

ARTICLE

ANTHROPOLOGY AND SCHOOL EDUCATION: INDIGENOUS EDUCATION, THE FIGHT AGAINST MISOGYNY, LGBTT-PHOBIA, AND DISCRIMINATION AGAINST AFRO-BRAZILIAN CULTURE**MARCEL DE ALMEIDA FREITAS¹**ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4928-2136>

ABSTRACT: The article focuses on some contributions of Anthropology to four aspects of schooling education: the indigenous schooling, the discrimination against women and LGBTT individuals, and the prejudice against Afro-Brazilian cultural practices and religious traditions. Regarding the methodology, we did a theoretical review about these themes in the interface of Anthropology and Education. Here the concept of school is understood as the main manifestation of formal education in the West and from the concept of educational field, that is, from its historical, social, political, economic and, particularly, cultural structures, a perspective in which Anthropology can strongly contribute. One of the most important anthropological postulates for School Education is that, contrary to common sense, human behavior does not depend so heavily on nature, but results mainly from learning in collective contexts. The main aim of this theoretical contribution is to present some challenges in the relationship among school, educational field, Brazilian culture and the extent to which school is not yet prepared to recognize and accept difference and diversity. In this text, we propose that Anthropology should turn more to school education and that, especially one of its practical application, the Pedagogy, could be more open to contributions from the anthropological field as it has been occurring, for instance, with Sociology and Psychology.

Keywords: anthropology and school; misogyny; LGBTTphobia; afro-brazilian culture; indigenous education.

¹ Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG). Belo Horizonte, MG, Brasil. <marcel.fae.ufmg@gmail.com>
Educação em Revista | Belo Horizonte|v.37|e26064|2021

ANTROPOLOGIA E EDUCAÇÃO ESCOLAR: A EDUCAÇÃO INDÍGENA, O COMBATE À MISOGINIA, À LGBTTFOBIA E À DISCRIMINAÇÃO CONTRA A CULTURA AFRO-BRASILEIRA

RESUMO: O artigo enfoca algumas contribuições da Antropologia para quatro aspectos da educação escolar: a educação escolar indígena, a discriminação contra as mulheres, contra pessoas LGBTQTT e o preconceito contra práticas culturais e tradições religiosas afro-brasileiras. No que diz respeito à metodologia, foi utilizada a revisão teórica sobre esses temas na interface da Antropologia com a Educação. Aqui o termo escola é entendido como a principal manifestação da educação formal no Ocidente e a partir do conceito de campo educacional, isto é, a partir de suas estruturas históricas, sociais, políticas, econômicas e, notadamente, culturais, perspectiva com a qual a Antropologia pode contribuir bastante. Um dos postulados antropológicos mais importantes para a Educação Escolar é que, ao contrário do que geralmente se acredita no senso comum, o comportamento humano não depende tanto da natureza, mas decorre, sobretudo, da aprendizagem em contextos coletivos. O principal intuito desta contribuição teórica é demonstrar alguns impasses na relação entre escola, campo educacional e cultura brasileira e o quanto a escola ainda não está preparada para o reconhecimento e o acolhimento da diferença e da diversidade. No texto, advoga-se que a Antropologia se volte mais para a educação escolar e que especialmente uma de suas aplicações práticas, a Pedagogia, se abra mais a contribuições do campo antropológico como vem fazendo em relação à Sociologia e à Psicologia, por exemplo.

Palavras-chave: antropologia e escola; misoginia; LGBTQTTfobia; cultura afro-brasileira; educação indígena.

ANTROPOLOGÍA Y EDUCACIÓN ESCOLAR: EDUCACIÓN INDÍGENA, EL COMBATE A LA MISOGINIA, A LA LGBTTFOBIA Y A LA DISCRIMINACIÓN CONTRA LA CULTURA AFROBRASILEÑA

RESUMEN: El artículo enfoca algunas contribuciones de la Antropología para cuatro aspectos de la educación escolar: la educación escolar indígena, la discriminación contra mujeres, contra personas LGBTQTT y los prejuicios contra prácticas culturales y las tradiciones religiosas afrobrasileñas. Hablando de la metodología, fue utilizada la revisión teórica sobre esos temas en su interfaz con la educación. Aquí el término escuela es comprendido como la principal manifestación de la educación formal en el Occidente y desde el concepto de campo educacional, o sea, desde sus estructuraciones históricas, sociales, políticas, económicas y, sobre todo, culturales, mirada desde la cual la Antropología puede contribuir más. Una de las suposiciones antropológicas más importantes para la Educación Escolar es que, al contrario de lo que en general se cree en el sentido común, el comportamiento humano no depende tanto de la naturaleza, sino adviene, sobre todo, del aprendizaje en contextos colectivos. El principal reto de ese aporte teórico es demostrar algunos obstáculos en la relación entre escuela, campo educativo y cultura brasileña y hasta qué punto la escuela aún no está preparada para el reconocimiento y la aceptación de la diferencia y de la diversidad. En el texto es propuesto que la Antropología se vuelva más hacia la Educación y, especialmente una de sus aplicaciones prácticas, la Pedagogía, esté más abierta a las contribuciones del campo antropológico como hizo con relación a la Sociología y a la Psicología, por ejemplo.

Palabras clave: antropología y escuela; misoginia; LGBTQTTfobia; cultura afrobrasileña; educación indígena.

INTRODUCTION

According to Mariza Peirano (1983), Anthropology, along with Political Science and Sociology, is one of the three social sciences that seek to understand the human being in collective coexistence, from the macrostructural level of large societies to the micro level of face-to-face relationships in groups. Thus, the text presents some contributions of Anthropology to four major themes in vogue in school education and very pressing in the current Brazilian context of resurgence of anti-democratic and intolerant postures, including official ones: education aimed at indigenous people, coping with discrimination against women and LGBTTs at school and prejudice against cultural practices and Afro-Brazilian religious traditions.

Until reaching the dialogue between Anthropology and Education (or Social Work, for example), a long path was traveled so that such field of knowledge would understand that "simple people" were not synonymous with "backward peoples", as well as abandon the evolutionary character of the first theorists of the nineteenth century, who saw European society as "advanced" and, therefore, charged with "civilizing" other peoples. The most common themes at the beginning of the systematization of anthropological thought were issues related to religion and the family organization of peoples (LAPLANTINE, 1994).

One of the most important anthropological postulates, including for School Education, is that, contrary to what is commonly believed in common sense and opposed to what is conveyed by the media, human behavior does not depend as much on nature as other animals' do; what determines it most – from the ways of thinking, going through subjective tastes, to the deepest emotions – is the fact man lives in a society submerged in a culture. Therefore, among other things, anthropology is concerned with understanding human culture and how it influences other phenomena of life, such as art, religion and education, for example.

According to Neusa Gusmão (2015), this is the reason why there is some kind of learning inherent to the several collective daily experiences in any society. Thus, the school does not configure the only place where education takes place; however, in this work, only institutionalized education is focused, since it is the main context that establishes the distinction between a subject who teaches (the teacher) and a subject who learns (the student), stipulating that the process should take place in this specific space, based on contents and practices intentionally defined for this purpose.

Specifically in the context of formal education, the interference of Anthropology has been crucial in recent years, although, to date, the imbrications between Pedagogy (the systematized education itself) and Anthropology have been timid, in view of the strong influence of liberal individualism and the positivist philosophical currents proper to the Western world in the first field. Because of this,

[...] the strong presence of psychology has led the educational process to focus on educational action more than in the educational field. [...]. *Educational action* is practical and more prescriptive. It aims to internalize feelings, habits, values inherent to the social order. It concerns the positivist theories of society. *Educational field* seeks a comprehensive view of social reality, more interpretive, ordered by the political field and power relations. Its paradigm is the notion of conflict. It considers the dynamism of the production and reproduction of the social world (GUSMÃO, 2015, p. 22).

Thus, in this text, the main mode of manifestation of formal education in the West, the school, is understood from the concept of educational field, that is, from its broader historical, social, political, economic and, especially, cultural structuring, a vision with which Anthropology can contribute more fruitfully. In fact, the main objective of this theoretical contribution is to highlight some impasses of the relationship between school, educational field and Brazilian culture and how much the school is not yet prepared for the recognition and acceptance of diversity and difference. With regard to the methodology, a theoretical review on these themes in conjunction with education was made.

ANTHROPOLOGY OF EDUCATION: SOME DEFINITIONS AND BRIEF HISTORY

The Anthropology of Education began when the social sciences, in general, and Anthropology, in particular, started criticizing the formalism of traditional Pedagogy (FORQUIN, 1993)

from critical theoretical frameworks even directed to classical anthropology itself by Cultural Anthropology. In this scenario, the concept of culture was central. In fact, the concept of culture was consolidated in the critic of evolutionism and diffusionism made by the German anthropologist Franz Boas, living in the United States:

The Boasian conception of culture is founded on a methodological relativism, based on the recognition that every human being sees the world from the perspective of the culture in which he grew up – in an expression that has become famous, he said we are chained to the "shackles of tradition". [...] The perception of the relative value of all cultures – the word now appears in the plural, and not in the singular, as in the case of evolutionists – also served to help deal with the difficult questions posed to humanity by cultural diversity [...]. According to Boas, to understand the observable differences between populations of different origins, it was important not to consider their supposed "racial" characteristics, but rather the effect of other variables, such as the environment and, especially, the social conditions in which these populations live. [...] In this sense, he also rejected the alleged scientific validity of intelligence tests, which were then used to "prove" the inferiority of people "of color" in relation to whites (BOAS, 2005, p. 18-19).

Traditional pedagogy was accused of teaching content attached to models and conventions that induced totalizing ways of being, thinking, acting and knowing. Another criticism was that the contents of classical education would be time-free and transcultural, decontextualized and de-historicized. The forms of expression and thought, the aesthetic references, the moral values of industrialized Western society, in short, were transmitted in the processes of schooling as if they had always existed. In these terms, especially from the American Cultural Anthropology, the Anthropology of Education already has a few decades of existence in the academic sphere:

As a subdivision of the wider field of anthropology, anthropology of education has been in existence for many decades. In the United States, for instance, German-born Franz Boas founded the first department of anthropology of the Americas at Columbia University. His research in the field of anthropology of education began in the 1930s in Teachers College, the graduate center of education and education-related disciplines. The name of the current graduate program at Columbia University is not anthropology of education but rather anthropology and education. [...] the goal of its activities has been the use of anthropological approaches (sometimes uncritically) to reflect (critically) in regard to education and its practices (TADDEI; GAMBONI, 2016, p. 29).

Thus, in order to become teachable and didactic, scientific content and humanistic knowledge are often subordinated to a profound decontextualization and simplification, losing ties with the culture of origin to become empty elements of an abstract "scholastic culture" loose in time and space. This culture would be very similar, according to Bourdieu and Passeron (1990), to the culture of the ruling classes, hence the school would be the vehicle par excellence not of social ascension, but of reproduction of inequalities.

Therefore, the full scope and apprehension of the rules and cultural concepts made available by the school, especially those related to the classical arts and the literate culture, depend on the prior internalization of these knowledge and values within the family. In fact, in this perspective, the education systems, by charging everyone – in exams – what only a few bring in their cultural baggage, reproduce sociocultural inequalities. In short, the school, different from what postulates common sense and neoliberal theories, does not offer democratic access to knowledge and competences for all, but reinforces the distinctions of cultural capital that exist in the broader society (BOURDIEU; PASSERON, 1990).

Forquin (1993), in turn, against the universalist decontextualization of curricula and didactics, shows that the Anthropology of contemporary Education opposes demands for functionality, relevance and realism to pedagogical practices and contents, understanding education broadly, as preparation for life in society and not only as an introduction of isolated and abstract repertoires, merely canonical.

Although it is ancient, the dialogue between Education and Anthropology is still a field in formation, consolidated in the interface of these two fields of human sciences, whose driving axis is,

especially, the appropriation of methodological resources, gathered under the name of Ethnography(s), by researchers in Education. This eventually makes the interactions between Education and Anthropology problematic, as Simoni Guedes (2014) points out.

Although the theme of indigenous education and those related to gender and sexual orientation have been absent, this work is part of the broad context of new themes that arise in the field of Education, which has been requesting approximations with other human sciences, such as Anthropology, either in methodological or theoretical-conceptual terms. Therefore, the work can be seen as the demarcation of the need for greater appropriation of educational themes by anthropologists and, on the other hand, of the preemption that Education is enriched with theories and anthropological methodological resources, favoring dialogue between both areas.

In the present text, field is understood as recommended by Pierre Bourdieu (1988). According to the sociologist, field is the space of specific practices, relatively independent, endowed with its own history; the field guides the movement of agents, defining a universe of cultural issues, references and marks. The field is structured by the objective relations between the positions occupied by agents and institutions and determines the mode of their relations. What sets up a field are the positions, the competitive struggles, and the interests of the agents. Such struggles take place both within each field and externally, from the fields to each other. When referring to struggle and antagonistic fields, Bourdieu places them in relation to a power. The field is structured from the power relations and opposition of forces distributed between dominant positions and dominated positions of the subjects, which vary according to the symbolic, social, economic and cultural capital of the agents.

Well before these theorizations, in the beginning of the twentieth century, with thinkers such as Émile Durkheim, for example, studies in the social sciences about formal education and on schooling already emphasized that education should fundamentally stimulate, in each individual, the gregarious aspect, the notion of being member of a collectivity defined in space and time. As priority, education should mean the perpetuation of a culture, which constitutes the core of a specific society, through the process of socialization. In these terms, the social sciences found that "[...] the first task of education is to make the child conform to the culture within which he will grow: the school has a moral duty to inculcate in the child the traditions that reflect more specifically the spirit of the nation" (FORQUIN, 1993, p. 125).

From the 1970s, especially in countries that had been colonies of European nations, and starting from historically silenced groups – black people, women, homosexuals, indigenous peoples, gypsies etc. –, propositions advocating a formal education more "adapted" and respectful of the peculiarities of different groups and/or places inspired criticism of school education, accused of erasing local cultures and knowledge. In Gusmão's analysis (2015), the problem with polarized postures is that they treat current societies as if they were monolithic, disregarding that all societies are in some degree of relationships with others, neighboring or not, presenting changes and internal conflicts; as they intercepted by contradictory ideological and thought currents, societies are permanently unstable. Therefore, cultural pluralism does not only concern the relationship between different nations, but is part of reality within each society.

In the educational literature produced throughout the 1960s and 1970s on school failure and on performance asymmetries according to the social origin of students, in the wake of Bourdieusian Sociology, the so-called culturalist theory had a privileged place. The theory attributes such inequalities to cultural issues pertaining to individuals from different social classes, as well as to differences in socialization in family life. Thus, many subjects from certain social groups, compared to most of those from other classes or groups, would be closer to the demands, routines, practices and, mainly, school knowledge, which would favor (but would not determine) the first to have better school performance.

Thus, children from culturally and economically disadvantaged social classes would be more prone to school failure due to presenting a cultural deficit, which, in turn, would affect cognitive apprehension in general. However, many theorists claim that this issue has no connection with the fact that popular classes have a "poor culture", as is usually thought, but rather with the fact that the elements that structure their cultural set are not valued by the broader society and, therefore, do not integrate the programs and curricula instituted as academic and/or school (FORQUIN, 1993).

An indigenous person who enters a medical course, for example, will hardly come across learnings linked to the knowledge of plants, teas and herbs, acquired with their ancestors. He will come across models of allopathic pharmacological knowledge, while the student of chemical parents, in the same course, will already be, in a way, familiar with some terms, concepts and scientific theories that circulate there. Thus, the question of cultural deficit is not so much quantitative, but qualitative: which cultural elements are valued, which elements are neglected and/or invisible in school education.

Often, this "other" culture is even stigmatized and deconstructed by the so-called canonical science. As a result, it is common, throughout socialization, the phenomenon named by anthropologists as acculturation: individuals are encouraged to abandon certain knowledge and/or beliefs, seen as subcultures and/or superstitions, in favor of a dominant culture (TOSTA; ROCHA, 2009). However, in the field of human sciences, these subcultures, within educational spaces, can become a "culture of resistance" and, often, cause transformations in school culture and more general knowledge, replacing some curricular contents in new or other terms.

The problem of common curriculum is established in the face of demands for contextual and differentiated curricula. This is what happens, for example, in indigenous education or quilombola education, the so-called Pedagogy of Pertinence, centered on the community and the elements of local life, turning to a radical pluralism with regard to the curriculum. Throughout history, the emancipation of the masses is claimed to be necessarily linked to a universal project of basically unified schooling, claiming access of all to the same components of the curriculum and aiming for an alleged equality of opportunity for the various subjects.

In the case of pedagogy anchored in postmodernity, some of its educational and political implications are questionable, especially those linked to the idealized concept of community. Today, there is no longer the ideal situation of an individual who belongs to a single and cohesive group, especially in the reality of large metropolises. In these spaces, each person is inserted, on a voluntary or non-voluntary basis, in a plurality of collectivities, not rarely some contradictory to each other, whose values may be diametrically divergent from each other. Thus, the social reality is increasingly fluid and multiform, in which the individual relies on different resources, values and references. In this sense, speaking in a multicultural curriculum will always be arbitrary, with some privileged knowledge and neglected ones.

Forquin (1993), then, problematizes that, even in cases of minority groups with relatively fixed identities and limits, as is the case of Gypsies in Europe or Koreans in Brazil, would it be the case to keep them marginal to the more general formal education given to the rest of society? Which skills, cognitive and cultural elements would these individuals have in the future to move through society, compete for jobs, interact, communicate, in short?

Ministering a minimum of basic knowledge, references, symbols and common values to all school-age students in a country is an indispensable political and ethical demand. The public education was built on this pillar of support at the beginning of the 20th century, presupposing the access of all individuals (albeit theoretically) to a core of cognitive experiences. On the other hand, the several social movements began to point out, from the end of the same twentieth century, that ethnic, religious, socioeconomic, gender and sexual orientation peculiarities, among others, could not be silenced in this process (TOSTA; ROCHA, 2009). Thus, the Anthropology of Education is recently faced with such dilemma, inextricably linked to the exercise of citizenship.

The crux of the issue is not to exclude the difference within school education – the specificities cannot be erased by a monological, macrostructural and authoritarian educational system, nor can there be a reduction of the subject to a single identity that deprives him of intellectual development and expansion of knowledge. Thus, because a student belongs to a group, the most comprehensive schooling cannot be exempted from teaching him certain theories or historical knowledge arbitrarily deemed by the school as not concerning his immediate and cultural reality; one should not have his formal education restricted to so-called "localism".

With regard to epistemology, the Anthropology of Education suggests educators to question what is considered "close" and what is seen as "distant" when it comes to real contexts, that is, "[...] how can we not see, in fact, that the true understanding of the immediate environment involves precisely the mediation of the most general and abstract knowledge?" (FORQUIN, 1993, p. 134). Thus, education must lead the student to the transition from a more ethnocentered, intuitive and operational worldview

to a more decentered, conceptual and global, cognitive process mediated by the most general and abstract categories, models and formulas. In summary, schooling should help subjects to make the transition from playful to logical, certainly without the devaluation and abandonment of the first element.

If the radically particularistic and contextual education is criticized for the risk of a certain lowering of the levels of performance requirement and abstraction, its opposite, free and canonical education, is also disapproved, particularly by anthropologists of post-structuralist education, due to its arbitrariness, since educators retain the prerogative to define what is pedagogically and culturally relevant (or not) to be taught/learned. As Dayrell (2001) shows, such arbitrariness combined with the reduction of collective solidarity may generate frustration and negative educational experiences, making the school being seen as a space to be attended merely by obligation, and its routines to be lived as simple bureaucracies, without real relation to the subjects' lives.

This process of educational decline, partly resulting from growing individualism in large cities, can lead to an even greater anomy (discredit and detachment from social values) and, in the extreme, foster violent practices, whether symbolic (rejection of school content and science) or physical (aggression to colleagues, teachers, etc.). This process is, at the same time, an effect and cause of the abandonment of the essential objective of the school, which is to socialize individuals, and the neoliberal emphasis on individual success, seen as insertion in the labor market. Therefore, an inclusive education should seek to bring community and immediate knowledge together with more theoretical and abstract knowledge (DAYRELL, 2001).

FOUR SCHOOL ASPECTS TO WHICH ANTHROPOLOGY CAN CONTRIBUTE

Some of the specific school realities to which Anthropology can contribute are still little explored, such as the education of native peoples – not only in Brazil, but in Latin America in general – gender issues – especially discrimination against women in educational contexts – the theme of sexuality, mainly discrimination against LGBTTT subjects, and ethnic-racial discrimination against cultural manifestations, especially religious, of African origin, a prejudice that is evident in textbooks and curricula, for example.

With regard to Indigenous Education, at the beginning of the 1990s, several civil associations and collective entities, headed by the Union of Indigenous Nations (UNI), become responsible for the issue in reference, seeking to understand their problems, question their complexity, rethink the directions they were taking and, above all, support and defend the remnants of the first peoples, then threatened with extinction (SILVA, 2001). Among these fronts, indigenous school education was one of the most primary.

Brazilian indigenous peoples have their own schooling processes which, even transmitting more general and consecrated knowledge of Western society, are individualized by preserving the traditional ways of seeing the world and acting, as well as native languages. This specific teaching is taught by other indigenous peoples who have attended a particular modality of teaching, the Indigenous Degree, which enables them to act as teachers in elementary and high schools within their home villages.

The training courses of this specific teacher are based on the Pedagogy of Alternation, that is, the indigenous leave the villages, go to universities, attend classes intensively for about a month or two, then return to the tribes, where they perform activities taught by teachers and study autonomously, in groups or individually. The Ministry of Education offers financial support for them to remain in the cities, and such courses are taught by federal universities, as is the case of UFMG through the Faculty of Education, for example. One of the criteria for the selection of the student is that he not only descends from native peoples, but that he lives in a village and shares traditional experiences specific to his culture.

It is worth mentioning, with Ciaramello (2014), that indigenous "schooling" is not recent in the country, having practically begun with Portuguese colonization, in jesuit missions, in which the objective was to catechize "the Indians", alphabetize them in Portuguese and "civilize them". In 1910, the SPI, Indian Protection Service, was created, which was nothing more than the state search to insert the natives in the process of economic interiorization of Brazil, in this case, through school education. Later, under the Military Dictatorship, indigenous schooling took place through an international

program, the SIL (*Summer Institute of Linguistic*), with the proposal not to accept differences, but with basically Catholic and, above all, Protestant missionary bias towards the natives.

From the 1960s on, Anthropology has focused more intensely on the ethnological studies of indigenous peoples, especially scientists such as Darcy Ribeiro, for example. Among the various themes of interest of researchers was informal education, that is, the one which takes place in religious rituals, within villages, in hunting, fishing, extractivism, ritualistic practices. However, Anthropology granted little attention to formal educational practices (school). This remained especially under the attention of activists, NGOs, teachers, pedagogues or public servants of bodies such as FUNAI, showing considerable cleavage between those who discussed spontaneous and daily education and those who practiced (but little theorized) the schooled education of the natives.

According to Silva (2001), the problem core of the meeting between the two areas – Anthropology and Education – is the possibility of an anthropological treatment of indigenous school education that deal not only with the theoretical framework of current South American Ethnology, but also with themes approached by Education and Pedagogy. A central theme in this proposal concerns the differences in the ways of thinking of the Amerindian in relation to Western society, especially with regard to the opposition nature/culture and the concept of human being. The researcher also mentions that the organization of indigenous schools in Brazil began in the mid-1970s, from social movements for the indigenous cause, giving rise to the so-called Differentiated Education.

A milestone in this process occurred in 1994 with the creation of the Indigenous School Education Program, whose guidelines were put into practice two years later, with the publication of the Law of Guidelines and Bases of Education, when schooling began to consider the ways of life, values, traditions and time markers proper to indigenous peoples, respecting ethnic diversity. Finally, it is worth mentioning that Basic Indigenous Education is offered in educational institutions inscribed in their own territories and, therefore, require particular pedagogy to respect the ethnic and historical peculiarities of each people. It is also essential that classes are bilingual, that is, in Portuguese and in the native language of the village where the school is located. In addition, like quilombola schools, such teaching units have autonomy to define their own calendars, festivities and holidays according to their cultural specificities and/or their traditional economic modes.

With regard to discrimination against women and homosexuals, in formal educational contexts, it is worth remembering that sexism and LGBTTphobia² are expressions of prejudice and discrimination present in political discussions and social movements since the end of the 20th century. In parallel, some school professionals have also observed that gender bias is one of the aspects that most affect the performance of those who attend school (FREITAS, 2018). Among the most common discriminatory practices, LGBTTphobia stands out, which is, briefly, prejudice and discrimination based on the sexual orientation and/or gender identity of the other, being directed to homosexual, bisexual, transvestite and transsexual people and/or groups.

According to Marcella Gomes *et al.* (2014), sexism is gender-based prejudice and discrimination, generally directed at women, with misogyny being the most common modality, that is, rejection of what is female. Especially post-structuralist feminist scholars have shown that school cultures tend to weave expectations, as well as to treat individuals in their community (students, teachers, employees and parents) according to dominant conceptions of social class, race/ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation. In the case of gender, historically the school has contributed to produce and reinforce many inequalities and prejudices (LOURO, 2003). This *ethos* marginalizes those who do not fit the hegemonic and authoritatively stipulated rules.

Thus, the school routinely ratifies and co-orses with symbolic and often physical, misogynistic and LGBTTfphobic violence. This means that educational institutions often promote these prejudices and discriminations unintentionally, since certain gender patterns are so incorporated into the daily school culture that the professionals who work there often do not realize they are putting discriminatory actions in place. Moreover, it is necessary to point out that women, transsexuals and poor

² The term LGBTTphobia is broader and encompasses different sexual practices and desires, as well as gender identities that do not fit the heterosexuality and female/male duality imposed on subjects in Western culture for millennia. For better clarification of the terms, see the editorial of a militant journalist in: <http://www.ihu.unisinos.br/78-noticias/579113-por-que-melhor-usar-o-termo-lgbtphobia-no-lugar-de-LGBTTphobia>.

and/or black homosexuals experience this violence differently if contrasted with homosexuals/transsexuals and women from the upper and/or white classes, for example.

Discrimination and prejudice are related terms, and may affect the same individual simultaneously, but they are not the same thing. Prejudice designates cultural constructions and negative cultural and/or psychic representations to individuals and/or groups considered inferior. Discrimination, in turn, refers to the realization, in the context of social and/or institutional interactions (including educational systems), of negative and/or aggressive attitudes departing from prejudiced mentalities and/or predispositions, generating the violation of fundamental human rights; in other words, discrimination would be the materialization of attitudes, values, ideas, conceptions and *ethos* prejudiced.

At school, these discussions are still practically taboo, although research on relations between gender, sexuality and learning (in this case, informal) began in the 1950s with the American anthropologists Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead, researchers of the current known as Culture and Personality (GOMES *et al.*, 2014), and former students of Franz Boaz. Heteronormativity, as an individual rule for sexual orientation, concerns its institutionalization as a cultural, political, economic, legal and religious standard – in a word, social. In school education, such process occurs explicitly and, overly, implicitly.

The institutionalization of heterosexuality is legitimized in all social fields: family, media, laws and school. One of the most harmful educational aspects of it is that homosexuality/heterosexuality binarism functions as a criterion for assessing the dignity of individuals and to facilitate or prevent people's access to material (one-use, e.g.) and symbolic goods, such as certain curricular contents and even scientific theories.

In these terms, it is urgent to reevaluate educational practices and discourses (didactics and curricula), because LGBTTphobia is a more extensive social construction, resulting from society, and crosses other socializing instances (church, family, sports), often being reproduced in school institutions, sustaining the sexist dichotomous logic and providing the exclusion of certain subjects. According to Louro (2003), this binarist sociocultural pattern classifies, hierarchizes, subordinates and excludes the pole constituted by the female sex, homosexual, trans and bisexual people.

In school culture, LGBTTphobia is generally materialized in verbal and physical aggressions, generating isolation, disorders and psychic suffering, causing school dropout, repetition or even aversion to that space, causing trauma in relation to educational institutions that can last a lifetime. With regard to teachers. The most common conduct is to consider LGBTTphobic jokes as innocent jokes, neglecting the situations of *bullying* or, what is more serious, also having violent (verbal) behaviors against these individuals.

There is a close relation between LGBTTphobia and misogyny, and this imbrication is based on heterosexism. Thus, gender inequality is built in our society by the opposition between male and female. Thus, homosexuality jeopardizes the fragilely maintained stability of sexual and gender identities, both structured by historical and culturally articulated man/woman binarism. Gender relations (or social relations between the sexes in France) concern differences in behavior, thoughts, values, symbols, social roles, exercise of power and access to economic goods, among other aspects, created by societies based on anatomical differences between women and men. Thus, femininity and masculinity are presented and experienced as distinct not for biological reasons, but because people are educated, cultured, in different ways, according to the sex attributed to them (GOMES *et al.*, 2014).

Regarding schooling specifically, the non-neutrality of teaching and learning processes, or the case of the supposed "natural" affinity of boys for the area of exact sciences and girls for the area of human sciences have long been recognized. Although real, these tendencies are not natural, but rather cultural facts built by society. Likewise, such cultural constructions have influenced the inclusion or exclusion of certain contents in teaching throughout history. In school micropolitics, access to knowledge is generally not the same for all individuals.

Its effects impose material and symbolic limitations on how much and what an individual can learn according to sex, influencing their behavior, self-confidence and opportunities in life. Several researches illustrate the non-neutrality in the teacher-knowledge-student interaction (LOURO, 2003; FREITAS, 2018). The construction of preferences and dislikes for certain fields of knowledge are socio-pedagogical phenomena, influencing the insertion or exclusion of subjects in society and causing the

existence of differentiated access to knowledge according to the prevailing gender relations in a given context.

In the same way as science, schools, according to Louro (2003), in their micropolitics, also deal with permitted or interdicted knowledge according to the sex of individuals. This discriminatory access, in general, does not occur consciously, but is hidden in "good deeds" by teachers, for example, assuming that girls are more "fragile" and should be spared from certain Physical Education practices, or on the contrary, to believe that enduring pain "is a man's thing" and that is why it is natural to submit children to physical and/or psychological suffering.

The negative implications of these school practices are to impose artificial limits (that is, they are created, they are not biological) on how much and what an individual can learn, influencing their behavior and possibilities in the groups they belong to. In this way, school situations are the result of the school's perception of those who will or those who will not have access to certain knowledge. The differentiated form of access to knowledge and activities at school for girls and boys can, therefore, define behavior patterns in school trajectories and influence school success and/or failure and which professions they will tend to seek.

Ethnographic studies, such as those by Guedes (2014), revealed that boys' speeches in the classroom are more heard and that curiosity in boys is more instigated, while the activities suggested to girls are more "predictable", that is, less challenging; in general they are given ready-made "fitting models", which they should simply fill in or follow, without being prompted to build knowledge. Thus, there are several situations in the classroom in which both sexes are treated differently, a discrimination that is generally thoughtless and not purposeful, since it is internalized since childhood (GOMES et al, 2014).

Still on the articulation of LGBTT-phobic prejudice and gender prejudice, the anthropologist Richard Parker (2002) is prodigal in demonstrating how gender inequality is more blatant in Brazil with homosexuals, seen as female, lesbians, seen as male, and with male and female transsexuals in several institutional environments, such as the school. Indeed, if today's jokes about black people or the Jewish holocaust, for example, are unacceptable, mockery involving sexual orientation is still admitted without major problems, as it is seen in Physical Education classes in particular and in sports in general; or else, the non-compliance with the regulations for the use of the social name in educational institutions.

Indeed, the fight against LGBTTphobia and misogyny in school education requires, in addition to questioning the sexist assumptions that have already been criticized by feminism, that compulsory heterosexuality also be questioned as a cultural rule of normality. Studies with high school students revealed that, on a more or less severe scale, "beating homosexuals" is seen as something less serious than involvement with drugs or theft, for example (National Committee on Human Rights Education, 2003, *apud* GOMES *et al.*, 2014). Thus, public policies aimed at education have the role of discussing culturally produced prejudices and effecting real equity among individuals, questioning norms when they are authoritarian, violating and oppressive.

Regarding Afro-Brazilian ethnic-racial issues, education in Brazil is identified, either by academic research or by black social movements, as a time/place where historical racial and social inequalities remain, according to Nilma Lino Gomes (2011). This configuration demands, on the part of the State, the adoption of practices and policies to overcome socioeconomic inequality and racism in education, and some practices in this sense began to be implemented more systematically in the country only from the 2000s onwards.

According to Marcus Fonseca (2016), Brazil stands out for being one of the largest multiracial societies on the planet, sheltering a significant contingent of people of color and Afro-descendants. This ethnic-racial characteristic is the target of studies and actions by the black movement and scientists who are interested in racial relations in the country, understanding as black the group of black and brown populations. The distribution of schooling indices, according to the color of Brazilians, shows that there are no significant distinctions between "blacks" and "browns" that justify such groups being analyzed separately.

In such a social, cultural, historical, political and economic scenario, black Brazilian subjects articulate their identities which, as such, are the result of simultaneous individual and social processes, materialized at the intersection with other categories such as gender, religion, rural or urban environment,

class and age group, in a context marked by ambiguous racism and permanent social inequality. From the black movements, race is understood as a social, historical and cultural construction for the classification of groups and individuals, although more recent research in the field of genetics has shown that it is inappropriate to speak of "races" for the whole of humanity from the biological point of view.

Several studies have shown the struggle of the Brazilian black population to overcome racism over time (GOMES, 2011; FONSECA, 2016), whether in the form of quilombos, abolitionist movements, through associations and their own press. However, it was in the 1980s, during redemocratization, that a new mode of political action for black movements in the country took place. From then on, intellectuals and activists began to question the exclusive focus of social class on actions and reflections on social inequality. They began to criticize public institutions, the left and social movements that existed until then about the omission of their practices in relation to the influence of racial issues on the permanence of poverty and exclusion.

Like women, with exceptions, black people remain underrepresented and placed in a subordinate way in the highest levels of power of large corporations and public institutions. Therefore, in the demands made by activists, a theme was always present due to its strategic character in society: education. However, black activists and intellectuals are aware that education is not the only way out for all social ills, despite having an important role in the process of self-knowledge and contributing to the formation of subjects who may occupy spaces of economic and/or political power, in addition to what is used by the labor market as a question of social inclusion/exclusion.

According to Gomes (2011), research conducted in recent decades indicates that the educational field has been producing and reproducing a systematic picture of ethnic-racial inequalities. This was most strongly evidenced with the consolidation of postgraduate courses in Education in the 1970s. In the context, groups of black intellectuals from public universities began to produce knowledge about ethnic-racial issues in the country. Among the issues addressed by early scholars are racial discrimination conveyed by textbooks, the urgency of inserting racial issues and issues related to the history of Africa in curricula and silence regarding open and, especially, veiled discrimination in schools. Consequently, the first theorists pointed out how the school was an institution that reproduced and ratified racism in Brazil.

This resulted in criticism of educational policies and triggered pressure on the Ministry of Education and on the managers of educational institutions and public schools concerning the role of education in overcoming racism in society (GOMES, 2011). Moreover, even though in the elaboration of the 1988 Constituent and the Law of Guidelines and Bases of Education (Law no. 9,394/1996) there was broad participation of black movements, the debates held around this theme were emptied of their political content by parliamentarians of the time. In addition, as Fonseca (2016) points out, the entry of black people into graduate courses has streamlined the themes of research, especially in the field of human sciences; a similar process occurred in relation to studies on women since the 1970s and studies on homosexuality in the 1980s.

This situation was only reviewed and altered with the sanction of Law No. 10,639/2003, which made it mandatory to teach the History of Africa and Afro-Brazilian Cultures in private and public schools in elementary and high schools. Therefore, until the 1990s, the struggle of the black movement in Brazil, with regard to education, required the introduction of the racial issue within public policies for universal education, focusing especially on basic education and access to higher education (FONSECA, 2016). However, when the black movement realized that official education was not committed to the change in racial subordination that had prevailed in the country for centuries, its claims rose in tone.

Struggles for Affirmative Action inspired by the achievements for the civil rights of African Americans began to be configured, initiatives that, at the end of the 1990s, were materialized in many university contexts. In this sense, the demands of black movements concerning education revolve two main poles: access to formal education, from basic level to university, as a social right, and the defense of the right to cultural and religious diversity. In 1997, the cross-sectional theme named Cultural Plurality was introduced in the National Curriculum Parameters (PCNs). However, according to Gomes (2011), the racial theme continued to be diluted in the discourse of cultural plurality and folkloricism, distantiating its teaching of political character and exempt from criticism of racism ingrained in Brazilian society.

Another criticism of the black movement is that pcns have a relatively conteudist character, assuming that the insertion of "sociocultural issues" transversalizing the curriculum would be sufficient to deal pedagogically with issues related to racial discrimination. Reinforced by official data prepared by the Institute of Applied Economic Research (IPEA), numerous entities of the black movement envisioned that this was the time to introduce affirmative action in the country and denounce that education had been a social phenomenon that contributed to the permanence of racial inequalities (GOMES, 2011).

Thus, educational policies were required to promote equity as one of the ways to guarantee the various collectives the realization of equal rights and opportunities; an equality based on recognition of and respect for the difference and which meant real overcoming of historical injustices coming from discrimination and racial exclusion. From 2003, this debate is deepened, and, for the first time in the federal government, a special secretariat for the promotion of racial equality is established. In the Ministry of Education, in 2004, the Secretariat of Continuing Education, Literacy and Diversity (SECAD) was created, recently extinguished by the far-right government sworn in on January 1, 2019, which represents a huge setback for Brazil in relation to concrete actions to mitigate structural racism.

"It is in this context that law no. 10,639, 01/2003 is finally sanctioned, amending law n.9.394/96 – Law of Guidelines and Bases of Education" (GOMES, 2011, p. 115). However, its effective implementation in curricula and educational practices has been one of the challenges of black social movements in the present. In March 2008, this law was amended, also counting on the history and culture of Brazilian indigenous peoples and being configured as an educational policy of the State, since it is a Law of Guidelines and Bases of Education, and not a particular legislation of the black population. In this sense, it has national coverage and should be implemented in all private and public school institutions in the country, as well as by universities, at all levels of education.

The implementation of this law depends, however, on greater mobilization of civil society in the sense that the right to ethnic-racial diversity is actually guaranteed in school curricula, political-pedagogical projects and teacher training, for example. It is a modality of politics that has been unusual in Brazil, because it is focused on valuing memory, culture and black identity through education. However, Gomes (2011) considers that the existence of legislation does not mean that it automatically becomes complex in school practices, because the guidelines and the law are confronted with discriminatory daily practices and a prejudiced collective imaginary, rooted in Brazilian society for centuries, which are materialized in the functioning and structuring of the country's education, with the belief in racial democracy, cordial racism, the ideology of bleaching and the naturalization of socioeconomic inequalities.

The change in this situation implies inserting the racial issue in the most general educational goals of Brazil in a forceful and critical way, going beyond the adoption of punctual and discontinuous projects focused on ethnic-racial themes. Gomes (2011) points out the national republican ideal is still resistant especially with regard to diversity, historically being marked by universalist and allegedly neutral public policies. Thus, the school still contributes little to the understanding of the ethnic-racial diversity of Brazil and to the understanding of how this is a political issue intersiled by power relations, the world of labor, knowledge and how it classifies and hierarchizes socially and racially the society.

Finally, about the methodological relations between School Education and Anthropology, ethnography, an anthropological method par excellence of data collection through the experience in groups, has been useful for those who research concrete educational practices, as is the case, for example, of quilombola education (CARRIL, 2017). In fact, one of the pioneering studies of the use of ethnographic procedures in the education performed in quilombos was undertaken with the Kalungas of northern Goiás. The investigation began from a pedagogical action whose scope was the affirmation of black identity and local history in community schools and it was result of the work of the project's interdisciplinary team – teachers/es, anthropologists, pedagogues, community members and students.

In this specific case, we intended to contribute with a more complex and less folklorist apprehension of this collectivity, a vision crossed by pedagogical phenomena and that contributed to understanding the peculiar dynamics of the quilombola community school, allowing the identification and deepening of the categories of representations and collective practices that support sociability, conflicts and the transmission of Afro-Brazilian traditions in that context. For this, the use of "[...]

theoretical and methodological instruments of anthropology – an academic discipline whose intention is (only) to analyze and know – to understand and contribute to pedagogy, that is, a practice that aims, first of all, to intervene" (GUEDES, 2014, p. 7).

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The core of anthropological thought – the human being question himself collectively in comparison to others and question other cultures – exists from ancient Greece, among all peoples, such as Mayans or Chinese, for example; however, anthropology emerged as a science only in the mid-nineteenth century in Europe. The main peculiarity of Anthropology in relation to other human sciences, such as Psychology or Sociology, is to face the culture lived and employ the comparative method in studies, not in the sense of trying to reduce one society to another, but understanding that what is familiar and what is strange is, after all, a relative question: depends on the place of who observes the other.

Education, on the other hand, is not a neutral and impartial phenomenon as it is generally thought. Broader political and cultural issues permanently run through the teaching and learning processes; some of these processes brought here, such as the indigenous school, Afro-Brazilian culture and gender and sexual orientation issues, make certain individuals have access to knowledge differently, even if this is not prescribed in official school public documents and policies.

Thus, the text highlighted the centrality of educational processes in combating the numerous prejudices – racism, sexism and LGBTTphobia, among others – promoting practices that favor the building of an equitable society and with respectful citizens (not only tolerant) in relation to different behaviors and groups. The school – professionals, parents and the student – still reflects the widespread social ignorance that discriminating is a form of violence. In addition, there is a relative lack of preparation of educators to deal with such situations in daily life. In this case, the anthropological view can contribute to lead to a familiarization with what is considered "strange" and "exotic" and to a strangeness of what is given as "familiar" and "normal".

In turn, the educational field, by resorting to Anthropology, contributes for it not being close only to the academy and distant from the concrete problems of the society in which it is produced. In fact, the interface between fields of knowledge, such as the Anthropology of Education proposed here, favors that the theories and academics who elaborate them engage politically, helping to deconstruct the image that is often found in fields such as anthropology or philosophy: they cannot have practical application and should be focused only on contemplative abstractions about the real, rarely intervening in it. However, it is not advocated here that fields such as Anthropology or Philosophy MUST necessarily be instrumental, but rather that THEY CAN be practical, especially when in interaction with other fields, such as the aforementioned Pedagogy, Communication or Social Work, for example.

Moreover, we noticed there is still a tendency among some educational agents to hierarchize social inequalities, therefore, racial inequality is placed as dependent on economic inequality. As a consequence, the isolated performance of some teachers is still the most common practice in schools towards a more incisive attitude towards ethnic-racial inequalities, for example.

In these terms, any investigation on educational policies in Brazil cannot neglect the issue of diversity and ethnic-racial, gender and sexual inequalities. Finally, Gusmão's statement (2015, p. 34) is not as a conclusive assis, but as a question and provocation for future investigations that aggregate Anthropology and Education: "In fact, in Brazil, in the first half of the 20th century, sociology looked more closely at education than anthropology [...]. The absence or scarcity in the tradition of anthropological studies on education theme in the Brazilian case may be something to be considered."

In summary, it is recommended that, as with Sociology, Anthropology also turns more to Education and that it, especially in its practical application, in this case, school education, be enriched even more from anthropological contributions, as it has been doing regarding Sociology and Psychology. In a more pragmatic perspective, Anthropology can bring to education, in times of hardening of pedagogical postures, a more inclusive and relativistic view, that is, the perception that there is not only a pattern of behavior, knowledge or thought; the worldview of my group is only one and not "the" world view, and subjects should not be evaluated for their sexual condition, gender or depending on their race/ethnicity.

* The translation of this article into English was funded by the Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de Minas Gerais – FAPEMIG – through the program of supporting the publication of institutional scientific journals

REFERENCES

- BOAS, Franz. *Antropologia Cultural*. 2 ed. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar editores, 2005.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre.; PASSERON, Jean-Claude. *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London: Sage, 1990.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. *Cosas dichas*. Buenos Aires: Gadisa, 1988.
- CARRIL, Lourdes de F. B. Os desafios da educação quilombola no Brasil. O território como contexto e texto. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, v. 22, n. 69, p. 539-564, abr./jun. 2017.
- CIARAMELLO, Patrícia R. Escolarização indígena, cultura e educação. *Educação, Sociedade & Cultura*, n. 41, p. 109-125, 2014.
- DAYRELL, Juarez. *A escola como espaço sócio-cultural*. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 2001.
- FORQUIN, Jean-Claude. *Escola e Cultura*. As bases sociais e epistemológicas do conhecimento escolar. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas, 1993.
- FONSECA, Marcus V. *A história da educação dos negros no Brasil*. Niterói: Editora UFF, 2016.
- FREITAS, Marcel A. *Mulheres cientistas*. Percursos e percalços a partir da realidade da UFMG. Belo Horizonte: Conhecimento, 2018.
- GOMES, Nilma L. Diversidade étnico-racial, inclusão e equidade na educação brasileira: desafios, políticas e práticas. *Revista Brasileira de Política e Administração em Educação*, v. 21, n. 1, p. 109-121, jan./abr. 2011.
- GOMES, Marcella M.; BROCHADO, Mariah; LIPOVETSKY, Nathália (orgs). *Curso de Aperfeiçoamento Paideia Jurídica na Escola: educação em direitos humanos para uma consciência jurídica cidadã*. Belo Horizonte: CAED/UFMG, 2014.
- GUEDES, Simoni L. Por uma abordagem etnográfica dos contextos pedagógicos. In: GUEDES, Simoni L.; CIPINIUK, Tatiana A. *Abordagens etnográficas sobre educação: adentrando os muros das escolas*. Niterói: Alternativa, 2014, p. 7-10.
- GUSMÃO, Neusa M. M. Antropologia e educação: um campo e muitos caminhos. *Linhas Críticas*, v. 21, n. 44, p. 19-37, jan/abr. 2015.
- LAPLANTINE, François. *Aprender Antropologia*. 8. ed. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1994.
- LOURO, Guacira L. *Corpos, gênero e sexualidade: um debate contemporâneo na educação*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2003.
- PARKER, Richard. *Abaixo do Equador*. São Paulo: Record, 2002.

PEIRANO, Mariza. Etnocentrismo às avessas: o conceito de ‘sociedade complexa’. *Dados – Revista de Ciências Sociais*, v. 26, n. 1, p. 97-115, 1983.

SILVA, Aracy L. Uma ‘Antropologia da Educação’ no Brasil? Reflexões a partir da escolarização indígena. In: SILVA, Aracy L.; FERREIRA, Mariana K. L. (orgs). *Antropologia, História e Educação. A questão indígena e a escola*. 2 ed. São Paulo: Global, 2001, p. 29-43.

TADDEI, Renzo; GAMBOGGI, Ana Laura. Education, anthropology, ontologies. *Revista Educação e Pesquisa*, v. 42, n. 1, p. 27-38, jan./mar. 2016.

TOSTA, Sandra; ROCHA, Gilmar. *Antropologia & Educação*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2009.

Submitted: 30/01/2020

Approved: 24/01/2021