

DIALOGUE FROM THE FRATERNITY PERSPECTIVE

Dr. Luiz Síveres
Catholic University of Brasilia
<https://muse.jhu.edu/issue/48202>

ABSTRACT

Understanding the dialogue from the perspective of fraternity, in the current context, requires a perception of reality that is revealed, with a marked tendency, by personal egocentrism, social inequality and religious proselytism. This can be perceived by different experiences that reveal, in part, an individual encapsulation, a political polarization and a religious division, aspects that express the need to promote dialogue between people, social groups and religious denominations. For this reason, it is proposed to return to the concept and practice of dialogue based on a relational dynamic, guided by the proposal of Martin Buber (1878-1965); and, to illuminate social reality, the theory of Jürgen Habermas (1929-) will be revisited; and, to deepen the disposition of the dialogue, with the purpose of building a fraternity project, the suggestion of Hans Küng (1928-2021) will be accepted. Such assumptions are recognized, among others, as elements of an educational project, in which dialogue should be exercised as a life style, a way of living and a possibility to transcend, either through experience of significant relationships, promotion of social equality or universal fraternity experience.

KEYWORDS: Dialogue. Fraternity. Education.

INTRODUCTION

At the beginning of this century and at the dawn of the new millennium, the scenario that is taking shape with very different cultural traits, polarized geopolitical spaces and social contexts strongly delineated by inequality, could be contemplated through an optics directed towards complex realities or a look focused on perplexing conjunctures. For the perception of complexity it is possible to capture the profile of a reality that would be flooded, day and night, by a deluge of information; where the vast majority of navigators would have only small canoes to survive in this sea agitated by constant economic, political and environmental crises; and docking in ports would be taking place, as a priority, to supply immediate consumption provisions, to reestablish superficial encounters or continue accelerating towards empty existential void.

On the other hand, the perplexity emerging from this conjectural framework points to the superficiality of relations, either: with oneself, with others or with the transcendent, giving the impression that one would just be surfing on the waves invading our existence or our relational potentialities. In addition, although we are in the same ocean, it is noticeable

that few are confined to their speedboats and the absolute majority of the population is adrift, collecting what remains floating to ensure their survival. At the same time, according to Bauman¹, this "liquid modernity", would be manifesting itself through the predominance of innumerable technologies, which on one hand would also be providing enormous benefits to humanity, but on the other, they would also be contributing to dissolve family bonds, dilute cultural ties, weaken religious beliefs or minimize ethical principles.

This reality would be affecting, however, everyone and everything, without distinction. That is why it's recommended to highlight the perception that we are no longer facing a local crisis, but we are inserted in a multiplicity of crises that are transversal and worldwide, revealing that the human being and the planet would be involved by this harsh stage, which could be characterized, both for its perdition and for its redemption. In view of this analysis, everything will depend on the "North" that the compass will indicate and on how humanity will go through its destination in the coming decades. Therefore, considering the perceived problem, what dynamics could be developed or what projects could be implemented to contribute to the development of more fraternal people, more equitable systems and more dialogical educational processes?

In view of this questioning, which reflects the predominance of some challenges that humanity would be facing, different suggestions could be indicated, aiming to enable a more humanized personal conduct, a more balanced social experience and a more promising future perspective. However, to contribute to a real possibility of change, reflection on the agenda is prioritizing the sharing of experiences, the proposition of equality as an antidote to social inequality, and the educational dialogue as a mediator of the fraternity, aiming to develop a culture of peace.

1. THE MEANING OF EXPERIENCES

*Experience, not truth,
is what gives education a meaning.*
Jorge Larrosa

Information, especially in the context of artificial intelligence, is an essential element for the current context, but the excess and exaggeration of technologies that are breaking into our lives and our homes, our devices and our machines, our networks and our satellites arouse

¹ Z. Bauman, *Modernidade líquida* (Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2001), p. 4-22.

the sensation that we are surfing on the surface of the tides, to the detriment of a deeper and expanded experience and that according to Larrosa², could give meaning to what we experience or teach. Those are life experiences and, as a result, educational experiences that could effectively provide an existential and educational sense.

Considering the dynamics of experience, according to Larrosa, it can provide an encounter with something that is experienced and through this bond, the subjects are touched, affected or surprised. From this relationship a reflection is triggered, an aspect that can contribute to a training process because "the knowledge of experience occurs in the relationship between knowledge and human life"³. This recognition is defined, in a special way, by the reflective potential and existential quality, contributing to the originality of the feeling and to the dialogical possibility between theory and practice, turning into passion. In this sense, experience enhances passion that, in turn, triggers compassion for a person, for a project or for a reality to be transformed.

From this perspective three experiences are reported that, on the one hand, show a transversal procedure and for another, traces of a circumstance that is expressed in the difficulty of experiencing the dialogue in the context of a logic of unilateral postures in the historical conjuncture that potentiates inequalities, and the religious systems that foster proselytism.

The first experience took place in mid-2017, when at the invitation of the United States embassy, I took a 45-day course, at the Dialogue Institute at the University of Philadelphia. The group consisted of 18 students from different countries, different cultures and different religions and the purpose of the meeting was to understand and exercise interreligious dialogue. I arrived in town on a Sunday morning, and at lunchtime I looked for a restaurant near the university. However, when I crossed an avenue, I noticed that on one side there was a group of Jehovah's Witnesses shouting: "I trust in God" and, after each manifestation, songs of praise and the announcement of biblical texts followed. But on the other corner, on the same avenue, there was a socialist group shouting: "Out President", and this position was followed by the waving of flags and the exhibition of pictures with

² J. Larrosa, *Pedagogia profana: danças, piruetas e mascaradas* (Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2017), p. 131-143.

³ J. Larrosa, "Notas sobre a experiência e o saber de experiência". *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, no. 19 (2002), p. 26.

personalities recognized for their struggle for democracy. Faced with this experience, I began to wonder: How "to cross" an avenue with corners occupied by such different groups? How "dialogue" between such monocratic positions can be established? How fraternity can be built with such different positions?

These questions resonated throughout the meeting and I returned to Brazil with the same questions in mind. Based on these challenges I also resumed Brazilian history and I had the second experience with a comprehensive look to understand the approximation or the distance between the religious belief and the political sphere. I realized this perspective could already be seen on the sea route, when the Empire moved to Colony and when they were sailing the same seas - conquerors and missionaries. When they got off the caravel and were on land, with personal belongings, swords and crosses were held as an expression that the State and the Church were "discovering" one continent and "catechizing" people.

The memory of this imaginary was to demonstrate that the composition of the public and religious space was revealing itself, as a continuous dynamism to strengthen the tones of inequality, very well explained by Gilberto Freyre through the analogy to "Casa Grande & Senzala" – "Big House and Slave Quarters" who, in fact, makes a relationship between the privilege of the few to the detriment of the work of many. Based on this allegory, which has covered all of Brazilian history and can be seen throughout the national territory, why has inequality been reproduced for so long and tolerated so naturally? Why have political systems, religious institutions and segments of society conformed to the economic, social and cultural inequalities so evidenced? What kind of dialogue could be exercised to overcome this inequality structure?

Although the prevalence of "the sword and the cross, "the big house and the slave quarters" and now a "God above all" continues strengthening this archetype of Brazilian culture, with the aim of promoting coloniality and inequality there were, in different periods of history, initiatives that proposed to overcome this abyss. Just to configure the account of the third experience, it is convenient to recognize the initiative of the Catholic Church, which, having as reference the Second Vatican Council and the inspiration of some Brazilian bishops, the Fraternity Campaign was created in 1962. This initiative continues to the present day and the goals of these campaigns are ending at ecclesial living, life in fraternity, having as a guideline the principles of the Gospel. Moreover, the willingness to renew responsibility

towards the promotion of the common good, expressed in themes that have linked, mainly, in recent years, fraternity to the problems of children, black people, women, the excluded, prisoners as well as family, housing, work, or the Amazon environments has been intensified.

Based on this experience, the Fraternity Campaign is being carried out in an ecumenical way, from 2010 and in every 5 years, involving all Christian religions. Now, in 2021, the Campaign will again be ecumenical and will address the theme: “Dialogue and Fraternity - commitment to love”. So, after more than fifty campaigns, what ecclesial projects or social policies have managed to promote fraternity experiences? By celebrating the fraternity campaign, and now, in an ecumenical way, would Christian religions be willing to carry out a dialogue between religions and with all religious denominations? Could the dialogue overcome the division between different religious denominations, reduce the distance between the profession of faith and the exercise of citizenship, or minimize the distinction between public and sacred space?

The three experiences reported express a circumstantial, historical and institutional connotation. However, in the possibility of overcoming cultural unilateralism, social inequality and the gap between faith and life, dialogue would be suggested as “Fio de Ariadne”- “Ariadne’s thread”, in order to provide a journey into these times and spaces that are, in turn, occasional, systemic and transversal to return, however, with the possibility of opening new dialogical dispositions and strengthen dialogical dynamics in favor of fraternity.

2. DIALOGICAL EXPERIENCES

*There will be no peace between nations without peace between religions.
And there will be no peace between religions without dialogue between religions.*

Hans Küng

The opening epigraph of this reflection in the context of a global ethics projects was endorsed by Küng⁴ to suggest an ecumenical moral in view of human survival and, for that, the willingness of people, religions and societies would become necessary to experience an ethics that could be universal and dialogical. Although dialogue is an element inherent to ethical conduct and religious doctrines, it will be understood as a transversal dynamic that will characterize the human condition itself, mediate social segments to overcome social

⁴ H. Küng, *Projeto de ética mundial: uma moral ecumênica em vista da sobrevivência humana*, 3rd ed. (São Paulo: Paulinas, 2001), p. 103-131.

inequalities and the possibility of reestablishing, through fraternity, a willingness for peace.

This three dimensional relationship, in which the dialogue will be understood as a personal, social and transversal dynamics, could be anchored to different theorists, however, considering the reflexive proximity of the dialogue with the human dimension, it will be linked to the proposal of Martin Buber (1878-1965); to illuminate social reality, the theory proposed by Jürgen Habermas (1929-) will be revisited; and , finally, to deepen the disposal of the dialogue , for fraternity project, for the construction of a culture of peace, the suggestion of Hans Kung (1928-) will be accepted. Although these authors have different origins, religions and theoretical proposals, they have in common the reflection and the practice of dialogue, which will be understood, respectively, for their attempt to humanization, by their proposal of equality and their fraternity project to build a culture of peace.

2.1 Dialogue as a principle of humanization

The human being can be identified by a diversity of characteristics that reveal his existential purpose, his relational dynamics and his universal perspective. However, dialogue would be in the set of possibilities to contribute to this perception that, fundamentally, would work as a structuring principle of the humanitarian and historical constitution for the construction of a civilizing project.

Therefore, in order to understand dialogue as an assumption that reveals these attributes of the human condition, the proposal of Martin Buber^{5,6} is presented as the most suitable, considering that in his philosophical anthropology, the human being is an essentially dialogical being, who is called to establish dialogical relationships through word, mediated by the encounter and experienced in the community, a space considered as the most privileged for the dialogical exercise.

Dialogue, as a word, is part of the universe of language and, therefore, it can be heard, proclaimed or reflected; the word can be interpreted, exchanged or directed; the word can be sung, poetized or symbolized; the word can be underlined, bolded or shaded; the word can be misrepresented, defaced or misunderstood; the word can be remembered, silenced or

⁵ M. Buber, *Eu e Tu*, 8rd ed. (São Paulo: Centauro, 2001), p. 43-50.

⁶ M. Buber, *Do diálogo e do dialógico* (São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2009), p. 53-68.

prayed. From these assignments, among many others, one could conclude that the human being is the word or that the word has become human, as the biblical text explains "the Word was made flesh" (Jno 1.10). This revelation affirms, however, that God became man and that, in turn, humanity encounters divinity through dialogue, which is the word. Therefore, dialogue as the word is expressed as language, manifested as humanity and points to the divine dimension.

In Buber's proposition⁷ there are two word modes: I-You and I-It. Both words are important and necessary, both for the personal dimension, as for the social and transcendental experience. The mode of I-It is configured by necessity and institutionality; while the mode of I-You has the potential to reveal the encounter of subjects who, in turn, establish inter-human relations. This encounter between the I and the You can be configured as finite, by linking with others and with nature, explicating the responsibility of the I; but also as infinite, by reference to the Mystery, manifested by the grace of God, revealing the gratuity of You. The dialogical dimension of the human condition is effective, in this case, through an encounter of subjects who establish a relationship between themselves, with others and with the transcendent, mainly through human responsibility and divine gratuity.

For Buber, dialogue is also consolidated through the encounter, because "all current life is encounter"⁸. This statement becomes operational, however, through reciprocal relationships with others and with nature. For this reason, a dialogical relationship is consolidated, which for the author, is a behavior, that is, a relational attitude that welcomes and strives to experience the presence "between" the subjects involved or "between" the experienced processes, because everything that is essential, existential and transcendental is experienced in the presence.

From the perspective of presence, dialogue is also a dialogical process and it is fulfilled in a community experience. According to Buber⁹, the community is not a geographical space or a grouping of power, but a place for encounter, a space for dialogue and an environment of infinite possibilities for the accomplishment of the human condition. Thus, dialogue is a willingness to welcome the other, a relationship of interaction with otherness and a community proposition, so that together, the subjects of the dialogue are

⁷ M. Buber, *Eu e Tu*, 8rd ed. (São Paulo: Centauro, 2001), p. 03-39.

⁸ *Ibid*, 13.

⁹ M. Buber, *Do diálogo e do dialógico* (São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2009), p. 91-109.

committed to building a culture of peace.

The proposed peace should be vital or organic, because it was not the absence of conflicts, but based on a path of change, regulated by a conversion procedure of community experiences exercised by the relational encounter and, finally, dialogue could be proposed as an attribute of the human condition in a solidary willingness to build a society based on justice and, consequently, a mediation to trigger a humanization process.

2.2 Dialogue as an equality process

Human civilization, especially over the past few centuries, has potentiated social inequalities, promoted mainly by global economic dissimilarities. For this reason, the need to change this liberal system is constantly reaffirmed, which abundantly favors a small social group, to the detriment of what is lacking for an amazing leftover mass. It is in this sense that one could recover the perception that there is a high degree of social injustice and, in being historical and structural, it reveals increasingly exposed indicators of misery, delinquency and what is disposable, the human being himself.

This conjuncture, however, has already been analyzed by thinkers, sung by poets, described by historians and prayed by religious, but it was mainly lived and is being experienced by the majority of people. Among the different suggestions already formulated, among many initiatives already exercised and among numerous projects already developed, it seems that no progress has been made, either in the understanding of this abyssal process or in proposing policies that could guarantee human life with more dignity.

In order to move forward with a more decent proposal, it is necessary to recognize that, historically, there has always been a predominance of an irrational elite and, as a result, an impoverished, forgotten and marginalized population. To illuminate this perception and suggest some direction, it is opportune to resume the proposal of a communicative rationality, proposed by Habermas¹⁰. Communicative action would be in the context of this rationality that, through dialogue, could overcome the structural precipice and promote social equality. According to the author, the theory of communicative action would indicate, on the one hand, for an instrumental reason, based on a system linked to a procedure of material production

¹⁰ J. Habermas, *The theory of communicative action. Reason and the rationalization of society*, Vol. 1. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1984), p. 48-95.

and reproduction, mostly by real and digital instruments; and, on the other hand, the communicative action, which would be part of the world of life, in which language, bonds and symbols would be present, and such a contribution would be recommended to suggest dialogue as a dynamism that promotes social equality.

The Habermasian proposal indicates, however, for the relevance of establishing a social interaction between people, but also, the importance of participating in a socialization process, which allows to form personal identity and foster their social belonging. As an approach to this assumption it would be suggesting the transition from an instrumental system to a relational world and, therefore, the change from strategic systems to communicative networks, procedures considered more appropriate and better idealized to understand and exercise dialogue.

Thus, dialogue according to Habermas¹¹, could be a privileged possibility to break with a system configured by the iron cage, or revealed by instrumental action, opening its doors to interact with the world of life, stylizing a network and revealing the symbolic reproduction of a free life. Thus, the prison action of reclusion, force and coercion would be replaced by communicative action through emancipation, cooperation and democracy.

Communicative action is, therefore, the dynamizing element of a dialogue that should trigger a social practice, in view of a responsible action in the public sphere to remove the huge social inequalities and promote the common good of societies. Such procedures would be recommended to overcome, through dialogue, the accumulative and exclusive dynamics of capitalist systems, taking as a reference democratic societies that would have, among other purposes, the perspective of equality.

2.3 Dialogue from a perspective of fraternity

Fraternity is a universal principle because all human beings and all societies have experienced some kind of fraternal bond. In addition, fraternity was a value proclaimed as a requirement for humanity to live with freedom and equality. Also, in the original experience of the Hebrew people, in the systematization of the first biblical text, the experience between two brothers was narrated. After a disastrous relationship, there was a dialogue between God

¹¹ J. Habermas, *The theory of communicative action. Reason and the rationalization of society*, Vol. 1. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1984), p. 353-427.

and Cain, and when asked by God: "Where is your brother"? Cain replied, "I killed him". That is, from then on, fraternity became fratricidal and to reestablish a fraternal dynamic, dialogue could be a recommended attitude and activity.

Therefore, in a more theological perspective, without belittling any religious experience, it is recommended to remember the three monotheistic religions: Judaism, Christianity and Islam, which have in common a relationship with the word, that is, they are based on revelations and condensed in book, as the Torah, the Bible and the Koran, respectively. In this sense, the religions of one word revealed, through Moses, Jesus and Muhammad, came to propose fraternity as an experiential principle and a universal procedure.

Within this monotheistic context, whose reference is the word dialogued, it is necessary to establish an alliance with all religious denominations, because in accordance with Küng¹², there will be peace among religions and, consequently, world peace, in so far as dialogue is exercised among them all. According to the author such a proposal would need to overcome a reality that would be guided by the development of a science without ethics, of technological omnipotence that destroys nature and of a democracy that is only formal and representative.

In addition to these challenges, which inhibit the experience of dialogue, it is necessary to recognize, according to Küng¹³, that contemporary dynamics would be strongly influenced by an indifference in relation to any proposed guideline, a relativism manifested to everything that points to more universal values, and a syncretism that is satisfied with the acquisition of benefits to promote individual religious consumption.

To minimize these trends dialogue is suggested, since it is understood as an appropriate dynamic to promote peace among religions and among humanity. For that, the proposal of Küng¹⁴ would be recommended, in the sense that it should be based on a firm position of all the interlocutors involved, in a willingness to welcome and interact with the themes addressed and, mainly, in a proposition of collective engagement for the definition

¹² H. Küng, *Projeto de ética mundial: uma moral ecumênica em vista da sobrevivência humana*, 3rd ed. (São Paulo: Paulinas, 2001), p. 132-136.

¹³ H. Küng, *Projeto de ética mundial: uma moral ecumênica em vista da sobrevivência humana*, 3rd ed. (São Paulo: Paulinas, 2001), p. 135.

¹⁴ H. Küng, *Projeto de ética mundial: uma moral ecumênica em vista da sobrevivência humana*, 3rd ed. (São Paulo: Paulinas, 2001), p.136-143.

and operationalization of projects that could make this purpose of building peace through fraternity viable.

The path of dialogue proposed by Küng¹⁵ should also take into account the sensitivity of each person and each group, but with the requirement of a gesture of generosity from those who would be involved in a peace project and that there could be a coexistence pact, based on the proposition of truth. Such attitudes would be anchored in an expression of freedom that, at the same time, would require a strong degree of responsibility, aiming to create transparent, ethical and fraternal relationships and mediations.

According to Küng, "the willingness to dialogue is, ultimately, a virtue of the willingness to dialogue"¹⁶. This virtue would need to be cultivated, mainly, in a context that would be configured within a new world constellation, increasingly identified by the polycentric, transcultural and multireligious dynamics. At the same time, this disposition for dialogue would need to be awakened in all those who interact with philosophical thinking, because it points to existential reasons; with all those who articulate themselves with theological knowledge, because it underlies the existential meaning of their relationship with the sacred; and, finally, a spiritual dialogue, because it establishes relationships with oneself, with others, with nature and with the transcendent.

3. EDUCATE FOR FRATERNITY

*There is no dialogue, however,
if there is no deep love for the world and for men.
(Paulo Freire)*

After following a path marked by the potential of dialogue, understood as an attribute of the human condition itself, as a principle that provides social equality and as an essential guideline for establishing fraternity, it is appropriate to indicate the educational project as an appropriate time and space for triggering dialogic processes, especially in divided environments to promote unity.

Such a perspective would be inserted, however, in the framework formatted at the beginning of this reflection, in the sense that humanity would be involved by different complex approaches and by different perplexed dynamisms. Considering, however, this

¹⁵ H. Küng, *Projeto de ética mundial: uma moral ecumênica em vista da sobrevivência humana*, 3rd ed. (São Paulo: Paulinas, 2001), p. 144-146.

¹⁶ *Ibid*, p. 145.

perplexed potentiality it is recommended to recall an old suggestion of Rabbi Maimonides, from the twelfth century who, when referring to perplexity, said that it should not be seen as a wrong way, but understood, from an appropriate interpretation, as a light that illuminates the walk.

Based on this proposition, that is, with the desire to turn on a light that illuminates the path of history, it would be proposing that an educational project, through dialogue, could contribute to a more humane, more dignified and fraternal society. This proposal would be fraught with the challenge to overcome individualistic dispositions, minimize lonely experiences among the crowd and strengthen the experience of freedom in the midst of an existential void.

The pedagogical path would be, in this sense, a procedure that could contribute, according to Síveres^{17,18}, to the development of the dialogical assumption, in view of a possible pilgrimage through the pedagogy of presence, proximity and departure. Such a suggestion would also be in line with the responsibility of the pedagogue himself, who should accompany the apprentice to self-knowledge and the recognition of the other, based on the recall and reconstruction of knowledge. Therefore, the pedagogical path and the exercise of the pedagogue would be impregnated with this dialogical energy, to enhance the principles of humanization, equality and fraternity.

Thus, the education for humanity, in the theoretical framework of Buber^{19,20}, would be based on encounter, relationship and dialogue. For this reason, his dialogical project refutes an educational model identified with advertising, through which prefabricated knowledge is injected into learners. Such an assumption, which would be a majority in almost all educational systems, would be strengthening an I-It mode relationship, to the detriment of a dynamic that recognizes the diversity of educational subjects and proposes different learning paths, based on an I-You mode relationship. Therefore, the Buberian educational suggestion, to form the character of the human being, would be based more on reflection and less on instruction, more on care and less on guidance, more on dialogue and less on

¹⁷ L. Síveres, *Encontros e Diálogos: pedagogia da presença, da proximidade e partida* (Brasília: Liber Livros, 2015), p. 25-75.

¹⁸ L. Síveres, *Pedagogia Alpha: presença, proximidade, partida* (Curitiba: Publishing, 2019), p. 85-172.

¹⁹ M. Buber, *Eu e Tu*, 8rd ed. (São Paulo: Centauro, 2001), p. 45-59.

²⁰ M. Buber, *Do diálogo e do dialógico* (São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2009), p.26-28.

advertising.

Education for equality, within the theoretical framework of Habermas²¹, through its communicative action, seeks to obstruct the door of the cage of individualism and proposes, precisely, the need for an interrelation with the other, that is, an intersubjectivity. For this, it is recommended not to be held hostage to technical knowledge or technological tools, however necessary and opportune they might be, to strengthen ethical and aesthetic skills, in order to expand, deep and transversalize the dialogical path. However, in the most philosophical and sociological approach, the author proposes a more critical pedagogical process, taking into account a more political teaching and learning path, guided by a communicative rationality, due to the promotion of a participatory democracy.

Education for the fraternity, having as reference the contribution of Hans Küng²², would be the desire to develop a global ethics in which religions, in a more emphatic way, would be willing to establish an affective and effective dialogue. For this, dialogue would need to have a declared intentionality to take over the legacies of the past, the challenges of the present, having on the horizon an interreligious dialogue that could point to hope and infinity. It is characteristic of authentic dialogue to try to go beyond dialogue itself and, for that, it is advisable to educate for a transcendental path through a spiritual journey. This spirituality would not be a dogmatic defense of the ego, but a disposition to recognize the other; it would not be a doctrinal justification, but a project of co-responsibility; and it would not be a salvationist promise, but a welcome of gratuitousness to boost a dialogical education between religions and societies.

Therefore, in order to educate for fraternity, among countless possibilities, a dialogical project between educator and student was considered, a dialectical dynamic between theory and practice, as well as a dialogicity between formation and transformation, aiming to promote the education of the human being, social transformation and the reconnection of religions, through dialogue.

CONCLUSION

²¹ J. Habermas, *The theory of communicative action. Reason and the rationalization of society*, Vol. 1. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1984), p. 455-492.

²² H. Küng, *Projeto de ética mundial: uma moral ecumênica em vista da sobrevivência humana*, 3rd ed. (São Paulo: Paulinas, 2001), p. 184-186.

Final considerations are characterized by the opportunity to reaffirm, among countless possibilities, that dialogue is an element inherent to human nature itself because we are beings of speech, encounter and relationship. At the same time, dialogue is a social activity, because through communicative action it is possible to develop an autonomous, democratic and political rationality. Lastly, dialogue is a recommended attitude to promote fraternity between personal relationships, in social spheres and, above all, among religious denominations.

However, an educational project that might be able to develop a teaching and learning process is recommended, whereas the logic of encapsulation, duality and instrumentality would be minimized, to the detriment of a procedure that could strengthen the relational dynamics, the dialogical reference and the multicultural approach. It would, however, be the transition from the monologue to the dialogue, from the algorithmic to the dialogical perspective and from the monolithic system to a pluricultural one.

In the course of this positioning, dialogue could be understood as an intrapersonal, interpersonal and transcendental dynamism and, thus, one would try to overcome the tendency of personal exclusivism, social parallelism and religious nihilism. Finally, dialogue would be suggested to be understood and practiced as a way of living, a way of getting along with and a possibility to transcend, whether through the experience of humanity, the promotion of equality or the experience of fraternity.

REFERENCES

- Bauman, Z. *Modernidade líquida*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2001.
- Buber, M. *Eu e Tu*. 8rd ed. São Paulo: Centauro, 2001.
- Buber, M. *Do diálogo e do dialógico*. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2009.
- Habermas, J. *The theory of communicative action. Reason and the rationalization of society*. Vol. 1. Boston: Beacon Press, 1984.
- Küng, H. *Projeto de ética mundial: uma moral ecumênica em vista da sobrevivência humana*. 3rd ed. São Paulo: Paulinas, 2001.
- Larrosa, J. Notas sobre a experiência e o saber de experiência. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, no. 19 (2002): 20-28.
- Larrosa, J. *Pedagogia profana: danças, piruetas e mascaradas*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2017.

Síveres, L. *Encontros e Diálogos: pedagogia da presença, da proximidade e partida*. Brasília: Liber Livros, 2015.

Síveres, L. *Pedagogia Alpha: presença, proximidade, partida*. Curitiba: Publishing, 2019.