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Abstract
The aim of this paper is to address some educational issues regarding some school’s transformations that have irrupted into the field on this specially chosen conjuncture from our Recent History. In order to do this, we will be interested in asking which kind of educational problematics have effectively taken place at school and have also operated as a sort of “before and after” turning point for rethinking daily life at school and the teaching training as well.

Keywords: educational issues; borders; new boundaries; school; teaching training.

Problemáticas disruptivas a través del tiempo: Breve genealogía “Ad libitum” sobre márgenes que manifestó la escuela.

(Argentina, 1970-2010)

Resumen
El presente trabajo intentará dar cuenta de un recorrido específicamente orientado a identificar cómo la escuela, institución histórica de certidumbre, necesitó repensarse a sí misma a partir de los nuevos embates provenientes de diversas esferas de la coyuntura a lo largo del tiempo. En este sentido, hemos considerado el universo de representaciones –y de transformaciones– sociales, políticas y educativas las cuales, efectivamente, irrupieron abruptamente en el campo de lo escolar en diferentes periodizaciones de nuestra historia reciente. De esta manera nos interesará fundamentalmente tratar de indagar en torno a cómo se configuraron aquel conjunto de problemáticas inéditas “límites” que significaron, para la escuela, violentar sus propios márgenes de manifestación social, privada y de política pública. Lo anterior, con el fin de no solo permitirnos trazar “un antes y un después” en lo relativo a las formas de habitar la vida escolar, sino, a su vez, intentar (re) conocer los circuitos implícitos y explícitos, formales e informales de sus modos de manifestación o re-traducción en nuevos umbrales de racionalidad y de reflexión institucional.

Palabras clave: problemáticas educativas; límites; nuevas fronteras; escuela; formación docente.
Introduction

Why write History if not to help our contemporaries to trust in the future and better face the difficulties they find every day? (Duby, 1996: 9). Those who lived eight or ten centuries ago were no less or more restless in spirit than we are today. History, as written today, struggles to discover, to probe what those men and women believed, what their feelings were, how they represented the world, and how the spirit of a society was as invisible as it is today. It also seeks to make evident how it deserves as much interest, possesses as much power as what is visible. Moreover, that is why it is different from ours. Unraveling the differences, but also the similarities between what they feared then, and what we fear today helps us face with greater clarity contemporary dangers (Duby, 1996: 9).

The idea of writing a paper with the aim of discussing the momentous universes of representation in school issues along different periods (1970-2010, focusing on each of its decades) arises from our own academic, political and educational interests. The questions about teaching and about learning drive us and inhabit us. Moreover, we seek to understand and analyze historically the way in which social and political conditions permeate school as an institution along those years.

The attempt to approach the ways of representation of violence on the borders, that is, the unexpected situations that have troubled the teaching community, and the school itself as an institution, have translated into the legal sphere, not always simultaneously. In other words, they have, through the political educational history of our country, materialized in different sets of laws. On the other hand, it is evident that they had previously affected the institutional, social, political and cultural ways in which relationships were established. That is, they have had an impact on what we consider the classical relationships among society, school, and state. Having that in mind, we cannot assert whether those disruptive changes have or have not been included as a rational device. But we can certainly infer that they have been perceived, and in some way or another, experienced by schools’ communities.

Thus, we are necessarily lead to establish certain differences among what is implied in the ideas of perceiving and experiencing on the one hand, and the self-capacity for generating institutional mechanisms and politics to favor the process of symbolization of the events on the other. These differences will allow for the transition and transformation of the disruptive experiential modes that have made, and still make possible the explosion of a quiet conservative logic (specific of a cultural identity ethos), based –and bequeathed– in the way games are played and time is used in schools.

In brief: we will deal with the ways in which those new arising issues were perceived, experienced and named in each historical record. In addition, we will inquire in which modes of subjectivation were enhanced and which modes were “exiled” from critical inquiry restraining, in this manner, the possibility of a rational political and institutional discussion.

Methodological issues

In order to carry out this work, we have resorted to methodological tools that helped amplify, overlap and tighten up a polyphonic concert of voices related to the narrative matrix of different institutional actors. These actors have also played a specific role in each of the selected historical periods. Therefore we have tried to seize the value of narratives interwoven with the underlying political senses that we attempt to articulate with a critical perspective. This perspective will allow us to identify, deconstruct, mark, infer, socialize and share a possible point of view for our subject matter. This approach, always subjective in its epistemological and hermeneutical levels, will nevertheless try to make evident the complexity of the field regarding the problematic issues mentioned above.

That is why, for the present work, we have mostly resort to the power of narratives, the strength of school memories and the fabric of meaning (re)constructed through open interviews to teachers, students, parents and members of management staff in the educational system. These actors have experienced and built the institutional spaces in each of those periods.

We propose our categories as Ad Libidum. Nonetheless, from our point of view, they do
not deny the logic of traditional research. On the contrary, in no way we mean we are free to do as we please. We intend to recover and pursue a sound analytical line of work by means of identification, selection, and fusion of narratives and experiential voices that did not have institutional audibility. In this way, we will try to restore part of their historical potential as regards what these voices could tell us about school. Thus, we intend to oppose the trend that ignores them in the research field in spite of the impossibility of backing them up with evidence as demanded by academia in its positivist scientific paradigm. That is the reason why the approach of this work is decolonial and impertinent, daring the historical hegemonic matrix of traditional research.

In this sense, it might not be excessive to issue a kind of epistemological warning. The attempt at inquiring the valid ways of constructing, identifying, signifying and interpreting the issues at hand with the aim of revealing either its critical resistance horizons or the oppressive reproductive logic related to mainly colonial or eurocentric structures, does not imply by any means to deny them. On the contrary, we seek above all to make visible and engage historical collective struggles and forces participating in the corresponding process in “a dialogue”, placing the emphasis in those thresholds that were left “outside” the symbolic world and that are still struggling for their recognition. That might demand a work of critical review of the dominant forces of their constitution (epistemological, political and pedagogic forces) with the objective of acknowledging the fields that made evident the ways in which those margins could function. In this way, we could recover inferred knowledge which had been exiled or denied as composing marginal areas that, at different moments in our history, were not able to be articulated or symbolized.

Therefore we propose an explicit, situated pedagogy, establishing a dialogue among our knowledge and the central issues discussed by the authors of the Manifest for this work. A situated pedagogy implies a political and critical standpoint towards the historical modes of teaching and learning, not only in an attempt to approach the world of teachers, but to understand and open up its frontiers.

In that sense, we must state a new warning as regards this sort of Ad Libitum approach. Even though we have conducted interviews to university and tertiary teachers in the teachers’ education field, we cannot deny the scarce amount of sources in our country, mainly in testimonies from teachers at the university level for the period covering the 70s up to the recovery of democracy, that is 1983. This is due to the resignations, expulsions and forced disappearance of part of that community during this period marked by state terrorism.

These brief methodological statements expose a hermeneutical, critical, decolonial and “impatient” logic in search of recovering the value of words, of revealing the way in which knowledge is constructed and given new meaning, and of understanding and restoring meaning to enduring stories and memories. Our purpose is not to consider them only in the frame of the “past” but mostly relate them to what will encounter us, what we will hopefully live.

**Journey Roadmap: Violence at the Borders I: The 70s and the Beginning of Democracy**

When darkness and shipwreck come, someone will rescue you, and keep on singing...

(M.E. Walsh)

The world of political and social reshapings that took place during the 70s in Argentina translated the underlying founding violence already existing that gained their utmost expression during the civilian-military dictatorship that started on March, 24th, 1976. In this context, school as an institution, and more precisely, public schools, were still the tangible evidence of what Domingo Faustino Sarmiento had imagined and dreamt: an environment for the citizens to socialize which was capable of subverting and defying subjects starting points and social classifications through a fair redistribution of social and cultural capital.

In this sense, the Public School System reflected mostly, at least until the military coup, that warp of voices and chalk, “bibles and heaters” as the tango goes. It was a tribute to the eclectic education of its own founding father, related to an effective device to capture childhood. According to Crespo (2007), Sarmiento:
was everything, from miner to president, from constitutional expert to retail employee. An intellectual worker of astonishing seriousness in warm lands, he did everything. And he did it here, in desolate provinces where it was usual not to do any work at all, or at least, most frequently, to do it in the wrong way (...) No activity was alien to him. So much so, that it is difficult to approach Sarmiento: the amount of his work is excessive; there is no way to deal with it. How can we approach the Andes, the Paraná River, the enormity of the Pampa, the outstanding greatness and dignity of the Americas? (...) Borges wrote that we can say that half of Sarmiento’s work is the many volumes out of his pen, and the other half, is this country we inhabit, this passion, this air (...). The big and the small. He founded a nation; he would write a theater play review or plant a tree. His last working day, September, 4th was of a fertile creative excitement: he had obtained water, Water! ... From the well he was building on his farm in Paraguay. A small thing, we might think, but it was a symbol, a mythic ultimate reason. Water is not a trivial thing, it is the breeder of life. (Crespo, 2007:23)

The previous quote, even though a bit extensive, contributes to shed light to the founding logic of what characterizes, in a rational and organized way, an array of necessary institutions needed, since the enacting of the Law Number 1420 issued in 1884, to give shape to the educational system. These institutions, we insist, were previously “imagined” by the eclectic manner of principles embodied by Sarmiento’s life.

Why, is it necessary then, to inquire into this foundational principle? Because the Civil-Militar dictatorship, which translated into the interruption of institutional functioning, would break, with its disciplinary order and its market economy, that eclectic logic which, until that moment was the warrant for the promises of diversity and the possibility of social and cultural progress through the world of school.

From that moment on, as many papers and research projects devoted to this special scenario show (Kaufman, Doval, 1997; Garcia; 2017) a repressive, disciplinary and anti-democratic order was imposed. This order, neo-capitalist in the economic field, had obviously an impact in school relationships. As we have already stated, the aim of our work is not to “repeat” what has already been researched about this and other topics specifically devoted to the educational system in our country (for that purpose please refer to Dr. Ascolani’s work, 2009). Our objective is to inquire into some controversies arising with unusual strength between school as an institution and civil population from the moment of that interruption. These confrontations, arrayed in “dualities” are the first disruptive barriers that schools had to face. Those schools had, as we have already mentioned, reflected and comprised metaphors and variables that went beyond those confrontations. Moreover, they were still part of the logic of Sarmiento’s school. The removal and migration of the eclectic social origin, which prevailed in schools, started a process of reclassification. This process produced a double effect of conflictive fragmentation. It bred economic (class) antagonism as well as “ideological” antagonism, opening the door to the greatest horrors of our recent history.

These antagonisms could be summarized in general terms as institutional and urban-civic “scripts” that translated –or inferred– the dominant rhetoric of the period. They will help us support and provide a critical view to the reconstruction of what was happening at the time.

- suspicious/trustworthy
- communist/patriotic
- terrorist/nationalist
- missing person as fiction or “myth”/missing person as a solid reality
- obedient/subversive
- righteous and human/illegal inhumane
- wealthy and poor (as a classroom and institutional divide)
- moral/immoral

This is how school begins to be part of disruptive circuits where new borders were drawn in a slow but inflexible way, shading school relationships. We could mention “uncertain” situations that arise in a potent manner in the new social and political scene. The examples that support what we are trying to express (product of our work with documentary sources and interviews) might be bind with the inherent anguish in processes where the necessary sym-
bolization to collectively understand what was going on in political terms, was absent.

That is, the presence on isolated signifiers would not favor symbolization or understanding or even allow a plausible reconstruction of certain situations within the school. This alienation of what was symbolic was replaced with what was at hand, or what could be inferred, disregarding specific cases of political compromise of some teachers. Once again, we put emphasis on the fact that the purpose of this work is to provide a view away from the political characters that resisted. Instead, we intend to provide the stand of the forgotten institutional in-betweens left in the dark where teachers and school community, in general, had to face new issues emerging from this new context. Following Biesta & Säfström (2011)

Placing education within the tension between “what it is” and “what it is not” has also effects as regards the theoretical resources that can be applied in education. We wonder if the different academic disciplines can completely apprehend the educational dimension of education, and as a consequence, perform an educational “work” (Biesta & Säfström, 2011: 4).

Not an easy task at all. We could mention oral reconstructions from many students who, confronted with a teachers absences (due to a sickness or maternity leave), would infer or “hear” theories that she/he “had been taken”, “killed”, “taken to some other province” or “disappeared”. Headmasters during interviews state that those were hard times, that they “had little information” and that they were once asked by the Education Ministry for a list of teachers whose husbands they believed might perform “illegal” activities. During this interview, the headmaster denied having agreed to write the mentioned list. The teachers, in turn, confronted with the frequent absences of their students “suspected” that “something” different from the “usual” could be “happening” in the family. All these translated into distressing modes of subjectivation:

When the process of subjectivation is reduced at “what it is”, it becomes identity, understood as the identification with an order or state of affairs already existing. When this process is reduced to “what it is not”, it becomes a fantasy; an imagined self that lays beyond reality (Biesta & Säfström, 2011: 4).

The perplexity, the hypothesis, the suspicions, the attempts at theorizing, inferring, imagining, in order to symbolize at least “something” around certain circumstances would be the strongest characteristics of this violence on the borders that schools suffered in one of the worst scenarios in Argentine history

“Instructions to climb a stair”, mix technique. Ana Kljajo
Second Station: Analysis of relevant issues that affected or allowed the “construction of meaning” as regards school between 1980-1990. From “Where do we come from?” to HIV in schools

“I don’t wanna be so mental”
(Charly García)

Standards and quality of democracy, in time, healed with the recovery of the democratic institutions. This took place without paying the cost of a mutilated and denied subjectivity. In this sense, an event that has marked a difference with other Latin American countries was the Trial to the Military Governments that took place in 1985 under Raul Alfonsin’s presidency (1983-1989). Before getting into the searching for meaning in school, we would like to refer briefly to certain collective experiences related to Alfonsin’s death on March 31, 2009.

His death, from the institutional perspective, opens the door to new processes of democratic life. These processes were related to the deployment of certain aspects that had crystallized or had been naturalized and were hindering the understanding of the genuine and symbolic importance that this president’s decisions had for the recovery of democracy.

To begin with, the public sorrow, the feeling of anguish intertwined with gratitude or guilt shows frequently and, in a way, inevitably from the moment in which life stories are re-lived or that our own singular psychic space is reflected at a collective level. Many of us, who are over 40 years old, and many others belonging to previous or following generations have worked on memories, analysis, feelings and symbolic relations intertwined individually with this dead that shed light on a collective psychic reality, unique and at the same time collective, stagnant up to that moment. This is probably so because of the memory of an unfinished presidential term, a government delivered before it was due to the “fauces” of neo-capitalism disguised as a “Productive Revolution” that eventually derived in one of the major crises of our country recent history (the 2001 crisis).

This is how, Alfonsin’s dead, forever associated with Malvinas’ War anniversary, and a new celebration of Christian Easter Holiday, works as a reminder of democracy frailty in that failed attempt to break the functioning of the Republican institutions in our country. This event finished with Alfonsin’s famous statement “Happy Easter, the house is in order and no blood has been shed in Argentina”.

As a consequence, many of us remember exactly where we were at that moment, remembering the satisfaction our parents felt and conveyed to us; their joy was a metaphor of a libidinal load of politics and a wish to participate in the construction of a better country which they made us think they had gained or conquered. They taught us about this new country holding our hands tight, carrying us on their shoulders, making us part of that symbolic weave, of that web of institutional subjectivation.

The school was no alien to these new ways of cultural, democratic and plural socialization in this reborn political weave; or to the tension between what education is and what it is not. The possibility of setting a date: day, month, year and time for the recovering democratic institutions does not always coincide with the recovering of democratic practices. These practices are dependent on processes. They are sometimes agonizing, long processes. Nevertheless, they are invested with the hope of a promise for liberty that any idea of education should carry in itself. We now share (as cultural scripts in a way do) the empirical data obtained in our field work as regards “new” identified school institutional issues. They function as thresholds of violence in the margins within the context we are working in.

- Children of missing persons (Grandparents as family heads; parents murdered)
- Teenage pregnancy; single mothers; how to “proceed” with the “effeminate boy” or “tomboy” girl; divorced parents; awkward sex-related questions (All these are logics reliant on a Eurocentric colonial matrix which in time reflect the articulation between moral-immoral, legitimate-illegitimate or normal-abnormal –including the disabilities in the classroom– dualities and of the silencing and controlling of bodies and sexualities during the dictatorship)
- As a consequence, we can infer the difficulties for the educational approach of “adoption” as a “phantasmatic”, “conflic-
Disruptive issues through time: Brief "Ad libitum" genealogy...

The emergence of something more than “cigarette” (tobacco) as the limit of institutional insolence or as a rite of passage into adulthood or adolescence. We face the advent of consumerism (drugs and market) linked to the “experience” of freedom (as opposed to the circuits of poverty and drug trade that will characterize the following decade).

Death of a student due to accidents or “traditional” sickness (always difficult, but different from the kind of death arising in school contexts between the 90s and 2000).

Analysis of relevant issues that allowed for the construction of meaning about school institution in 1990

“And if the sun wouldn’t shine and I would be forever trapped here” (L.A.Spinetta)

As we have already shared along this work, our emphasis is not on the diverse academic production referred to the selected periods, but, taking them into account, on establishing a dialogue within the threshold emerging issues that destroyed certain borders within the school as an institution.

The 90s opened the door to a reshaping of school that, according to Grinsberg (2006)

far from operating a reduction of government influence within the social sphere, some governmental practices and logics were transformed. That should not be confused with a lack of government; instead we can consider the de-governmentalization of the Estate and the transferring of many of its functions towards the community and the civil society (Grinberg, 2006: 68)

According to this chronological line of critic, the transformation that occurred in the patterns of practices necessarily in this context implied the “denial” of the desiring subject, and consequently, the conditioning of the historical subject. It was essential to “re-socialize” in new ways in the production of subjectivity, it was necessary to link the (an) historical production with new power relationships and control devices. If we argue that schools represent “beacons of hope”, and at the same time, they are spaces where social logics are translated, it was inevitable then, that in that neo-capitalist context, paraphrasing Borges (1960) “books and night” would enter the classrooms.

Leaving aside processes of political reshaping, educational standardization, or measurement of teaching practices as the hegemonic ways of designing public policies related to schools, we intend to share part of the universe of representations of issues collected from relevant oral sources that construct the script that helps us locate the social and educational thought of the period. In this way, we can identify:

- The first HIV cases in schools (boys and girls who have contracted the virus from their parents due to drug consumption or the absence of prevention in sexual behavior during the previous decade).
- Extension of the limits of poverty making more evident its links to the concentration of wealth and social decay.
- Increase in drugs consumption and its diversification in social class terms.
- The decline of job offers: forced leaves or flexible labor laws that made school face new types of family organization (unemployed parents, schools as main providers of meals).
- Institutional instability, job insecurity and the signifiers “competence” and “competitiveness” for educational public policies and legislation.
- The reappearance of the evaluation device as a metaphor for standardization related to market needs and international politics.
- Reshaping and uncertainty in Polimodal⁴, uncertainty over the arrival of new technologies to the classroom.
- An attempt to strengthen the idea that teachers and public schools are a burden for the state, opposite private school system.
Analysis of relevant issues that allow for the construction of meaning about school in XXI Century

Paint our faces the color of hope… (Diego Torres) (This song turned into a school hymn and was sung one and a thousand times after the crisis of the year 2001)

The outbreak of the crisis of 2001 in Argentina, is still (from our point of view) a special (and personal) object of interest for the analysis of educational research. We may commit the “sin” of self-reference when we remember the lack of validation or at least the idea of epistemological suspicion when granting academic status to this object of study in 2002, few months after the crisis started. After the years passed, these events became a symbol in the region of the first country which broke with the neo-capitalist order of the 90s, through a struggle which cost death and suffering.

We do not intend to extend on issues already tackled in other articles, so we are just going to contextualize the 2001 crisis as a result of the launching of a number of politics which enhanced the financial risk index for our country. They entailed social exclusion, emigration, capital exodus, social outburst and death (physical and symbolic). At the same time, it started a path of social, political and cultural rebirth. In this background, where there was no space for politics of affiliation of the “Other” (in addition to pots and pans sounding as a protest, the freezing of savings in banks and the emergence of semi-currency and barter “clubs”) it might be interesting to resort to a question posed by a psychologist. This question opened the door to our analysis of the period. We refer to Silvia Bleichmar (2002). A few months after the breaking of the crisis she stated this simple but demolishing questioning:

How can we measure, in acceptable rates the overwhelming increase of the “country pain”? If we measure real feel with an equation among temperature, wind, and atmospheric pressure, why shouldn’t we combine statistics of suicide, accidents, strokes, sudden deaths, shattering and shattered modes of violence, the amount of antidepressant pills sold, the increase in alcoholism, the abandonment of newborns in dumpsters—as a master metaphor for the expectations the excluded had for their children’s fate—school dropouts, exile to unsuspected places... to measure the daily suffering we are destined to experience due not to the economic insolvency of the country but its ruling class moral bankruptcy? (Bleichmar, 2002: 27)

To be brief, we will mention as the main thresholds for this period (emphasizing once again that we focus on the disruptive margins and not in the transformative “positive” ways that actually became an exercise of freedom and resistance where oppression had inhabited):

- First killings and massacres in Argentine schools (Carmen de Patagones; “Pan Triste” Case: secondary school student’s suicide who killed himself in the classroom by shooting his heart).
- Increase in cases of children and youngsters molestation and battered mother’s showing up at school (increase in the visibility and frequency of gender violence).
- “Unstopable” increase in drugs consumption and the appearance of “little soldiers”, that is, teenagers that become part of drug dealing circuit.
- Reversion of the ways and distribution of school authority. Parents/Students questioning the authority of teachers, and even inflicting physical violence on them.
- Political-legislative reshaping that influences the ways in which dates traditionally “controversial” within the matrix of teacher education are approached: October 12th, March 24th, 1976; Genocides Memorials; the approval of a law demanding the constitution of students unions, the approval of Gay marriage which influences sexual education approach; the inclusion of diversity as regards body politics and the emergence of different childhoods, youths and subjectivities; new categories access school to think and stress the way working classes are conceived in relation to social, political and educational spaces (picketers, welfare plans; gender, ethnic, union and social movements). They demand not just a “place” in
school as an institution but their recognition in the acquisition and interpretation of citizenship for these groups. These are the reasons for the tensions arising in the traditional matrix for teachers’ education in this new world of contemporary demands and reshaping.

To sum up, and taking into account the present Manifesto:

The stress between what “it is” and what “it is not” emerges from the confrontation of “what it is” to “what it is not”. It is related to the way in which “that it is” is interrupted by a radically new element instead of the usual repetition of the already existing. That interruption –we can call it dissent– is the place where subjectivities are born. It is the place where speech is neither repetition nor self-assertion; it is unique and uniquely new. It is, therefore, the place where freedom arises. (Biesta y Säfström y Säfström, 2010: 4)

And for the speech to stop being repetition or self-assertion of the sameness, that is, of what we are already doing –and being– along with our Latin American History, it is necessary to revise the origin of cultural constructions and the matrix and discursive positioning that made sense towards action or inaction. We need to shed light with postcolonial “flashlight” on those unmapped territories and subalternities. As a consequence, and arriving at the end of our journey (or at least our next station) we concur with Young when he states:

The desire of an anti-colonial historian today is to recover a subaltern history that rewrites the narrative received from colonizing scholars and also from the ruling native elites, a history of the excluded, of those which lack a voice, of those which, in the best case scenario were just the object of study as well as the object of colonial fantasy. (Young, 2006:10)

If this problematic “disruptive” “ad libitum” issues have something in common, that is, a “common thread”, it is the fact that their semantic factor relates etymologically to “pleasure” or to “will”. Nevertheless, they seldom speak from an inclusive positioning, from a metaphor of the plural or the diverse. On the contrary, they “burst in” or are disruptive because they are still part of a colonial wound. In this way, they constantly confront with the historical originated forms (a euphemism for eurocentrism) constitutive of school, and also of our selves. In Deleuze and Guattari (1978) words:

When we refer to wishes and statements, the point is not to reduce the unconscious, or to interpret or to make sense of it according to a tree. The point is to produce the unconscious and with it, new statements, other desires. (Deleuze y Guattari, 1978:29)

And for the “other” desires to take place the “subaltern”, as a category and signifier, has to migrate from the unconscious to the sphere of the visible and the political. In Mignolo’s words (2006)

The logic of coloniality operates in four domains of human experience: (1) The economic domain: land appropriation, labor exploitation, and financial control; (2) the political domain: authority control; (3) the social domain: gender and sexual control and (4) the epistemic and personal/subjective domain: knowledge and subjectivities control (...) Each domain intertwines with the others: the appropriation of lands and exploitation of labor are related to financial control, authority, gender, knowledge, and subjectivity. (Mignolo, 2006:36)

Education, in this complex conjunction, as a metaphor of a kaleidoscope in constant movement, will have to endure not giving up and not accommodating to a single symmetrical shape. We will have to dare to accept we will always deal with a simple glimpse among mirrors. Mirrors that cannot perpetually apprehend us, instead they should be capable of breaking in, and finally, allow for the emergence of what is radically new and that will always be related to the liberation of life.


