree in pedagogy.

I would like to highlight some important moments in my life. While pursuing my master's degree at PUC in São Paulo beginning in 1981, I was an active member of the National Education Association (*Associação Nacional de Educação* - Ande). Founded in 1979 by a group of professors and students led by Dermeval Saviani, I served as vice president during Selma Pimenta's term as president. I edited the Ande magazine for two years. I also joined the National Association for Research and Postgraduate Studies (Associação Nacional de Pesquisa e Pós-Graduação - Andep), which was founded in 1978. I actively participated in the foundation and development of GT 4–Didactics,

with which I am still affiliated today. As an ANDE member, I helped organize the first four Brazilian Education Conferences (Conferências Brasileiras de Educação - CBE). The first was held in 1980, at the end of the military dictatorship. The fourth was held in Goiânia in 1986. Until 1990, these conferences were coordinated by three entities: ANDE, ANPED, and CEDES. Selma Pimenta and I represented ANDE. The central theme of the IV CBE, held in Goiânia in 1986, was "Education and the Constitution," resulting in the Manifesto of Educators. This document informed the section on education in the 1988 Constitution. I was also an active participant in several National Meetings on Practical Teaching Didactics (*Encontros Nacionais de Didática Prática de Ensino* - ENDIPE), coordinating the seventh in 1994 and the eleventh in 2002. I also became involved in the founding of the Center for Studies and Research in Didactics (Centro de Estudos e Pesquisas em Didática - CEPED) in 2001 with fellow professors from Goiás. This entity has held the State Meeting on Didactics and Teaching Practices (*Encontro Estadual de Didática e Práticas de Ensino* - EDIPE), the, for over 20 years, with the most recent one held in 2023.

In terms of my academic career, I have collaborated with several national research groups, including GEPAPE and GEPEFE at FEUSP, GEPEDI at UFU, and Núcleo de Ensino de Marília at Unesp Marília. Internationally, I have traveled to Chile twice to deliver lectures and courses. The first visit was in 2011 at the Universidad de la Frontera's School of Education in Temuco, Chile. It is a public institution linked to the Chilean Ministry of Education. The second visit was in 2012 at the Universidad Alberto Hurtado, a private Catholic institution. I have also given lectures and courses in Mozambique twice: once in 2014 at the Pedagogical Universities of Maxixe and Maputo, and again in 2019 at the Pedagogical Universities of Nampula and Quelimane. From 2014 to 2015, I represented Brazil in a research group coordinated by Prof. Yves Lenoir at the University of Sherbrooke in Quebec, Canada. The group was part of an international project involving eight countries in Latin America and Europe entitled "What School for the 21st

Century: An International Investigation with Different Categories of Actors." The project was a comparative study of the perceptions of various stakeholders (teachers, future teachers, public education officials, school administrators, business leaders, parents, etc.) regarding the educational goals of schools. International research was not feasible, but my research group at PUC Goiás conducted the same research for the state of Goiás under my coordination, completing it in 2022. During my postdoctoral studies, I carried out academic activities in Spain at the University of Valladolid and the Autonomous University of Madrid; in Portugal at the Catholic University of Braga; in Colombia at the National Pedagogical University of Bogotá; and in Argentina at the University of Buenos Aires. I have maintained academic contact over the years with renowned international researchers, including Bernd Fichtner (Germany), Michel Young (England), Yves Lenoir (Canada), Martín Rojo (Spain), Rafael Penágos (Colombia), José Augusto Pacheco (Portugal), Maria Serena Vegetti (Italy), Seth Chaiklin and Mariane Hedegaard (Denmark), and Bernard Charlot (France and Brazil).

2) AML and RVP — How has your educational, professional, and academic background influenced your views on school and education?

JCL — I believe that each period of life brings experiences that affect our ideas and practices, depending on the meaning we attribute to them and how we experience them. I think this applies to all researchers. As I mentioned earlier, I had two very different experiences in my life that were even contradictory, but they led me to a rich synthesis in the formation of my thinking and teaching practice. The first experience was spending nine years of my adolescence and youth in a Catholic seminary steeped in Jesuit pedagogy, which left an indelible mark on my intellectual and moral development. Those years at boarding school were an almost complete reproduction of the intellectual, moral, and religious ideas presented in the *Ratio Studiorum*, the

Jesuit pedagogy document. I won't discuss this here nor make any value judgments, but I will emphasize the privilege I had as a boy from a poor background to receive such an enviable humanistic education. Without the seminary, I would have joined the 70% of children excluded by the infamous entrance exam in the 1950s. This exam was used to select students who would continue their studies in secondary school after completing primary school. My fight for public education stems from this realization. At that time, I believe 90% of students accepted into the seminary came from poor families. These boys were able to acquire an excellent cultural and scientific education and succeed in school. This fact convinced me that poverty couldn't be an obstacle to learning. Thus, I committed myself to fighting for a public school system that emphasizes cultural and scientific education to provide poor young people with relevant knowledge.

My second experience was working at the Lapa Experimental Group for six years. As director, I acted according to John Dewey's interpretation of new pedagogy. While my consciousness was steeped in traditional pedagogy, I internalized the guidelines of new pedagogy and put them into practice as a school director. Later, while studying for my master's degree, I encountered the ideas of one of my mentors, Georges Snyders. I read his book, *Progressive Pedagogy*, in which he suggested integrating elements from both pedagogical approaches to overcome them. As director of the experimental school, I intuitively sought to articulate the experience of one type of pedagogy in the seminar with that of another type in my professional activity. This process became clearer when I became acquainted with historical-cultural theory, especially the work of V. V. Davydov. In Goiânia, as I mentioned earlier, while directing a teacher-training center and later a private school, I continued trying to synthesize the new and traditional pedagogies to help teachers address real issues in the classroom. I believe it was my dual education and existential experiences that enabled me to implement Snyder's recommendation to incorporate and transcend.

In this context, something providential happened that helped me better

understand this synthesis. At the end of the period when I was sidelined by the military dictatorship, I decided to enroll in a specialized education course at the UFG Faculty of Education, where I had been dismissed for political reasons. During that time, I came across the books *The Reproduction*, by Bourdieu and Passeron, and *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*, by Althusser. I also read an article by Dermeval Saviani in which he commented on the work of the Argentine author Luis Jorge Zanotti, who compared traditional and new pedagogies. Additionally, I read the book *Progressive Pedagogy*, by Snyders, which offered the same analysis. Accessing this material was a defining moment for me because I saw written what I had intuitively thought based on my professional experience. When I started my master's degree, I began studying not only Snyders's texts but also those of Antonio Gramsci, Bogdan Suchodolski, Mario Manacorda, and Bernard Charlot. Later, these studies resulted in articles such as "*Pedagogical Trends in School Practice*" and "*Didactics and Historical-Social Practice*," among others. Thus began my journey as a scholar of the Marxist approach to pedagogy, initially following the studies of Dermeval Saviani closely. In the following years, this led to my master's dissertation, "A prática pedagógica do professor da escola pública" (The pedagogical practice of public school teachers) (1984), and my doctoral thesis, "*Theoretical and Practical Foundations of Teaching: An Introductory Study on Pedagogy and Didactics*" (1990), in addition to articles and book chapters.

3) AML and RVP — Your career has certainly been marked by political struggle and resistance. At the beginning of your career, you faced the military dictatorship, a period of repression in which professors, researchers, intellectuals, artists, and activists were deliberately persecuted to silence them. How did you personally cope with this situation, and how has it affected your work, ideas, and body of work?

JCL — Yes, indeed, the 1964 civil-military coup is part of my history, not only because I witnessed it, but because of its impact on my personal and professional life. On March 31, 1964, the date on which the military took over in what they called a revolution, I was just over 18 years old and in my second year of philosophy at PUC in São Paulo. Having recently left the seminary, my admission to PUC led me to become involved in the Academic Center and to participate in demonstrations and political acts against the military regime. Joining the Academic Center introduced me to a left-wing political organization, Popular Action (PA), founded in 1962. This organization had its origins in the Catholic University Youth (Juventude Universitária Católica - JUC), a movement linked to the progressive wing of the Catholic Church. In its political orientation document for militants, the organization was seen as “the expression of a generation that translates into revolutionary action the choices it has made in the face of Brazilian reality, taking up the perspective of socialism as humanism, as a critique of capitalist alienation and a real movement to overcome it.” It was inspired by progressive Catholics such as for example, Emmanuel Mounier, Jacques Maritain, Father Jean-Louis Lebret, and two Jesuit intellectuals, the French priest Teilhard de Chardin and the Brazilian Henrique de Lima Vaz. In practice, it adopted the Cuban guerrilla militancy manual, which demanded strict discipline, party ethics of sacrificing personal life for the collective and absolute fidelity to the revolutionary ideal. Later, with the military coup, the organization openly adopted social revolution as a radical transformation of society with the implementation of socialism, now in the form of Marxism-Leninism. Many politicians known today belonged to the PA, such as José Serra, José Dirceu, José Genuíno, Aldo Arantes, among others, names that came to occupy positions in the country's politics.

Thanks to my background in philosophy, I was active in this movement not only in political activities within the CA and the party itself, but also as a trainer of cadres. At its founding, this organization defined itself as Christian leftist but became a Marxist-Leninist party in 1964. Until 1968, it led student organizations such as the UNE and state student entities. After actively

participating in actions against the dictatorship and suffering political persecution at its hands, the PA went underground under other names in 1996. Initially, it implemented an armed struggle movement called the Workers-Students-Peasant Alliance, in which I did not participate.

In short, my past led to the loss of my political rights. As I mentioned earlier, I was hired as a professor at UFG after passing a public exam. However, I was dismissed by the National Information Service (Serviço Nacional de Informações - SNI) because of my political activism in my youth. This is what happened. Following the 1964 military coup, repression tightened. The SNI was created, and mechanisms of espionage and repression were set up in all states with the support of the army and police. Through espionage in schools, colleges, and factories, the repressive agencies built up files on "subversives." In São Paulo, there was the Department of Political and Social Order (Departamento de Ordem Política e Social - DOPS) and Operation Bandeirante (Operação Bandeirante - OBAN). In addition to intelligence agency agents, taxi drivers, restaurant waiters, and even some students were paid to spy on behalf of the security and repression services. Fake students enrolled in colleges to spy on political activists and report them to the police. Microphones were installed in the light sockets near the tables in the bars most frequented by students. We had to be careful about what we said because there was a real risk of being watched or recorded. In this repressive context, where colleagues were arrested and tortured into turning in other colleagues, Ação Popular decided to go underground at the end of 1966, the year I graduated. Unlike many of my fellow activists, I did not go underground. Instead, I entered the workforce, first as a school principal, then as an educational technician in Goiás, and finally as a university professor.

Political repression caught up with me again when I tried to take a position as a professor at the Faculty of Education at the Federal University of Goiás after passing a competitive exam. My joy at becoming a university professor was short-lived. I was dismissed by the military regime after less than four months because of my political activism in my youth. I will tell you

a little more about that. When I passed the UFG competitive exam, one of the hiring requirements was a document from the National Information Service (NIS) that required me to present a Political Background Certificate from the Department of Political and Social Order (DOPS) of the Secretariat of Public Security. The security agencies had compiled records of my political activism in the student movement. Since I had migrated from São Paulo to Goiás, they concluded that I was continuing left-wing political activities under the guise of being a professor. I was interrogated three times about my political activities: first at the Public Security Secretariat in Goiânia; second at the State Information Service (Serviço Estadual de Informações - SEI) headquarters, also in Goiânia; and third at the National Information Service (NIS) in the Maristela Building in Brasília. The agents offered me two options to keep my job: I could either turn in my leftist colleagues at UFG or write an article for the city's largest newspaper redeeming myself from my militant past. I did not accept either proposal, so I did not obtain the certificate. After the interrogations, I was forced to resign from my position as a professor. The same procedure was followed regarding my position at the State Department of Education, from which I was also dismissed because the security agencies had exchanged information.

Well, I survived. With the Amnesty Law of 1979, I was reinstated at the university, and what happened was that my socialist convictions were strengthened, I prepared myself for a postgraduate study project on the foundations of socialist pedagogy, and I refined my desire to be an educator committed to a school of political and pedagogical quality, especially focused on the impoverished sectors of society.

4) AML and RVP — How did educational institutions—especially universities, research centers, and schools—deal with this period? What strategies did they develop to fight for democratic ideals, freedom of thought, and freedom of expression? How did they organize to confront

this moment? What theoretical and methodological guidelines were developed to challenge the dominant models?

JCL — Yes, I can talk a bit about that, but first, I need to provide some context. The period leading up to the military coup was a time of great enthusiasm on the left. There was hope for the social reforms planned by the João Goulart government. There was also a major political mobilization in the arts and the success of popular education movements in the Northeast. Other events included the first writings of Paulo Freire and the activities of the progressive wing of the Catholic Church, including the Catholic Action, JUC, JEC, and JOC movements. Meanwhile, it was already known that the U.S. government had been monitoring Brazilian politics since the Kubitschek administration (1956–1961). This influence was explicit in the economic field but also in education, health, and housing due to the Alliance for Progress program created by the US government in 1961. The program's stated objectives were to accelerate social and economic development, reduce social inequalities, and promote democracy. However, its real intention was to coordinate the countries of the Americas to counter the influence of the Soviet Union and the alleged communist threat to the American continent, especially after the Cuban Revolution in 1959. The Alliance for Progress provided aid to developing countries in various forms, including loans to governments for infrastructure, education, and health; training for technicians and professors; agrarian reform; and basic sanitation, as well as food assistance. During this same period, studies were underway to reform Brazilian education to align with the US economic model. These reforms were later formalized in the MEC-USAID Agreement and implemented through the 1968 university reform and the 1971 Law of Guidelines and Bases, also known as Law 5692/71.

Thus, on March 31, 1964, a civil-military coup was carried out with the support of conservative military personnel, politicians, and business leaders after a campaign to destabilize the government backed by US authorities. A new period in Brazilian history began the military dictatorship. In the 1960s

and 1970s, educational policy was based on a productivity conception of education, which triggered political and academic reorganization movements in the progressive field of education as a form of resistance to the dictatorship. In 1980, entities in education promoted the First Brazilian Conference on Education, which sparked major socio-critical trends regarding issues in Brazilian education.

I started with this context to show the impact of the military coup on educational institutions. The regime's arrogance, assault on democracy, suppression of constitutional rights, repression, political persecution, and censorship-impacted society, especially left-wing movements, inhibiting open militancy for years. Having spent my undergraduate years in political activism, I entered professional life as a school principal imbued with leftist ideals. I imagined myself as a leftist principal who would implement leftist ideals and practices in education. However, it was no longer a matter of political organization but rather individual action, and at most, action with the school team—even then, not explicitly. The atmosphere was one of oppression and fear. I remember that, in 1968, DOPS agents removed a math professor linked to the clandestine movement from the classroom at the school where I was principal and took him away.

However, in São Paulo, there were some forms of resistance in more restricted areas. Before the military coup, the Department of Education authorized three educational innovation experiments in the public school system of São Paulo: the USP Application College (created in 1962 and closed in 1969), the Lapa Experimental Group (created in 1961 and closed in 1990), and the Vocational Gymnasiums (created in 1962 and closed in 1970). These experiments shared some pedagogical characteristics, all of which were imbued with the principles of the new school. These characteristics included curricular and methodological flexibility, active pedagogical methods, democratic forms of school organization and management, new dynamics of teacher-student relations, the provision of concrete experiences of participation and citizenship for students aimed at forming values and

attitudes, and school-community integration. These experiments also explicitly served as laboratories for pedagogical experimentation, aiming to expand their results to the official school system. Many professors who worked in these experiments were leftists who believed they could do more critical work within the school, even within the limits of the New Pedagogy.

These experiences were a form of resistance because they were all shut down. There were several reasons for this, one of which was political persecution due to their innovative and critical nature. In 1969, the army and federal police invaded and closed all schools in this network. The idea of creating experimental schools emerged during the country's redemocratization period beginning in 1945. Brazilian educators sought innovative teaching methods, primarily in France at the Centre International d'Études Pédagogiques in Sèvres, where projects based on active learning methods called "Classes Nouvelles" were developed. Educator Luiz Contier brought the project to Brazil, where it was disseminated with adaptations in public and private schools. This brought it to the attention of authorities at the Ministry of Education. In 1958, the Ministry of Education (MEC) issued the document "Instructions on the Nature and Organization of Experimental Classes," which aimed to guide the operation and implementation of experimental classes in the official education system. The Classes Nouvelles had a significant influence on Catholic schools in São Paulo, thanks to the contributions of Jesuit priest Pierre Faure and, in some cases, the ideas of Emmanuel Mounier, Paulo Freire, and John Dewey. The Experimental Group of Lapa, where I worked, was directly influenced by this movement, which also impacted the training of its professors. The principles and ideas of the "Classes Nouvelles" were incorporated into LDBEN No. 4024/1961, which gave legal status to the establishment of experimental schools in Article 104 (not revoked by Law 5692/71).

As previously mentioned, these experiences' pedagogical proposal, theoretical basis, objectives, forms of evaluation, and other aspects, including the idea of student protagonism and the use of differentiated pedagogical practices, bore strong marks of the Escola Nova. Although this proposal was

criticized for being more oriented toward the psychological than the scientific aspects of student training, the Escola Nova movement of the 1960s and 1970s marked a trend toward valuing its principles. This trend undoubtedly influenced the São Paulo education system and the nation as a whole, influencing the thinking and practices of researchers and teacher trainers whose names are still prominent today. Some notable figures include Selma Pimenta, Marli André, Manoel Oriosvaldo de Moura (Ori), José Fusari, Vera Placco, Mariazinha Fusari, Anna Franchi, Isabel Franchi Capeletti, Ana Maria Saul, Tizuko Morschida Kishimoto, and Heloisa Dupas Penteado. As I have mentioned, I contributed by bringing my experience to Goiás to run a teacher training center and an elementary school.

My memories take me back to the 1980s when distinguished colleagues from academia initiated the First Brazilian Education Conference (Conferência Brasileira de Educação — CBE). At that time, signs of the military regime's exhaustion were already apparent. At that time, I was pursuing my master's degree at PUCSP and was active in the educators' political movement. It was no coincidence that the First CBE was held at PUCSP; at the time, it was one of the few institutions involved in resisting and struggling against the dictatorship. Between 1970 and 1980, professors from public institutions were persecuted for their political opposition to the regime. Many of these professors were welcomed and hired by PUC, including Florestan Fernandes, Octavio Ianni, Paulo Freire, Maurício Tragtenberg, and Bento Prado Junior. PUC showed political sensitivity and democratic resistance on several occasions. For example, in July 1977, it hosted the Annual Meeting of the Brazilian Society for the Advancement of Science (SBPC) after the military government banned it from several official institutions. In September of that year, military police troops under the command of Colonel Erasmo Dias invaded the PUC campus to suppress a student protest and arrest professors, students, and staff. PUC created its own Truth Commission in conjunction with the National Truth Commission to support the efforts of relatives of political activists killed or disappeared due

to crimes committed by civil and military authorities associated with the dictatorship. PUCSP has played a significant role in hosting educational events and movements, including the aforementioned First Brazilian Conference on Education (CBE). Additionally, PUCSP was one of the first institutions to establish postgraduate programs in education. The Postgraduate Program in Educational Psychology was established in 1969, followed by the Master's Degree in Philosophy of Education in 1971. Later came the Doctorate in Education under the coordination of Dermeval Saviani. The program attracted excellent professors such as Saviani, Octávio Ianni, Antonio Joaquim Severino, Miriam Warde, and Guiomar Namo de Melo.

I am referring to the context in which the First National Conference on Education was held because it was, in my opinion, the first concrete action to bring educators together to assess the state of national education under the dictatorship and outline strategies to address the situation.

The military regime's educational project, based on the theory of human capital, was implemented through educational technicality. The military consensus was that the people needed basic schooling appropriate to the regime's supported economic development model, as well as a neutral university free from ideological influences. The two concrete measures based on Law 5,692/71 were the quantitative expansion of public schools and extending compulsory schooling from four to eight years. The second measure was the creation of the University Reform Law of 1968 (Brazil, 1968). Clearly, we saw this as an attempt at clear ideological control over schools and universities, and we resumed the struggle for education as a social and political right and for democratic public schools.

Thus, amid a global economic crisis, problems with the country's economic management, popular pressure, and the emergence of opposition political sectors, conditions began to form for the start of redemocratization during the final years of the military regime (1979-1985). This led to the creation of associations and unions involving professors and specialists in basic and higher education. The educational field reorganized and mobilized

at the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s, resulting in the formation of entities such as the National Association of Graduate Studies and Research in Education (Anped) in 1978, the National Association of Education (Ande) in 1979, and the Center for Education and Society Studies (Cedes) in 1980. These associations represented segments of educators and played a decisive role in the democratization and development of Brazilian education. This role culminated in the First CBE.

This event featured theoretical discussions and strategies for rebuilding Brazilian education, with a focus on restoring the social and political significance of public schools and their role in serving the majority of the population.

Following the conference, socio-critical theories of education strengthened, including classic theories such as critical-social pedagogy, historical-critical pedagogy, and liberating pedagogy, as well as neo-critical theories such as critical curriculum theory, communicative action theory, intercultural education, and complexity theory. These theories reinforced criticism of technicality and neoliberal guidelines from international organizations. On the other hand, they introduced different perspectives on the goals, objectives, and functions of public schools. This created dissension around these goals, hindering collective action by educators on a public education project. In my opinion, these repercussions continue to affect education today.

Each association formed in the late 1970s played an important role in reorganizing the field. However, I would like to highlight the founding of the National Association of Education (ANDE), in whose activities I was directly involved. In my opinion, ANDE played a unique and decisive role in the struggle for an ideal public school system. Founded in 1979 by Dermerval Saviani and a group of professors and graduate students from PUCSP, ANDE aimed to mobilize Brazil's educational community for the democratization of education, the valorization of public schools, and the recognition of educators' work. This group's ideas gained visibility through the *Revista da Ande* magazine, which circulated for ten years. The first issue featured the association's mission statement on the front page: to work within Brazilian

society to create, an education system fully aligned with the principles of democracy and social justice. The magazine advocated for the democratization of education, a quality school accessible to all, free education, guaranteed permanence for students, especially the poorest, performance standards compatible with students' social characteristics, and improved working conditions and remuneration for professors.

The ANDe activists clearly communicated the findings of their research on the consequences of the measures taken by the military regime under General Garrastazu Médici and Minister of Education Colonel Jarbas Passarinho. In 1971, Law No. 5,692 was enacted, extending compulsory schooling from four to eight years and establishing vocational education at the secondary level. To comply with this law's provisions, the Ministry of Education launched a program to increase elementary school enrollment due to the high number of school-age children not attending school during the military dictatorship. According to researchers at the time, nearly 30% of children between the ages of 7 and 14 were not in school. The policy of increasing the number of school seats was initially seen as a step forward in democratizing education. However, this quantitative expansion did not consider the consequences for schools, such as the need for more buildings, an increased number of professors, and pedagogical adaptation to a new population entering school. The government's response to these issues was improvised, including reducing teacher training. In other words, the expansion was for less: the quantitative increase was not followed by measures to ensure quality. I believe this marked the beginning of the significant challenges that continue to affect public education today, including the poor condition of school buildings, the devaluation of teachers' professional status, stagnant wages, reduced teacher training, and, ultimately, the deterioration of the country's educational quality.

The ideas promoted by ANDE, such as the valorization of public schools, emerged during a pivotal period in the fight for democratizing education and establishing free, secular, high-quality public schools for all. In this sense, the

movement reaffirmed the democratic principles that the Pioneers of New Education defended in the 1930s, albeit in a different political context. It also anticipated the democratization of public schools, a movement that still inspires many researchers and professors today.

I would also like to mention the National Meetings on Didactics and Teaching Practices, which were part of the significant educational mobilization of the 1980s. ENDIPEs did not start with this name. The first academic meetings on the renewal of teaching methods were held separately in this context of educator mobilization. Initially, three seminars entitled "*A Didática em Questão*" (Didactics in Question) were held in Rio de Janeiro in 1982 and 1983, coordinated by Vera Maria Candau. The third seminar was held in São Paulo in 1985. Simultaneously, three Teaching Practice meetings were held: the first in Santa Maria in 1979; the second and third in São Paulo, one at USP and the other at PUCSP, in 1983 and 1985, respectively. I participated in the latter meeting at PUCSP, where I presented a paper on critical-social didactics. Simultaneously, the third meeting of *Didactics in Question* was taking place at USP. Selma Pimenta, Ivani Fazenda, Aida Monteiro, and I were present at the PUCSP event and made a proposal to our Didática colleagues at the USP event to merge the two meetings. The proposal was approved at a joint meeting, and the National Meeting on Didactics and Teaching Practices (ENDIPE) was formed. Considering the previous three meetings, we agreed that the next one would be the fourth ENDIPE, which was held in Recife in 1987. The theme of that meeting was "*Pedagogical practice and transformative education in Brazilian society*." I coordinated two ENDIPEs in Goiânia with a large team: the VII in 1994 and the XI in 2002. Both meetings included participation from local universities, particularly the Universidade Federal de Goiás e a Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Goiás.

I strongly believe that the theoretical and methodological trends currently characterizing the field of education began to take shape in the progressive camp starting with the First World Conference on Education in the 20th century and in the decades that followed. For some time, I have been

trying to identify the most prominent trends in educational research. Three trends have emerged that are widely accepted by researchers: a socio-historical-cultural view influenced by various forms of Marxism; a sociological/intercultural view based on critical curriculum theory; and a post-critical sociological view based on post-structuralist perspectives. These trends bring together various interpretations of original theories, forming a wide range of relevant theoretical propositions. However, they have also resulted in significant dissent regarding the purpose of school education. In my opinion, this hinders the establishment of a minimum agenda for a democratic, humanizing, and emancipatory school education project. A clear example of this can be found in the themes of the 21 Endipes that have already been held; these themes are consistent with the theoretical affiliations of the group that promoted the event in each location. Some have a more sociological bias, while others have a more pedagogical bias. However, there is always a notable fluctuation in themes. In fact, one of the last events had the following theme: "*Where is Didactics Going? Confronting Current Theoretical Approaches and Political Challenges.*"

However, I think I can safely say that these associations' actions, together with those of other political forces, played a decisive role in the redemocratization of society. This included the drafting of the 1988 Constitution, which enshrined the right to quality public education for all. In the following decades, educators launched movements to incorporate provisions in favor of public education into Law 9,394 of 1996 and the National Education Plans. Unfortunately, many of these gains were thwarted after the 2016 coup plotted by conservative forces and the 2018 election of Jair Bolsonaro.

5) AML and RVP — Critical-Social Didactics, as well as Critical-Social Pedagogy of Content, was an important contribution of the work you carried out in partnership with other Brazilian educators and researchers. In this historical journey of activism and scientific

production, at what point did Didactics take center stage in your professional production and performance? How did it emerge and how did the intellectuals of the time react?

JCL — My involvement with teaching is visceral and linked to my motivation for the value of school and education, given my poor social origins and my own experience with schooling. These circumstances, along with favorable opportunities for my intellectual development, shaped my view of society. I have a strong perception of the relationship between social and educational inequalities, or poverty and education. Teaching was not a choice for me; it was the result of my social and educational background. When I left the seminary to continue my philosophy studies at PUCSP, I knew I would be a professor. At that time, the philosophy degree program included a subject called "Didactics" in the last year, as required by law. It was awful. They gathered all the students in a large room, and the professor gave a lecture. In contrast, however, the qualification course I took at PUCSP, taught by Professor Joel Martins, introduced me to John Dewey's thinking and the principles of the New School. Dewey called this vision the "community school."

That was when the professor recommended that I join the team at the Lapa Experimental School Group. At the age of 22 and a half, I became the director of one of this organization's units, which was an experimental school. As I mentioned earlier, this experience was like a second school for me. In addition to working with New Pedagogy and active methods, I learned how to interact with teenagers. I had gained some management experience in an academic center and in student politics, but I had a very mature pedagogical support team. This team consisted of a pedagogical coordinator, an educational advisor, an educational psychologist, and a social worker. These people were handpicked because it was an experimental school. I had exceptional pedagogical, administrative, and human support from the general director of this pedagogical experimentation movement, Professor There disadavantaging me. I was the director of that school for six years. This experience was

important not only professionally but also intellectually because it greatly influenced my ideas about didactics. At the experimental school, we didn't just do professional work. We also had study meetings to discuss school life, teaching methods, and relationships with students. These meetings reinforced a pedagogical-didactic perspective. Due to circumstances in my life that I have already mentioned, I ended up being a school principal for another six years, this time at a private institution in Goiânia. In both roles, I was more of a pedagogical coordinator than a principal. Overall, those 12 years shaped me as an educator and later as a researcher.

My master's and doctoral projects clearly aimed to develop a conception of didactics inspired by historical and dialectical materialism. My initial studies in this area began in 1981 and were published in the *Revista da Ande* starting in 1983. First was an article on pedagogical trends, followed by another in 1984 on the relationship between didactics and historical-social practice, as I mentioned earlier. Due to these articles, I began receiving invitations to give lectures. Then, my friend Selma Pimenta, a former college classmate and colleague at the Experimental School in Lapa, as well as a comrade in the struggle for pedagogy and didactics, suggested something I could not have imagined: the publication of a book by Editora Loyola. I compiled six texts, some of which were lectures I had given, and in 1985, Editora Loyola published my book *Democratização da Escola Pública: a pedagogia crítico-social dos conteúdos* (Democratization of Public Schools: Critical-Social Pedagogy of Content).

I would like to discuss the theoretical development of my ideas about didactics. Since the early 1980s, I had been immersed in the collective movement of educators supported by the PPGE of PUCSP. This movement was committed to creating quality public schools after 20 years of dictatorship that prioritized the interests of the people. My studies were guided by several important Marxist authors: the Frenchman Georges Snyders, the Pole Bogdan Suchodolski, the Italian Mario Manacorda, the Frenchman Bernard Charlot, and the Brazilians Dermeval Saviani and Octavio Ianni. I did these readings

for my master's thesis, which was entitled *A Prática Pedagógica de Professores da Escola Pública* (The Pedagogical Practice of Public School Professors). Gradually, I began to develop my project of creating a critical pedagogy inspired by Marxist principles to support critical didacticism.

I believe the definitive impetus for formulating the theoretical foundations of critical social didactics was my intellectual encounter with Georges Snyders and Bernard Charlot—the same Charlot who lives in Aracaju today. Snyders came to the Faculty of Education at the Federal University of Goiás (UFG) in Goiânia at my invitation in 1988 and passed away in 2011. During this time, I developed the concept of schools as mediators between content and students' living conditions. These authors taught me that, in the context of capitalism, schools should help children explore and analyze social realities and their contradictions. Snyders wrote that the knowledge taught distinguishes pedagogies; that is, he affirmed the primacy of content articulated to students' interests with the professor's mediation. He proposed that teaching content should start from students' culture and experiences to help them progress and develop an elaborate culture. For him, discussing pedagogy meant examining the relationship between students' culture and school culture, as well as the means to transition between the two. School should be, on the one hand, a continuation of social experience and, on the other hand, a break from it. Charlot, in turn, emphasized the political dimension of pedagogy. In a class-based society, he argued, schools could not avoid making their sociopolitical goals explicit. He therefore proposed a social pedagogy distinguished by valuing access to school knowledge through teaching directly linked to children's social experience, which he believed would motivate them to study. Linking content to real social realities and basic human needs is one-way professors can help children explore and analyze the adult social world and its contradictions in capitalist society.

Initially inspired by these authors, I imagined a critical-social pedagogy of content. First, content takes precedence from a critical perspective. It is critical because it signals a pedagogy rooted in the contradiction of social

classes in capitalist society. This pedagogy situates the educational phenomenon within its social and historical determinants. It is social in that it considers the social praxis of production as the foundation of historical development. This situates all educational practice within the dynamics of social relations. Therefore, it apprehends the contradictions therein. This is contrary to deterministic conceptions or those based on an essence of human nature. In short, a critical-social pedagogy of content would theoretically commit to investigating concrete educational actions through which school knowledge could be mediated with students' concrete conditions of existence. In practical terms, it asks how to work pedagogically with the subjects of study based on students' concrete social experiences. Thus, the dialectical view of my reference theorists made me consider sociocultural differences in the teaching-learning process—a powerful idea that has stayed with me to this day.

I would say that critical social pedagogy led to critical social didactics, which questioned the nature of teaching as a transformative practice and the methodological elements that would help professors situate their work within the context of transformative social practice. To address this issue, I first wrote an article on pedagogical trends, followed by a more extensive work, *Didactics and Historical-Social Practice: An Introduction to the Fundamentals of Teaching*, in 1984. The latter was written for an event at the Universidade Federal de Uberlândia. In this text, I wrote that professors would mediate processes through which students appropriate or reappropriate knowledge from their culture and the dominant culture, elevating it from common sense to critically elaborated knowledge. In other words, professors would promote pedagogical mediations to facilitate the formative encounter between students and school knowledge based on their concrete social experience. Over the following decades, I repeated this formulation incessantly in my writings and lectures. In that text, I also briefly mentioned my concern with professors mastering logical-methodological means of action, which involves articulating teaching methods with the method of dialectical reflection. Later, in 1990, I published the book *Didática*, which presented social critical didactics in a more systematic way.

6) AML and RVP — How would you evaluate this movement that shaped the area? What were its main impacts on education sciences, classroom work, and political and social movements?

JCL — The articles I mentioned in my previous answer were published in the 1985 book *Democratization of Public Schools* by Editora Loyola. They were motivated by my research interests and the clashes in the academic world at the time. As you may recall, in 1982, Saviani published his seminal work, *School and Democracy*, which introduced the initial formulation of a critical pedagogy rooted in Marxism. However, since 1980, there had already been clashes between Saviani's supporters and Paulo Freire's supporters. I was part of a group of educators who gravitated around the National Education Association (Ande), initially led by Saviani. His position on public schools was affirmative. Meanwhile, colleagues aligned with Paulo Freire's ideas argued that the existing school system was an ideological apparatus serving the ruling class. Therefore, they believed it was necessary to defend popular education rather than public schools. For this group, the emphasis on content was a cultural invasion against the interests of the people. Later, both groups realized that this polarization was inappropriate and untimely from a political point of view. In fact, during Luiza Erundina's administration at São Paulo City Hall, Paulo Freire led the Municipal Department of Education (Secretaria Municipal de Educação - SME) from 1989 to 1991. This formal public institution had a management program similar to those previously proposed by ANDE.

I believe that during the political era of the 1970s and 1980s, when there was a search for solutions to national education issues and pedagogical proposals to create a democratic public school system, my ideas attracted the attention of educators, particularly those with a direct pedagogical focus in their work. Initially, these ideas had repercussions in the ANDE and the ANDE Magazine. Then, in 1985, a well-attended seminar entitled "*The theory and*

practice of critical-social pedagogy of content: from dialogue to collective debate" was held in Niterói, Rio de Janeiro. Nilda Alves chaired the coordinating committee, which included Regina Leite Garcia, Ana Lucia Jensen, Vera Candau, and Iliana Paulo. It was an important event for me because I saw that my ideas about school and didactics were shared by other colleagues. Speeches were given by Saviani, Carlos Jamil Cury, Nilda Alves, and me. Later on, however, the positions of research groups began to diverge, mainly due to the emergence of critical curriculum theory. This broadened the range of proposals for critical didactics. Colleagues such as Nilda Alves and Vera Candau developed their own proposals, and critical curriculum theory gained autonomy.

It is important to note that the establishment of the curriculum as an autonomous field of study, which led to its separation from the field of didactics, definitively sealed the divide between the two. This had consequences for teacher training formats and the concepts and forms of teaching organization. Didactics mostly operated within the framework of modern conceptions, albeit in various forms. In contrast, critical curriculum theory was based on a clearly sociological and political, neo-Marxist approach. This approach was sometimes supported by English critical sociology, the critical theory of the Frankfurt School, and the post-structuralism view. The post-structuralism perspective took a hostile stance toward the field of didactics, intensifying the clash between the two fields, the effects of which are still evident in education today. I wrote several texts highlighting this clash.

In the early 1980s, during the final years of the military dictatorship, several states with governors linked to opposition movements launched progressive educational policies. Some of these policies were influenced by critical-social pedagogy, as occurred in Paraná and the Federal District during the "New Republic." These policies are discussed in a classic book by Luiz Antonio Cunha entitled *Education, State, and Democracy in Brazil*.

The book *Didactics*, published in 1990, appeared almost at the same time as my doctoral thesis, entitled *Theoretical and practical foundations of*

teaching: an introductory study of pedagogy and didactics. This book was intentionally written from a critical didactic standpoint, inspired by Marxist pedagogues and didacticisms whom I had access to through books published in Cuba. The book was surprisingly well received in teacher training courses throughout Brazil. Since its first edition and successive reissues, more than 120,000 copies have been sold.

Another line of study parallel to my work in didactics concerned the scientific and professional field of pedagogy. The book *Pedagogia e pedagogos, para que?* (Pedagogy and Pedagogues, for What Purpose?), published in 1998, was written amid my disagreements with Anfope. Published in the same year, the book *Adeus professor, adeus professora?* (Goodbye Professor, Goodbye Teacher?) Presents my position on the crucial issue of the relationship between schools and information and communication technologies. I argue that schools and teachers should embrace these media without straying from their role of providing basic cultural and scientific education aimed at developing intellectual capacities. In 2001, I published *Organização e Gestão da Escola: Teoria e Prática* (School Organization and Management: Theory and Practice), a book I enjoyed writing because it reflects my experience as a school principal and addresses school organization as more than a bureaucratic issue. The underlying idea is that organizational and management practices are educational practices that influence the motivations and learning of teachers and students. Recently, I incorporated L. S. Vigotski's concept of the social situation of development into my vision of school organization and management. There are other books and chapters, but the ones I mentioned are the most important.

My work continues to the present day and is directly related to my in-depth study of historical-cultural theory, particularly the works of L. S. Vigotsky, A. N. Leontiev, V. V. Davydov, Seth Chaiklin, and Marianne Hedegard. I have sought to better understand the idea that the purpose of school is to promote and expand students' abilities and skills by teaching them content. I continue to believe that it is impossible to educate the mind without

motivating students to acquire content and skills. Therefore, I am studying how professors can help students make abstractions and generalizations and form concepts based on content to develop higher mental processes. I am also committed to linking students' cultural and scientific education to sociocultural practices. In other words, I am interested in understanding how practices involving conditions of origin, social and cultural diversity, and social inequalities intersect with content, teaching, and learning practices. I seek support from Heidegger and Charlot in this endeavor.

7) AML and RVP — Your work has remained faithful to your ideological and political choices, as well as certain educational principles that have shaped your career as a researcher and professor of Didactics. How did you first encounter the field of Didactics for Human Development, also known as Developmental or Developing Didactics? How did you encounter this theoretical approach? What was the turning point?

JCL — The development of critical social didactics and its convergence with historical-cultural theory is a long-standing process. As I've mentioned, my motivations for formulating a Marxist-based pedagogy are multifaceted. Along with several colleagues mainly associated with ANDE, I envisioned public schools as sites of class struggle, resistance, and the acquisition of culture and science as a way to address the inequalities imposed by capitalist society. This is why I considered working with critical content to be so important. However, I also wanted to invest in an approach that considered the material, social, and cultural conditions of students' lives. This idea stemmed from my own school experience and a phrase repeated exhaustively during my days as a student activist: the dialectical method seeks a concrete analysis of concrete situations. I made particular use of the works of Snyders and Charlot during this time, as they emphasized the connection between scientific knowledge and the social

experience of children — that is, the connection between schoolwork and the real social problems experienced by students. While preparing my doctoral thesis in the late 1980s, which sought to systematize critical social didactics, I incorporated four additional texts into my study of Marx, Gramsci, Snyders, Manacorda, Suchodolski, Charlot, and Sanchez Vázquez, as well as the works of Saviani and Ianni: *Didáctica de la escuela media* (1978) by M. A. Danilov and M. N. Skatkin (1984); *El proceso de enseñanza en la escuela* (1978), translated from Russian to Spanish; and *Psicología y pedagogía: bases psicológicas del aprendizaje y del desarrollo* (1977) with texts by A. R. Luria, A. N. Leontiev, L. S. Vigotski, and other Russian authors. This book was published in Portugal. The fourth book was *Introducción a la Didactica General* (1978) by the German author Lothar Klingberg. I obtained the Spanish translations through Cuban colleagues, who also provided me with other translations of Soviet pedagogy manuals.

In some way, these works reflected the development of the theoretical and investigative field of didactics in the Soviet Union and East Germany. This development included research inspired by L. S. Vigotski, though historical-cultural theory was not explicitly mentioned. I began to shape critical-social didactics with this material. Until the late 1980s, publications on L. S. Vigotsky were scarce in Brazil, and only a select group of researchers had access to his work and that of Leontiev from other countries. In 1984, *The Social Formation of the Mind* was translated from English into Portuguese. In 1987, *Thinking and Language* was also translated. During the same period, research groups focusing on historical-cultural or sociocultural theory were established at USP, UNICAMP, and PUC in São Paulo. While completing my master's degree in education in 1984, I had the privilege of participating in study sessions with one of these early groups in the graduate program in social psychology at PUC São Paulo. Silvia Tatiane Maurer Lane led the group, which included readings and discussions of works by Karl Marx, S. L. Rubinstein, L. S. Vigotsky, and A. N. Leontiev. In 1984, the year this group conducted its research, one of the first collective works on historical-cultural psychology was

published: Social Psychology: Man in Motion, in which I wrote a chapter titled "Educational Psychology: A Critical Evaluation." After the initial publications, I defended my doctoral thesis, Theoretical and Practical Foundations of Teaching: An Introductory Study of Pedagogy and Didactics, in 1990. In the same year, I published the book Didactics with Editora Cortez. In this book, I formulated a version of critical-social didactics. I mention this to show that I had an affinity for L. S. Vigotski's studies even before they were called Historical-Cultural Theory.

Following the defense of my thesis and publications, I received many questions about the direction critical-social didactics should take and its potential role in teacher training. First, I considered the answers that a leftist theory of education and didactics could provide to the challenges posed by postindustrial society and postmodern thinking in the context of demands for emancipatory education. Second, I considered how teaching and learning processes could ensure cognitive quality in public schools in a manner consistent with students' material, social, and cultural conditions, raising the issue of learning strategies and teacher training. The third question was how to incorporate all of this into teacher training policies. At the time, there was a strong critical-reflective trend in teacher training in academic circles. I developed the following line of reasoning: If the focus of didactics is on the conditions and ways in which students improve and enhance their learning, then how can we help them learn to think? How can we help them use categorical elements of reality analysis and reason logically? How can we help them think about what they learn? In other words, how do students learn to solve problems, face dilemmas, and perform well in challenging situations? I was also seeking to better understand how students' living conditions affects learning and how the dialectical method could be used in didactics. It was then that I began to discuss the pedagogy of thinking, or learning to think. In other words, I explored how schools could contribute to the intellectual development of students and professors and the impact of sociocultural and material contexts on this process. In my research projects, I sought to connect historical-

cultural theory with cultural research from the perspectives of authors such as R. Williams, J. Bruner, P. Bourdieu, and especially Gimeno Sacristán and Pérez Gómez. This line of study prepared me for my encounter with V.'s pedagogy of thinking.

V. Davydov. Subsequently, I encountered the publications of Seth Chaiklin and Marianne Hedegaard, who integrated the formation of theoretical-dialectical thinking and the sociocultural practices experienced by students into their theoretical approach.

In my view, developmental didactics emerged in Brazil alongside two works by V. V. Davydov: *Tipos de generalización en la enseñanza* (1981), translated from Russian, and Problems of Developmental Teaching (1988). The story of how I discovered the latter publication is worth recounting. In the late 1990s, I closely followed the work of Manoel Oriosvaldo (Ori), who had been researching mathematics teaching and formulating the concept of Guiding Teaching Activity from A. N. Leontiev's Activity Theory perspective for some time. In 2002, Ori invited me to attend a course taught by Argentine researcher Mario Golder on Historical-Cultural Theory at an event organized by the Study and Research Group on Pedagogical Activity (Grupo de Estudos e Pesquisa sobre Atividade Pedagógica - GEPAPE) at the Faculty of Education of USP. During the course, Professor Golder provided an overview of studies conducted in the Soviet Union based on the work of L. V. Vygotsky, explicitly mentioning the contributions of Vasily V. Davydov. Professor Golder was a gray-haired gentleman over 80 years old, and his passion for historical-cultural theory strengthened my socialist convictions and adherence to the theory. After class, I went to the faculty photocopier to consult the archives and found a copy of V. V. Davydov's Problems of Developmental Teaching (1988), published by Soviet Education Review. I never found out which professor left this text at the photocopier. After reading it once, I was certain that I wanted to have it translated into Portuguese. Prior to that, my colleague Raquel Marra and I had been teaching a course titled "Didactics from the Perspective of Historical-Cultural Theory" in the postgraduate program at

PUC Goiás. In 2003, we began using the book in our classes and changed the course's name to "Developmental Didactics." We attempted to obtain permission to publish our translation through Professor Seth Chaiklin, who was married to V. V. Davydov. However, we were informed that she would only authorize publication if the translation were done directly from Russian to Portuguese. This was not feasible for us at the time. Based on this book, I published the first more systematic article on the thinking of V. V. Davydov in a Brazilian periodical in 2004 entitled: *Didactics and the Learning of Thinking and Learning: The Historical-Cultural Theory of Activity and the Contribution of Vasili Davydov*).

While writing this article and conducting research on V. V. Davydov's work, I received exceptional support from Professor Seth Chaiklin. Prof. Chaiklin, along with Mariane Hedegaard and Uffe Juul Jensen, all from a university in Denmark, organized the book *Activity Theory and Social Practice*. This book is the first volume of the proceedings from the Fourth International Congress of the *International Society for Activity Theory and Cultural Research* (ISCRAT), which took place in Denmark in 1998. After obtaining this book online, I decided to turn to Prof. Chaiklin for help with translation problems since we were translating V. V. Davydov's *Problems of Developmental Teaching* (1988) at the PPGE. The professor was extremely helpful, and I continued to correspond with him until I met him in person in Seville, Spain, at the ISCAR (International Society for Cultural-Historical Activity Research) Congress in 2005 (he was accompanied by his partner, Mariane). The book containing the papers presented at the Fourth International Congress of Russian and East European Psychology (ISCRAT) included a chapter entitled "A New Approach to the Interpretation of the Content and Structure of Activity," written by V. V. Davydov and read by P. Hedeggard, the then-president of the Congress, as Davydov had passed away a month earlier. In the text, Davydov reinterpreted A. N. Leontiev's theory of activity, emphasizing the role of emotions in learning and human development. We translated the text and included it as reading material in our

classes. Over the following years, we obtained approximately ten articles by V. V. Davydov in Russian through Seth Chaklin and Galina Zuckerman. Ermelinda Prestes, the sister of Zoia Prestes, translated these articles from Russian into Portuguese. Some of these articles provided a history of the Elkonin-Davydov system, while others addressed topics related to developmental teaching and study activities. Our relationship with Chaklin and Hedegaard provided us not only with updated texts but also with a deeper understanding of their pedagogical theory, Radical-Local Teaching and Learning. We eventually incorporated this theory into our studies.

8) AML and RVP — What led you to transition from critical-social didactics of content to a historical-cultural approach? What similarities and differences do you see between these two approaches?

JCL — The discovery of V. V. Davydov was a turning point in my studies. It answered many of my questions about critical-social didactics. These questions included: What are the purposes of school education? What is the role of the school? What is the meaning of critical content? What is the relationship between the school and scientific knowledge? What is the role of professors in teaching how to think? What is the relationship between content and methods? What is the relationship between dialectical method and teaching method? Until then, I had sought inspiration in the works of L. S. Vigotski and A. N. Leontiev, as well as in collections of texts published by Editora Moscou and existing academic productions in the country. With knowledge of V. V. Davydov's work, I was able to develop a more theoretically grounded didactic based on historical-dialectical materialism. Regarding the purpose of school, L. S. Vigotski and A. N. Leontiev wrote that it is an institution in which students appropriate the human capacities incorporated in the content as a condition for psychic development. V. V. Davydov expanded on this idea by contributing his thoughts on the modus operandi of study activities, which involve the complex

processes of human consciousness, such as generalization and concept formation. These processes are specific to the teaching-learning process in schools. This enabled me to better understand the meaning of the term "content," which is now linked to the process of acquiring human capacities and the pedagogical conditions of this acquisition in the study process.

Regarding the role of schools in teaching critical thinking, V. V. Davydov was clear that they should teach children to think theoretically. Critical-social pedagogy defends the idea that schools should foster critical and thoughtful individuals. This idea is now being realized through the application of dialectical logic to promote intellectual development by forming theoretical and scientific thinking. To this end, Davydov formulated a theory of study activity, in which students form theoretical concepts through abstraction and generalization. This promotes a systematized didactic method based on dialectical reflection.

The contributions of V. V. Davydov that I mentioned show that the goals of critical-social pedagogy regarding school and the teaching-learning process reappeared more fully in developmental teaching theory. This theory has much more tradition and theoretical weight thanks to the contributions of researchers such as L. S. Vigotski, A. N. Leontiev, and D. B. Elkonin. Therefore, I decided it was unnecessary to keep the name I had given to my proposal for critical-social pedagogy and didactics.

Over the following decades, other factors enabled me to develop my view of human-development-focused didactics based on the writings of V. V. Davydov, especially in the field of developmental education. First, international exchanges through conferences and publications brought contributions from foreign researchers that enriched the conceptual foundations of historical-cultural theory. Another factor was Brazilian researchers' attention to translation issues and access to original texts in Russian and other languages, especially the translation of texts from Russian to Portuguese. A third factor was access to publications and contacts with researchers associated with the Elkonin-Davydov system. In the case of our

PPGE, Galina Zuckerman and her colleagues came to Goiânia and provided clarifications on research in didactics, particularly on conducting formative experiments. Finally, an important factor was my rapprochement with and dialogue with Seth Chaiklin, Mariane Hedegaard, and their work.

There are some clues that explain why I adhere to developmental didactics from the perspective of V. V. Davydov. I understand that it expresses what I imagined for critical-social didactics. Hedegaard and Chaiklin's Radical Teaching-Learning Approach was decisive in shaping my view of developmental didactics. Their work enabled a concrete articulation between sociocultural processes, changes in higher psychic functions, and their relationship with the material, social, and cultural contexts of students' lives and teaching-learning processes. In other words, this collaboration resulted in a synthesis of epistemological, psychological, and sociocultural elements in the teaching-learning process.

Rather than speaking of similarities and differences, I would like to emphasize that possible gaps in developmental teaching theory in relation to my critical didactics project were largely filled by Hedegaard's studies. In any case, Brazilian researchers must take every precaution when considering studies on developmental teaching theory and the radical-local approach. They must consider the concrete historical, social, and cultural factors of the Brazilian context. These factors differ greatly from the original context in which the theoretical and methodological bases of these theories were formulated. The specific circumstances of public education in Brazil require imagination, political action, and realistic research to pave the way for developmental teaching in our schools.

9) AML and RVP — Developmental Didactics has been defined as "[...] an interdisciplinary science linked to educational psychology that deals with the organization of classroom processes aimed at developing maximum human psychic potential. Thus, it has the proper

organization of processes as its object, the psychic development of students as its purpose, and learning as its condition" (LONGAREZI; PUENTES, 2023, p. 98). (Longarezi & Puentes, 2023, p. 98). In the school context, how would you characterize a type of didactics that promotes development? What is its main purpose? Why does it present itself as a critical perspective consistent with the educational demands of lower-income students?

JCL — First, your definition is accurate and consistent with what L. S. Vigotsky would say. The best teaching and learning promote and enhance students' human development through content. In other words, it promotes qualitative changes in how students are, think, and act based on their autonomy and integral personality. You asked me what didactic methods promote human development and what my view of developmental didactics is from V. V. Davydov's perspective. I have developed several ideas on this topic. The best pedagogy helps professors intervene in the development of higher psychic processes. These human capacities are socially and historically constituted in the development of science, art, philosophy, morality, and technology. These processes refer to the development of intelligence, such as deliberate attention, logical memory, thinking, forming concepts, and using oral and written language and calculation. They lead to the development of personality, including autonomy, consciousness, moral conduct, affectivity, and control of one's behavior. More specifically, I believe that in developmental didactics, teaching enables students to think theoretically, or to reason dialectically. This involves moving from abstract to concrete thinking and from general relations that express the essence of an object of study beyond its apparent aspect to particular relations referring to that object of study. I believe this is what V. V. Davydov refers to as theoretical thinking. According to Davydov, the content of the teaching-learning process aimed at human development is theoretical knowledge based on the historical materialist dialectical method through which students' theoretical thinking is formed.

Regarding theoretical thinking, V. V. Davydov writes that in our research group, we talk about theoretical-conceptual and theoretical-dialectical thinking. In my view, theoretical thinking is a mode of mental operation by which we grasp reality in all its complexity. In other words, it is a type of thinking that aims to understand an object of study in terms of its relationships — that is, the interrelationship of its parts with the whole and its general and particular aspects — in order to discover a general relationship or principle that characterizes the phenomenon being studied. We achieve this through abstraction, generalization, and forming theoretical concepts. Based on this general principle or core model, we verify its occurrence in particular cases. Therefore, content—including concepts, theories, skills, procedures, and values—is valuable only as a basis for forming general and specific cognitive abilities, such as analysis, synthesis, verification, comparison, evaluation, explanation, problem-solving, and hypothesis formulation. This is why I say that, in developmental didactics, the mental process of knowledge is more important than knowledge itself.

Regarding the critical perspective of developmental didactics and its relation to the educational demands of the lower classes, I would first say that a humanizing education believes in human potential. The Jesuits used the expression *semper magis*, meaning individuals can always do more with depth and quality. Therefore, they can expand their intellectual capacities, abilities, capacity to feel, capacity to develop human and social values, and capacity to help others. In this sense, education is an inalienable right of all human beings because it is a process of humanization and emancipation through which individuals acquire the characteristics of humanity. Saviani aptly writes that educational work produces, directly and intentionally, the historical and collective humanity of men in each individual; thus, we become human through education. Boaventura Santos wrote that, in an unjust society, material inequality is deeply intertwined with nonmaterial inequality, mainly due to unequal education, which deprives people of the ability to symbolize, communicate, organize, and assert their interests. This unjust society deprives

the vast majority of individuals of the material and spiritual conditions necessary for developing human capacities. Thus, the importance of school education grows.

10) AML and RVP — Even before studying L. S. Vigotsky's key ideas about the relationship between psychic development and learning — namely, that content is fundamental to learning and that methods are derived from it — you had already proposed a didactic approach focused on content. Content is the fundamental aspect of your immediate approach to didactics for human development, as seen through the lens of V. V. Davidov. Like Davidov, when you speak of learned content, you are referring not only to subject matter but also to the methods by which these subjects are taught. Content includes knowledge, skills, and habits, as well as the methods of scientific thinking and the mental formations that develop in this process. Nevertheless, your proposal has been harshly criticized for being content-based, technical, and transmissive. What is your opinion on these criticisms? What does the term "content" really mean in the context of human development didactics? Can a relationship be established between content/disciplinary knowledge and content/didactic knowledge?

JCL — Andrea and Roberto, that's a great question. As I mentioned at the beginning of this interview, I am very grateful for the legacy of my education. I was a poor boy who received an excellent, well-rounded education. I had access to books and a library—just imagine! As a professor, I developed a dream to make this opportunity available to all poor boys and girls. As I mentioned, I acted on this dream when I learned from George Snyders, a staunch communist, that pedagogy is defined by its content. It is the knowledge taught that distinguishes pedagogy. Content leads to either

conservative or progressive teaching. Snyders reiterated in several of his texts that there is a link between content and the concrete experience of students in their class condition. He spoke of a relationship of continuity between students' current culture, primary culture, and elaborated culture. I have always found this idea fantastic. I remember how he insisted that students should be familiar with cultural masterpieces to develop a desire to overcome their social conditions of origin. This occurred during my schooling at the seminary. So, when I wrote the article on Pedagogical Trends in 1982, my understanding of "content" was influenced by Snyders' ideas. In other words, critical content is linked to social realities. At the time, I knew nothing about L. S. Vigotski. Twenty years later, I read this statement attributed to Vigotski in V. V. Davydov's book: "Teaching acts on mental development, first and foremost, through the content to be assimilated." I imagined that Snyders had read Vygotsky, though I don't know if he did. The idea was the same, though.

You are right. Since the beginning of my studies, I have focused on the primacy of content in school. This later led me to V. V. Davydov. My focus on content caused me many headaches, and my colleagues started calling me a "contentist." Early in my career as a lecturer, I had a colleague named Paolo Nosella from the Universidade Federal de São Carlos who liked to criticize me. With his strong Italian accent, he would say in his lectures: "Libâneo keeps talking about content. He doesn't know the suffering of the working class. He has no experience with people hanging onto bus bars. It's not content that people need, but critical awareness." I think it was an idea of content as cultural invasion, as Freire wrote in his early writings. Neither Nosella nor those who still call me a "contentist" understood the link I have always established between appropriating content and mastering the mental procedures associated with it and forming critical consciousness. When I talk about content, I think of a phrase by V. V. Davydov, who said that the content of study is theoretical and scientific knowledge, as well as the intellectual capacities associated with that knowledge. This means that the scientific concepts studied in subject areas carry intellectual capacities, i.e., the methods and procedures for grasping scientific concepts.

In this way, the development of scientific concepts and intellectual abilities are interrelated. As we acquire knowledge, we develop mental operations connected to that knowledge. Likewise, as we develop mental operations, they enable us to acquire knowledge. Andrea and Roberto, when I speak of methods and procedures, I am referring to the method of dialectical reflection. Through abstractions and generalizations, we examine the essence of things, their connections, and their relationships within a complex and contradictory social totality. This allows us to surpass the limitations of immediate sensory experience. This constitutes the formation of theoretical-dialectical thinking, through which we arrive at the critical dimension of content.

Let me elaborate on these ideas a little further. If I were to ask a professor to define content, he or she would probably say that it is the subject matter or knowledge of a school subject—the topics that are part of science, math, history, and English. In Developmental Teaching Theory, however, the definition of content goes further.

So, what is content? To answer this question, I must follow a logical sequence of ideas. According to V. V. Davydov, different forms of intellectual activity emerge in the human activity of transforming reality. These forms include cognitive, artistic, religious, and moral activities, among others. Davydov calls these forms "forms of social consciousness and thought," which are represented by science, art, morality, and laws.

These forms of social consciousness become material and spiritual culture. When transformed into school content, they enable human beings to develop their forms of action, consciousness, and thought. These ideas also appear frequently in the writings of A. N. Leontiev. According to Leontiev, when a child appropriates these forms of social consciousness, they reproduce the historical human activity embodied in them. Leontiev also says that these forms of social consciousness are associated with human capacities and abilities as practical ways of acting in accordance with these forms.

Thus, I would argue that these forms of social consciousness and the resulting human capacities constitute the content that individuals must

appropriate in order to become human. This occurs in sociocultural practices, particularly in school. Content is the basis of knowledge in a given field of study, synthesizing general problem-solving methods in science, art, and moral principles. In other words, content brings together the human capacities and abilities developed throughout history within a specific science or art form. Appropriating content means experiencing the human form through which it was produced. For instance, people needed to solve problems related to counting livestock, crops, and building houses, which led to the development of mathematics. Mathematics incorporates problem-solving methods developed throughout human history, and learning mathematics consists of studying these methods.

If I understand correctly, the appropriation of content by students does not entail memorizing, reproducing, or mastering the material. Rather, it means that students must internalize the human capacities and skills embodied in various scientific and artistic fields. In other words, students must internalize the socially and historically developed ways of dealing with the objects of reality covered by each field. These capacities or modes of activity become internalized means for students, meaning they become means of their own activity. Based on this definition of "content," I conclude that content is inseparable from the development of related capacities and skills. In other words, students' psychological development is linked to the content and the corresponding abilities and skills they must assimilate. One skill expected of professors knows how to identify the human abilities that have been generalized throughout the development of the science that gives rise to a subject. To do so, professors must understand the conceptual structure this statement has at least three theoretical and practical consequences, primarily for teacher training. First, professors must understand that content and skill development are inseparable; in other words, learning content must be converted into thought processes and modes of action. Second, the objective of school learning activities is to appropriate generalized methods of action found in the content in order to master scientific and artistic concepts. Third, there

must be a necessary interconnection between disciplinary and didactic knowledge. In other words, the logic of didactic knowledge must be sought in the nature and logic of disciplinary knowledge. This is a subject that deserves further discussion. of the subjects and the investigative processes that led to its formation.

11) AML and RVP — We would now like to ask a more specific question about the practical implementation of developmental didactics in the classroom. Anyone familiar with this theory knows that study activity is the fundamental organizational structure of developmental didactics. This activity is structured by study tasks and study actions (study, control, and evaluation actions). How can the study task be put into practice within the study activity? What characteristics should a professor have from the perspective of human development didactics?

JCL — Since at least 2004, in the line of research on Historical-Cultural and Pedagogical Practices at the PUC Goiás PPG, we have conducted didactic-formative experiments according to V. V. Davydov's developmental teaching theory. Over the past 20 years, we have improved our understanding of teaching organization through study activities and tasks, the most immediate objects of the experiments. The experiments place students in study activities through study tasks to develop theoretical-dialectical thinking. Based on the content, students appropriate generalized modes of action in each field of knowledge and acquire the skills to think and act with them in the study activity.

I define a study activity as a situation that triggers study: a theoretical-practical activity organized by the professor in which students seek new ways to solve a problem, thereby developing mental operations and forming theoretical thinking. The purpose of a study task is to challenge students to perform mental transformations with the content and produce qualitative changes in their thinking and behavior. In other words, the study task promotes changes in the students themselves.

Instill in students the need to master the spiritual heritage of the human species.

a. Assign study tasks that require students to transform their thinking through the study material. According to V. V. Davydov, the elements of study activity are, first, analyzing the content to identify the central general relationship that students need to understand and the skills and abilities they need to develop in relation to the content. Second is discovering how this general principle manifests itself in other particular cases. Third is deducing the conceptual core. Study tasks should therefore be organized in a way that is sufficiently attractive and motivating to encourage mental transformation with the study material. For instance, when teaching about water, nouns, and multiplication, it is important to begin with tasks that stimulate students' interest and curiosity, enabling them to make initial empirical abstractions and grasp the main general relationship of the content. Through problem solving, tasks should gradually lead students to transform the objects of study into objects of thought through theoretical abstraction and generalization, culminating in mastery of the conceptual core.

To carry out the study, the actions indicated by V. V. Davydov must be taken. The first and most important step is to work with the problem and related data to discover the object being studied's general relationship or principle. Davydov calls this principle the germ or nuclear model. The objective is to identify the central conceptual relationship underlying the concepts of the subject of study. This involves identifying the internal and external relationships present in the object of study. In this step, the teacher formulates the generalization to be reached with the students. For example, the topic could be water: its composition, physical characteristics, and relationships with human beings. To do so, the teacher proposes a problem as a starting point for solving the study tasks. Students are encouraged to work with initial abstractions through which they "think" about the problem, observing the problem data and contradictions from the most concrete to the most specific and general. The goal is to identify the main relationship or general, essential characteristic of the object "water." The task consists of finding ways to help

students resolve contradictions and conflicts to form a conceptual model and assimilate the general principle. In this case, the conceptual model is that of water. The second study action corresponds to modeling the concept. After students arrive at the core model and key concept of the content, they will model this conceptual model using graphs to show the relationships found. In the third action, students will observe that this general relationship manifests in many particular relationships, and vice versa. At this point, the professor will help students analyze how the universal, general form of the object of study transitions into particular forms within a specific problem or situation. These actions result in the internalization of concepts and the ability to use them as mental tools to understand reality through abstractions and generalizations — that is, dialectical theoretical thinking.

12) AML and RVP — Your shift in focus from critical-social content didactics to human development didactics was fundamentally shaped by the work and ideas of Vasili V. Davidov. Over the past twenty years, however, your theoretical positions have advanced to incorporate issues not studied by Davidov, such as sociocultural practices. Could you explain how you arrived at Marianne Hedegaard's position? What is this author's fundamental thesis regarding the place of sociocultural practices? Davidov's work. Could you explain how Hedegaard arrived at this conclusion? What is her fundamental thesis regarding the place of sociocultural practices in didactics? Why did you consider this issue relevant in the context of Brazilian education and schools? Are Hedegaard's theses related to your strongly held thesis about the "socially just school"?

JCL — That's correct. In our research group at PUC Goiás, which focuses on historical-cultural theory and pedagogical practices, we incorporate Mariane Hedegaard's ideas. We first met their ideas around 2004 when we translated

Radical-Local Teaching and Learning. This book presented the results of a pedagogical research study on teaching and learning among Puerto Rican children in poor New York City neighborhoods. In 2012, we invited the couple to Goiânia to give lectures and participate in activities with our research group. At the time, Seth was a professor of educational psychology at Aarhus University in Denmark, researching V. V. Davydov's theory and its implications for the education of cultural minorities. Mariane, a professor of developmental psychology at the University of Copenhagen, has always studied the lives of children in various settings, such as daycare, family, and school; the transitions between these settings; and how these transitions affect learning and development, particularly among cultural minorities. We began our study of these authors with an analysis of their book because it helped us guide our students in conducting didactic-formative experiments. Later, we had access to other works by these authors, mainly by Hedegaard, on teaching, learning, and sociocultural practices.

The Radical-Local Teaching and Learning approach is based on the understanding that school knowledge is always rooted in a historical and social context. In other words, general concepts inherited from humanity's social and historical experience must be applied to students' current lives. It is radical because it challenges traditional teaching methods, and it is local because it connects general concepts to students' lives. For these researchers, understanding general subject concepts requires theoretical-dialectical thinking in relation to students' local life situations.

My approach to Hedegaard is part of the path of constructing a vision of didactics that began with my early research. In that research, I proposed a school that would connect the content with students' social experiences. Due to my own life history, I have always been concerned about the influence of sociocultural contexts on the constitution of subjectivity and, therefore, on learning processes. Since teaching the Didactics course at PUC Goiás's Graduate Program in Education, we have introduced cultural research studies from different authors' perspectives, such as R. Williams', J. Bruner's, P.

Bourdieu's, and especially Gimeno Sacristán's and Pérez Gomes'. This line of study has led us to integrate historical-cultural theory and cultural studies, bringing us to the work of Seth Chaiklin and Mariane Hedegaard. They have incorporated theoretical-dialectical thinking and sociocultural practices into their theoretical approach.

By the time I had access to Hedegaard's books and articles, I had already formed the notion of the socio-historical determination of psychic development. Classical historical-cultural theory failed to convey the concept of situated learning or learning in a specific cultural and relational context. More importantly, it did not explain how to apply this concept to the learning process. Although there were interpretations of L. S. Vigotski's ideas by sociocultural theorists, they seemed little inclined to emphasize learners' internal psychological activity aimed at forming theoretical-conceptual thinking. They preferred to emphasize learning in the context of speech and social interactions. In short, I wanted to know how to implement what Snyders talked about: what concrete pedagogical actions mediate between school knowledge and students' real-life situations and between students' culture and school culture. This was also Charlot's concern from her earliest writings. This is precisely what interested me in Hedegaard's thinking and research. She advocates a theory of learning based on forming theoretical-dialectical thinking alongside students' social and cultural experiences. According to Hedegaard, professors should guide teaching based on general concepts and advance toward surrounding reality in all its complexity. In other words, they should understand how everyday concepts interact with scientific concepts and how these general concepts manifest in concrete social, cultural, and material conditions.

In other words, Hedegaard's research emphasizes the role of social and institutional practices in families, daycares, schools, workplaces, and in students' attribution of meaning and significance, including their motivation to complete learning tasks. According to Hedegaard, these socioculturally rich practices can promote learning, but they can also inhibit or restrict children's learning. In this way, they are conditions for development. I have adopted

these ideas, and today, the main research question I ask myself is this: How can the historical and social conditions of students' lives and their sociocultural practices be incorporated into work with scientific content, creating a double movement between the everyday concepts generated in everyday life and the scientific concepts worked on in school? The professor begins with everyday concepts and moves on to scientific concepts. The students then return to their families and communities with a different view of the problems, having gained a conceptual understanding of them. This is how knowledge becomes relevant to students outside of school. I envision this path for a socially just school.

Finally, I would like to comment on Hedegaard's significant contributions to developmental didactics. Considerable differences exist between the Danish and Brazilian education systems in terms of the aims and objectives of school education, the curriculum, organizational structure, and the profile of students attending public schools. In Hedegaard's research, social diversity in schools mainly stems from the presence of children of immigrants or refugees. This highlights the importance of considering cultural traditions, values, and ways of life. In other words, a unique social situation emerges in education. In Brazil, internal migration exists; however, this characteristic is almost diluted by the fact that nearly all public school students come from impoverished backgrounds (approximately 70% of the total population). Thus, Hedegaard's contribution to the Brazilian educational context is not so much due to the fact that he deals with segments of society marked by well-defined sociocultural characteristics, but rather, it is due to the fact that he makes it possible to consolidate a pedagogical principle whereby teaching content presupposes incorporating the student's perspective into didactic situations based on their concrete historical and social living conditions. The question is how to introduce the sociocultural practices that students bring from their concrete material, social, and cultural living conditions into the professor's daily pedagogical work with teaching materials. There are other factors to consider in Hedegaard's

concept of the "double movement" in teaching. These factors include the perception that society's elites have of the role of public schools, financial resources allocated to school education, educational legislation, researchers' and teacher trainers' perceptions of the purposes of public schools, teacher remuneration and working conditions, and teacher training. These topics are for another discussion.

13) AML and RVP — In Brazil, we have witnessed substantial growth in studies and initiatives that employ a historical, cultural, and developmental approach. This includes the registration of over 115 research groups spanning the country's five regions (ASBAHR; Oliveira, 2021). How would you analyze the growth in interest in this approach?

JCL — As I mentioned earlier, I was finishing my master's degree at PUC in São Paulo in 1984 when Vigotski's first book, *The Social Formation of the Mind*, was published in Brazil. I also mentioned that, that same year, I had the privilege of participating in one of the first research groups in historical-cultural psychology in the graduate Social Psychology course at PUC São Paulo. Silvia Tatiane Maurer Lane coordinated the course at the time. In 1983, I took a course with Professor Maria Laura, studying A. N. Leontiev's book *Actividad, Conciencia y Personalidad*, translated from Russian to Spanish in Mexico, as well as Rubinstein's book *Psicología*. My involvement with Silvia Lane's research group allowed me to meet other researchers beginning to study the socio-historical or historical-cultural approach. These researchers had access to a few English and Spanish publications of works by L. S. Vigotsky, A. R. Luria, and A. N. Leontiev, as did researchers from USP and UNICAMP. A few years later, in the early 1990s, academic production in the human sciences increased significantly due to the political détente that began in the 1980s, towards the end of the military dictatorship. This period of Brazilian politics brought about progressive changes in educational policies in some

states, political reorganization and mobilization in the educational sector, establishment of the New Republic, and resumption of the democratic process, drafting of the 1988 Federal Constitution, and holding of scientific events. This created a cultural climate conducive to disseminating ideas from the socialist field. These events, I believe, explain the impact of the ideas of L. S. Vigotski, A. R. Luria, and A. N. Leontiev on the fields of education and psychology.

N. Leontiev started in the 1990s. However, there were more studies on L. S. Vigotski, including books and articles that discussed this author's system of ideas in depth and with openness, such as the social nature of human development, the relationships between thought and language, and between learning and development. Comparative studies between Vygotsky's ideas and those of other prominent researchers, such as Bakhtin, Piaget, and Wallon, also emerged in Brazil and abroad. Vygotsky's Selected Works, translated from Russian into Spanish, was first published in 1995. In 2001, Paulo Bezerra published the first translation from Russian into Portuguese based on L. S. Vigotski's book, entitled *A construção do pensamento e da linguagem* (The Construction of Thought and Language), which was previously published by Editora Martins Fontes. It is also important to acknowledge the pioneering academic work of Ana Luiza Smolka at UNICAMP, Marta Khol de Oliveira at USP, and Teresa Rego, who wrote the first book to systematically present Vygotsky's ideas, entitled *Vygotski: Uma Perspectiva Histórico-Cultural da Educação* (Vygotsky: A Historical-Cultural Perspective on Education). The book introduced essential theoretical and methodological assumptions to teacher trainers and undergraduate students in a rigorous, systematic, and accessible manner.

In August 2012, at the 11th Conference of the Teaching Center at Unesp Marília, I presented a chart of research groups registered with CNPq at that time in a lecture entitled "Trajectory of Historical-Cultural Theory in Brazil." Unfortunately, the work was not published, but it provides a historical record of the state of research on Historical-Cultural Theory at that time. The survey was based on data from the Lattes Platform Directory of Research Groups

(CNPq) and the websites of postgraduate programs. Of the 55 groups identified, 26 were in the Southeast (47.2%), 16 were in the South (29.9%), seven were in the Northeast (12.7%), five were in the Midwest (9.1%), and one was in the North (1.8%). The groups had various names, including socio-historical-cultural theory, historical-cultural psychology, historical-cultural theory of activity, and sociocultural theory. Thirty-three of these groups were in education, six were in psychology, seven were in applied linguistics, and the rest were in physics, mathematics education, literature, sociology, physical education, and history. Notably, the first groups emerged between 1990 and 2000 at institutions such as UNICAMP (1992), PUCSP (1993, 2004), UFJF (1995), UFP (1997), UFMS (1999), USP (2002), PUCGO (1999), and UNESC (2001).

As shown in a study conducted by Asbahr and Oliveira in 2021, what happened in the following decades is well known: a significant increase in academic production related to the two theories — the historical-cultural and developmental teaching theories — as well as the growth of research groups. Several regions in Brazil have held conferences, symposiums, and scientific meetings with Russian, Argentine, North American, Cuban, Mexican, Spanish, Danish, and other researchers in attendance. These events have promoted dialogue between local and international research and improved the quality of scientific production in the field of historical-cultural theory. I must acknowledge the role of the Study and Research Group on Didactics and Professional Teacher Development (GEPEDI) in this movement. You two, who are now interviewing me, lead this group. I closely followed the three editions of the International Colloquium on Developmental Teaching between 2012 and 2016. These were attended by researchers from Russia, Cuba, Mexico, and other countries. It is also important to highlight the International Symposium on Developmental Teaching and Specific Didactics we held in Goiânia in 2017. The symposium featured three international speakers who are researchers in the Elkonin-Davydov system: Galina Zuckerman, Elena V. Chudinova, and Sergey F. Gorbov from the Laboratory of Psychological Development of Children at the Elementary School of the Psychological Institute of the

Russian Academy of Education. These scientific exchanges have greatly enriched our research, allowing us to establish contact with researchers directly linked to the Vigotski School tradition and broaden the conceptual system of the theory.

I would like to share a relevant comment about the research groups active in our country. The titles, projects, and publications of these groups reflect a diversity of theoretical perspectives, which lead to different interpretations of the fundamental concepts of the Vygotsky School and related theorists. Thus, research groups are distinguished by their adherence to specific theoretical orientations. Examples include Leontiev's theory of activity, Galperin and Talizina's theory of staged assimilation of mental actions, Davydov's theory of developmental teaching, and Bakhtin's language theories. There are also those who prefer to link themselves specifically to the formulations of L. S. Vigotski. These groups differ in their theoretical orientations, ranging from Leontiev's theory of activity and Galperin/Talizina's theory of staged assimilation to V. V. Davydov's theory of developmental teaching and Bakhtin's language theories. Additionally, there are differences between groups and researchers depending on whether their research leans toward psychology or pedagogy.

14) AML and RVP — The groups have different histories of adopting this framework. Several initiatives have been produced in specific school contexts based on the authors who support the actions of the different groups. What are the main historical and cultural influences that characterize the work of Brazilian groups? In your view, are new variants being produced in Brazil? Could you mention some?

JCL — That's a tough question to answer, and it's also a sensitive issue. I can't discuss the theoretical foundations of each research group or their approaches to teaching, but I can talk about my initial perceptions of their differences. Based on

studies of L. S. Vigotski's arrival in Brazil, Maria Teresa Freitas's 1994 book *O pensamento de Vygotsky e Bakhtin no Brasil* (The Thinking of Vygotsky and Bakhtin in Brazil) reveals that foreign publications were available in the 1970s. However, I believe that, by the early 1980s, two trends had begun to emerge, at least in São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro. The first was sociocultural theory, linked to the interpretation of L.

S. Vygotsky focused on linguistic studies and cultural diversity issues disseminated by American researchers. These researchers organized the texts of L. S. Vygotsky that gave rise to the book *The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*, which was translated in Brazil as *Formação Social da Mente*. The socio-historical-cultural theory, also known as historical-cultural psychology, began with Silvia Lane's social psychology studies at PUC São Paulo in the early 1980s. This theory is based on the idea of understanding the historicity of subjects, or how they are formed through social relations, culture, and work. It also explores how subjects can expand their consciousness by reinterpreting the meaning of their existence and transforming their environment. Subsequently formed groups, in some way, referred to the ideas developed in these trends in education, psychology, and language. These groups often took a perspective of dialogue and interdisciplinary, albeit based on different interpretations of concepts and modes of pedagogical action. I perceive that the formation of research groups throughout Brazil between the 1980s and 1990s, coupled with an abundance of publications during this period, diversified the sources of reference and research interests surrounding the founding concepts of L. S. Vigotski. Regarding the two lines of research I mentioned, I believe almost all contemporary groups adhere to historical-cultural theory, albeit with variants.

It is important to acknowledge the establishment of the Study and Research Group on Pedagogical Activity (GEPAPe) in 2002. Led by Prof. Dr. Manoel Oriosvaldo de Moura, this group is based at the Faculty of Education of USP. The group initiated a line of studies within historical-cultural theory, supported by Leontiev's activity theory. The studies focused on the pedagogical

activity of professors and sought to identify the elements that constitute the teaching and learning process. GEPAPe was developed on a solid theoretical foundation that was open to various interpretations of historical-cultural theory. The group trained researchers in various regions of the country and established several study and research centers. Undoubtedly, other solid groups formed in several states, strengthening the intellectual movement around historical-cultural theory.

It is also important to mention ISCAR Brasil, the Brazilian branch of the International Society for Cultural Research and Activity (ISCAR). Few of us follow this entity's activities, which gained momentum between 2010 and 2022 after the VI International Congress of ISCAR in Natal in 2021. This society's name is noteworthy because it represents the intersection of historical-cultural theory, sociocultural theory, and activity theory. This intersection does not seem to have been assimilated by Brazilian researchers. Until 2002, it was well known that there were two groups of researchers in the tradition of L. S. Vigotski who held separate congresses: one on sociocultural theory and the other on historical-cultural theory. Since 1986, historical-cultural theory has been supported by ISCRAT (the International Society for Cultural Research and Activity Theory), which held four conferences until 2002. Following the final congress, the movement became known as ISCAR (Society for Cultural and Activity Research) and began to include followers of sociocultural theory. The first ISCAR conference was held in Seville, Spain, in 2005 under this name, and subsequent conferences have been held in various locations. The sixth conference will be held in Brazil in August 2020 at the Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte. In 1987, supporters of sociocultural theory established the SSCR (Society for Sociocultural Research). The SSCR held three conferences, the last of which took place in Brazil under the leadership of Prof. Ana Luiza Smolka from UNICAMP.

As reported, this entity joined ISCAR in 2002. ISCAR Brazil was presumably established at the congress that brought the two organizations together. Prof. Ana Luiza was the first representative of the Brazilian session

for two terms. She was followed by Prof. Fernanda Liberali (PUC São Paulo), and the current representative is Prof. Adolfo Tanzi Neto (UFRJ). Although this entity has attempted to bring together research groups from the Vygotskian tradition, ISCAR Brazil has not effectively grouped the various trends in the country. This is partly because its representatives belong to groups with very specific lines of research in linguistic studies and socio-historical psychology. It seems that ISCAR Brazil has not established itself as representative of the many theoretical variants in the field of education.

15) AML and RVP — Your work has contributed greatly to pedagogy and didactics in Brazil. Many generations of professors and researchers have benefited from your work, and many more will certainly do so, recognizing and appreciating your efforts. In light of this, what advice would you give your successors? Which issues have been resolved? What questions remain to be addressed with an ethical, political, ideological, pedagogical, and investigative commitment to advancing didactics in Brazil?

JCL — Well, dear friends Andrea and Roberto, I must thank you immensely for this opportunity to talk about my life journey and my thoughts. I am happy when, during lectures, professors thank me for Didática (Didactics), Pedagogia e pedagogos para quê? (Pedagogy and Educators, What For?), or Organização e Gestão (Organization and Management). They say that they learned a lot from my books, passed competitive exams, and got jobs. I also enjoy seeing my students, both male and female, take advantage of my classes and articles and conduct research at school. As a researcher, I feel fulfilled, and I am proud to say that my research is pedagogical and didactic. My research interests are directly focused on schools, classrooms, and professors' work, while always considering external structural constraints. In my opinion, educational research has advanced greatly in our country, in both

the analysis of external school aspects, such as educational policies, and internal pedagogical aspects, including studies in didactics and teaching methodology. Historical-cultural theory and developmental didactics already have an invaluable collection of publications. However, my experience tells me that there is a great distance between academic production and the reality of schools and teacher training. For decades, we have been unable to solve the chronic problems in our school education, which compromise the social and pedagogical quality of teaching and mainly affect poor segments of society. Those who follow Brazilian education through research, the media, or direct observation see children and young people completing various stages of schooling with no noticeable improvement in learning quality or intellectual, emotional, and moral development.

A brief overview of public education policies reveals a history rife with setbacks. In the 1930s, the *Manifesto dos Pioneiros da Educação Nova* (Manifesto of the Pioneers of New Education) sparked the first real movement for school democratization. At the end of the military dictatorship in the 1980s, the National Education Association (Anped), CEDES, and other movements and associations began working for democratic public schools. The transition to democracy brought the 1988 Constitution, which formalized many ideals of public education, especially the right to a quality public education for all. Unfortunately, since the 1990s, educational policies generated by international organizations, mainly the World Bank, have imposed a results-based educational model on emerging countries, as seen with the *World Declaration on Education for All*. Throughout the various governments that followed, national education plans and inclusion policies were introduced, which led to some progress, for better or worse. However, throughout this period of almost 35 years, the results-based education model remained unchanged and was reinforced beginning in 2016 with the parliamentary coup against the Temer government and the subsequent election of Jair Bolsonaro.

The gradual dismantling of public education began with cuts to public

resources, increased privatization and outsourcing of education, militarization of schools, surveillance of professors' work for ideological conformity, and attempts to introduce homeschooling. Currently, Brazilian education is committed to a curriculum based on teaching results. This curriculum, represented by the BNCC, subordinates education to the interests of the economy and the market. It is in accordance with guidelines from international organizations linked to the world's most industrialized countries. These organizations are guided by the criteria of a society that is administered for the control of individuals. A pragmatic, utilitarian, and simplified school model has been implemented through test-based teaching and the quantification of learning. This model is designed to serve poor populations in poor countries. This results-based education causes immense damage to public schools, hinders professors' work, and impairs students' learning. This approach reduces education to the mere transmission and memorization of content, trivializing the teaching-learning process. Students are deprived of their active role in learning, and their social, cultural, and material contexts are disregarded. Furthermore, this results-based education policy deprofessionalizes teachers, reducing them to executors of standardized tasks without autonomy or creativity. In short, this type of education encourages competition between socially unequal students, resulting in a limited, restrictive education and social injustice in schools. It develops productive skills according to market interests rather than skills aimed at human development. I call this poor schools for the poor.

In light of the challenges facing public schools in our country, historical-cultural theory and developmental didactics offer an alternative to the neoliberal perspective on education and the curriculum. These approaches aim to promote humanizing, emancipatory, and democratic education. This approach focuses on developing students' human potential through science, art, and morality. It aims to foster critical thinking, sensitivity, and collective social and moral values, as well as creative forms of participation in social, professional, and cultural life. Despite the limitations of Brazilian public

schools, the theory of developmental teaching and its ramifications in didactic propositions offer hope for new paths in the pursuit of excellence. Indeed, pedagogical theories and models developed in different sociocultural contexts must be adapted to the economic, political, and sociocultural realities of Brazil. Theorists from Russia and other countries have made significant contributions to developmental didactics. However, Brazilian researchers must meet two conditions to adopt it: first, the theoretical framework and recommended teaching practices must be tested against the historical, social, cultural, and material conditions of the Brazilian context. Second, this contribution must be complemented by studies that update the theory. Above all, it must address theoretical and practical teaching issues that were not addressed in the Soviet context, such as culture, social and cultural diversity, digital technologies, and social networks.

For the sake of democracy and social justice in schools, as well as the role of teachers in this regard, researchers and teacher trainers must continue to investigate teaching methods that address the social and educational disadvantages of students from disadvantaged backgrounds. These students often have underdeveloped intellectual capacities due to the social and educational inequalities they face. The challenge for developmental didactics is determining how professors will incorporate sociocultural diversity and social inequalities into content teaching from the perspective of the dual movement in teaching. This involves articulating the connection between content teaching and students' social, cultural, and material conditions. In my opinion, educators of all progressive theoretical tendencies must join forces to resist the neoliberal avalanche and fight for a school that educates human beings and citizens, promoting their physical, psychological, emotional, moral, and aesthetic development based on their concrete reality. This school should humanize people through cognitive, procedural, and evaluative content that develops capacities and skills to act in the world with solidarity and recognition of differences and reduction of social inequalities. This theory also highlights the role of individuals in transforming reality. People can fight for

a different vision of humanity, a different model of society, and a different vision of human development than what we have today in the Brazilian education system.

16) AML and RVP — We appreciate your willingness to engage in dialogue. Please leave suggestions here for works published today in Brazil that you consider essential for studies focusing on this approach. These suggestions should be useful for both young people new to the theory and more experienced researchers. Thank you!

JCL — Andrea and Roberto, here are a number of references that have influenced my scientific work.

BOOKS

LIBÂNEO, J. C. *Democratização da escola pública: a pedagogia crítico-social dos conteúdos*. São Paulo: Loyola, 1985 (2020, 28a edição).

LIBÂNEO, J. C. *Didática*. São Paulo, Cortez Editora, 1991 (2020, 30a edição).

LIBÂNEO, J. C. *Pedagogia e pedagogos, para quê?* São Paulo, Cortez Editora. 1988 (2017, 12ª edição).

LIBÂNEO, J. *Organização e Gestão da Escola: teoria e prática*. Goiânia, Heccus Editora, 2006.

LIBÂNEO, J. C.; OLIVEIRA, J. F.; TOSCHI, M. S. *Educação escolar: políticas, estrutura e organização*. São Paulo, Editora Cortez, 2005 (2020, 10ª. edição).

LIBÂNEO, J. C.; ALVES, N. (org.). *Temas de pedagogia: diálogos entre didática e currículo*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2012.

TEXTS ON DIDACTICS

Articles

LIBÂNEO, J. C. O ensino da Didática, das metodologias específicas e dos conteúdos específicos de ensino fundamental nos currículos de cursos de pedagogia. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagógicos*, v. 91, p. 562-583, 2010. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24109/2176-6681.rbep.91i229.630>

LIBÂNEO, J. C. O campo teórico e profissional da didática hoje: entre Ítaca e o canto das sereias. In: FRANCO, M. A. S. e PIMENTA, S. G. (org.). *Didática: embates contemporâneos*. São Paulo: Loyola, 2010.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. O dualismo perverso da escola pública brasileira: escola do conhecimento para os ricos, escola do acolhimento social para os pobres. *Educação e Pesquisa* (USP). (Impresso), v. 38, p. 13-28, 2012. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1517-97022011005000001>

LIBÂNEO, J. C. Políticas educacionais em discussão no Brasil: o lugar do currículo e da didática. *Revista APASE* (São Paulo), v. 1, p. 6-90, 2013.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. Políticas educacionais no Brasil: desfiguramento da escola e do conhecimento escolar. *Cadernos de Pesquisa* (Fundação Carlos Chagas), v. 46, p. 38-62, 2016. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/198053143572>

Chapters

LIBÂNEO, J. C. Os campos contemporâneos da didática e do currículo: aproximações e diferenças. In: OLIVEIRA, M. R. N. S. *Confluências e divergências entre didática e currículo*. Campinas-SP: Papirus, 1998.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. As teorias pedagógicas modernas revisitadas pelo debate contemporâneo na educação. In: LIBÂNEO, J. C.; SANTOS, A. (org.). *Educação na era do conhecimento em rede e transdisciplinaridade*. São Paulo: Alínea, 2005.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. Didática como campo investigativo e disciplinar e seu lugar na formação de professores. In: OLIVEIRA M. R. N. S.; PACHECO, J. A. (org.). *Curriculum, didática e formação de professores*. Campinas (SP): Papirus, 2013, v. 1, p. 7-207.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. As políticas de formação de professores, o conhecimento profissional e aproximações entre didática e currículo. In: OLIVEIRA, M. R. N. S. (org.). *Professor: formação, saberes e problemas*. Porto (Portugal): Porto Editora, 2014, v. 1, p. 7-160

LIBÂNEO, J. C. Antinomias na formação de professores e a busca de integração entre o conhecimento pedagógico-didático e o conhecimento disciplinar. In: MARIN, A. J.; PIMENTA, S. G. (org.). *Didática: teoria e pesquisa*. Araraquara: Junqueira & Marin, 2015, v. 1, p. 7-256.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. Finalidades educativas em disputa, didática e currículo. In: LIBÂNEO, J. C.; ECHALAR, A. D. L. F.; ROSA, S. V. L.; SUANNO, M. V. R. *Em defesa do direito à educação escolar Didática: currículo e políticas educacionais em debate*. 1ed. Goiânia: Gráfica UFG, 2019, v. 1, p. 2-262.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. Presente e futuro do campo disciplinar e investigativo da didática que conteúdos? In: D'ÁVILLA, C.; MARIN, A. J.; FRANCO, M. A. S.; FERREIRA, L. G. (org.). *Didática: saberes estruturantes e formação de professores*. 1ed. Salvador: EDUFBA, 2019, v. 3, p. 149-160.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. Educação escolar e sociedade democrática: o impacto dos Endipes no movimento da didática em busca de um projeto de escola pública. In: CANDAU, V. M.; CRUZ, G. B.; FERNANDES, C. (org.). *Didática e fazeres-saberes pedagógicos*. Petrópolis - RJ: Vozes, 2020, v. 1, p. 7-291.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. Para a pós-pandemia, repensar a pedagogia para uma escola socialmente justa. In: OLIVEIRA, A. F. de. (org.). *Uma nova educação é possível*. Goiânia (GO): Kelps, 2021, v. 1, p. 6-112.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. Metodologias ativas: a quem servem? Nos servem? In: LIBÂNEO, J. C.; ECHALAR, A. D. L. F.; SUANNO, M. V. R.; ROSA, S. V. L. (org.). *Didática e formação de professores: embates com as políticas curriculares*. Goiânia: Cegraf UFG, 2022.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. Uma interlocução com a obra de Bernard Charlot: a escola do direito à diferença e do direito à semelhança entre os seres humanos. In: CAVALCANTI, D.; REGO, T. C. (org.). *A obra de Bernard Charlot por seus intérpretes*. Curitiba: CRV, 2023, v. 1, p. 1-190.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. A didática e seus compromissos com a práxis pedagógica transformadora: considerações sobre uma escola socialmente justa. In: LONGAREZI A. M.; MELO, G. F.; XIMENES, P. A. S. (org.). *A didática e seus compromissos com a práxis pedagógica transformadora: considerações sobre uma escola socialmente justa*. Jundiaí SP: Paco, 2023, v. 1, p. 51-62.

LIBÂNEO, J. C.; FARIAS, C. M. M.; FELIX, C. M. C. Por uma escola socialmente justa: confissões de LIBÂNEO J. C. In: SCHEFER, M. C.; CUNHA, J. R.; COSTA, L. A. C. C. (org.). *Entre-telas com pesquisadores sociais indisciplinados*. São Paulo: LiberArs, 2021, v. 1, p. 87-102.

Chapters

LIBÂNEO, J. C. Educação: Pedagogia e didática - O campo investigativo da Pedagogia e da Didática no Brasil: esboço histórico e buscas de identidade epistemológica e profissional. In: PIMENTA, S. G. (org.). *Pedagogia e Didática: Tendências e Desafios*, S.Paulo: Cortez, 1970.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. Didática e epistemologia: para além do embate entre didática e didáticas específicas. In: VEIGA, I. P. A.; D'ÁVILA Cristina (org.). *Profissão docente: novos sentidos, novas perspectivas*. Campinas: Papirus Editora, 2008 (2^a edição, 2010).

LIBÂNEO, José C. Currículo de resultados, atenção a diversidade, ensino para o desenvolvimento humano: contribuição ao debate sobre a escola justa. In: BOTO, C.; SANTOS, V. M.; SILVA, V. B.; OLIVEIRA, Z. V. (org.). *A Escola pública em crise: inflexões, apagamentos e desafios*. São Paulo: Livraria da Física, 2020, v. 1, p. 11-385.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. A desfiguração da escola e a imaginação da escola socialmente justa. In: MENDONÇA, S. G. L.; MIGUEL, J. C.; MILLER, S.; KÖHLE, E. C. (org.). *(De)formação na escola: desvios e desafios*. Marilia (SP): Cultura Acadêmica, 2020, v. 1.

SPECIFIC TEXTS ON DEVELOPMENTAL DIDACTICS

Articles

LIBÂNEO, J. C. A aprendizagem escolar e a formação de professores na perspectiva da psicologia histórico-cultural e da teoria da atividade. *Educar em Revista*, Editora UFPR, Curitiba, nº 24, p. 113-147, dez. 2004. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/0104-4060.352>.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. A didática e a aprendizagem do pensar e do aprender: a teoria histórico-cultural da atividade e a contribuição de Vasili Davydov. *Rev. Bras. de Educação (ANPEd)*, Rio de Janeiro, n. 27, dez. 2004.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. A integração entre o conhecimento disciplinar e o conhecimento pedagógico na formação de professores: a contribuição da teoria do ensino de Vasili Davidov. *Didácticas Específicas*, Madrid, v. 10, p. 5-37, 2014.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. O campo teórico e profissional da didática hoje: entre Ítaca e o canto das sereias. In: FRANCO, M. A. S.; PIMENTA, S. G. (org.). *Didática: embates contemporâneos*. São Paulo: Loyola, 2010.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. Formação de Professores e Didática para Desenvolvimento Humano. *Educação e Realidade*, v. 40, p. 629-650, 2015. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/2175-623646132>.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. A teoria do ensino para o desenvolvimento humano e o planejamento de ensino. *Educativa* (Goiânia. Online), v. 19, p. 353-387, 2016. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18224/educ.v19i2.5391>.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. Finalidades educativas escolares e escola socialmente justa: a abordagem pedagógica da diversidade social e cultural. *Política e Gestão Educacional* (online), v. 24, p. 816-840, 2020.

FREITAS, R. A. M. M.; LIBÂNEO, J. C. Didática desenvolvimental e políticas educacionais para a escola no Brasil. *Linhas Críticas* (online), v. 24, p. 816-840, 2019. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26512/lc.v24i0.21850>.

LIBÂNEO, J. C.; SILVA, Eliane . Finalidades educativas escolares e escola socialmente justa: a abordagem pedagógica da diversidade social e cultural. *Política e gestão educacional* (online), v. 24, p. 816-840, 2020.

LIBÂNEO, J. C.; SILVA, E. . Atividade de estudo e desenvolvimento humano: a metodologia do duplo movimento no ensino. *Obutchénie: Rev. de Didática e Psicologia Pedagógica*. Uberlândia (MG), v; 5, n. 3, set/dez 2021. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14393/OBv5n3.a2021-59160>.

LIBÂNEO, J. C.; FREITAS, R. A. M. M. O experimento didático formativo na perspectiva da teoria do ensino desenvolvimental. *Educação e Pesquisa* (USP), v. 48, p. 1-19, 2022. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1678-4634202248246996>.

CUNHA, A. L.; LIBÂNEO, José C. O sistema Elkonin-Davydov no contexto da educação básica russa e possibilidades de efetivação de suas proposições no contexto brasileiro. *Educativa* (Goiânia). Online. v. 25, p. 1-25, 2022. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18224/educ.v25i1.13251>.

Chapters

LIBÂNEO, J. C. Docência universitária: formação do pensamento teórico-científico e atuação nos motivos dos alunos. In: D'ÁVILA, C. (org.). *Ser professor na contemporaneidade: desafios, ludicidade e protagonismo*. Curitiba: Editora CRV, 2010.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. Conteúdos, formação de competências cognitivas e ensino com pesquisa: unindo ensino e modos de investigação. In: Pimenta, S. G.; ALMEIDA, I. (org.). *Pedagogia universitária: caminhos para a formação de professores*. São Paulo: Cortez, 2011.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. Finalidades educativas escolares, escola socialmente justa e a didática voltada para o desenvolvimento humano. In: RICHTER, D.; SOUZA, L. F.; MENEZES, P. K. (org.). *Percursos teórico-metodológicos e práticos da Geografia Escolar*. Goiânia: C&Alfa Comunicação, 2022, v. 1, p. 7-266.

LIBÂNEO, J. C. Da didática crítico-social à didática para o desenvolvimento humano. In: LONGAREZI, A. M.; PIMENTA, S. G.; PUENTES, R. V. (org.). *Didática crítica no Brasil*. São Paulo: Cortez Editora, 2023, v. 1, p. 5-328.

LIBÂNEO, J. C.; FREITAS, R. A. M. M. *Vasily Vasilyevich Davydov*: a escola e a formação do pensamento teórico-científico. In: PUENES, R. V.; LONGAREZI, A. M. (org.). *Ensino Desenvolvimental*: vida, pensamento e obra dos principais representantes russos. Uberlândia: EDUFU, v. 1, 2013.

LIBÂNEO, J. C.; FREITAS, R. A. M. M. Abstração, generalização e formação de conceitos no processo de ensino-aprendizagem. In: PUENTES, R. V.; LONGAREZI, A. M. (org.). *Ensino Desenvolvimental*: Sistema Elkonin-Repkin. Uberlândia (MG): Edufu/Mercado de letras, v.1, 2019.

Teoría del aprendizaje desarrollador: diálogo con José Carlos Libâneo

RESUMEN

La entrevista establece y aborda, a partir de un conjunto de dieciséis preguntas, los principales momentos del desarrollo académico, personal, profesional, intelectual y político de uno de los educadores, pedagogos y docentes más relevantes de la segunda mitad del siglo XX y primeras dos décadas del siglo XXI. José Carlos Libâneo (1945-) es responsable por una vasta y sólida obra de difusión nacional e internacional, especialmente su libro Didáctica (1990), considerado en la lista de los más citados en el área educativa. Un intelectual políticamente comprometido con la educación de los niños pertenecientes a las clases más pobres, a favor de una escuela pública de calidad, con el aprendizaje de contenidos científicos vinculados a las condiciones históricas y sociales concretas de la vida de los estudiantes, Libâneo es un ejemplo para las nuevas generaciones.

Palabras clave: José Carlos Libâneo. Aprendizaje desarrollador. V. V. Davydov.

Referências

ASBAHR; F. da S. F.; OLIVEIRA, M. L. S. de A. M. Inventário dos grupos brasileiros de pesquisa na teoria histórico-cultural a partir do Diretório de Grupos do CNPq. *Obutchénie. Revista de Didática e Psicologia Pedagógica*. 5(2), 566 – 587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14393/OBv5n2.a2021-61477>.

BRASIL. *Lei nº 5.692, de 11 de agosto de 1971*. Fixa Diretrizes e Bases para o ensino de 1º e 2º graus, e dá outras providências. Disponível em: <https://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/lei/1970-1979/lei-5692-11-agosto-1971-357752-publicacaooriginal-1-pl.html>.

BRASIL, Ministério da Educação. *Lei nº 5.540 de 28 de novembro de 1968*. Fixa normas de organização e funcionamento do ensino superior e sua articulação com a escola média, e dá outras providências. Disponível em: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/l5540.htm.

BRASIL, Ministerio da educação. *Lei nº 9.394 de 20 de dezembro de 1996*. Estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional. Disponivel em: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/l9394.htm.

DAVYDOV, Vasily Vasilyevich. Problems of developmental teaching. The experience of theoretical and experimental psychological research. Soviet Education, New York, 1988.

LIBÂNEO, José Carlos. Democratização da escola pública: pedagogia crítico-social dos conteúdos. 14ª edição. São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 1985[1996].

LIBÂNEO, José Carlos. Didática. São Paulo. Cortez, 1990[2002].

LIBÂNEO, José C. Organização e gestão da escola. 1a. ed. Goiânia - GO: Alternativa, 2000a. 259p.

LIBÂNEO, José C. Organização e gestão da escola: teoria e prática. Goiânia: Edição do Autor, 2000b. 177p.

LIBÂNEO, José C. Pedagogia e pedagogos, para quê? 4a. ed. São Paulo: Cortez Editora, 2001a. 200p.

LIBÂNEO, José C. Adeus professor, adeus professora? Novas exigências educacionais e profissão docente. 5a. ed. São Paulo: Cortez Editora, 2001b, 103p.

LONGAREZI, A. M.; PUENTES, R.V. A ascensão do pensamento didático desenvolvimental na obra de José Carlos Libâneo (1976-2020). In: SUANNO, M.; SOAREZ, S.; ROSA, S. V. L. (org.). *Educação como prática social, didática e formação de professores: contribuições de José Carlos Libâneo*. 1 ed. Goiânia: Editora Espaço Acadêmico, 2020, v. 1, p. 189-247.

LONGAREZI, A.M.; PUENTES, R.V. Didática Desenvolvimental: os fundamentos de uma perspectiva crítica brasileira. In: LONGAREZI, A.M.; PIMENTA, S.G.; PUENTES, R.V. Didática crítica no Brasil. São Paulo: Cortez, 2023.

LONGAREZI, A. M.; PUENTES, R. V.; SOUZA, L. M. Resenha do Democratização da escola pública: a pedagogia crítico-social dos conteúdos. *Resenhas Educativas/ Education Review*, v. 27, p. 1-10, 2020.

PUENTES, R. V.; LONGAREZI, A. M. José Carlos Libâneo: gênese e desenvolvimento de seu pensamento didático. *Ensino em Re-Vista*, Uberlândia, v. 27, p. 1275-1305, 2020.

SAVIANI, D.. Escola e Democracia. Campinas: Autores Associados, 1983, 104p.

SAVIANI, D.. Pedagogia Histórico-Crítica. Campinas: Autores Associados, 1991, 128p.

Received on February 5, 2024

Approved on July 8, 2024