

Introduction to teaching anthropology



<https://doi.org/10.56238/ptoketheeducati-003>

Adelcio Machado dos Santos

Ph.D. in Engineering and Knowledge Management (UFSC). Post-Doctorate in Knowledge Management (UFSC). Professor, researcher, and advisor of the Graduate Program in Education of the Alto Vale do Rio do Peixe University (UNIARP).
 E-mail: adelciomachado@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Education, in the final analysis, consists of the vital process of personality development and formation; Education is not to be confused with the mere adaptation of the individual to the environment. It is

a creative activity that encompasses man in all his aspects; it begins in the family, continues in school, and continues throughout human existence. Anthropology, for its part, collimates exhibiting the diversity of human beings to better understand human ontology. Thus, this discipline tries to understand humanity in all its complexity without simplifying and denying autonomy. This is the reason why she is interested, above all, in the difference between cultures, historical periods, groups, and individuals. Education and Anthropology are intricately connected, as a human being means being able to graduate.

Keywords: Education, Teaching, Anthropology.

1 INTRODUCTION

For Benevides (1996), Education involves the formation of the human being to develop the potentialities of knowledge, judgment, and choice to live consciously in society.

In this same sense, it corroborates MOTTA (1997) that Education is a process that man goes through to achieve learning, which provides knowledge, the development of cognitive and psychomotor skills, and effectivity. It always involves two or more interlocutors, designated educators and learners, uses an educational method, in a constant movement of transmission.

Education consists of action, by which a person or groups of people acquire general, scientific, artistic, technical and specialized knowledge, to develop their capacity or aptitudes. In addition to knowledge, the person also acquires, through Education, certain habits and attitudes.

It can be developed in educational establishments specially organized for this purpose, such as elementary schools, colleges, musical conservatories, universities, or through everyday experience, through personal contacts, reading newspapers, magazines, books, appreciation of paintings, sculptures, films, musical and theater plays, trips and conferences.

In line with the teaching of Wulf (2005), anthropological knowledge has an important role both in the field of educational sciences and in the field of Pedagogy.

Immediately, a new dimension of pedagogical knowledge emerges called pedagogical anthropology or, to put it more precisely, the historical and cultural anthropology of Education.



2 ANTHROPOLOGY OF EDUCATION

This designation opens the scene of one of the most innovative and challenging debates in Education today: the overcoming of fixed and closed systems of principles and values, by a historical and cultural perspective and, therefore, always provisional and relative to pedagogy.

In the 60s and 70s, Educational Anthropology was interested only in the child seeing in him only a *homo educandus*. It highlighted general aspects about the Education of children, their vocation, inferring historical-cultural conditions about them (SANTOS; Regert, 2020). The different cultural and historical aspects among children from all over the world, as already analyzed in Cultural Anthropology, in the Anglo-Saxon region, seemed until then the least interesting (WULF, 2005).

At the beginning of the 90s, when the double historicity and the domain of historical anthropology were unveiled, a change of tactics could be effected. In the 90s, several attempts were made to use this discovery to advance historical-pedagogical anthropology (SANTOS; Regert, 2020).

One comes to understand the meaning and scope of comparative anthropology, which consists in the articulation of a general perspective with a particular vision of approach to human nature.

According to the conception of Von Humboldt, comparative anthropology has its particularity in the fact that it deals with an empirical matter in a speculative way, a historical fact in a philosophical way and human nature in the sense of its possible development (WULF, 2005).

Anthropology is therefore no longer solely empirical or solely philosophical. It is, on the contrary, a matter of reconciling the philosophical and the empirical, of understanding a historical fact within a philosophical perspective, to discover a possible evolution of human nature.

In establishing this relationship between philosophy and empiricism, between the transcendental and the historical, Von Humboldt¹ engages in a historical-anthropological study guided by philosophy.

To the extent that this study has as its task to highlight the possibilities of development, the objectives of anthropology are added to those of Education. Therefore, the gaze is directed to explore the differences between culture, historical periods and individuals, without establishing a fixed and ultimate norm.

Thus, Anthropology seeks to expose the particularities of the moral characteristic of man by comparing them between the different origins of the human being, not forgetting that man lives in groups and forms societies as a whole (SANTOS; Regert, 2020).

Knowledge of the moral characteristic seems to be the main goal of anthropology. The task of anthropology is to explore the cultural differences between individuals and society.

Although the difference between human types is very important, it is also indispensable to recognize that individuals and societies form a whole (SANTOS; Regert, 2018).

¹ Alexander Von Humboldt was a naturalist who developed and specialized in several areas (ANDRADE, 2019).



Therefore, such a Science aims, on the one hand, to explore the differences between societies, cultures and individuals; on the other, it is about understanding the ideal of humanity in all its diversity and contingency.

In addition to anthropological research is responsible for discovering the diversity of characteristics in societies, of different individuals and human groupings, it is necessary to define the notion of characteristic.

Comparative Anthropology tends to reconstruct the character of the human being from his expressions and his manners (SANTOS; Regert, 2018).

It is about understanding your traits, the relationship of forces that move you and your inner strength and perfection, much more than your outer attitudes and ends.

When analyzing the individual, it is necessary to distinguish what is essential from what is accessory, from understanding in time and history, as well as his openness to the future.

Finally, it is necessary to synthesize the diversity of phenomena into the highest unity. Thus, anthropology has the task of analyzing the scope of the diversity of men without disregarding identity.

The knowledge of the human being and his Education are intrinsically linked. Practicing Education with the human being is impossible without knowing him, without anthropological studies being carried out. For its part, anthropology aims to educate man and the entire human species (SANTOS; Regert, 2020).

The relationship between anthropology and the theory of Education is contingent, there are many possibilities to determine the link between the two and to realize one of its possibilities, after making a choice (SANTOS; Regert, 2020).

If the relationship between anthropology and Education is considered as contingent, this relationship requires a thorough and cautious investigation, being open and variable, with positioning to each new situation (SANTOS; Regert, 2020).

This opening of possibilities requires a choice, for it must be delimited in each specific historical situation.

As previously presented, man as an individual has his culture and lives in groups, anthropological knowledge is acquired through the investigation of different cultures and societies. It helps to understand specifically each culture, each group and each human being (SANTOS; Regert, 2020).

According to Wulf (2005), the effort to understand man globally, advancing beyond the individual and including differences and contingencies, becomes a challenge for historical and cultural anthropology. Education aims to link external conditions of society with internal conditions of the individual (SANTOS; Regert, 2020).



For such processes to result in success, it is necessary that man be free and that society allows sufficient access to Education. Only in this way can a complex culture be produced.

The results of these education processes are open to the future. This means that Education believes in the infinite character of the process of educating and forming man, counting on the unknown and the uncertain future (SANTOS; Regert, 2020).

For Von Humboldt, language unifies his conception of anthropology and his theory of Education, also adding new dimensions on the themes (WULF, 2005).

Thus, as for anthropology and the theory of Education, the historical-empirical diversity of languages is for Von Humboldt a richness of the world and of man. However, such diversity does not prevent the process of communication between men (SANTOS; Regert, 2020).

In the same way that in anthropology, the investigation of different cultures increases knowledge about the human being, the exploration of differences between languages increases knowledge about the linguistic phenomenon (SANTOS; Regert, 2020).

It is through language that makes the world human; it translates the world that inhabits man into the world of man. Its boundaries are the limits of each culture and each social individual (SANTOS; Regert, 2020).

Given the importance of the role of the economy of labor and the economy of time in the effort to create universal man, the anthropological question is the resumption of an acceleration of time and a decrease in labor (SANTOS; Regert, 2018).

Meaning and perceived objects intersect, not only when one sees, but also when one touches, when one hears and tastes. Man does not see without presuppositions (SANTOS; Regert, 2018).

On the one hand, the individual begins to perceive the world in an anthropomorphic way, that is, they start from its physiological bases. On the other hand, perception is oriented according to historical-anthropological and cultural data.

According to Wulf (2005), Education requires the work of interior representations. I work in discourse, but also the search for its genuine content.

Education must therefore make human beings capable of better managing tensions and conflicts to build a common future for humanity. It is necessary to consider Education as a value in itself and as a process that lasts a lifetime.

Since Education seeks to meet the new demands of society, economics and politics, it is necessary to avoid reducing it to something tied to these demands.

Education and training need to become flexible, and to bridge the diversity and heterogeneity of the world and its regions. It is about teaching the human being to live together, peacefully and constructively (SANTOS; Regert, 2018).



By teaching oneself to live together, one hopes to develop knowledge of others and creativity. Among the forms of knowledge, much importance should be given to the sciences, because they contribute to social development (SANTOS; Regert, 2018).

Education and training must, above all, be attentive to the development of memory, reflection, imagination, health, aesthetic and communicative faculties and the concrete needs of individuals.

The anthropological knowledge of Education works in a double historical and cultural contextualization. On the one hand, for the one who produces the knowledge, on the other hand, for the one who, in the researches, relies on this knowledge, produced in a certain context (SANTOS; Regert, 2018).

This double historicity and culturality makes the content of anthropological knowledge relative. In addition, Educational Anthropology becomes a historical and cultural anthropology of Education, which takes into account the historicity and culturality of the researcher and his object.

The historical and cultural anthropology of pedagogy also seeks to relate its perspectives and methods with the perspectives and methods of its object (SANTOS; Regert, 2018).

For Wulf (2005), the Anthropology of Education has as its task the analysis, organization, reevaluation and production of knowledge through the sciences of Education, as well as the deconstruction of the concepts of Education, in an anthropological perspective.

Finally, it can be said that the Anthropology of Education also includes reflection on both the competencies and the limits of one's knowledge (SANTOS; Regert, 2018).

It analyzes the difficulties of man's self-definition and Education, which arise with the disappearance of universal reference points. It shows how the consequences of these difficulties depend on the relationship with their conditions of production.

3 ANTHROPOLOGY AND THE THEORY OF EDUCATION

Harmom and Jacobs teach (apud Reis (1996, p. 46),

Education is much more than just a process to acquire useful knowledge. Education makes the common mind more active and alert. [...] Education trains the mind to consider many possibilities, to see things through a new and broader perspective, to question and challenge the *status quo*, to think and imagine, to innovate and invent, to make decisions and act on their initiative.

For Pinto (1987, p. 29), "education is the process by which society forms its members in its image and function of its interests".

Reis (1996, p. 58) defines that,

[...] to educate is to allow man to construct his identity. This construction will allow you greater pleasure (personal energy), when sharing life in society, making adaptations and personal and reciprocal transformations.



Émile Durkheim stated that Education is a social fact (FERRARI, 2008). This statement does not contain anything surprising for today, because the study of sociological aspects of Education and its different theoretical-methodological approaches circulates widely in the academic field, give subsidies to the planning of educational actions and public policies in this sector, and are often published by the mainstream press.

In the study of the historical context in which the slow and progressive constitution of the educational system took place, Durkheim took as a basis the observation that even in the simplest societies educational practices were instituted to transmit to children and young people their accumulated knowledge, norms, customs, values and histories of the group (FERRARI, 2008). This gives the educational system a common - social - essential character.

Educational actions should not be understood as isolated from other social practices, since, despite the relative autonomy of each social system, they are always parts of a whole with which they integrate in the achievement of a common end.

To distinguish the character and nature of Education, Durkheim ([1922], 1978, p.41) defined it as:

The action exerted by the adult generations on those generations that are not yet prepared for social life; it aims to arouse and develop, in the child, a certain number of physical, intellectual and moral states, demanded by political society as a whole, and by the special environment to which the child, in particular, is destined.

Education is confused with the process of humanization itself, because it is the empowerment of the individual both to live civilly and productively, as well as to form his code of behavior and to act coherently with his principles and values, with openness to review them and modify his behavior when changes become necessary (MOTTA, 1997).

According to Freire (1977, p. 76) "education, whatever the level at which it takes place, will become all the truer the more it stimulates the development of this radical need of human beings, that of their expressiveness."

Education both has an individual side, which involves the formation and development of the personality of each individual, and has its social side, since all school education, analyzed as a sociocultural process, is usually related to a national project.

Concerning national Education, we can highlight the ideas of Sucupira (1963, p. 21):

The idea that we make of national Education starts from this evident truth that in reality there is no formation of abstract man, there can be no education detached from the concrete motivations and objectives of a given society. One cannot think of the process of humanization of man independently of a people, of a culture, of a historical circumstance, of a national community. Therefore, to each historical-cultural configuration corresponds a self-understanding of man and, consequently, every Education that is elaborated in it, even aiming at the realization of man in his universal dimensions, necessarily reflects the spirit of his time, the life and soul of his culture.



Education, being par excellence the process of systematic and conscious changes that is done in a planned and organized way, tends to establish itself as the most effective instrument that the state has to effect the development of a people, because it involves all the processes aimed at preparing people for external and internal changes (MOTTA, 1997).

It is necessary to anticipate the development and leave them able to accept, understand the challenges of the future with the capacity to mold them to their principles, values and individual and social interests (MOTTA, 1997).

The primary objective of Education is to provide man with cultural instruments capable of promoting the material and spiritual transformations required by the dynamics of society.

Education increases man's power over nature and, at the same time, seeks to conform him to the goals of progress and social balance of the collectivity to which he belongs.

In the light of the reflections of Motta (1997, p. 81), it is highlighted that,

The primary objective of Education is to awaken and provide the growth of criticality (understood as the capacity for criticism of history, reality and ideologies and self-criticism) and creativity, which impel man to try to conquer, by himself and with his fellow men, his freedom and to evolve, in the world and with the world, discovering the micro and macrocosm, inventing interferences and transformations in reality, and transcending oneself, tending towards its full realization.

According to Benevides (1996), the educational process implies a succession of acts in time, a sense of continuity, which can be considered integrally.

Thus, it will accompany the human being throughout his life. It can still be considered in stages, or aspects; or periods; or formal episodes, such as those relating to the teaching of Education in specialized institutions.

The good sense of formation, transformation or change of behavior points to a goal to be achieved in the educational process.

Through the educational process, the human being incorporates the relevant knowledge and the postures elected by society, so that every educational process always makes a transmission of values and the achievement of objective, which can even be to enable submission to a dominant political system and prevent an attitude of criticism of the ideology that sustains this same political system (BENEVIDES, 1996).

Finally, it is necessary to synthesize the diversity of phenomena into the highest unity. Thus, anthropology's task is to analyze the scope of the diversity of men without disregarding the identity of the individual cell.

The knowledge of the human being and his Education are intrinsically linked. There is no educational process without knowing man, so the need for anthropological studies is the first step for the process to develop. In turn, Anthropology enables the Education of the collective and social man.



4 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

As a social dynamic, the educational process must provide the elaboration and mastery, by individuals and groups, of new models or forms of inquiry of reality, of evaluative and normative models for action and of forms of communication and expression that strengthen the bond and cohesion of the group or community.

In essence, the educational process consists in the permanent transformation of behaviors for an increasingly integral understanding and an increasingly solidary action on the world, in its physical, biotic and anthropic totality (CRUZ, apud CASAS ARMENGOL, 1986).

Finally, according to the magisterium of Maria Montessori, which is concerned with the preservation of a broader heritage "the education of human beings" (MONTESSORI [1977] apud RÖHS, 2010).

As a tool in the educational universe, Anthropology unveils and explores the cultural particularities of the human being, in addition to studying the society where he is inserted.

In short, the Anthropology of Education has the role of analysis, organization, reevaluation of the educational process and production of knowledge, respecting cultural and anthropological perspectives, in the construction of knowledge by humanity.



REFERENCES

- ANDRADE, R. de O. Um ecologista no novo mundo. Revista FAPESP, São Paulo, ed. 281, jul. 2019. Disponível em:
<https://revistapesquisa.fapesp.br/um-ecologista-no-novo-mundo/> Acesso em: 1 jul. 2020.
- BENEVIDES, M. V. Educação para a cidadania. Lua Nova, São Paulo, n. 38, p. 223-237, dez. 1996.
- CASAS ARMENGOL, M. Universidad sin clases: educación a distância em América Latina. Caracas: OEA – UMA - Editorial Kapelusz, 1986.
- DURKHEIM, E. Educação e sociologia. São Paulo: Melhoramentos, 1978.
- FERRARI, M. Émile Durkheim, o criador da sociologia da educação. *In*: Nova Escola. Publicado em: 1 out. 2008. Disponível em:
<https://novaescola.org.br/conteudo/456/criador-sociologia-educacao>. Acesso em 1 jul. 2020.
- FREIRE, P. Ação cultural para a liberdade. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1977.
- RÖHRS, H. Maria Montessori. Tradução: Danilo Di Manno de Almeida; Maria Leila Alves. Recife: Fundação Joaquim Nabuco, Editora Massangana, 2010. (Coleção Educadores).
- MOTTA, E. de O. Direito educacional e educação no século XXI. Brasília: UNESCO, 1997.
- PINTO, A. V. Sete lições sobre educação de adultos. 5 ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 1987.
- REIS, A. M. V. Ensino a distância... megatendência atual: abolindo preconceitos. São Paulo: Imobiliária, 1996.
- SANTOS, A. M. dos; REGERT, R. A consolidação de uma subárea epistemológica. Vivência 52 Revista de Antropologia, Natal, n. 52, p. 214-225, 2018.
- SANTOS, A. M. dos; REGERT, R. Antropologia da educação: a consolidação de uma subárea epistemológica. *In*: MONTEIRO, A. A. de S. (org.). A educação no Brasil e no mundo: avanços limites e contradições 3. Ponta Grossa: Atena Editora, 2020. p. 287-298. Disponível em:
<https://www.finersistemas.com/atenaeditora/index.php/admin/api/artigoPDF/30693> Acesso em: 3 jul. 2020.
- SUCUPIRA, N. L. B. Relações entre o Conselho Federal de Educação e os Conselhos Estaduais. Documenta, Rio de Janeiro, n. 21, v. 2, dez. 1963.
- WULF, C. Antropologia da educação. Campinas: Alínea, 2005.