

ARTICLE

**EDUCATION FOR A HUMAN RIGHTS CULTURE:
intersubjective sharing of values¹**

CRISTÓVÃO TEIXEIRA RODRIGUES SILVA¹

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9679-8330>
<crisovao.teixeira@urca.br>

JOÃO ADOLFO RIBEIRO BANDEIRA²

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0795-7687>
<joaoadolforibeirobandeira@gmail.com>

ANTONIO BASILIO NOVAES THOMAZ DE MENEZES³

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7841-2118>
<gpfe.ufrn@gmail.com>

¹ Universidade Regional do Cariri - URCA. Crato, Ceará (CE), Brasil.

² Universidade Federal do Cariri - UFCA. Juazeiro do Norte, Ceará (CE), Brasil.

³ Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte - UFRN. Natal, Rio Grande do Norte (RN), Brasil.

ABSTRACT: The set of Human Rights is a direct response to the totalitarian practices of extermination of human beings, the result of a technical-instrumental rationality, during World War II (1939 - 1945). Thus, this article seeks to investigate whether education is an adequate strategy for the formation of a multidimensional Culture of Human Rights based on the intersubjective sharing of values, without using force/violence or political/economic superiority as elements as promoters of the commons. It begins with the presentation of some concepts and characteristics regarding education and Human Rights. Next, the multiplicity of foundations and dimensions of Human Rights Education HRE as outlined from the second half of the twentieth century, in international and national documents. Finally, the main characteristics of a technical-instrumental world-culture and the possibilities of social transformation are addressed, through human interaction mediated by communication. The article is developed in a dialectical approach, using the literature review as a technique, which subsidizes the discussion of concepts and the analysis of some legal documents. After the investigative path, it is concluded that HRE is a multidimensional strategy for promoting a Culture of Human Rights

¹ The translation of this article into English was funded by Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico - CNPq/Brasil.

by reinforcing the common aspects of humanity, producing consensus around human dignity, respect, and inclusion, without resorting to the use of force, threat, or oppression.

KEY-WORDS: Human rights education, culture of human rights, multidimensional education, communicative interaction, intersubjectivity.

EDUCAÇÃO PARA UMA CULTURA DE DIREITOS HUMANOS: compartilhamento intersubjetivo de valores

RESUMO: O conjunto dos Direitos Humanos é uma resposta direta às práticas totalitárias de extermínio de seres humanos, fruto de uma racionalidade técnico-instrumental durante a Segunda Guerra Mundial (1939 – 1945). Assim, este artigo busca investigar se a educação é uma estratégia adequada para a formação de uma Cultura multidimensional em Direitos Humanos baseada no compartilhamento intersubjetivo de valores, sem uso da força/violência ou da superioridade política/econômica como elementos promotores do comum. Inicia-se com a apresentação de alguns conceitos e características a respeito da educação e dos Direitos Humanos. Em seguida, apresenta-se a multiplicidade de fundamentos e dimensões da Educação em Direitos Humanos – EDH, conforme delineado a partir da segunda metade do século XX, em documentos internacionais e nacionais. Por fim, são abordadas as principais características de uma cultura-mundo técnico-instrumental e as possibilidades de transformação social por meio da interação humana intermediada pela comunicação. O artigo desenvolve-se em uma abordagem dialética, utilizando como técnica a revisão de literatura, que subsidia a discussão de conceitos e a análise de alguns documentos jurídicos. Após o percurso investigativo, conclui-se que a EDH é estratégia multidimensional para promoção de uma Cultura de Direitos Humanos ao reforçar os aspectos comuns da humanidade, produzindo consensos em torno da dignidade humana, do respeito e da inclusão, sem recurso ao uso da força, da ameaça ou da opressão.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Educação em direitos humanos, cultura de direitos humanos, educação multidimensional, interação comunicativa, intersubjetividade.

EDUCACIÓN PARA UNA CULTURA DE DERECHOS HUMANOS: intercambio intersubjetivo de valores

RESUMEN: El conjunto de Derechos Humanos es una respuesta directa a las prácticas totalitarias de exterminio de seres humanos, resultado de una racionalidad técnico-instrumental, durante la Segunda Guerra Mundial (1939 - 1945). Así, este artículo busca indagar si la educación es una estrategia adecuada para la formación de una Cultura multidimensional en Derechos Humanos basada en la compartición intersubjetiva de valores, sin utilizar la fuerza/violencia o la superioridad político/económica como elementos promotores del común. Se inicia con la presentación de algunos conceptos y características respecto a la educación y los derechos humanos. Luego, presenta la multiplicidad de fundamentos y dimensiones de la Educación en Derechos Humanos - EDH, tal como se esboza a partir de la segunda mitad del siglo XX, en documentos internacionales y nacionales. Finalmente, aborda las principales características de una cultura-mundo técnico-instrumental y las posibilidades de transformación social, a través de la interacción humana mediada por la comunicación. El artículo se desarrolla con un enfoque dialéctico, utilizando como técnica la revisión de la literatura, que apoya la discusión de conceptos y el análisis de algunos documentos legales. Luego de la trayectoria investigativa, se concluye que la EDH es una estrategia multidimensional para promover una Cultura de Derechos Humanos reforzando los aspectos comunes de la humanidad, produciendo consensos

en torno a la dignidad humana, al respeto y a la inclusión, sin recurrir al uso de la fuerza, amenaza u opresión.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Educación en derechos humanos, cultura de derechos humanos, educación multidimensional, interacción comunicativa, intersubjetividad.

INTRODUCTION

Today, the set of Human Rights is a direct response to the totalitarian practices of extermination of human beings, the result of a technical-instrumental rationality during the Second World War (1939 – 1945). Since then, concern has grown in the international community with the events of this period that called into question the centrality of the human being in the philosophical debate and the purpose of political practices. The extermination of groups of human beings on a factory scale made it evident that, to the detriment of humanist values, economic (development/market) and political-administrative (power/domination/control) interests, when they guide collective practices, can lead to actions based on strength and conquest. Common social norms and values, equality of material conditions, culture, and social history, that is, the human aspects formulated within intersubjective interaction, were subjected to technical-instrumental interests.

Unlike the production of wealth and the control of life, ethical, cultural, and humanist values, which form Human Rights, they cannot be imposed by force or coercion. To be an element of social production that leads to human freedom and emancipation, such values need to be shared based on dialogue, understanding, and reflection toward consensus. The goods and interests protected as Human Rights depend on favorable conditions for communicative cooperation between the subjects involved.

Especially since the 1960s and 1970s, the international community has made efforts to include Culture in Human Rights as a dimension of educational practices. Therefore, it is necessary to investigate whether education is an appropriate strategy for the formation of a multidimensional Culture in Human Rights based on the intersubjective sharing of values. Faced with this problem, it is necessary to identify the concept, dimensions, and purposes of Human Rights Education – HRE to ultimately verify whether such elements are following a multidimensional practice of intersubjective sharing of values, without the use of force/violence or of political/economic superiority as an element that promotes the common.

Methodologically, this article takes a dialectical approach to educational phenomena and the promotion of a Culture of Human Rights. The concepts are not taken as dogmas but as critical and reflective formulations on social and human actions. A literature review is used to present the main ideas on the topic and the national and international legal documents analyzed.

This work, in the first part, seeks to answer the introductory question: *What is Human Rights Education – HRE?* It begins with the presentation of some concepts and characteristics regarding education, as a process of understanding and social transmission, which designates broad social reproduction or the intentional practice of teaching-learning. Next, the possible delineations of Human Rights are discussed, assuming a perspective that is not restricted to a legal-normative vision, but also involves ethical, political, sociocultural, and economic values. Associating the concepts presented, HRE is pointed out as a multidimensional practice of training subjects of Human Rights, which encompasses the comprehensive performance and consensual sharing of values.

In the second part, the multiple dimensions of HRE are addressed, describing, and identifying its political, ethical, economic, legal, and sociocultural aspects, which go beyond the

transmission of technical-instrumental knowledge. To this end, the HRE outlines are presented in international and national plans, declarations, and guidelines, committed to respect for difference, solidarity, freedom, social justice, and peace. The multidimensionality of HRE requires the insertion of reflective and critical practices that remove authoritarian, imposing, or oppressive actions from human interaction in the community.

In the last part, the article discusses the symbolic and shared aspects that form a culture. The central elements of the Culture of Human Rights are discussed, contrasting with a world culture based on the satisfaction of individual, marketing, technical, and consumerist interests. These characteristics are pointed out as an impediment to the formation of a culture based on intersubjective sharing, as it is based on dominance and conquest, that is, on a *homo-machina* relationship. HRE, on the other hand, points to the possibility of forming a culture based on human dignity, which requires a *homo-homo* relationship. Thus, only respect for difference and the promotion of intercultural dialogue can produce a common point of articulation for social actions, without resorting to force or oppression.

EDUCATION AND HUMAN RIGHTS: UNDERSTANDING AS A PROCESS OF SOCIAL FORMATION

Education is one of the main symbolic reproduction processes of a society, which can be perceived in two complementary senses, one broader and the other stricter. The first is linked to the broad processes of transmitting a worldview from before subsequent generations. The second concerns specific and organized teaching and learning practices. Both forms coexist, in which various institutions such as the family, religions, school, social movements, the press, universities, etc., take part.

In the broadest sense, education represents “[...] a fraction of the life world of social groups [...]” (Brandão, 2007, p. 10-11). The worldview that forms a community must be produced, reproduced, and shared by everyone who makes it up. Education has the function of transmitting and building common elements, “[...] social codes of conduct, work rules, the secrets of art and religion, crafts and technology that people need to reinvent, every day, the life of the group and that of each of its subjects [...]” (Brandão, 2007, p. 10-11). In a broad notion, as presented here, education designates the modes of transmission of social knowledge, encompassing multiple means and objectives. In all instances – family, religion, etc. – they are educators, in a non-systematized way they act for and based on knowledge that allows the formation of new social subjects.

When power, which produces order, and work, which produces goods, are divided, knowledge, which forms the community's worldview, also becomes an instrument of political difference. Hence the need to create specialized spaces for the transmission of knowledge, based on the distinction between “[...] what is done, what is known with what is done with what is known” (Brandão, 2007, p. 27). The school represents the specialization (space-time) of education, arising from the separation between knowledge and teaching knowledge. Free forms: family and community education are not extinct but suffer a social demotion in a hierarchy of transmitted knowledge.

In a more restricted view, education designates “[...] the process through which individuals acquire mastery and understanding of certain content considered valuable” (CHAVES, 2009). The achievement of education occurs through the action of teaching, which involves three components: “[...] the one who teaches, the one to whom it is taught, and what is taught”. (Chaves, 2009). Teaching concerns the intentional act of transmitting something to another person or group. When that person learns, understands, or acquires mastery of the content transmitted, learning is achieved. There are many ways of teaching and learning, but education presupposes some characteristic elements.

For Chaves (2009), education only exists when two components are present. First, the *content*, which is not limited to “[...] strictly intellectual or cognitive, but any types of skills, cognitive or not, attitudes, etc. [...]”. What is taught is quite broad, but it must be identified, even if the action does not produce the intended result. In addition to the delimitation, the content needs to have value in the society where the educational process is taking place. If the content has no social value, there is no education, despite teaching-learning taking place.

The second element is *understanding*, which according to Chaves (2009) qualifies the domain. According to this criterion, “It is one thing to assimilate, purely and simply, the values of a given culture (domain). Another thing is to accept them, judiciously, after an examination that leads to an understanding of their reason for being [...]” (Chaves, 2009). Understanding involves understanding the reasons and purposes of the acquired content. Without this process, there is only conditioning, which designates “[...] a teaching that was interested only in the acceptance of norms and values, and not in their understanding, the teaching was also non-educational [...]” (Chaves, 2009). Education takes place only when it leads to reflection. If educational practices lead only to assimilation, without understanding, the educational process will fail. Mere dominance, which does not encompass the reasons and purpose of knowledge, leads to the weakening of social interaction around common shared values.

From these two complementary ideas about education, it can be understood that it takes place in two interdependent dimensions: individual and collective. As a social practice, “[...] it comprises the set of processes, influences, structures, and actions that intervene in the human development of individuals and groups in their active relationship with the natural and social environment [...]” (Libâneo, 2001, p. 7). On an individual level, the educational process transforms human beings “[...] in their physical, mental, spiritual and cultural states, which gives a configuration to our individual and group human existence” (Libâneo, 2001, p. 7). Education is part of the social structures that create conditions for sharing a worldview, in its symbolic, material, and subjective aspects.

As a form of communication and human interaction, education designates the broad and non-systematized process of cultural transmission, as well as involving specific and systematized forms of teaching-learning. Thus, informal, and formal educational practices share the same purpose, which is to promote the assimilation of “[...] knowledge, skills, techniques, attitudes, values existing in the culturally organized environment and, with this, gain the necessary level to produce other knowledge, techniques, values, etc.” (Libâneo, 2001, p. 7). There is no disinterested education, disconnected from the social context or community human achievements. In a feedback process, society and individuals move from the shared world to the reconstruction of a new shared world.

Concerning the purposes, according to Libâneo (2001, p. 8), “Education is a social practice that seeks to achieve in human subjects the characteristics of full humanization”. In this way, there is a double, mutually influential process – transformation and reproduction. Culturally transmitted knowledge serves to form individuals and maintain social relationships, at the same time as it reinforces human potential for transforming oneself and the environment. By transmitting socially valued content, education produces reflection on which values, beliefs, and interests should remain within the cultural set. If there is oppression, domination, and extermination of individuals or groups, in the face of antagonism of interests, the humanization of subjects through education means the radical transformation of these relationships.

The self-reflexive social process, especially in the second half of the 20th century, after the atrocities committed during the Second World War (1939-1945), has produced a set of international precepts that form the legal, ethical, and political normative set of Human Rights. To build consensus around minimum values, to be respected and promoted for all human beings, in addition to external characteristics, such as nationality, race, sex, ethnicity, religion, age, social class, economic capacity, etc.

The totalitarian experience, during the Second World War, for Celso Lafer (2015, p. 161), “[...] represents a proposal for organizing society that aims for the total domination of individuals”. As the author explains, domination is carried out on two levels, *isolation* prevents public life, and *desolation* destroys private relationships. The concentration camp is the most emblematic figure of politics that considers human beings as superfluous (Lafer, 2015). Humans cease to be the source value of social relations, breaking with the Enlightenment paradigm of human dignity. In its place, progress, domination, administration, and economic development are placed, expressed in a technical-instrumental rationality.

In response to these threats to life and humanity, after the Second World War, the United Nations - UN was created, which is a milestone in the systematization and standardization of Human Rights, through an institution of international composition². The creation of the UN, through the signing of the Charter of the United Nations, on July 26, 1945, by 51 countries, is due to the recognition that the survival of humanity depends on the collaboration of all peoples, based on unconditional respect for human dignity (Comparato, 2003). The effort goes towards ensuring that other social interests must have freedom, equality, and social justice as their limits, direct consequences of human dignity. Without sharing these conditions and values, the full performance of human potential is impossible.

The desire to form an international community around such ideals is not a creation of the 20th century, despite the unquestionable systematic innovation on a global scale. In the 17th and 18th centuries, some documents affirmed rights with universal philosophical-normative claims or that limited the State's actions in the face of individuality and subjectivity. We can mention the English Declaration of Rights (Bill of Rights – 1689); the Declaration of Independence (1776) and the Constitution of the United States of North America (1787); the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen of the French Revolution (1789). In the 19th and early 20th centuries, other legal documents were also drawn up, whether multilateral treaties between nation-states or Constitutions of legal-political organization, which in many aspects affirmed the prevalence of human dignity over other social interests (Comparato, 2003).

Throughout the 20th century, Human Rights will be elevated to a common element in the formulation of public policies, national and international, and in the actions of non-governmental organizations. As a normative reference, according to Perez Luño (1999, p. 48), they designate a set of rights, interests, and institutions: “[...] that concrete the demands of dignity, freedom, and human equality, which must be positively recognized by legal systems at national and international level”. A sense of Human Rights is linked to the normative elements that make up legal systems, especially Constitutions and International Documents. However, the legal aspect does not contain its values and potential.

Over the years, the content of Human Rights has been expanded, however, the emergence of new interests has not been accompanied by the social transformations necessary to sustain them. For example, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in Article 1, states that “all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. Endowed with reason and conscience, they must act towards each other in a spirit of fraternity” (UN, 1948). For Flores (2009, p. 27), when put in these terms, “Rights, therefore, are something that we already have because we are human beings absolutely outside of any social condition or characteristic”. For him, there is a confusion between the reality of Human Rights and the reasons for their existence.

In this sense, Human Rights go beyond the strict legal sense, read around the “[...] social dynamics that tend to build material and immaterial conditions necessary to achieve

² For an understanding of the importance of the creation of the UN in the promotion and protection of Human Rights, see LAFER, Celso. The UN and human rights. *Estudos Avançados*, São Paulo: USP, v. 9, no. 25, p. 169-185, 1995. For a critique and contextualization of the role of the UN in the face of current imperialism, see AMIN, Samir. Imperialism, Past and Present. *Tempo*, Niterói: Editora Universitária da UFF, v. 8, no. 19, Jan./Jun., p. 77-123, 2005.

certain generic objectives that are outside the law” (Flores, 2009, p. 29). Positiveness in legal documents represents a reinforcement, an instrument for implementation, but it cannot be confused with its implementation. Human Rights designate the goods that are necessary for human dignity, with legal norms (Constitutions and Treaties) being the means to guarantee them. The emergence of Human Rights has its place of formation moved from the exclusively legal scope to be inserted into the social dynamics (ethical, political, economic, cultural) of achieving material conditions. Flores (2009), in this way, points out that the conceptualization of Human Rights must encompass the social struggle that “[...] manages to obtain the legal guarantee for its better implementation and effectiveness (Flores, 2009, p. 28). Positiveness is not the starting or ending point of Human Rights, but the path to human dignity.

As they designate interests and assets, that are or are not protected by legal norms, the category of Human Rights is volatile, as social demands can lead to the expansion of guarantees. For Bobbio (2004, p. 18-19), “[...] there are no fundamental rights by nature. [...] the class of human rights is also heterogeneous³”. Today, Human Rights have an extension that ranges from individual freedoms – civil and political – to collective interests, which concern peace, cultural plurality, and socio-environmental justice. The challenge is to guarantee them without distinction in the most diverse contexts possible.

Access to Education is among Human Rights, which designates access to spaces for the formal and informal transmission of knowledge, as well as the conditions that are necessary for its performance. Education, as social production, and reproduction, comes to be seen as a condition for the full development of human potential. As Carvalho (2014, p. 175) states, education is

[...] essential to human development, because without the possibility of this intellectual development, of obtaining and expanding knowledge, of stimulating psychic development and without receiving teachings about coexistence and forms of social integration, the human being will not achieve a dignified life without dignity will have no value other rights.

In search of the formation of a community linked by respect for human dignity, based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights – UDHR, of 1948, this process will observe the following normative directions: universalization, multiplication, diversification and positivization (Tosi; Ferreira, 2014). Such trends are linked to the cosmopolitanization of the world, which promoted the expansion of goods and interests and the specification of entitled subjects, leaving aside an abstract and generic perspective. The affirmations of Human Rights inherent to the human condition, as stated by Flores (2009), do not produce spontaneous adherence, nor immediate realization. Achievement depends on adequate conditions⁴.

³ The so-called Rights of man designate, from a natural law basis, “[...] those that belong or should belong, to all men, or of which no man can be deprived” (Bobbio, 2004, p. 17). Today the expression is useful for the philosophy of law, as it deals with what “should be”, from an extra-legal point of view, thus linking the investigation of ideal foundations and reasons, regardless of whether it is positive or not. On the other hand, the expressions Human Rights and Fundamental Rights are related to positive law. According to Ingo Sarlet (2007, p. 35-36), “[...] the term 'fundamental rights' applies to those rights of the human being recognized and made positive in the sphere of positive constitutional law of a given State, while the expression 'human rights' would be related to documents of international law, as it refers to those legal positions that recognize human beings as such, regardless of their connection with a certain constitutional order, and which, therefore, aspire to universal validity, to all peoples and times, in such a way that they reveal an unequivocal supranational (international) character”.

⁴ The legal limitation even occurs in the formalism of International Human Rights Law, as the form of enforceability and punishability in an international system of justice and the difference in which only treaties, agreements and conventions define the character of enforceability and if they are internalized in the respective legal systems, that is, that international jurisdiction is recognized. For an expansion of the discussion on International Human Rights Law and its legal architecture, see TRINDADE, Antônio Augusto Cançado. *Tratado de Direito Internacional dos Direitos Humanos (Volume I)*. Porto Alegre: Sergio Antonio Fabris, 1997.

To form a global community that shares minimum values, one of the assumptions is the recognition of the educational dimension of Human Rights, in the broad and strict sense already presented. According to Tosi and Ferreira (2014, p. 45), “Education for citizenship is one of the fundamental dimensions for the performance of rights, both in formal education and informal or popular education and the media”. In a capillary and diluted way, the ethical, legal, and political values that form Human Rights must be shared, spreading across social institutions of cultural communication. Citizenship supports participation, community equality, and inclusive protagonism in the formulation of social directions.

Following this line of thought, HRE is “[...] a cultural socialization regulated by Ethics, by values centered on the dignity of every human being” (Silveira, 2014, p. 85). In other words, HRE breaks with the logic of social relations in which power and profit are the current elements of social regulation, which led to the creation of totalitarian societies and allowed the mass extermination of human beings. HRE arises from the systematization and standardization of the set of Human Rights standards, which take human beings and their communities as a source of value for social relations, serving as an instrument for their strengthening.

In this sense, HRE designates a process of transmitting specific content, valued internationally as necessary to create social relations free from oppression, extermination, and oppression. As Zenaide (2016, p. 41) states, HRE is about “[...] educating to exercise participation and social protagonism to govern the city, promote respect among all people for development and peace [...]”. HRE is, for these purposes, multi-dimensional. Its outline is found in socially broad educational processes beyond school teaching and the transmission of technical-scientific knowledge. Human interaction is, ultimately, its central element, as it is the promotion of this social aspect that fills it with meaning, foundation, and objectives.

It is possible to identify in the HRE “[...] *an explicit vocation for building a historical project, a motivating volunteer defined by an option for structural change and a commitment to popular sectors*” (Sime, 1991, p. 88). The importance of integrative and reflective pedagogical practices comes from the experiences of popular education in Latin America, in the 1970s and 1980s. Such elements point to the construction of an educational practice that encompasses the integrality of human life and that questions oppressive and imposing relationships (gender, class, race, culture, etc.).

In Brazil, the National Human Rights Education Plan – PNEDH (*Plano Nacional de Educação em Direitos Humanos*), understands HRE “[...] as a systematic and multidimensional process that guides the formation of the subject of rights [...]” (Brasil, 2007, p. 25). HRE rescues the dimension of intersubjective production of values, as a training strategy. Instead of denying validity to communicative processes, what happens is a reinforcement, enhancing spaces and expanding ethical, sociocultural, political, historical, and economic contents. According to the PNEDH, the multidimensions of HRE are:

- a) apprehension of **historically constructed knowledge about human rights and their relationship with** international, national, and local **contexts**;
- b) affirmation of **values, attitudes, and social practices that express the culture of human rights** in all spaces of society;
- c) formation of a **citizen conscience** capable of being present at cognitive, social, ethical, and political levels;
- d) development of **participatory methodological processes and collective construction**, using contextualized languages and teaching materials;
- e) strengthening **individual and social practices that generate actions and instruments in favor of the promotion, protection, and defense of human rights**, as well as the **reparation of violations** (Brasil, 2007, p. 25, emphasis added).

Human Rights, as a set of ethical, political, and legal values, acquire centrality in formative social processes, hence the essentiality of educational practices. The formation of subjects of rights depends on the recognition of the insufficiency of technical-instrumental

knowledge for the construction of a human community. The potential of a set of universally valid values can only be explored if there is space for the exercise of social interaction designed to achieve something common. Without intersubjective cooperation, Human Rights tend to be more of an instrument of domination and oppression than of human freedom and autonomy.

THE MULTIPLE DIMENSIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION – HRE

Just like the set of Human Rights, education aimed at their promotion, dissemination, and strengthening is multidimensional. It covers social, historical-cultural, legal, political, and ethical foundations. It is possible to verify this breadth in the conceptions adopted in the drafting of the United Nations Charter (1945) and in the UDHR (1948). International efforts to form a culture of Human Rights are not limited to just listing rights, but to seeking mechanisms for forming consensus, based on communication and dialogue around human dignity as a unifying social value.

Aimed at human interaction and coordination of social actions, the role of education is linked to the transmission of “[...] cultural experiences lived as a set of human relationships with Nature and between members of the species, to enable them to production and reproduction of its existence” (Silveira, 2005, p. 245). Human experiences are not limited to material reproduction, through the development and appropriation of productive techniques, but encompass an entire symbolic framework that forms an intersubjectively shared set of values.

In the social space of intangible production and reproduction, HRE seeks to create conditions for the formation of a Culture of Human Rights through practices “[...] on the subjects – producers of culture – as virtualities for the construction of identities about themselves and of other subjects, therefore, also of their community and other communities” (Silveira, 2005, p. 245). The socialization of a set of symbolic elements (codes, norms, representations, rules, beliefs, interests, values) that make up the unit harmoniously arranged around human dignity “[...] in the sense of empowering subjects (individual and collectives) for the defense and promotion of this culture” (Silveira, 2005, p. 246). The transformation of the worldview can alter material relations (power and wealth), ensuring that they are not obstacles, but instruments for the full realization of human dignity.

Due to these premises, HRE is not exhausted in the transmission of cognitive-instrumental knowledge. Multidimensionality requires interdisciplinary educational practices, whether through thematic transversality or the articulation of established knowledge. In the school context, there is no need to identify HRE with a curricular subject, as Professor Tosi (2005, p. 37) says, “It is not a mere subject in which human rights are studied, but a learning process for ethical values collectives [...]”. HRE serves socialization around human dignity, which involves the articulation between spaces and knowledge of human interaction (family, religion, government, press, companies, etc.). It also seeks to transmit interdisciplinary content (theories and practices): ethical, historical-cultural, legal, political, and economic. For these reasons, HRE can never be reduced to school practices, despite these being privileged spaces to insert the construction of such values.

The expanded perspective of HRE is drawn from international and national regulations that institutionalized and organized the principles that should horizontalize its practices. At the international level, the concern with HRE is made explicit in the preamble of the UDHR (1948), affirming the instrumental role of education in the formation of a common ideal. In Article 26.2, the foundations of education are established as “[...] strengthening respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. [...] understanding, tolerance and friendship between all nations and racial or religious groups [...]” (UN, 1948).

Especially from the 1960s onwards, some International Treaties brought greater detail on HRE. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights – PDESC,

in Art. 13, when dealing with education as a Human Right, establishes that the basic assumptions are “[...] the full development of the human personality and the sense of its dignity and strengthen respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms” (UN, 1966). The PDESC is an example of legal regulations that guarantee the enforceability of HRE actions, “[...] they cease to be ethical guidelines, or natural law, to become a set of positive rights that bind internal relations and external [...]” (Tosi, 2014, p. 43). As Flores (2009) highlights, positivity does not perform right, but it guarantees more instruments for the recognized goods and interests. From then on, the UN will develop a series of actions to promote HRE around the world.

In 1974, at the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization – UNESCO, held in Paris, the UNESCO Recommendation on Education for International Understanding, Cooperation and Peace and Education Relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (UNESCO, 1974). The Recommendation recognizes the importance and need for education to implement and achieve a Culture of Human Rights. To this end, States Parties must undertake to develop and implement education plans that cover all social processes through “[...] which individuals and social groups learn to consciously develop [...] the set of their capabilities, attitudes, skills and knowledge” (UNESCO, 1974). The concept that should guide educational policy is that of a multiple practice, in form and content.

The normative dimensions of respect for differences, solidarity and cooperation with sociocultural minorities, absence of war, and promotion of peace are essential components of social practices based on Human Rights. In addition to structuring collective relationships, such values must be integrated into the formation of the “[...] developing a personality of each child, adolescent, young person, or adult, applying these principles in the daily reality of education at all levels and under all circumstances. the forms [...]” (UNESCO, 1974). In a mutually influential way, the subjects of law in social interaction will be in constant formation and transformation, adjusting to contextual interests and needs, without abandoning the centrality of human dignity as an individual and collective foundation.

In this context, Munhoz (2017, p. 461-462) points out several regional and global initiatives compatible with the objectives outlined by the UNESCO recommendation (1974). In the scope of Latin America, there is popular education, practiced by “[...] *Consejo de Educación de Adultos de América Latina* (CEAAL), which, since 1982, has been dedicated to the construction of a Latin American democracy through popular education” (Munhoz, 2017, p. 461-462). In the same sense, the “Inter-American Institute of Human Rights, since the 1980s, created by agreement between the State of Costa Rica and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, was already dedicated to carrying out interdisciplinary courses in human rights” (Munhoz, 2017, pp. 461-462). The two actions are inserted in the context of informal and formal educational spaces, breaking with any practice limited to the school space, distant from local reality, or without articulations between social actors.

At the international level, the 1990s were especially important in the production of strategic documents to make the interests and needs surrounding the implementation of an HRE on a global scale viable. Some references were

the Vienna Declaration and Program of Action for Human Rights, adopted by the World Conference on Human Rights (Vienna, June 1993), the World Action Plan in Favor of Education for Human Rights and Democracy, adopted by the International Congress on Education for Human Rights and Democracy (Montreal, March 1993) and the Strategy and Action Plan of the Associated Schools Plan for 1994-2000 [...] (UNESCO, 1995, p. 7).

Still in 1994, given the guidelines already established, the Declaration of the 44th session of the International Conference on Education (Geneva, October 1994) was drawn up, which resulted in the Integrated Action Plan on Education for Peace, Human Rights and

Democracy (Paris, November 1995). The Action Plan suggested “[...] basic guidelines that can be translated into strategies, policies and action plans at institutional and national levels, according to the conditions of different communities” (UNESCO, 1995, p. 7). Instead of a monolithic project, HRE is a proposal to be adapted to local contexts, in their cultural and material processes. An alleged *universal/unitary/homogeneous* Culture of Human Rights, based on symbolic substitution and appropriation, does not follow respect for difference and the construction of an international community based on plurality, solidarity, and cooperation between peoples. This last perspective would represent a continuity of violent practices of imposing one worldview over another.

Political and economic practices cannot be copied to implement HRE. Edgar Morin (2003) makes a distinction between Humanistic Culture and Scientific Culture, which point to two distinct directions in the relationship with human knowledge. The first “[...] faces the great human questions, encourages reflection on knowledge and favors the personal integration of knowledge” (Morin, 2003, p. 17). However, “[...] it tends to become a mill devoid of the grain of scientific achievements about the world and life, which should feed its great questions [...]” (Morin, 2003, p. 17). Linked to philosophical reflections, this knowledge seeks to think about the meaning of human relationships and establish values, beliefs, and social interests, forming the entire symbolic framework necessary for interaction and the full development of the human personality.

On the other hand, Scientific Culture tends to “[...] separate areas of knowledge; it entails admirable discoveries, brilliant theories, but not a reflection on human destiny and the future of science” (Morin, 2003, p. 17). Unlike Humanistic Culture, scientific Culture is designed in such a way that it does not tend to carry out “[...] reflection on general and global problems, it becomes incapable of thinking about itself and of thinking about the social and human problems” (Morin, 2003, p. 17). It is not possible to defend an absolute split between the types of culture, considering that, at least in part, both make achievements and construct answers to life's problems. Instead of proposing a theoretical-practical purity, Morin (2003) draws attention to the fact that the process of social reproduction, in the material and immaterial aspects is formed by multiple knowledge that are integrated.

HRE must, in these ways, be focused on the formation of an ethics of planetary understanding (Morin, 2000, p. 99). Thus, scientific-technological progress (Scientific Culture) cannot be the only guide for human actions and educational practices. Understanding (Humanist Culture) inserts argumentation in the place of excommunication and anathematization of the other or the different, breaking with the logic of incomprehension as a social strategy (Morin, 2000). If practices of violence and oppression are the result of a culture that sees the human being as another instrument for power and wealth, comprehensive practices must seek communicative and dialogical articulation between subjects of dignity. The basis of an *ethics of understanding* is present in HRE, as stated in Article 78 of the Vienna Declaration and Program of Action, its purpose is “[...] the promotion and achievement of stable and harmonious relationships between communities, as well as to promote mutual understanding, tolerance, and peace” (UN, 1993).

Due to the urgency of the times, in 1994, at the International Conference on Education, the UN General Assembly approved Resolution 49/184, which stipulated the period from January 1, 1995, to December 31, 2004, as the United Nations Decade for Human Rights Education. Like previous documents, the Resolution understands that HRE refers to “[...] a comprehensive and continuous process by which people at all levels of development and from all social strata learn to respect the dignity of others [...]” (UN, 1998, p. 80). In the same sense presented, an International Action Plan of the United Nations Decade for Education in the field of Human Rights and the Guidelines for National Action Plans for Education in the field of Human Rights were approved (UN, 1998).

All documents are based on the need to “[...] transpose human rights from the expression of abstract norms (sic) to the reality of the respective social, economic, cultural and political conditions” (UN, 1998, p. 13). It is therefore recognized that the set of Human Rights needs to dialogue with the sociocultural contexts of people. The rapprochement between abstract precepts and everyday life meets the notion of common cultural formation, in the sense presented by Silveira (2005). The need to privilege an ethical and sociocultural dimension of HRE emerges, without that educational practices can maintain the cultural, non-reflective model of transmitting cognitive-instrumental knowledge aimed at power and wealth.

PLANS AND GUIDELINES FOR HRE IN THE BRAZILIAN CONTEXT

During the United Nations Decade for Education on Human Rights, Brazil developed its first National Human Rights Plan – PNDH I (*Plano Nacional de Direitos Humanos*) (1996), after the 1st National Conference on Human Rights. The creation of PNDH I, the first in Latin America and one of the first in the world, showed that, in Brazil, “[...] post-redemocratization civil governments began to incorporate human rights into government policies” (Adorno, 2010, p. 9). The Brazilian movement was already a response to internationally established guidelines for the creation of a National Human Rights Education Committee and a National Action Plan (UN, 1998, p. 48).

In the following years, PNDH II (2002) and III (2009) were launched, all results of revisions to their predecessor (Adorno, 2010). The three Plans have common characteristics. They maintain a line of continuity, despite representing maturity and important increases in the commitment to Human Rights in Brazil. For Adorno (2010), Plans I, II, and III are non-partisan, creating commitments by the Brazilian State to the promotion and protection of Human Rights, a requirement for strengthening democratic institutions; contain proposals for social articulation that involve the State (federal, state and municipal) and civil society; adopt a vision of interdependence of all Human Rights; resulted from national conferences and civil society consultations; and indicate goals (short and long term) with clear and precise objectives.

Concerning PNDH I, PNDH II innovated by incorporating “[...] economic, social and cultural rights [...] and the rights of people of African descent” (Adorno, 2010, p. 13). Thus, the Brazilian State began to recognize the existence of racism, which allowed the formulation of compensatory policies, aiming to eliminate discrimination and promote racial equality. PNDH III expands the rights already presented in the previous ones, structuring them into 6 axes:

[...] democratic interaction between the State and civil society; development and human rights; universalization of rights in a context of social inequalities; public security, access to justice and combating violence; human rights education and culture; and the right to memory and truth [...] (Adorno, 2010, p. 13).

As a deepening of the commitment to HRE, in 2003 the National Plan for Education in Human Rights (PNEDH- *Plano Nacional de Educação em Direitos Humanos*) was drawn up, which is based on the dissemination of HRE in various areas of formal education (basic and higher), non-formal, of the justice and security system and the media. According to the PNEDH, “[...] education is understood as a right and an indispensable means of accessing other rights. [...] aimed at full human development and its potential, valuing respect for socially excluded groups” (Brasil, 2007, p. 25).

The PNEDH, by developing the bases and foundations of HRE, already expressed in a wide set of national and international documents, reinforces the ethical commitment to education. Human Rights are presented not only as a set of legal norms but as universal precepts of respect for human beings and the culture and community of which they are part (Tosi, 2005, p. 36). PNDH I, II, and III, when outlining the framework within which HRE must act, affirm

the inseparability of the set of Human Rights. The three Plans highlight the close connection between the promotion of material equality, the eradication of discrimination, and the coordination between public authorities and civil society (unions, associations, social movements, etc.) to realize these rights.

The National Guidelines for Human Rights Education (DNEDH- *Diretrizes Nacionais para a Educação em Direitos Humanos*), prepared by the National Education Council (CNE), in 2012, explain dimensions of ethical, critical, and political values (CNE, 2012, p. 8). Ethicality encompasses humanizing values, those that place human beings and their cultures as starting and ending points of actions, which do not consider domination, oppression, and extermination as social practices. Being critical, HRE promotes reflection to understand social, economic, and cultural contexts, being able to support intentional actions to respect and promote Human Rights. From a political point of view, the formation of subjects is directed toward emancipation, freedom, and autonomy, which are linked to the capacity for interaction and inclusion in the diversity of human manifestations (CNE, 2012).

In the search for a new global ethos, HRE is based on dialogue and non-authoritarian communication between individual and collective subjects. Without respect for cultural and epistemic differences and distinct social needs and interests, it is not possible to build a deep connection between people, in other words, a Culture of Human Rights is impossible. Thinking about HRE is reflecting on its objectives and purpose, looking for strategies that can guarantee social interaction based on broad and unrestricted human dignity.

HUMAN RIGHTS CULTURE: THE INTERSUBJECTIVE FORMATION OF THE COMMON

The multidimensionality and multiplicity of HRE foundations point to the need for sociability centered on human interaction and communication. Such processes, at least in the face of the current product of modernity, have been overlooked as inefficient and incapable of fulfilling the promises of technological progress, economic development, and social organization. As Morin (2003) points out, scientific culture, which is dominant in the current process of social reproduction, has operated without deep reflections on its practices and results. The autonomy of scientific knowledge produced an exaggerated technical-instrumental protagonism and placed all other social systems at its service. As a result, relationships measured by strength, dominance, and conquest became the standard of human interaction.

According to Silveira (2005), HRE can be an instrument in reformulating this systemic relationship, returning instrumental interests to their rightful place. Technique and its products – development, and progress – need to be guided by social systems of human interaction and communication, thus submitted to the purposes produced in these fields. The dominance of the entire process of social reproduction by technical-instrumental rationality represents systemic deregulation, which has resulted in an impediment to the performance of human dignity in a broad and unrestricted way.

The world has become one, in some ways, as it is interconnected by globally shared interests. However, the unifying process has not been carried out through instruments of communicative interaction, but through strategies of domination and conquest. For Lipovetsky and Serroy (2011), there is a world culture, formed along these lines, based on four structuring elements: hypercapitalism, hypertechinization, hyperindividualism, and hyperconsumption. It is now possible to see the formulation of excesses as a scheme of the social framework, which has led to deinstitutionalization and deterritorialization, that is, to the rupture of collective links of human interaction and communication. Instead of the formation of social links built by a dialogical relationship of mutual understanding, efficiency, and profitability have been the mediating factors of human interaction (LIPOVETSKY; SERROY, 2011).

Capitalist economic relations are not limited only to the organization of production and distribution of social wealth, but to the “[...] organizing scheme of all activities, the general model of action and life in society” (Lipovetsky; Serroy, 2011, p. 38). The social/human ethos became a capitalist ethos. Therefore, the belief in social coordination has been replaced by community and collective values, with the possibilities of technological coordination, which can promote unlimited progress. Human beings, as promoters and producers of history, have been replaced by the machine. But not just in the equipment sense, but in the ideal sense, in the form of mechanistic relationships of efficiency and productivity. Humans have converted themselves and others into *homo-machina*.

Power relations, in this model, are rearranged, formulating new justifications. The cultural tradition, which supported political power through religion, age, aristocratic authority, etc., loses its place to another source of legitimation – the basis of social work (Habermas, 1997, p. 64). Capitalism is based on equivalence in exchange relations, designated by the market, and the maintenance of this process becomes the foundation of political domination. The bases of traditional social organization begin to be subject to strategic and instrumental rationality, emerging the “[...] infrastructure of a society under the duress of modernization” (Habermas, 1997, p. 65). Instrumentality, formulated based on efficiency and productivity, penetrates all areas of human relations, even occupying spaces that were previously oriented towards the reproduction of social values that supported this communication.

Thus, the technique is elevated to the center of social relations, replacing any other forms of human interaction. The State, as a modern representative of the convergence of collective interest, becomes depoliticized, as its purpose begins to be “[...] stability and growth of the economic system [...] politics aims not at achieving practical ends but the resolution of technical issues” (Habermas, 1997, p. 70, emphasis added). As a regulator of reciprocal market relations, the State excludes public opinion from decision-making. In place of democratic debate and symbolic mediations, “[...] science and technique became the first productive force [...]” determining a social organization based on a technical-scientific logic (Habermas, 1997, pp. 72-73). The construction of consensus, based on dialogue, in social interaction spaces/institutions, is replaced by technical information. Society impoverishes its symbolic, cultural, ethical, political, historical framework, etc.

The depoliticization of public space represents the crumbling of the common, of agreements, of convergences, producing hyper-individualism. Social transmission frees from “[...] all old forms and collective inclusion [...]” (Lipovetsky; Serroy, 2011, p. 52). Human Rights are not safe from such social deformations. As a heterogeneous set of interests, they undergo a process of segregation, abandoning any community or collective foundation, anchoring themselves in a process of atomization of identity and particular communities. Given this tension, HRE needs to be read from the perspective of the intersubjective sharing of values, not the subjective imposition of universal knowledge.

Disoriented from any common sense or collective agreement that directs desires and actions, “[...] the essence of our exchanges tends to become commercial relations, it is almost the entirety of our existence that is colonized by brands and the market” (Lipovetsky; Serroy, 2011, p. 58). Hyperconsumption drives human fulfillment and unifies global actions around the market. This process of convergence is fragmented, based on isolated actions, conditioned by the impossibility of other forms of implementation. There are groups of individuals in search of individual interests, unable to form a community in the absence of common elements.

Human action is no longer guided by interaction processes, such as the formation of social norms, political decisions, and cultural knowledge, and begins to respond to external technical stimuli. Habermas (1997, p. 76) speaks of “adaptive behavior”, which is caused by “[...] continuous erosion of the sphere of linguistically measured interaction, under pressure from the structure of rational action directed towards ends”. Despite the apparent freedom, due to the

absence of direct norms, the conditioning of behavior occurs imperceptibly through indirect stimuli that direct political, electoral, consumer, and professional interests, etc. The field of freedom, in the face of hypertechnization, becomes increasingly restricted, even if it is not easily perceived.

In these ways, HRE proposes the difficult task of altering the process of internalization of social relations, thinking that it is possible to stimulate systems of intersubjective construction. To achieve this, according to *Habermasian* thought, it is necessary to consider two levels of values, those that are strictly linked to the sociocultural context, therefore only valid there, and others with universal claims, valid for everyone or no one (Bannell, 2013). Human Rights would be in the second category. However, validity is thought of in terms of claims, not objective data.

Validity is formed within a discursive context, the product of a reflection resulting from the problematization of reality. The values cannot be taken as indisputable. They are products of the intersubjective relationship, that is, of rational cooperation between speakers (Bannell, 2013). When technical determinations are expanded to all human relationships, communication as creation loses space, leaving the locus of construction of social norms empty. In the face of absence, instrumental ideals – conquest and domination – begin to dictate the entire process of social reproduction. Human relations become subject-object or *homo-machina* relations.

By explaining the political, economic, ethical, historical-cultural, and social dimensions of Human Rights, HRE aims to promote the decolonization of spaces of human interaction mediated by communication. Returning to Morin (2003), scientific culture is not prone to reflection, given its instrumental aims and purposes. Instrumental and technical rationality promotes reviews based on efficiency, productivity, and success. The criteria for the social validity of human actions become composed of subjective and monological formulations and are only later imposed through power and wealth. Knowledge is reduced to a cognitive dimension.

On the other hand, humanist culture (Morin, 2003) comes closer to the multidimensionality of HRE, based on “[...] formation of a citizen consciousness capable of being present at cognitive, social, ethical and political levels [...]” (Brasil, 2007, p. 25). One of the purposes of HRE is that the transmission of technical-scientific content is carried out in conjunction with a set of values that guide this knowledge. It is about creating spaces and subjects that articulate scientific knowledge with the social, political, economic, historical-cultural, and ethical context.

As a proposal for cultural diffusion, HRE aims to modify human relationships, redirecting the foundations of social and intersubjective actions based on intersubjectively shared values (Silveira, 2005). From a common value base, human beings can distance themselves from the totalitarian ethos, fuel for oppression, domination, and extermination. By changing the movement between idea and action, the maintenance or transformation of social relations will result.

In this scenario, education is of great importance “[...] both for the elaboration of appropriate and adequate strategies to change the objective conditions of reproduction and for the *conscious self-change* of individuals [...]” (Mészáros, 2020, p 65). The autonomy of the subjects, capable of seeing themselves as producers of history, represents a possible counter-internalization, based not only on the denial of the dominant global ethos but on the performance of a concretely sustainable alternative.

As a human product, HRE has potentiality. Concretization is always done within contexts that can maximize intersubjective possibilities or deny them. HRE's challenge is to promote and reinforce common human aspects that can be shared and validated universally, without thereby nullifying individuals and communities in their particularities. Instead of hyper-

individualism, which breaks any bond of similarity, singularity needs to find space for existence within a broad and fertile field of human expression.

With the affirmation of individual dignity, which is before and alien to the collective context, “[...] modern jusnaturalism creates a new problem: in this new society of individuals equal to each other, despite their particularities, nothing unites them” (Reis, 2020, p. 46). Heir of this current of thought, Human Rights, finds himself immersed in this trap: humans without humanity. Universal homogenization around individualism can lead to the deepening of segregationist identitarianism, forming particular communities.

The Culture of Human Rights must go against sociability that “[...] allows each person to create a very positive image of themselves, at the same time that it relegates the image of others to the background” (Reis, 2020, p. 47). Technique as a mediating language of human relations creates a multitude of subjects without interaction. Relationships are mediated by conquest and aimed at satisfying needs not built from communication between speakers (*homo-homo*), but in a subject-object relationship (*homo-machina*).

Human Rights, as values that claim universal validity, for “[...] the reconstruction of the common, the community, which involve reciprocal commitments, seem to require that they recognize their similarities, that they break with the world restricted to the self and that they project beyond yourself” (Reis, 2020, p. 48). The multidimensionality of HRE maintains the porosity of the educational process, going beyond the transmission of technical-scientific knowledge. Without abandoning modern achievements and creations, educational practices in Human Rights return knowledge to its context, informing its dependence and instrumentality, that is, they are subordinated to interests formulated based on the sociocultural, ethical, legal, and political values that are the creation of communicative reflection. Subverting this order, allowing instrumental knowledge according to human interaction, is perpetuating totalitarian behaviors that deny human dignity.

The Human Rights discourse must be formed in intersubjective self-reflection, mediated by a broad process of interaction to formulate consensus and value agreements. In this sense, for Rodino (2020, p. 167), “[...] the discourse of human rights erected an abstract value as common and exclusive to the human species – dignity – and it contains equal and irrevocable rights that the States must guarantee”. In a first sense, Human Rights explain a universal value claim, based on the potential for a communicative convergence that goes beyond particularities and sociocultural contexts.

In addition to the universalist stance, Human Rights “Simultaneously recognized many concrete differences that distinguish human beings in reality [...] as legitimate differences that also deserve respect and protection” (Rodino, 2020, p. 167). Thus, aspects linked to ethnicity, gender, nationality, culture, ideology, beliefs, and individual capacity have been included in the dimensions of protection and promotion of the Culture of Human Rights. Without particularities being respected and considered, it is not possible to build communication that leads to understanding and sharing common values.

HRE has the potential to promote human interaction based on foundations other than conquest, individualism, and technicality. The focus on education, as an action for the intersubjective sharing of values, is based on the recognition that “[...] *human practices are regulated through linguistic and communicative competencies (skills or abilities). Without them, we only must resort to strength, which is the way to reason*” (Rodino, 2020, p. 169). The purpose of overcoming a culture of domination over humans and nature involves educational practices that are organized in a critical, reflective, and dialogic way. For multidimensional content to be produced and transmitted, the dialogue that leads to understanding must be reestablished and the spaces for intersubjective interaction expanded.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

HRE has been presented as a multidimensional social practice for the formation of a culture of Human Rights to replace practices of conquest and domination over nature and other human beings. Since the creation of the UN in 1948, the international community has faced the challenge of forming a minimum consensus around human dignity. The obstacles relate to the need to overcome a technical-instrumental view of social relations, which is based on knowledge produced individually and then imposed on the rest of the individuals.

The research problem that was addressed sought to bring some considerations about the possibilities of adapting educational practices to the formation of a multidimensional Culture in Human Rights based on the intersubjective sharing of values. The key element for the analysis is the assumption that ethical, cultural, and humanistic values, which form Human Rights, cannot be imposed by force or coercion. To be an element of social production that leads to human freedom and emancipation, such values need to be shared based on dialogue, understanding, and reflection toward consensus.

Based on these considerations, the article developed the idea that education designates a broad process of sharing a worldview, which is done by various social institutions when inserting new subjects into the community. It also designates intentional teaching-learning actions, which serve to transmit content – cognitive, social, and emotional – that is socially valued. Human Rights can be one of those contents that, when shared among members of a community, form the bond for coordinating collective and individual actions. Therefore, the HRE designates the actions planned to promote the dissemination and promotion of human dignity as a central value in the formation of Human Rights.

Something that the article highlighted was that Human Rights are not monolithic, but involve a plurality of interests – ethical, political, sociocultural, economic, and legal. Thus, for HRE to be adequate, it is necessary to take a multidimensional perspective, which encompasses several social institutions, in addition to the school, as well as interdisciplinary practices, articulating socially relevant theories and practices. The plans, guidelines, and declarations, at the international and national level, present the outline of HRE following such a plural, holistic and integrative perspective.

HRE is focused on education based on critical reflection and respect for differences. Its characteristics require a scenario that promotes dialogue that aims to understand and share the same values, abandoning the imposition of unquestionable, non-dialogued, and immutable knowledge. Unlike a scientific and technical culture, HRE represents a humanistic and communicative science, which takes all social elements as important in the process of forming knowledge about the world, norms, and the production of subjectivities.

As pointed out in the final part of the article, the technique, elevated to the last social criterion for the validity of human actions, is not sufficient to guide the use made of itself, allowing human actions to be of the subject-object type (*homo-machina*). In this process, common elements are not sustained, as there is no identity between the two poles of the relationship. The characteristic that unites the subject with an object, in modern society, is dominance and conquest. If this relationship is transported to intersubjective relationships, the way will be opened for total domination of individuals, destroying the processes of public and private interaction. Democracy does not find space for existence, nor do particular social relations resist.

A Culture of Human Rights can only be built if educational processes are committed to values formed intersubjectively. The emergence of a common aspect among humanity is not a given, but a construct. It needs to be fostered, promoted, and protected. It is necessary to promote a counter-internalization of the current world culture. Choosing human dignity as the foundation of educational practices can guarantee space for the expression of

individuality, without disrupting agreements and consensus collectively constructed through communication.

The biggest challenge for HRE is to succumb to an individualistic reading of its content and practices. Abandoning a multidimensional notion of Human Rights, restricting them to legal norms, or linking HRE actions to the school environment, filled only with cognitive-instrumental content, would represent a failure of a program to form a Culture of Human Rights. Permanently rethinking the relationship between the theoretical outline, the social context, and the execution of HRE activities can be a strategy to prevent dialogical and communicative practices from being supplanted by the mechanization of human relations projects.

Expanding research on a rationality that replaces the technical and individualistic one can strengthen social spaces and human actions that are based on communicative and dialogic rationality. This epistemic direction contributes to the actions and purposes of HRE, aiming at the formation of a multidimensional culture in Human Rights, based on dialogue and consensus.

REFERENCES

- ADORNO, Sérgio. História e desventura: o 3º Programa Nacional de Direitos Humanos. *Novos estud. – CEBRAP*, São Paulo, n. 86, p. 5-20, mar. 2010. Disponível em: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0101-33002010000100001&lng=en&nrm=iso. Acesso em: 24 fev. 2021.
- AMIN, Samir. O Imperialismo, passado e presente. *Tempo*, Niterói: Editora da UFF, v. 8, n. 19, jan./jun., p. 77-123, 2005. Disponível em: https://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1413-77042005000100005. Acesso em: 19 mar. 2021.
- BANNEL, Ralph Ings. *Habermas & a educação*. 2. ed. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica Editora, 2013.
- BOBBIO, Norberto. *A era dos direitos*. Tradução: Carlos Nelson Coutinho. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier, 2004.
- BRANDÃO, Carlos Rodrigues. *O que é educação*. 1. ed. 49. reimpr. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 2007.
- BRASIL. Comitê Nacional de Educação em Direitos Humanos. *Plano Nacional de Educação em Direitos Humanos*, Brasília: Secretaria Especial dos Direitos Humanos, Ministério da Educação, Ministério da Justiça, UNESCO, 2007. Disponível em: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/docman/2191-plano-nacional-pdf/file>. Acesso em: 24 fev. 2021.
- BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Conselho Nacional de Educação. PROCESSO: 23001.000158/2010-55. *Parecer e Projeto de Resolução que Estabelece Diretrizes Nacionais para a Educação em Direitos Humanos*. Brasília (DF), 2012. Disponível em: <https://www.gov.br/mdh/pt-br/navegue-por-temas/educacao-em-direitos-humanos/DiretrizesNacionaisEDH.pdf>. Acesso em: 24 fev. 2021.
- CARVALHO, Maria Elizete Guimarães. Direitos Humanos e Educação: a formação docente como um direito. In: FLORES, Elio Chaves; FERREIRA, Lúcia de Fátima Guerra; MELO, Vilma de Lurdes Barbosa e. (org.). *Educação em Direitos Humanos & Educação para os Direitos Humanos*. João Pessoa: Editora Universitária da UFPB, 2014.

CHAVES, Eduardo O. C. A Filosofia da Educação e a Análise de Conceitos Educacionais. *Repositório Institucional da UFSC*, 2009. Disponível em: <https://repositorio.ufsc.br/handle/praxis/123>. Acesso em: 17 fev. 2021.

COMPARATO, Fábio Konder. *A afirmação história dos Direitos Humanos*. 3. ed. rev. e ampl. São Paulo: Saraiva, 2003.

FLORES, Herrera Joaquín. *A reinvenção dos direitos humanos*. Tradução: Carlos Roberto Diogo Garcia; Antônio Henrique Graciano Suxberger; Jefferson Aparecido Dias. Florianópolis: Fundação Boiteux, 2009.

HABERMAS, Jürgen. *Técnica e ciência como “ideologia”*. Tradução: Artur Morão. Lisboa-PT: Edições 70, 1997.

LAFER, Celso. A ONU e os direitos humanos. *Estudos Avançados*, São Paulo: USP, v. 9, n. 25, p. 169 – 185, 1995. Disponível em: <https://www.revistas.usp.br/eav/article/view/8895>. Acesso em: 19 mar. 2021.

LAFER, Celso. *A reconstrução dos direitos humanos: um diálogo com o pensamento de Hannah Arendt*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2015.

LIBÂNEO, José Carlos. Pedagogia e pedagogos: inquietações e buscas. *Educar*, Curitiba, n. 17, p. 153-176, 2001.

LIPOVETSKY, Gilles; SERROY, Jean. *A cultura-mundo: resposta a uma sociedade desorientada*. Tradução Maria Lúcia Machado. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2011.

LUÑO, Antonio Enrique Pérez Luño. *Derechos Humanos, Estado de Derecho y Constitucion*. 6 ed. Madrid: Tecnos, 1999.

MÉSZÁROS, István. *A educação para além do capital*. Tradução: Isa Tavares. 2. ed. 6. reimp. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2020.

MORIN, Edgar. *Os sete saberes necessários à educação do futuro*. Tradução: Catarina Eleonora F. da Silva e Jeanne Sawaya; 2. ed. São Paulo: Cortez; Brasília: UNESCO, 2000.

MORIN, Edgar. *A cabeça bem-feita: repensar a reforma, reformar o pensamento*. Tradução: Eloá Jacobina. 8. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 2003.

MUNHOZ, Maria Letícia Puglisi. Educação em Direitos Humanos e a Promoção da Diversidade. In: FERREIRA, Lúcia de Fátima Guerra; et al. (org.). *Anais do IX Seminário Internacional de Direitos Humanos da UFPB. Desafios e perspectivas da democracia na América Latina*. João Pessoa: CCTA, 2017, p. 460-477. Disponível em: http://www.cchla.ufpb.br/ncdh/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/IX-SIDH_Anais-Elet%C3%B4nicos_24_11_17.pdf. Acesso em: 20 fev. 2021.

ORGANIZAÇÃO DAS NAÇÕES UNIDAS (ONU). *Década das Nações Unidas para a educação em matéria de direitos humanos 1995/2004: lições para a vida*. Genebra: ONU, 1998. Disponível em: https://gddc.ministeriopublico.pt/sites/default/files/documentos/pdf/serie_decada_1_b_nacoes_unidas_educacao_dh_.pdf. Acesso em: 20 fev. 2021.

ORGANIZAÇÃO DAS NAÇÕES UNIDAS (ONU). *Declaração dos Direitos da Criança*. Adotada pela Assembléia das Nações Unidas de 20 de novembro de 1959 e ratificada pelo Brasil. Disponível em:
<http://www.direitoshumanos.usp.br/index.php/Crian%C3%A7a/declaracao-dos-direitos-da-crianca.html>. Acesso em: 20 fev. 2021.

ONU. *Declaração e programa de ação de Viena*. Conferência Mundial sobre Direitos Humanos. Viena, 14-25 de junho de 1993. Disponível em:
<https://www.oas.org/dil/port/1993%20Declara%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20e%20Programa%20de%20Ac%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20adoptado%20pela%20Confer%C3%Aancia%20Mundial%20de%20Viena%20sobre%20Direitos%20Humanos%20em%20junho%20de%201993.pdf>. Acesso em: 20 fev. 2021.

ONU. *Declaração Universal dos Direitos Humanos*. Proclamada pela Assembleia Geral da ONU, em Paris, em 10 de dezembro de 1948. Disponível em:
<https://www.unicef.org/brazil/declaracao-universal-dos-direitos-humanos>. Acesso em: 20 fev. 2021.

ONU. *Pacto Internacional de Direitos Econômicos, Sociais e Culturais*. Adotado e aberto à assinatura, ratificação e adesão pela resolução 2200A (XXI) da Assembléia Geral das Nações Unidas, de 16 de Dezembro de 1966. Disponível em:
http://www.unfpa.org.br/Arquivos/pacto_internacional.pdf. Acesso em: 20 fev. 2021.

UNESCO. *Recomendação da UNESCO sobre a educação para a compreensão, cooperação e paz internacionais e a educação relativa aos direitos humanos e liberdades fundamentais*. Conferência Geral da UNESCO na sua 18.^a sessão, em Paris, França, 1974. Disponível em:
<https://gddc.ministeriopublico.pt/sites/default/files/recomunesco-educacao.pdf>. Acesso em 20 fev. 2021.

UNESCO. *Declaração e Plano de Ação Integrado sobre a Educação para a Paz, os Direitos Humanos e a Democracia*. Conferência-Geral da UNESCO na sua 28.^a sessão, Paris, França, 1995. Disponível:
https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000112874_por. Acesso em: 20 fev. 2021.

REIS, Helena Esser dos. Dignidade: condição humana compartilhada. *Revista Interdisciplinar de Direitos Humanos – RIDH / Observatório de Educação em Direitos Humanos/UNESP*, Bauru: OEDH/UNESP, v. 8, n. 2, p. 41-54, jul./dez. 2020. Disponível em:
<https://www3.faac.unesp.br/ridh/index.php/ridh/article/view/829/395>. Acesso em: 27 fev. 2021.

RODINO, Ana María. De la teoría y la aplicación lingüística a la construcción de la dignidad y los derechos humanos. *Revista Interdisciplinar de Direitos Humanos – RIDH / Observatório de Educação em Direitos Humanos/UNESP*, Bauru: OEDH/UNESP, v. 8, n. 2, p. 159-171, jul./dez. 2020. Disponível em: <https://www3.faac.unesp.br/ridh/index.php/ridh/article/view/838>. Acesso em: 28 fev. 2021.

SARLET, Ingo Wolfgang. *A eficácia dos direitos fundamentais*. 7. ed. Porto Alegre: Livraria do Advogado, 2007.

SILVEIRA, Rosa Maria Godoy. Educação em Direitos Humanos e Currículo. In: FLORES, Elio Chaves; FERREIRA, Lúcia de Fátima Guerra; MELO, Vilma de Lurdes Barbosa e.

(org.). *Educação em Direitos Humanos & Educação para os Direitos Humanos*. João Pessoa: Editora Universitária da UFPB, 2014.

SILVEIRA, Rosa Maria Godoy. Educação em/para os direitos humanos: entre a universalidade e as particularidades, uma perspectiva histórica. In: ZENAIDE, M. de N. et al. *A formação em Direitos Humanos na universidade: ensino, pesquisa e extensão*. João Pessoa: Editora Universitária da UFPB, 2005.

SIME, L. Educación, persona y proyecto histórico. In: MAGENDZO, A. *Educación en Derechos Humanos: apuntes para una nueva práctica*. Santiago: Corporación Nacional de Reparación y Reconciliación. Programa Interdisciplinario de Investigaciones en Educación – PIIE, 1991.

TOSI, Giuseppe. Os direitos humanos como eixo articulador do ensino, da pesquisa e da extensão universitária. In: ZENAIDE, M. de N. et alii. *A formação em Direitos Humanos na universidade: ensino, pesquisa e extensão*. João Pessoa: Editora Universitária da UFPB, 2005.

TOSI, Giuseppe; FERREIRA, Lúcia de Fátima Guerra. Educação em direitos humanos nos sistemas internacional e nacional. In: FLORES, Elio Chaves; FERREIRA, Lúcia de Fátima Guerra; MELO, Vilma de Lurdes Barbosa e. (org.). *Educação em Direitos Humanos & Educação para os Direitos Humanos*. João Pessoa: Editora Universitária da UFPB, 2014.

TRINDADE, Antônio Augusto Cançado. *Tratado de Direito Internacional dos Direitos Humanos (Volume I)*. Porto Alegre: Sergio Antonio Fabris, 1997.

ZENAIDE, Maria de Nazaré. Linha do tempo da educação em direitos humanos na América Latina. In: RODINO, Ana Maria. et al. (org.). *Cultura e educação em direitos humanos na América Latina*. Brasil: trajetórias, desafios e perspectivas. João Pessoa: CCTA, 2016.

Submitted: 08/30/2021

Preprint: 14/05/2021

Approved: 08/13/2023

AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTION

Author 1 – Writing of all stages of the manuscript, preparation of the project, bibliographic review, definition of methodology, discussion of results, and conclusions.

Author 2 - Collaborated in the review of all stages of construction of the manuscript, project preparation, bibliographic review, definition of methodology, discussion of results and conclusions.

Author 3 - Doctoral advisor of the 1st author, responsible for providing guidance and corrections to all stages of writing the manuscript.

DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest with this article.