Introduction

The present text is the result of a doctoral thesis defended at the School of Education of the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS). Considering the peculiarities of Indigenous peoples and their specific historic and cultural traditions, it is possible to search for other ways of constructing knowledge from Indigenous peoples, in a decolonial movement. I will reflect on some of these paths used by the Kaingang in their production of ancestral knowledge, considering the processes of transference which sustain this people. In this sense, Tonico Benites says that in the process of transferring knowledge, leaders are the aggregators and producers of knowledge; for instance, grandfathers and grandmothers, fathers and mothers of children, are all fundamental figures. These are aspects which need to be taken into account in order to understand the school of today and its role in Kaingang communities. It is important to recognize the advances made in Indigenous school education in terms of legislation, but also to understand that much still needs to be done in terms of its practical construction: the behavior of this institution in the face of Indigenous knowledge and its daily relations, the place and time of children, parents and the Indigenous community in this school.

I believe that it is necessary to search for appropriate concepts to support Indigenous (Kaingang) school education that can redirect schooling on Kaingang lands; to highlight the place where Indigenous knowledge is constructed, taking into account cultural traditions, customs, values, knowledge and their own world view. It is necessary to understand why and how this knowledge is (in)visible, made invisible and (mis)understood both in and by the school. Likewise, it is necessary to say and to understand that school is only one more space for the construction of knowledge in the face of the breadth of times and places of Indigenous education which is linked to ancestrality.

The Place of Construction of Indigenous Knowledge

In line with this understanding, the Kaingang language or Indigenous language is essential in the construction of knowledge: Ūn si ag tú pê, belonging to the Kaingang; that which is of the Kaingang, evoking the memories of the Kaingang elders to show how to behave in this world, which is based on relationships with the other. This other is represented in the people's set of elements and artifacts, their territories, their relationships of affection with nature, their memories of the past-present. With this understanding, the plants and trees of the forests have lives, souls and spirits for the Kaingang. Ka tân is the spiritual force of the trees; Nân tân, the spiritual force of the forest, its owner. Both are legitimate interweavings in Indigenous existence; they are not separate, like reason and emotion in Western thought.

When a Kaingang enters into the forest, they need to ask the permission of these spirits - Nân tân - and respect their territories. In doing so, they will not run any risk of, for example, becoming lost and wandering with no way out. Another example of great respect is when a Kaingang person goes to extract medicines for their healing rituals: before cutting the tree and removing its roots, leaves, and bark, they need to talk to it, relating its importance for the healing, in a gesture of respect for the ancestry present in nature. This respect is clearly

PATHS OF ANCESTRY:
Sustaining Kaingang Epistemological Existences

By Bruno Ferreira
(translation by Coletivo de Tradutores Berkeley-Brasil)

1. Graduated in History - Full Degree from the Regional University of Northwest Rio Grande do Sul State (UNIJUI). Specialist in Indigenous Education, Diversity and Culture at the College of Theology (EST), São Leopoldo; Master's and PhD in Education at the School of Education of the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS), Brazil; Researcher at the PEABIRU research group - Amerindian Education and Interculturality at the School of Education (UFRGS). Assistant coordinator of the UFRGS Centre for Indigenous Knowledge in Schools. Researcher in school education and indigenous education - indigenous learning methods; Kaingang pedagogy; public policies for indigenous school education. History professor; History of Education; Indigenous Rights at the Angelo Manhká Miguel State Institute of Indigenous Education - Inhacorá Indigenous Land, São Valério do Sul (RS), Brazil.

2. Derek Allen, Luiza Bastos Lages, Mônica Carvalho Gimenes, Gabriel Lesser, Ana Claudia Lopes, Isaac McQuinn, and Liam G. Seeley.
evidenced in the festival of *Kiki*, in the felling of the pine tree to make the trough where the drink will be prepared. In this relationship there exists no separation between man and nature, in resistance to “the new and radical dualism that separates nature from society, the body from reason” (Quijano (2005), p.138), typical of Western thought.

In light of this, I will highlight Kaingang knowledge, produced out of other ways of seeing the world: their mode of full coexistence in relationships with the other, of construction and transference of cultural values coming from the relationship with nature, the space where they seek inspiration for understanding their realities. In this sense, when the Kaingang go to the forest, they want to hear the movement of the rivers, their voices, the birdsong, the wind that shakes the tree branches; to listen to the silence of the early morning and understand the movements of the spirits present in these territories, to understand where, and until when, one can stay in the forest. “All want to hear the words of the spirits that carry their images to the limits of the forest and the sky,” says Davi Kopenawa (Kopenawa (2015), p.167). However, the devastation of forests on Kaingang Indigenous lands has been increasing, making life more challenging, as their traditional values run the risk of being perturbed by suicidal models of development.

In order to understand the construction of knowledge, it is important to make an effort to understand time-space for the Kaingang, in its complexity, in a contextualized way. I’ll try to contextualize it here, starting from the ideas that time is in space just as space is in time, which are articulated in the narratives of this people, understanding that they are significant in the construction and reconstruction of lived experiences - *vãsỹ* (past times-spaces). These narratives have an affective link between the past and present - *Ũri* (present time-space) in which it is not possible to separate the past from the present, because there is a link in the experiences built up over ancestral time: in this way, time-space will always be connected, forming a single body. Maria Conceiçã£o de Lacerda says that each space has its time, and each time its space. The time to make a vegetable plot, the time to plant, the time to wait for the plant to grow and produce, ritual time, the common time...
of everyday life and the time of history, all with their own space-time.

In this sense, the Kaingang have various time markers: time to prepare the plots; time to sow determined seeds; time to wait for the plant to grow and mature; time to harvest and store; time for rituals; time to make common narratives of their daily lives and explanations of their world, mystical narratives.

The Kaingang have countless ways of telling their time-spaces, which can be the singing of birds, of animals, the appearance of various signs in nature. In this understanding of man-nature unity, time-space as a single part, which can be represented in the word kanhkã - in which one of the closest translations into English can be sky, in the Kaingang understanding also meaning kin, Tỹ ēg tóg jagẽ kanhkã kor nỹtĩ - we are all kin. The understanding of kanhkã is what sustains the relationships of balance between people and nature, time-space. Kanhkã, is an important expression to demonstrate time-space and its relationships in the Kaingang world. It is important to highlight that wâsỹ and Ûri is the circularity of the construction of knowledge, past-present-past, therefore the construction of knowledge among the Kaingang is not fragmented, but rather connected in the world, in territory.

Furthermore, Kanhkã is the concept that underpins collective relationships between people and nature, the affective feeling of belonging of the individual to a collectivity and the collectivity in the individual, a relationship of balance with nature, in the belief in their relatives, in the production of reciprocity and complementarity. Moreover, in a broader sense, respect and acceptance of the other for the collectivity, this other that is independent of belonging to an Indigenous people, respecting their differences and specificities, in an intercultural practice.

In this sense, Kaingang researcher and activist Douglas Rosa says that:

Kanhkã goes beyond the understanding associated with the meaning of the term in the Portuguese language. It is a web that runs through morality and ethics, a relationship of mutuality and reciprocal connection. It is a value of immanent plenitude, since its principles and values are constantly being reupdated in ancestrality, based on respect for the cosmology that allows for the collective balance of the people, constituting the philosophy of life, of living and being together. (Oral communication with Douglas Rosa, 08/2020)

The complementarity between human and nature goes beyond the individual and is present in the Kaingang's daily collective life. The existence of each of these elements of cosmology is essential for the balance of collective life. It's important to emphasize that this is, by nature, an antiracist conception. As a philosophical understanding it was stifled, silenced by the colonial philosophy that imposed individualism and the separation of human from nature, human from human, laying the foundations for racism and making Kaingang knowledge invisible.

With this understanding, the Kaingang conception of space-time is the accumulation of relationships from all time and, therefore, the experiences inherited and accumulated in the traditions of the Kaingang people. Space-time go hand in hand, indissociable, reflections of the ancestries present in the constructions/reconstructions of knowledge reconnected between people through their own methodologies that allow the subjects of this knowledge to speak and listen. The image below shows Kaingang teacher Natalino Góg Crespo (in memory) experiencing another space-time in the construction of knowledge, his own circular methodology of balanced speaking and listening.

This means that constructions of knowledge are not separate, because each depends on the others, represented with the practices of the center towards the outside Vâsỹ; Ûri. Vâsỹ are ancestral practices: narratives, songs, games, cosmological organization, the foundations of Kaingang knowledge about their own way of living.
and relating to the other, their own processes of seeing the world, which can be their own world, as well as the world of non-Indigenous people, in an intercultural movement. Uri are the practices developed today, in a relationship of continuity with Vãsỹ: resignified festivals, traditional rituals, gathering, fishing, animal husbandry, the production of artisanal crafts, their own educational processes and schooling practices - resignified practices that link the past and present, in which the future is present in the past. This understanding is very important for guaranteeing the place of knowledge for future Kaingang generations.

However, despite the Kaingang being subjected to catechization projects, and many others that preached development models and tried to impose another language, Portuguese, as well as other values, which led to many Kaingang not speaking their own language and even to feel ashamed of being Indigenous, today the Kaingang remain resistant and resilient. Luciano says that the notion of resilience values exactly the active and reactive capacity of Indigenous subjects, who often refuse to be passive or reactive victims in the name of protagonism and their own autonomy, even in situations where they appear or are discursively presented as victims, defeated or dominated. This understanding doesn't mean the abandonment of resistance, which was very important for the maintenance of traditions, customs, language and the Indigenous way of being, but rather, it does help to account for the new contexts lived by the Kaingang, including the presence of school in children's education.

This allows the Kaingang to believe in their relatives, people from their own folk and from other Indigenous peoples, regardless of where they belong, referring them to the strengthening of life based on reciprocity: “the foundation of this proposition is the relationship of balance and reciprocity between all forms of life existing in nature” (Markus (2018), p.48). It is not about a moral attitude, but a regulating principle of community life, of the economic, cultural, social and political aspects present in everyday gestures, permeating the means of production, consumption, and socialization of material goods.

Thus, the understanding of space-time as a place of construction of the Kaingang knowledge in a collection of elements of history, traditions, and culture, which are not isolated from the territory, in the same way that space is not separated from time, since these move together and complement each other in the comprehension of Indigenous existence. Being so, space-time is understood based on the logic of its construction, from the requirements that provide natural spaces for knowledge and that, through their methods/techniques, construct, modify and are also modified in their contexts. Space-time is made up of the rivers, forests, dwellings, people, rituals, places to fish, hunt and farm, which are also important for collective existence. This collective space-time is loaded with the historical marks of struggles, resistance, challenges, constructions and reconstructions of worlds that take place during the existence of the Kófa, the elders, the young and the Kaingang children.

Space-time is perceived and understood in a relationship of affection, identity, and
belonging, in which the children, the young, and the elders are subjects in the construction of knowledge, of wisdom. The Kófa practice their stories of struggle, the young bring and build their experiences, the children experience and practice what they have seen and, thus, constructing and sharing with the collective, they give meaning to the experiential context. In this way, knowledge in each present subject is built and enriched, constituting a collective subject, related to the whole which forms the space in which it was built, and the knowledge is built.

The dialogues between the elders, the young, and children allow all to be subjects of the construction, they are important before the changes that occur in their communities. In this process of knowledge construction it is important to highlight that with the changes that happen in Indigenous communities, the children appropriate other forms of play, among these are electronic devices like cell phones; in this case, the children acquire other abilities and appropriate technologies, thus, they may promote exchange with the elders, they learn the narratives told by the elders and in the same way teach them to experience these other contexts.

It is important to emphasize that children play these games not as an activity disconnected from their context, but as an activity that represents the daily life of the adults and is experienced by all. Therefore, we may say that the children are willing to perform activities that are helpful in maintaining the traditions, values and culture of their people, and which are passed down from generation to generation in this way. As we can see, the children learn in the most diverse space-times, beyond space and school time. As we well know, school is very recent among the Kaingang, that is a later conversation.

The Kaingang people, over time, just as other Indigenous peoples, will create, re-signifying forms of education based on tradition, values, rituals, and beliefs, in their own languages, articulating and giving meaning to their perceptions along with the children, the young, and the adults of their communities. In this sense, the learn-teach of the Kaingang with their children confers autonomy and affirms them as subjects of their actions and decisions. The freedom of action of the child is very important, in which the word “no” is removed from their learning and teaching. Nunes corroborates this in his speech, referring to other Indigenous societies of the country:

In Brazilian (I)ndigenous societies [...] the phase corresponding to infancy is marked by what we consider to be an enormous freedom in the experience of time and space, and the social relationships that are established through them, preceding the period of transition to adulthood, which then inaugurates very dangerous limits and constraints. (Nunes (2002), p. 65)

In this sense, it is very common for Indigenous children to be involved with daily activities. A separation of services between adults and children is not perceived: all are capable of performing
the same work according to their physical abilities. Thus, children, upon experiencing daily life, constructing and transferring knowledge and understanding, take consciousness of their importance, not only directed at a future action, but as an effective and affective part of a construction in the present, within their traditions, values and culture. In this construction, the learning is always searching the past of their ancestors for points of convergence between the context and experience of the present and the events of the past.

The Kaingang consider children to have the ability to construct and transfer knowledge and, thus, respect them as they are; they accept them as active and effective participants, in all knowledge construction processes.

A more simplistic view might say that it is imitation. However, imitation has important foundations in knowledge construction, in the learning of Indigenous children, because children observe and do. The word imitation needs to be understood with more depth regarding children. According to Bergamaschi:

The person is, since they are young, an observer of the nature of which they feel a part and have as an inspiring source of life and education, but is also an observer of the behavior of other people. Especially the young ones have in their older siblings and the adults their parameters and, through imitation, construct their particular behavior. In this sense, since they are young, the person observes, inspiring themselves in that which surrounds them, having as an example the images which are at their disposal, seeking to resemble the other and from there to create their own behavior, that also distinguishes them. They imitate in play and other life situations, as they accompany adults in the most diverse activities. (Bergamaschi (2005), p.155)

With this understanding, imitation is one of the forms of learning that leads to the development of traditions, customs, rituals, beliefs, and culture and, thus, transfers important information and knowledge between individuals and collectives for generations. Imitating involves and develops listening, observing, experimenting, doing things together and, in your own way, creating your own way of building on what you observe. With this understanding, imitation is one of the forms of learning that leads to the development of traditions, customs, rituals, beliefs, culture and, thus, transfers important information and knowledge between individuals and collectives for generations.

Knowledge-construction for the Kaingang child is part of their cosmology, of their way of being in the world. The child is a legitimate and important part of the everyday life of their community, family, and other people of the experiential context. Learning is the result of the joint development of experiences and practices between people of different ages and the environment in which they are inserted. The child’s learning comes from the example set for them, which is specific to their family group, their community, their people and other non-Indigenous societies. The Kaingang people’s own model of education needs to dialogue with school education present in Indigenous lands.

Another place, a space-time for constructing Kaingang knowledge is the roda de chimarrão (yerba mate circle), chimarrão is part of Indigenous culture. The roda de chimarrão overflows with knowledge. The Kófa Kaingang (Kaingang elders) say that drinking chimarrão helps to create and transfer good ideas to one another, helps to resolve problems, and plan actions together with the community and family. The roda de chimarrão
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normally happens during the day, around the fire, and as Kaingang Research Professor Dorvalino Refejo Cardoso says, “the fire is to heat up ideas, strengthen the words, clear their paths”.

The fire warms and points the way in conversations of the kófa (elders), in settling problems involving people within the community itself. A situation is constructed so that everyone remains calm, the roda de chimarrão em torno do fogo (yerba mate circle around the fire) being an important tool to facilitate dialogue. For these and other reasons, chimarrão is a habit that passes from generation to generation.

The Kaingang culture is rich in narratives, ancestral memories, stories, their myths that are retold in the conversation circles in their time-space and around the fire. In this sense it is important to highlight the Kaingang maternal tongue, since in these spaces the orality is fundamental to the construction and reconstruction of the people’s knowledge, strengthening cultural belonging. The language is an important tool of social-political power as an ethnic affirmation, demarcation of epistemological territory, and orality is thus fundamental as a place for constructing knowledge.

In general, Indigenous peoples have many space-times for constructing knowledge, their territories overflow with knowledge that for a long time remained invisible and which is gradually occupying spaces in academic environments based on authorship that legitimizes and makes visible this millennia-old knowledge. This knowledge needs to occupy more and more spaces and dialogue in academia and schools both inside and outside Indigenous lands.

Kaingang Knowledge and the Relationship With School

In order for the Indigenous knowledge to dialogue with the school system, we need to recover some paths, places already established and developed by our elders, knowledge that is present in the communities and that could define or, at least, put into movement new paths to school, redefining its role. To place Kaingang knowledge in a balanced relationship with that which was violently introduced by the school to the Kaingang; to open archaic models of school organization by force.

In this sense, to provoke changes in the construction of public policies in school education, with concern for the knowledge and traditional wisdom, values, rituals, and culture of Indigenous peoples and, especially, of the Kaingang people. In this sense, the knowledge, their organization, and their own processes of learning need to be present in school, breaking with school models that have been perpetuated for centuries, of an organization that disciplines people. As Michel Foucault says:

In the 18th century, ‘rank’ begins to define the great form of distribution of individuals in the educational order: rows or ranks of pupils in the class, corridors, courtyards; rank attributed to each pupil at the end of each task and each examination; the rank he obtains from week to week, month to month, year to year; an alignment of age groups, one after another; a succession of subjects taught and questions treated, according to an order of increasing difficulty. And, in this ensemble of compulsory alignments, each pupil, according to age, his performance, his behavior, occupies sometimes one rank, sometimes another; he
moves constantly over a series of compartments—some of these are ‘ideal’ compartments, marking a hierarchy of knowledge or ability, others express the distribution of values or merits in material terms in the space of the college or classroom. (Foucault (1987), p.173)

Acknowledging that, historically, the school is a space of assimilation of non-Indigenous peoples and imposition of market values, denying of cultures and Native identities, the understanding of these archaic processes of school organization allows Indigenous knowledge to gain space and gather attention in the methodologies and spaces of learning. That way we can think of school as a space of constructing relationships based on interculturality, as a tool for dialogue based on Indigenous heritage and knowledge from Western societies. The school, in this sense, could be the space to reflect on the lives of Indigenous peoples, with the contradictions that, in general, permeate the relations between different societies. In this understanding, Luciano says that interculturality presupposes considering collective subjects, of rights and millennial civilizations, as neither better nor worse than other human civilizations. This implies that, in a relationship of intercultural dialogue, the different peoples and cultures need to be on an equal footing and balance.

In this sense, to confer a function to the school as an important space for the strengthening of Indigenous knowledge is made necessary, overcoming practices of imposition of knowledge, so-called universals, but that in their majority are at the service of a society based on the exploitation of the other through slave labor as a means to have a supposedly good, healthy and balanced life.

On account of this, we consider it necessary to approach the lived problems in schools on Kaingang land, it is necessary to understand that Kaingang knowledge is acquired throughout their lives, built collectively, in the most diverse space-times existent in Indigenous lands, where everyone learns with each other, regardless of their age.

In our Indigenous society, we believe that everybody is capable of interfering in each others’ processes, generating a back-and-forth effect between past-present-future. The future is built in the combination of these relations of interdependence, in the same way as the interdependent relationship of the lived experience as a people. It is in this context that school should be thought of, intertwined with Vãfy artisanal craft, in which each detail is important. To understand the school with this meaning is a great challenge, as a space to experiment with the different methodological behaviors in the construction of Indigenous knowledge.

In this sense, orality, as previously stated, and the use of the mother tongue are powerful tools for learning, transference and re-elaboration of peoples’ knowledge. I believe that the school should be one of the places that enable the
Kaingang child to strengthen the autonomy built together with their community and, what is more, to be fulfilled in their education. In this sense, to understand the importance of orality as a strategy, the value of the Kaingang mother tongue.

In the direction of the construction of Kaingang knowledge in relation to the school, the canto (song) is a powerful method in the building and transfer of knowledge and in the learning process. It may offer innovative means to the pedagogical practices in our Indigenous schools. The canto has many meanings, and could be of lament, in the loss of a member of their people, of their family, of community, and even the death of a river, of plants, forest, animals, because all of them are part of the world, of our cosmology. It could also be, a canto of joy, of achievement, of birth, the arrival of a new year, when hopes are renewed for a life of collective abundance, festivities, the outcome of their fights, resistances, battle cantos. The cantos, dances and narratives represent the re-enchantment of the Indigenous world, a connection to the world’s physical and spiritual balance in a single body and space. This comprehension offers another view on the Indigenous epistemological construction.

With this understanding, Indigenous peoples, the Kaingang teachers and people in general are part of a whole and, because of that, bring in their manifestations the experiences produced from their ancestrality. Thinking as such, the practice of orality in the Kaingang language is fundamental to the construction of new practices, of the recognition of the knowledge that must be the protagonists in our schools, since only that way can we delve deeper into people’s cultural traditions and have a formal Kaingang education.

Knowledge of culture and of tradition is passed along from generation to generation through orality as such; the elders impart the myths, the ways of life, the artisanal craft techniques, and the Kaingang language [...] I speak here about the transference of knowledge as the elders’ practices: Kanhgag si ag t¾ kinhrá én ti. (Claudino (2013), p.29)

In this sense, the Roda de Conversa (conversation circle) and orality can be used as methodological procedures, not only for the construction and transference of knowledge but to structure understanding and deepen the practical relations in our Indigenous communities, more directly in the construction of specific, distinct, multilingual, intercultural and community-based Indigenous education, one in which education should not be separate from other life situations.

In this type of conversation, it is of utmost importance to bring personal and collective experiences to the collective realm in recognition of Indigenous knowledge that is invisible. Besides describing experiences and lived practices, they highlight and value the traditions, beliefs, customs, the culture of the Kaingang people. It is a way to recognize and value the relations built throughout history, whether collective or individual. Equally, it enables a profound reflection, which means greater equilibrium and rigor in the search for qualitative production, emerging in individual discovery, ascending to the collective knowledge, or collective-individual, in which one depends on the other in the construction process.

These are reflective situations that enable understanding of the invisibilities of Indigenous knowledge in schools on Indigenous and non-Indigenous lands, with all the difficulties that present themselves since their implementation. It is a search for an instrument of resilience for the Kaingang, in the sense of strengthening their traditional educational and cultural practices, complementing themselves with other knowledge, necessary to their existence. In this manner, we have a way of thinking about schools on Indigenous lands, conferring a greater clarity to their function, identifying practices that little differentiate themselves from the colonizer and integrationist school in order to replace them with others with their own meaning, of affirmation and not destruction.

As reflected in past decades, thinking about the role of school, this concern is still necessary today, since the “school enters the community and gets hold of the community. It becomes the owner of the community, rather than the community its owner” (Ferreira (1997), p.217). Recapturing a historical perspective of the first schools for Native peoples, in which the Indigenous were compulsorily forced to accept this institutional package, the school, preventing Indigenous education for a long time. It is this that we must ponder over, in the understanding of this new space of production and transference of knowledge called the school, an institution which since its introduction to Indigenous Kaingang lands served as a tool to introduce and to pass along the values of non-Indigenous society, which devalues important values of complementarity and reciprocity amongst relatives.
Final Considerations

With that in mind, it is worthwhile to point out some paths to a school that values the most varied knowledge built by human societies, especially that of Indigenous peoples who seek, with much wisdom, strategies for the maintenance of their ancestral knowledge. Indigenous societies' own processes will add to school experiences, with other modalities and ways of learning, built throughout history. School, progressively, is being appropriated by Native peoples, in a movement of self-determination, as a place where the relationship between their own knowledge and the wisdom of other societies should be articulated, constituting a political possibility of propagation of important knowledge and values: school as a privileged space of interculturality of societies.

Therefore, it is necessary to understand the construction of learning for the Kaingang children in relation to the other members of their people and, furthermore, to keep up with, school events in a more systematic manner, focusing on the acknowledgment and affirmation of traditional Kaingang knowledge and their relationship with the knowledge of non-Indigenous societies, which are still predominant and, sometimes, exclusive in schools.

To make use of the school, in a firmer and more organized manner, as a space of learning and, equally, to understand the importance of this institution for the acquisition of knowledge and techniques that are indispensable to the organization of Indigenous peoples in the contexts that present themselves as increasingly more complex. Translating these understandings is of extreme importance, because it is not just to understand the way Native peoples manifest themselves, but also to distinguish and value this knowledge built throughout time and that many times were appropriated by non-Indigenous people, leaving their true authors in anonymity. So it is not said about an improper appropriation of Indigenous knowledge that, at the same time, puts them in the condition of a people without culture, without knowledge, without wisdom, denying them life concepts built way before the appearance of white people in these lands, today known as Brazil.

It is necessary to recognize and admit that the Kaingang are the producers of concepts and methodologies that guarantee and qualify life. There is a need to work so that from this knowledge new paths to education emerge, that can deal with the learning processes of Indigenous children, people, and their human activities.
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