

## THE DISCOURSE ON INTERDISCIPLINARITY IN PAULO FREIRE

### O DISCURSO SOBRE A INTERDISCIPLINARIDADE EM PAULO FREIRE

### EL DISCURSO SOBRE LA INTERDISCIPLINARIEDAD EN PAULO FREIRE

 Maria Aparecida Vieira de Melo<sup>1</sup>

 Ricardo Santos de Almeida<sup>2</sup>

 Maria Aparecida Cruz<sup>3</sup>

1. Pedagogue. Doctorate in Education. Federal University of Rio Grande. E-mail: [m\\_aparecida\\_v\\_melo@hotmail.com](mailto:m_aparecida_v_melo@hotmail.com)
2. Geography. Doctorate in Education. Federal University of Santa Maria. E-mail: [ricardo.almeida@igdema.ufal.br](mailto:ricardo.almeida@igdema.ufal.br)
3. Pedagogue. Master's student in Educational Science. E-mail: [cidavitor2003@yahoo.com.br](mailto:cidavitor2003@yahoo.com.br)

**ABSTRACT:** The discursive analysis on interdisciplinarity in Paulo Freire's writings provide us with a mapping of the sources, where the described and analyzed utterance helps us to understand how the discourse on interdisciplinarity is presented by Freire? Our purpose is to excavate the corpus/analytical on interdisciplinarity in some source texts, as well as to identify the enunciative correlates that are triggered by Freire on interdisciplinarity and to explain the bundles of relationships that lead to the discursive order on interdisciplinarity. In the set of things said and written by Freire about interdisciplinarity, we highlight dialogue as fundamental to an interdisciplinary educational practice.

**Keywords:** Interdisciplinarity; Discourse; Paulo Freire; Educational practice.

**RESUMO:** A análise discursiva sobre a interdisciplinaridade nos escritos de Paulo Freire, nos proporciona o mapeamento das fontes, onde o enunciado descrito e analisado nos favorece compreendermos como está posto por Freire o discurso sobre a interdisciplinaridade? Temos por finalidade, escavar o corpus/analítico sobre a interdisciplinaridade em alguns textos-fontes, bem como, identificar os correlatos enunciativos que estão acionados por Freire sobre a interdisciplinaridade e explicitar os feixes de relações que ordenam a ordem discursiva sobre a interdisciplinaridade. No conjunto das coisas ditas e escritas por Freire sobre a interdisciplinaridade, destacamos o diálogo como fundamental de uma prática educativa interdisciplinar.

**Palavras-chave:** Interdisciplinaridade; Discurso; Paulo Freire; Prática educativa.

**RESUMEN:** ¿El análisis discursivo sobre la interdisciplinariedad en los escritos de Paulo Freire nos proporciona un mapeo de las fuentes, donde el enunciado descrito y analizado nos ayuda a comprender cómo Freire plantea el discurso sobre la interdisciplinariedad? Nuestro propósito es excavar el corpus/analítico sobre la interdisciplinariedad en algunos textos fuente, así como identificar los correlatos enunciativos que Freire desencadena sobre la interdisciplinariedad y explicar los haces de relaciones que ordenan el orden discursivo sobre la interdisciplinariedad. En el conjunto de cosas dichas y escritas por Freire sobre la interdisciplinariedad, destacamos el diálogo como fundamental para una práctica educativa interdisciplinar.

**Palabras-clave:** Interdisciplinariedad; Discurso; Paulo Freire; Práctica educativa.

Received in: 23/07/2021

Accepted in: 17/10/2021



All content in this journal is licensed under a Creative Commons license (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 International), except where otherwise noted.

## Introduction

Education is a complex field, therefore it also requires educational practices concerning this specificity to enter the territory of language to elucidate the discourse on interdisciplinarity from the perspective of Paulo Freire.

The toolbox that we will use to map, excavate and explain the findings on the discourse of interdisciplinarity is the archeological analysis of the discourse of Foucault (2008), as it is the methodological procedure that best communicates the discourse on interdisciplinarity. It is applied in three stages: the mapping of primary and secondary sources, the excavation of the analytical/descriptive corpus and, finally, the clarification of the findings, that is, the text fracture, the fragment on interdisciplinarity placed by Freire in his writings. The archaeological curiosity that motivates us to investigate is: how is the discourse on interdisciplinarity put by Freire? To this end, the objectives of this investigation are: to analyze the discourse on the interdisciplinary statement, to excavate the corpus/analytical on interdisciplinarity in some source texts, as well as to identify the enunciative correlates that are triggered by Freire on interdisciplinarity and explain the beams of relationships that order the discursive order over interdisciplinarity.

Freire, when approaching interdisciplinarity, refers to a dialogical pedagogical practice. That is, educators need to plan the pedagogical work together with other teachers from different areas of knowledge and not in isolation. Because, only then, we will have the experience of interdisciplinarity in the educational context.

## The discourse on interdisciplinarity

The “Pedagogia da Indignação: cartas pedagógicas e outros escritos” is our primary source, as in this work, Freire clarifies how the interdisciplinary pedagogical practice promotes a dialogical and intercommunicative work, through the principle of exchange, using didactic material and notebooks to substantiate the studies. Here is a text excerpt that elucidates this understanding:

Yes, these notebooks were read and discussed; and this was not the exclusive work of Philosophy; it was the work of an interdisciplinary group made up of professors of our generation, professors of History, Literature, Geography, Political Science, and Sociology. This entire team read, from their perspective, those extraordinary notes that are the writings of a worker. And each one made a reading based on the point of view of their specialty. The literate interpreted these texts as a literary document, the sociologist made his analysis from a sociological perspective, verifying which strata of the population were present and what role they played, etc.; the philosopher, in turn, sought to understand the ideological struggle. All of this led us to meetings that were fantastic as collective learning and teaching meetings. The collective dialogues with students – it was impressive, Paulo! I believe that there, in reality, students and professors learned how to do Philosophy, we learned History, Literature and Sociology. And each of these sciences is directly linked to the reality that was lived in the country and not tied to transcendent, foreign realities. (FREIRE, 1985, p. 9).

Thus Freire highlights the *modus operandi* as interdisciplinarity takes place in the real context, that is, in the concrete reality. The correlates such as 'collective dialogues, group, learning meetings' corroborate an intercultural practice, considering that the notebook is the didactic resource that embodies the interdisciplinary unfolding, where teachers from different areas can work from the thematic unit derived from the concrete reality, as well as elucidating that the study of Sciences was made from real, concrete,

and not abstract or foreign data. In this way, from local to global knowledge, from common sense to scientific, promoting learning for both educators and students.

The discursive displacement of interdisciplinarity in the source “*Pedagogia do Oprimido*” elucidates dialogue as a crucial element for the experience of interdisciplinary educational practice. Thus, the interdisciplinary team performs the dialogic task, as stated by Freire (1987, p. 65) when mentioning “the task of the dialogic educator is, working in an interdisciplinary team this thematic universe, collected in the investigation, to return it, as problem, not as a dissertation, to the men from whom he received it”. The thematic universe promotes the dialogue, which is activated in the investigated reality, thus starting from the concrete reality in which the limit-situation is placed. Movement that takes place in dialogicity, as stated by Freire (1987).

Having prepared the codifications, studied by the interdisciplinary team, all the possible thematic angles contained in them, the investigators begin the third phase of the investigation. As these circles are operationalized, with the decoding of the material prepared in the previous stage, the discussions will be recorded and analyzed by the interdisciplinary team. Its last stage begins when the investigators, having completed the decoding in the circles, begin the systematic and interdisciplinary study of their findings. Once the thematic delimitation has been made, it will be up to each specialist, within their field, to present the project of “reduction” of their theme to the interdisciplinary team. (FREIRE, 1987, p. 75).

The codifications carried out by the interdisciplinary team, from all different angles permeate the epistemic deepening of the thematic unit, being a constant of action/reflection/action, promoting the practice of the third phase of the investigation, with the intervention of specialists in their respective areas of knowledge.

The interdisciplinary educational practice requires intervention in the socio-historical reality, living up to the thematic unit that inserts people to act in their respective fields, thus promoting a holistic approach in favor of a particular action.

The specificity of the interdisciplinary educational practice in “*Ação Cultural para a liberdade e outros escritos*”, Freire (1981) is concerned with narrating his experiences with the peasants. In this case, he explains how interdisciplinarity with the peasants develops. Here is a fracture of the text that explains how this discursive event takes place:

There is something more that the analysis of this discourse can provide: the recognition of a series of concerns of peasant communities that, in the final analysis, reveal a theme to be treated interdisciplinary and on which the organization of the program content for post-literacy could be based. (FREIRE, 1981, p. 24).

Interdisciplinarity favors a pedagogical action that corresponds to the deepening of the thematic unit, which is unfolded in contents that permeate the epistemic penetration for a political/pedagogical action, a possibility that transcends the practice of teaching reading and writing. The logic of interdisciplinary practice involves intercommunication, which is dialogic between the various specialists who deal with the subject interdisciplinary.

In the book “*Pedagogia da Indignação: cartas pedagógicas e outros escritos*”, Freire (2000) explains how to carry out interdisciplinarity, given that this does not happen in isolation, but in the interaction with others, as stated “one thing is the educational action of a hopeless educator and another is the educational practice of an educator that is based on interdisciplinarity” (FREIRE, 2000, p. 51). A

pedagogical practice that takes place in a traditional perspective of teaching, in a fragmented and isolated way, being carried out only by the specialist teacher in the area, tends to corroborate the limitation of knowledge and its production, when it is produced through interdisciplinarity, the educator in general broadens the vision around the knowable object. For this reason, it is important that the educational action takes place rooted in an interdisciplinary teaching practice and not disciplinary as commonly happens on the school floor.

Paulo Freire elucidates very clearly in his work *“Cartas a Guiné-Bissau: registros de uma experiência processo”* (1987) how there is a pedagogical limitation of an educator when he works alone, or simply when he is not involved in a collective pedagogical proposal, which may come from pedagogy of projects. Thus, nowadays, the educator needs to develop pedagogical actions that are concerned with curricular integration, so that, in the end, they can develop an interdisciplinary work.

The theme of each of the units of learning or knowledge that I will present, I repeat, in a purely exemplary way, would be ordered, certainly in a different and much more complete way, if handled by an interdisciplinary team, predominantly national. And it would, on the other hand, be enriched with nuances that go unnoticed when submitted to the debate of students who would thus give their contribution to the organization of the programmatic content of their own education. (FREIRE, 1987, p. 124).

The recognition made by Paulo Freire about the complexity of the school activity developed through interdisciplinarity leads us to the differentiated teaching-learning process, one that must take place in the collective, hence the importance of social movements that articulate their pedagogical actions in the community. In this way, we would like to enter the territory of language on interdisciplinarity in order to understand its *modus operandi*. Because, the interdisciplinary team working on a learning unit favors a greater depth in the theoretical and practical area, the dialogue would be warmer, more horizontal and, above all, the content would be better problematized, conceptualized and understood in its cultural, political, economic and social.

The interdisciplinarity in the work *“Pedagogia da Esperança: um reencontro com a pedagogia do oprimido”* (1992) is seen as an action that should be the occupation of deans and their advisors, as stated by Freire, because in this way, teaching together with educational management should walk interdisciplinary. Thus, Freire (1992, p. 99) states that “another aspect that deans and their advisors paid equal attention to, in the field of teaching, was the search for interdisciplinary and not purely disciplinary understanding of teaching”. Teaching from the perspective of deans and their advisors permeate the interdisciplinary practice in their performance, so the integration of knowledge is experienced in a holistic way by all who are working in their respective areas.

Knowledge is not dissociated from the existential dimension of the human being. In this way, it is not possible to work the isolated content of the social, cultural, political, economic and emotional dimension of the subjects, as if they were objects that are not traversed by social events or, in other words, the social phenomena that traverse the knowable subjectivity of subjects of law.

Thus, it is essential that we conceive that bodies are not distinct from the perceptions of epistemologies and theories. Therefore, Freire (1997) draws attention to the process of hominization, which takes place in its entirety, in an integral and not fragmented way, as we have witnessed throughout the history of education, especially that which concerns one for the elite and the other for the poor. This dual education process tends to develop actions that dichotomize the body, the mind from the space-time in which the subjects are inserted. In this sense, Freire (1997, p. 48) says that the “reading of the body with

students, interdisciplinary, breaking dichotomies, unfeasible and deforming ruptures”. It is necessary, therefore, that the educator has the expertise to work the totality of knowledge from the body, without fragmenting or dividing, but conceiving the necessary rupture in the deforming practices that are established in the school.

Thus, Freire also recommends the need to avoid specialism, as this specialty remains on the school floor for decades, which can make an integral pedagogical practice unfeasible. Thus, as he mentions how to avoid such a risk, here is the fragment that elucidates this assertion “to avoid the risk of a negative specialism of study groups as theoretical contexts, it is important to hold periodic interdisciplinary meetings bringing together different groups to debate a the same theme, seen from different but relevant perspectives (FREIRE, 1997, p. 76), interdisciplinary meetings held periodically between different groups to debate the same topic is crucial, as the different perspectives on the content promote the necessary epistemic deepening that it concerns an interdisciplinary experience of the knowledge construction process, which takes place through the active participation of everyone.

Conscious bodies in the knowledge acquisition process are not fragmented from their complex existence. In other words, the subject's physical, mental, emotional integrality is with him, constitutes being what he is. That's why we shouldn't approach the knowable contents/objects as things external to us, in a merely abstract way, no! Bearing in mind that we are concrete beings and that we are situated in a concrete socio-historical context.

For this reason, Freire (1983, p. 9) evidences about interdisciplinarity, warning us in the contemporaneity of its emergence, because “today, probably more than yesterday, it seems to the author unavoidable to discuss, interdisciplinary, technical assistance, taking the man who serves as the center of the discussion. Not, however, an abstract man, but the concrete man, who does not exist if not in the concrete reality, which conditions him”. The concrete man is situated in a reality that is crossed by social, political, economic, cultural, emotional and now pandemic phenomena. This reality needs to be problematized, contested and contextualized, in the same way that it receives the proper pedagogical intervention.

### **The bundles of relationships on interdisciplinarity**

The shifts of interdisciplinarity according to Freire's postulates concern dialogue, pedagogical practice and ongoing training, as we can illustrate in Figure 1.



Figure 1 - Schema of the displacement of interdisciplinarity



Source: Authors, 2021

According to the analysis/description of the analytical corpus on interdisciplinarity in the researched sources, having the "*Por uma Pedagogia da Pergunta:*" as the primary source and "*Professora sim, tia não: cartas a quem ousa ensinar, Extensão ou comunicação?, Pedagogia da Esperança: um reencontro com a pedagogia do oprimido, Pedagogia da Indignação: cartas pedagógicas e outros escritos, Pedagogia do Oprimido, Cartas a Guiné-Bissau: registros de uma experiência em processo e Ação Cultural para Liberdade e outros escritos*" as secondary sources, we will now go into what concerns the bundles of relations that establish the discursive order on interdisciplinarity, thus, the enunciative unfoldings of how interdisciplinarity happens on the school floor, or training spaces, whether formal or informal.

We understand that one of the means that articulates interdisciplinarity is collectivity. It is the learning meetings that take place collectively between the interdisciplinary team that make the epistemic deepening to be carried out through the ramifications that the knowable object occupies, that is, the domain fields that circulate the thematic unit/content and/or knowable object.

From the learning meetings, the dialogue is established with the link of the holistic vision that is based around the investigated problem-situation. A situation that politically and pedagogically involves all subjects, who dialogue from their fields of domain, thus promoting the constitution of the knowledge derivation tree. Reason why the dialogue is horizontal, problematizing and contextualizing the action of the problem-situation is investigated.

Interdisciplinarity was a pedagogical practice that Freire experienced, precisely the circle of culture, as it emerged from the vocabulary universe of the participants. This movement conferred the unfolding of the themes addressed with due epistemic deepening. Thus, through the vocabulary universe, the limit-situation posed began to be problematized and, consequently, the pedagogical intervention was carried out according to the limit-situation. This pedagogical action supported the debate between students and educators to permeate the organization of the content, which really mattered for that collective to learn.

Thus, the political/pedagogical engagement of teachers was crucial, as they explored the concrete reality in which the subjects of rights were inserted, thus, subjects and reality are concrete, and because they are concrete, they need to be considered in their concreteness, operating, therefore, the necessary turns for the transformation, emancipation and liberation of the subjects that were around that concrete reality. With this, Freire (1981) elucidates:

The literacy process, as a cultural action for liberation, is an act of knowledge in which students assume the role of knowing subjects in dialogue with the educator, a knowing subject as well. For this reason, it is a courageous attempt to demythologize reality, an effort through which, in a permanent distance from the reality in which they find themselves more or less immersed, literacy students emerge from it to critically insert themselves in it. (FREIRE, 1981, p. 39).

The liberation process takes place in the position assumed by the subjects as knowing, dialogical beings who come to understand reality not as a given, but as a historical construction that is at the service of the oppressors, who want to alienate, imprison and subjugate the transforming capacity of each subject, that is, its power to be more.

Since dialogue is the operative of an interdisciplinary practice, Freire explains the essence of the literacy process, considering that the infrastructural change is carried out from the organization of the portfolios to the position of the participants imply in this interdisciplinary practice.

As an act of knowledge, the literacy process implies the existence of two dialectically related contexts. One is the context of authentic dialogue between educators and learners, as subjects of knowledge. It's the theoretical context. The other is the concrete context, in which facts take place – the social reality in which literacy students find themselves. (FREIRE, 1981, p. 41).

The two dialectically related contexts have the authentic presence of the subjects (educators and students), thus, the dialogue established between these subjects expands the possibility of knowledge, which comes from theories and from the reality in which the subjects are inserted. Understanding this interdisciplinary practice is essential for breaking with the teaching practices of depositing knowledge. Thus, reality is the basis for the subjects to enter the training processes. Emphasizing the process of decoding reality, Freire (1981) states:

Coding, on the one hand, mediates between the concrete and the theoretical context; on the other hand, as an object of knowledge, it mediates the knowing subjects who seek, in dialogue, to unveil it. This is why, being the seal of the knowing act, the dialogue has nothing to do, on the one hand, with the monologue of the “banking” educator; on the other, with the spontaneous silence of a certain type of liberal educator. Dialogue actively engages both subjects in the act of knowing educator-learner and educator-educator. (FREIRE, 1981, p. 42).

Dialogical practice involves the active engagement of both subjects who are in the process of knowing. This time, the bank educator's monologue practice and the liberal educator's silence, which runs the risk of happening in the remote work practice that we are experiencing, because of the Sars-CoV-2 pandemic, is broken. We understand that the importance of dialogue in this process of knowledge construction is an interdisciplinary didactic attitude that favors the participation of all, as highlighted by Freire (1981):

For the dialogue to be the seal of the act of true knowledge, it is necessary that the knowing subjects try to scientifically grasp reality in order to discover its reason for being – what makes it be as it is. Thus, knowing is not remembering something previously known and now forgotten [...]. (FREIRE, 1981, p. 45).

The apprehension of the reality mediated by dialogue tends to open up the production of knowledge with regard to the scientific and popular knowledge that emerges from this reality. In this way, we advance that dialogue reveals the interdisciplinarity between knowable subjects.

The essence of dialogue is love. That is why love promotes education for humanization and, in this sense, it is only humanized in the dialogic process of humanization (FREIRE, 1987, p. 08). Therefore, Freire (1987) declares that “there is no dialogue, however, if there is not a deep love for the world and for men. It is not possible to pronounce the world, which is an act of creation and re-creation, if there is not, love that infuses it”. Dialogue only takes place between people who love and respect each other. Which is why love is crucial in an interdisciplinary educational practice. Since it is the foundation of dialogue, love is also dialogue.

Love is commitment to men. Wherever these oppressed are, the act of love is to commit to their cause. The cause of your release. But this commitment, because it is loving, is dialogic (FREIRE, 1987, p. 10). Dialogue confers the autonomy of the subject in being an autonomous subject, so the liberation happens operationalized by the practice of a dialogic action, with a loving social commitment, thus conferring the transformation of the destiny of historical subjects. Freire (1987, p. 16) elucidates that “if I don't love the world, if I don't love life, if I don't love men, dialogue is not possible for me”. That is, dialogue is a loving practice, a gesture of concrete love, the act of listening and speaking is essentially the intercommunication between people who love, respect, learn and grow simultaneously.

We emphasize that the loving dialogue does not happen in passivity, conformism and fatalism, but in adversities, conflicts and conflicts that involve class subjects, especially the working class. In the educational context, dialogue is fundamental for the knowledge acquisition process. Considering that we are essentially dialogical subjects, Freire asserts (1987, p. 50) “the dialogical man, who is critical, knows that if the power to know how to do to create, to transform is a power of men, too that they can, in a concrete situation, alienated, have this power harmed”. Love is a dialogical act that refers to the concrete relationship with the historical. According affirms (FREIRE, 1987, p. 55):

By being based on love, humility, and faith in men, dialogue takes place in a horizontal relationship, in which the trust of one pole in the other is an obvious consequence. It would be a contradiction if, loving, humble and full of faith, the dialogue did not provoke this loss of trust between its subjects. For this reason, there is no such confidence in the antidialogicity of the “banking” conception of education. (FREIRE, 1987, p. 55).

Dialogue is a loving act of trust and faith in the subject's countless possibilities of becoming in the dimension of being more. Therefore, “if faith in men is an a priori datum of dialogue, trust is established with it. Confidence makes dialogical subjects more and more partners in the pronunciation of the world. If this confidence fails, it is because the conditions discussed above have failed”. The complicity in educational achievements is permeated by interdisciplinarity and strengthens fellowship in pedagogical actions. According to Freire (1987):



For the educator-learner, dialogic, problematizer, the programmatic content of education is not a donation or an imposition - a set of information to be deposited in the students, but the organized revolution, systematized and added to the people, of those elements that they gave them in an unstructured way. (FREIRE, 1987, p. 60).

The problematizing educator lives up to the dialogical aspects when interrogating the programmatic content to be worked on, not in a given way, but constructed through interdisciplinarity. In this way, the revolutionary systematization with all historical subjects participating in the training process is important, as it is through this dialogic task that interdisciplinarity contributes to meaningful learning.

In this sense, Freire (1987, p. 64) elucidates that “the task of the dialogical educator is, working in an interdisciplinary team on this thematic universe, collected in the investigation, to return it, as a problem, not as a dissertation, to the man whose child.” Thus, the educator must explore the reality, by emphasizing a theme, carrying out the investigation, investigation and intervention in this investigated reality, in order to operate ruptures in its *status quo*. Because, “if the educational program is dialogic, this means the right that educators-learners also have to participate in it, including topics not suggested. These, by their function, we call “hinge themes” (FREIRE, 1987, p. 70).

The “hinge themes” happen in dialogical practice, because when students participate in the teaching-learning process in an authentic and active way, it helps the teacher to even expand their vision, enabling even more interpenetrations in the themes that move from the unit thematic. In this way, it enables a pedagogical revolution that crosses cultures, thus favoring its revolution as suggested by Freire (1987, p. 80) when pointing out that “the pedagogical, dialogical sense of the revolution that makes it a “cultural revolution” also has to accompany it in all its phases.” Monitoring all phases of an interdisciplinary educational practice takes place through dialogue.

In “*Extensão ou Comunicação?*” (FREIRE, 1983) clarifies that the educational practice for freedom does not occur outside the dialogic action, because:

On the contrary, educating and educating themselves, in the practice of freedom, is the task of those who know that they know little – that's why they know they know something and can thus come to know more – in dialogue with those who, almost always, think they know nothing, so that these, transforming their thinking that they know nothing into knowing that they know little, can also know more. (FREIRE, 1983, p. 5).

Dialogue concerns the educational practice for freedom in a dimension of experiencing the essence of humility, in recognizing that we do not know everything and therefore something we do not know, that knowledge happens through exchange, sharing and intercommunicative interaction. Once:

Dialogical being, for true humanism, is not to say that it is uncommittedly dialogic; it is to experience the dialogue. Dialogical being is not to invade, it is not to manipulate, it is not to sloganize. Dialogical being is to commit to the constant transformation of reality. This is why, since dialogue is the content of the way of being proper to human existence, it is excluded from any relationship in which some men are transformed into “beings for another” by men who are false “beings for themselves”. It is that the dialogue cannot be locked in an antagonistic relationship. (FREIRE, 1983, p. 10).

Humanization is developed through an authentic dialogue, impregnated with meaning and meaning and not merely an empty speech, a slogan because it is beautiful to be heard, dialogue empowers people, puts the subject in his/her proper place, not as an object of narrated story, but as its protagonist. The essence

of dialogue returns a humanity that has been stolen by oppressors, lords and dictators. There are no superior and inferior beings, where one can dominate the other, but beings who, knowing they are different, fight equally for their humanity, recognize that they are human beings to be more and better, to be masters of themselves, owners of their narratives and protagonists of their histories, concrete and historical collective affairs. There is no superiority among human beings because they recognize that they are unfinished and unfinished subjects, but that they are also finite:

Dialogue is the loving encounter of men who, mediated by the world, “pronounce” it, that is, transform it, and, by transforming it, humanize it for the humanization of all. This loving encounter cannot be, for this very reason, a meeting of irreconcilable people. (...) The conquest that is implicit in the dialogue is the conquest of the world to be more of all men. (FREIRE, 1983, p. 60).

The interdisciplinary educational practice is linked by the dialogical encounter. Thus, educators and students are subjects of loving encounter with the practices of transforming reality, loving the act of learning, loving the essence of becoming. Education is eminently a dialogic loving act, which promotes the transformation of subjects and reality, facing all adversities and difficulties through the dialogic interaction of this interdisciplinary educational practice.

Dialogue is the nexus of an interdisciplinary pedagogical practice. That is why the educator must be dialogical, he must also be entitled to intervene in reality through the pedagogy of projects and through the pedagogy of the question, the dialogue around a thematic unit supports the penetration of other themes, for example, the garbage theme, how garbage can be worked pedagogically in the fields of Portuguese language, geography, history, mathematics and other curricular components that cross the pedagogical practice of educators on the one hand and on the other hand how students learn the theme garbage explored didactically in these various curriculum components? In this case, through the interdisciplinarity to be experienced with the pedagogy of projects, as well as the culture circles and the pedagogy of the question permeate interdisciplinary practices for the systematization of knowledge, favoring the appropriate interventions in reality with historical subjects and solving situations -limits that are set in this reality.

Interdisciplinary pedagogical practice is inserted in the enunciative device of permanent training. Movement that must be the result of the performance of school management, as teachers cannot be asked to carry out pedagogical practices that they are unaware of, without prior training to do so. As our culture is Cartesian, knowledge fragmenting and compartmentalized, unfortunately educators do not have a keen vision of the whole, they end up seeing more of the part that interests them, this is my discipline, my area, they do not put themselves at risk in daring to do something different from what they received in initial formation. In this sense, ongoing and in-service training permeates new learning and pedagogical adventures to be experienced with students in the classroom. Therefore, interdisciplinary actions are highlighted through field classes, dialogue circles, seminars, workshops and other activities that displace teachers and students towards the movement of meaningful learning.

For Freire (1997, p. 8):

The issue of teacher training, together with the reflection on the educational-progressive practice in favor of the autonomy of the being of the students, is the central theme around which this text revolves. Theme that incorporates the analysis of fundamental knowledge to that practice and to which I hope the critical reader will add some that I have missed or whose importance I have not realized. (FREIRE, 1997, p. 8).

Teacher training must be aligned with the reflection on educational practice with autonomy in the process of becoming human beings, so the analysis of the knowledge necessary for a practice and the subjects who must critically position themselves in relation to the reality data that are constructed historically. A differentiated practice on the school floor allows everyone to critically reflect on the practice of teaching and learning.

The act of teaching requires teachers to acquire knowledge so that they can be taught, that is why continuing education is crucial to a progressive educational practice, according to Freire (1997),

Knowledge that seems to me indispensable to the teaching practice of progressive, critical educators or educators, some of which are equally necessary for conservative educators. These are knowledge demanded by the educational practice itself, whatever the political option of the educator or educator (FREIRE, 1997, p. 12).

The knowledge must be learned by all educators in their different levels of reality, as well as by different collective subjects in the most varied educational contexts, because, politically speaking, all educators must experience the formative experience of constant learning.

The pedagogical practice of the educator from the perspective of interdisciplinarity takes place according to the democratic principle, otherwise an autonomous educational practice by all subjects is not possible, if only the teacher is responsible for the knowledge to be taught. In this perspective, Freire (1997) states that:

The democratic educator cannot deny himself the duty, in his teaching practice, to reinforce the student's critical capacity, his curiosity, his insubordination. One of its primary tasks is to work with students on the methodical rigor with which they must "approach" the knowable objects. And this methodical rigor has nothing to do with the "banking" discourse. (FREIRE, 1997, p. 25).

The attitude of the teacher who strives for a democratic educational practice motivates students to be actively participating subjects. Thus, students are equally responsible for their learning when they assume the position of curious, critical and unsubmitive subjects to certain truths put forward and finished, such as those that are included in textbooks that do not tell the story of indigenous and black peoples as warriors and resistant to the processes of oppression, but they are always in the place of lower status as lazy, soulless, blank sheets and other sayings that deny the historical process of resistance, struggle and a lot of blood spilling in favor of freedom, because ancestry did not die in vain.

## Final Considerations

The interpretation we carried out in Paulo Freire's works on interdisciplinarity was important to analyze how the discourse about it was materialized. In this case, in the set of Freirian works ("*Por uma Pedagogia da Pergunta*", as primary source; "*Professora sim, Tia não: cartas a quem ousa ensinar*", "*Extensão ou Comunicação?*", "*Pedagogia da Esperança: um reencontro com a pedagogia do oprimido*", "*Pedagogia da Indignação: cartas pedagógicas e outros escritos*", "*Pedagogia do Oprimido*", "*Cartas a Guiné-Bissau: registros de uma experiência em processo*" e "*Ação Cultural para Liberdade e outros escritos*", as secondary sources) favored us to conclude that:

Knowing our archaeological curiosity as it is put by Freire in the discourses on interdisciplinarity, we found that it is part of the interaction with the team through the dialogue about the thematic unit and its intervention in the investigated reality.

Considering our objective to analyze the discourse on the interdisciplinary utterance, we emphasize that the enunciative layers are unfolded in dialogue, pedagogical practice and ongoing training.

With regard to the enunciative correlates of interdisciplinarity, we emphasize the dialogue that unfolds in love, faith and trust in the human being. Thus, this is the triad that permeates a liberating educational practice as it promotes the possibility of transformation and liberation for the subjects.

Therefore, given the findings, we consider that interdisciplinarity should be taught and practiced on the school floor through project pedagogy, culture circles, dialogue tables, workshops and many other pedagogical actions that can be done with the intervention in the investigated reality, breaking the walls of the school, occupying the communities and in the midst of extreme situations, seeking the viable novelty. As we are doing in the midst of the pandemic, remote work mediated by digital information and communication technologies has favored the sharing of knowledge, dialogue, communication and the expansion of knowledge, because by entering reality and realizing its problem, intervention and not merely adaptation.

In this context, educators are constantly challenged to innovate, reinvent and recreate their educational practice, always seeking interdisciplinarity through dialogue contributing to this purpose, after all, collective work generates much more results than working in the solitude of teaching of the teacher with his fragmented vision of reality, when sharing, the vision expands, becomes holistic. Thus, the teacher can see the whole.

## REFERENCE

- FREIRE, Paulo. **Professora sim, tia não**: cartas a quem ousa ensinar. São Paulo: Olho d'Água, 1997.
- FREIRE, Paulo. **Pedagogia da indignação**: cartas pedagógicas e outros escritos. São Paulo: Editora UNESP, 2000.
- FREIRE, Paulo. **Pedagogia da esperança**: um reencontro com a pedagogia do oprimido. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1992.
- FREIRE, Paulo. **Cartas à Guiné-Bissau**: registros de uma experiência em Processo. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro, Paz e Terra, 1978.
- FREIRE, Paulo. **Ação cultural para a liberdade e outros escritos**. 5. ed. Rio de Janeiro, Paz e Terra. 1981.
- FREIRE, Paulo. **Pedagogia do oprimido**. 17. edição. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1987.
- FREIRE, Paulo. **Por uma Pedagogia da Pergunta**. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1985.
- FREIRE, Paulo. **Extensão ou comunicação?** 7. ed. Rio de Janeiro, Paz e Terra, 1983.