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Summary:
This text essays a conversation with Paulo Freire about his writing processes indivisible of the reading processes, which are referenced by him as an essencial part of his work as an educator. Hence, based on his work – Pedagogia do oprimido (Pedagogy of the Oppressed) (Freire, 2005a), Pedagogia da esperança (Pedagogy of Hope) (Freire, 2011a), Cartas a Cristina (Letters to Cristina) (Freire, 2019), among others –, we intend to understand and reflect upon his reading processes, and about the beauty of his language, as the continuation of his praxis in devenir. Whilst ranging excerpts of his less academic texts, we also aimed at understanding the reading-writing processes as developmental practices, because we understand the unfinished condition of every human being, with particular emphasis on educators. Of generous and democratic language, we find that Paulo Freire, in an engaged mode of writing, in a mode of writing that is committed to the other and the world, who has never separated work from life, palavramundo (wordworld), has written all of his work certain that his existence was an unmeasurable contribution to understanding the importance of professors and researchers of today and tomorrow in the intelectual production processes as a political task.
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INITIAL CONVERSATIONS

To write about Paulo Freire’s writing is to write with him about a type of writing that is involved with existence as a historical subject committed with others and with the world. In his political educator task, reading-writing are processes that divide, share and dialogue with an oriented, ethical and alterity-related praxis that is never separated from the struggle for better material and non-material conditions of existence, for all of us. Considered by us as a theme that is irrevocably coherent with the uses of language we have been striving to discuss in the public universities, we venture to essay about this theme as a need to evoke our inextricable political task with the texts we say, write and publish.

In the year of 2021, when Freire would celebrate his 100th October, in spite of the many hostile declarations made which were nevertheless not capable of alleviating the reach of his contribution to the debate on education all around the world, countless tributes were given both in Brazil and in foreign countries. Reaching this point with his “body soaked in History”, Paulo Freire is still remaking it and granting it to us as our construction, for we are unfinished, and in process, for it is unfinished, and inscribing itself in this space-time frame. Since we believe that the unprecedented is always viable and expected, during the undertaking of this essay we searched for fragments of reading-writing concerning his praxis which in his writing processes is realised as a dialog-text that is inexhaustible of possibility.

We aim to establish in these limits a necessary dialog with Freire’s work, striving to reflect upon the writing process itself as an essential element of his praxis and the uses he makes/we make of the languages produced in the academic sphere, while defending that Freire’s generous language is proof of an intellectual exercise in humility and solidarity that intervenes in the world and democratizes know-hows (because they aren’t only scientific) and knowledges.

Likewise, as a secondary but no less important goal, the aim of this dialog – possibly fertile, however very incipient – is to reflect upon our own writing processes above all in the academic discursive sphere. Here, we talk about the writings of researchers, and professors that even throughout continuous training, little do they discuss with their own peers about their own reading-writing practices, this being a result of the large amount of requirements of what we understand as academic capitalism, a kind of submission of the higher-level education to the neoliberal economy (Slaughter; Rhoades, 2004).

As we debate with Paulo Freire about his writing experiences, we will enquire about our own writing experiences, much more as intellectuals of education than as professional researchers in this area because, fundamentally, we are educators.

WEAVING WRITINGS WITH PAULO FREITE

In 1997, Paulo Freire wrote the Introduction to Os professores como intelectuais: rumo a uma pedagogia crítica da aprendizagem (Teachers as Intellectuals: Toward a Critical Pedagogy of Learning), Henry Giroux’s book. In it, he reinforced that writing is not just an action, but a
political task. This is an affirmation that the he in fact promotes in his coherent practice-theory-action, even though there is no absolute coherence according to Freire (2011). Alongside Giroux, a person with whom he has had (has) many conversations in order to think about our continuous intelectual work, Paulo Freire indicates an element that is found in all of his vast body of work: praxis in a collective and democratic dimension, and because it is also unfinished, engaged in history in devenir. The reflections produced in this essay are aimed at this praxis that is lived upon writing in his own teaching-learning-researching processes as a transformative and political intellectual.

Even though we made reference to one of Paulo Freire’s introductory texts (forewords, introductions, etc.), we have sought to engage in dialog with an endless number of fragments of his body of work, including the First words of some of his books, especially those that begin the book Letters to Cristina, which he wrote in the process of writing in a dialectical and responsible way as to the world and the others (Freire, 2019). We believe that the core of Freire’s work as an intellectual is in the famous Thesis Eleven of Marx’s Theses on Feuerbach – “The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point is to change it.” (Marx; Engels, 2007, p. 535).

This is why reaching the most critical comprehension of the oppression situation still does not free the oppressed. By laying it bare, however, they give another step towards overcoming it as long as they engage in the political struggle for the transformation of the concrete conditions in which the oppression occurs. (Freire, 2011, p. 44, stressed by us).

And so he did. In Paulo Freire’s writing processes, the word, which is palavramundo (wordworld), is therefore praxis. When invited to write the foreword to A sombra desta mangueira (Under the Shadow of the Mango Tree), Ladislaw Dowbor suggests that an introduction to Paulo Freire’s work is redundant because the work itself is practice-theory-action.

To write the preface to Paulo Freire’ book provokes a strange redundancy sensation. Is his own characteristic style, Paulo does not only write but also thinks his act of writing in permanent distancing from himself. To the prefacer remains the task of recuperating the image from the mirror, as well as the image of the image. (Dowbor, 2019, p. 15, stressed by us).

In his best known book in the languages subject, A importância do ato de ler: em três artigos que se completam (The Importance of the Act of Reading: In Three Articles that Complete Each Other), Freire emphasizes that the action of reading one’s own world, one’s own history, while activating childhood memories and writing about this reading triggers a reliving-recreation of one’s own experiences. He asserts: “Language and reality stick to each other in a dynamic manner.” (Freire, 2011b, p. 20). Freire considered that his literacy process having occurred under the shade of a mango tree, on his backyard floor, and later on in the school of teacher Eunicce Vasconcelos whom he cherished and always remembered, was one of the main aspects of his understanding that it is not possible to separate the reading of a word from the reading of the world.

The reading of the world precedes and also entails the reading of a word. That is a double and continuous process: from word to world and from world to word. The process of writing according to Freire (2011b), which we are focused on in this essay, is also a movement to read the world in/with the word in this double movement.

---
1 For Freire (2011b), Thesis on Feuerbach, with only two pages and a half, is one of the most important philosophical documents that exist.
I never live a time for pure writing, because to me the time for writing is a time for reading and rereading. Everyday, before I start writing, I have to reread the last 20 or 30 pages of the text I’m working on, and, from space to space, I make myself read the full written text. I never do only one thing. I live intensely the inseparable reading-writing relation. (Freire, 2019, p. 19).

Without romanticizing the inseparable reading-writing process, Paulo Freire includes himself in the act of intellectual craftsmanship, recalling Wright Mills to whom he makes direct reference in Considerações em torno do ato de estudar (Considerations about the act of studying), a text published in the book Ação cultural para a liberdade (Cultural Action for Freedom), of 1981, when he expatiates on the “idea sheets”. Mills (2009, p. 130) believed there is an existential dimension to the intellectual artisanal work, since in the academic discursive community, as well as in other communities, work and life are mixed together.

In Carta de Paulo Freire aos professores (Letter from Paulo Freire to teachers), he traces the inherent think-read-write relation, a process which teachers need to strongly experiment. Paulo Freire asserts that writing three times a week – whether it is a note about a reading, a comment about a movie or about a classroom event, or even a letter to no one – is a critical exercise that is paramount to those who teach-learn as a teacher’s task. For us, using reading diaries has been a constant practice, because it allows this free, own and thoughtful making, without the strands that academic conventions rigorously incentivate. After all, we must write (Freire, 2001) even if in the short term the main listener is the writer himself, because it is with him and with the readings that there is a dialog in that time-space of writing.

When he criticizes that the act of reading for studying is commonly used to consume ideas, Paulo Freire (1981) points out that you can’t measure study by the amount of books one reads (by the way, we don’t believe that knowledge can be measured) since studying is an act of (re)creation, as the reading of the palavramundo (wordworld) infers. For that matter, Paulo Freire (1981, 2011b) emphasizes the need for teachers and researchers of today and tomorrow to have intellectual discipline in the reading-writing processes, aiming to what is necessary: epistemological curiosity, intellectual unsettling and, recalling Educação e mudança (Education and Change) (Freire, 1979), commitment, which is engaging with the concrete reality.

This doesn’t mean, in any way, that the praxis of those who read and write as a teacher and researcher political making, as practice-theory-action, is translated into a restrained, standardized and formal usage of language in written texts. For us, this would mean to surpass the intentional (for it is not neutral) word-world-subject(s) relation. The word we chose to say what we want/wish to say is neither a disperse not exact fragment of the world. To seriously read-write texts (meaning to study in accordance with the author) urges us to occupy the position of historical subjects, in situated social roles we occupy in a dialog relation with other historical subjects. It is worth recalling that dialog is the essence of an education as the practice of freedom (Freire, 2005a, 2005b).

In his 10ª Carta à Cristina (10ª Letter to Cristina), Paulo Freire dwells on the fact that whoever writes an academic text must also emphasize the beauty of their language, even if the aesthetic moment is often upsetting. Moraes and Castro (2018) have discussed alternative perspectives for the academic writing that is materialized in texts that circumvent scientific normalization, such as poems, diaries and letters, and as those written by Paulo Freire: Carta de Paulo Freire aos professores (Letter from Paulo Freire to Teachers) (Freire, 2001), Cartas a Cristina (Letters to Cristina) (Freire, 2019) and Cartas a Guiné-Bissau (Letters to Guinea-Bissau)
(Freire, 1977). In a letter addressed to teachers, Paulo Freire (2001) explained that writers need to write in a simple and gentle manner, and not in an unfathomable and hermetic manner, which makes us think that the language he uses in writing his texts corresponds to what he defends in a very notorious way. This entails ethical and aesthetic matters.

João Wanderley Geraldi, in A linguagem em Paulo Freire (Language in Paulo Freire) from 2005 presents at least three meanings for language in the educator’s work: (i) Paulo Freire’s own language, which we could call freiriana/freireana (Freirean), or perhaps linguagem freiriana/freireana (Freirean language); (ii) language in the discursive arrangement of Paulo Freire’s mode of thinking, perhaps discurso freiriano/ freireano (Freirean discourse); and (iii) the language that is a phenomenon, as understood by Paulo Freire. We see no fragmentation between those three meanings, for they are also coherent, inseparable, images through the mirror: it is not possible to use Freire’s speech without mentioning his language and the way he understands it.

Let’s not forget the 40 hours of Angicos in 1963 in Rio Grande do Norte when approximately 300 adults went through a literacy process. As for literacy, Freire’s pedagogy begins in the desire to understand the universe of words, the subject repertoire, of those with a history and ways to read the world. This teaching-learning to read-write movement entails the dialog. In order to move on, from this word repertoire there is a variety of triggering words that are chosen based on its abundance and phonetic difficulty and in its pragmatic aspects, urged upon its social-cultural-political reality. This is explained by Paulo Freire in Educação e mudança (Education and Change). In this sense word is palavramundo (wordworld).

Let’s never forget the 1964 Coup – right after Angicos – either.

In this direction we recognize that among the creative uses of language in Paulo Freire, which are intentional and rooted in his intellectual educator posture and in his praxis, is the orality as “popular and singular mode of culture and knowledge production” (Geraldi, 2005, p. 9). It’s from his “silence” in the exile where his language also comes; his wish to say, speaking in written form, in dialog with others.

As an example, in A pedagogia da esperança (Pedagogy of Hope), Paulo Freire recalls one of his visits to one of the SESI social centres in the Pernambuco countryside to present research results to the families of students of an elementary school. He recalls that this was “the clearest and most overwhelming lesson” he was ever given:

“We’ve just heard”, he began, “some pretty words from Dr. Paulo Freire. Really beautiful words. Well-said. Some of them simple words, that we understand easily. Others more complicated, but we could understand the most important things they all meant” (Freire, 2011a, p. 36).

Sitting back in his chair, as he said, Paulo Freire kept listening to the that worker’s description of the house he lived with his family and of other aspects that demonstrated how precarious their lives were.

During the comings and goings of his speech, in his worker syntax, in his prosody, in his body movements, the metaphors which are so common to the popular speech, he called the attention of the educator sitting in front of him quietly, sitting back in his chair to the need
of – while making his speech to the people – the educator to be aware of the world comprehension that the people are having. (Freire, 2011a, p. 38).

The beauty in Paulo Freire’s language is also in the story of his language in praxis, as we have been saying. Geraldi (2005) designs the “narrate and think” formula for his discursive structure because his narratives are the lived experiences. Such narratives, whilst recreated, retold and reproduced are articulated with a language of possibilities. “In the paulo-freirean way of speaking, body, gesture and voice get together in the aesthetic way of defending ethics” (Geraldi, 2005, p. 13). His spoken, narrated and non-reported writings go exactly to the point which he intends to enunciate and announce, not fixing himself to the writing academic limits.

In truth, while I left the airport of Dar es Salaam, 5 years ago, towards the university “campus”, crossing the city, it revealed itself in front of me as something I would review and in which I would reenounter myself. From that moment on, the smallest things – old friends – started speaking to me, of me. The color of the sky, the green-blue of the sea, the coconut trees, the mango trees, the cashew trees, the perfume of the flowers, the smell of the earth [...] (Freire, 1977, p. 13).

This simple, accessible and personal language, just as he describes in the 14ª Carta à Cristina (14th Letter to Cristina) (which discusses Education and Democracy), enlightens us with another aesthetic that is artisanal, such as the one shared in the fragment above, among fruit trees, the african sky and sea, and which don’t reduce but on the contrary widen the reading possibilities of a written text. We understand that there isn’t only one way to say, write, and read, even if the text is addressed to the same discursive community, such as the one that unites professors in initial development, both in the basic education and in the higher level. We also understand that there are ways to standardize and to normalize these pracrices that, from one point of view, become strategies that demonstrate neutral views about education, science and language, and from another, limitate the reach of our voices and, of course, reduce the aesthetic and authorial possibilities. In any case, it is not possible to exempt discourses related to education, science and language. Every word is ideological. Every palavramundo (wordworld) is ideological, situated and intentional.

Differently, Paulo Freire’s democratic language reveals itself in the critical awareness about the collective construction of knowledge. The educator recognizes the readings he has made and that have inspired his writing, and his writing processes, in many segments of his work.

“I only read Gramsci when I was in exile. I read Gramsci and I found out I had been very much influenced by him long before reading him. It is fantstic to find out we were influenced by the thoughts of someone without ever being presented to their intellectual production” (Freire, 1995, p. 63-64).

These notes make us acknowledge Antonio Gramsci’s writings from jail. He was arrested during the italian fascist regime. During that period, while Gramsci’s analysis matured and deepened, he wrote many letters to family members, friends and colleagues from 1926 to 1945, which were compiled in Cartas do cárcere (Letters from Prison). It was during his period in exile in Chile, during the time when he was accused of subversion and forced to leave his own land, the “People’s Land” (Freire, 2012, p. 45), that Paulo Freire wrote one of his most important works, in 1968, the Pedagogia do oprimido (Pedagogy of the Oppressed). “The Pedagogy of the Oppressed arises from all of this, and I speak of it, of how I learned to write about it and even of how, when I first talked about it, I began learning how to write about it.” (Freire, 2011a, p. 18).
In order to think the intellectuals and their writing processes, Paulo Freire didn’t establish a
dialog only with Antonio Gramsci, but also with Mikhail Bakhtin. João Wanderley Geraldi pointed
that out in Paulo Freire e Mikhail Bakhtin: o encontro que não houve (Paulo Freire and Mikhail
Bakhtin: The Meeting that Never Was), a text from 2003, even though we stress the risks in this
type of approximation. As he recalls in A pedagogia da esperança (Pedagogy of Hope), Freire
mentioned a few other dialogs he had been establishing (Karl Marx, György Lukács, Karel Kosík,
among others). As a matter of fact, these are some of the sources for his theoretical thought,
although he didn’t take the time to write down last names, years and pages in every text
intersection.

In Russia, Mikhail Bakhtin, who was also sentenced to exile by the Stalinist regime, is
another intellectual that creates his own language in order to build a philosophical language.
Language – in its relation with the responsible and responsive act, which means to “take a step that
is singular and unrepeatable” (Ponzi, 2017) – is an Event of Being. Whilst criticizing
theoricism, he explains:

In its totality, the theoretical reasoning is not but a moment of practical reason, meaning
that of the reasoning that results from a unique subject’s moral direction in the singular
existing event. This existing is not definable by the categories of a theoretical consciousness
that is non-participating, or of the action, through the categories of the effective operational
and participatory experimentation of the concrete singularity of the world (Bakhtin, 2017,
p. 58-59).

Para uma filosofia do ato responsável (For the Philosophy of the Responsible Action) is
one of Mikhail Bakhtin’s works that has been of great interest to us, especially concerning the
possible articulation with the discussion on ethics and praxis in Paulo Freire. We intend to recall
this issue in another article because we believe that there might also be an encounter between
Paulo Freire’s idea of “viable unprecedent” and Mikhail Bakhtin’s “memory of the future”. As
Geraldi (2004) reiterates, life as an ethical and open event is unfinished, incomplete, inconclusive,
and is conducted in responsible/responsive actions, between an “me-you interbuilding” (Nunes,
2003). Paulo Freire (2006) clarifies that it is imperative that educators understand and live life as a
process, as a come-to-be, after all.

We find compelling in Paulo Freire’s work this responsible and responsive act – in the
sense of giving an answer in a dialog with someone. The educator as an unique subject in the
world, as we all are, lives in devenir. They are anchored in a theoretical-practical reasoning of
their experimentation of the world, in effective and deliberate participation, to paraphrase Bakhtin
(2017). Such participation arised from their ethical, irreproachable, and sympathetic commitment,
which doesn’t see only themselves but also every human being. Their choice of language tells us
that. The vocabulary, the metaphors, the digressions chosen, the write-spoken-speaking reinforces
that their texts are a result of an intellectual work targeted to the outside, to the other.

Paulo Freire criticized “the anxiety in searching for texts and statements” that support his
speech, a practice which is intensely lived in the academic writing processes as legitimation or
validation of what is being said. Paulo Freire (2019) argues that his writing process has nothing to
do with arrogance or self-sufficiency. The humility he defends is also in the language he uses, and,
after all, in lovingness and “raiva justa” de seu dizer comprometido com o mundo, com a
possibilidade real de sua transformação. É isso o que a ele mais importa.

In A pedagogia do oprimido (Pedagogy of the Oppressed), in the chapter that discusses
dialogicity, Freire places the word as thinking-action, as the “true word”, which is praxis.
Therefore, he considers humility inherent to dialog: “Self-sufficiency is incompatible with the
dialog. The men who aren’t humble or that lose their humility cannot approach the people. They cannot be their world pronunciation fellows.” (Freire, 2005, p. 93, stressed by us). In this sense, as we evaluate Freire’s writing processes as a manifestation of a coherence and commitment with the world and with others – in successive and implied responsible action, and our vocation to be more than what we are –, we think about our writing processes and our writing concealing processes in the public university, as well as about the languages we use and share in this sphere and beyond it. We believe that this is a way to understand, to think about and to act with coherence in the language we experience in the academic sphere.

In this point-process of our essay, we thought of at least two developing processes for writing in writing: the practices of researchers, teachers and educators who read, write and publish articles in the daily routines of work in which they engage, in their making and in their continuous development; and the writing processes of students pursuing a degree in education, which have a lot to read in their initial scientific development process, during the daily routine of classes, internships, and projects. Even if there are many contradictions related to these practices, especially if we were to discuss the ideological, hierarchical and power aspects in the academic relations – as a debate about the scientific publishing universe would require –, these writing practices are a basis for the production and circulation of what is considered scientific knowledge, and, of course, a basis for the development of future teachers.

For that matter, as we sort only one of Paulo Freire’s contributions, and because we wish to incite democratic practices in the reading, writing and speaking processes of our word, we arrive at the palavras(mundo) (wordworlds) that are nearly succumbed in an apparently neutral scientific speech. Once again, in Cartas a Cristina (Letters to Cristina), specifically in O papel do orientador de trabalhos acadêmicos numa perspectiva democrática (The counselor’s role in academic papers in a democratic perspective), Paulo Freire arises our thinking about one of the most important tasks in our jobs at the university: the counseling processes. Freire listed in successive paragraphs through iterations of the “The counselor’s role is” theme a set of essential educational actions aimed at scientific development in the academic sphere, such as “discussing what it means to write a text” (Freire, 2019, p. 265).

It draws our attention the fact that there are only a few researches about this process that is so important for the intellectual development of teachers. No doubt, the counseling process, especially the counselor-counselee relation is a theme that is not investigated enough. In the universities’ daily routines, whether it is in the pedagogy courses, or in the postgraduate courses, we discuss the themes, deadlines, formatting and general rules for the written work (monographs, dissertations, theses), and constantly complain about the student’s writing difficulties. However, we keep on providing counseling the same way we received counseling, how we have seen it done, how we find appropriate to do it and how we find possible to do it.

We believe that the counselor-counselee relation goes through mainly what we discussed in this essay: the writing processes as an extension of our praxis – a writing that is praxis: “Life, as a constant search and seeking movement cannot be in any of its multiple moments – such as the one in which we write dissertations and theses – immobile” (Freire, 2019, p. 262). Não se trata de escrever para obter um título, mas sim de escrever como processo educativo, formativo, intencional, situado. Para Paulo Freire (2019), a orientação é, nesse sentido, nossa tarefa.

Ana Maria Araújo Freire, in Cartas a Cristina (Letters to Cristina), when writing the Notes, reiterates that her text with its own soul and autonomy does not erase her as a historical subject but, on the contrary, it establishes her style and way of saying her “many words”, which were always respected by Paulo Freire.

The counselor’s role is to discuss with the counselee as many times as necessary, during the time limit they have, the progress of the research, the development of his ideas, the sharpness in his analysis, the simplicity and beauty of his language or the difficulties they
face while handling their theme, during a consultation to the references, or in the actual act of reading and studying. The loyalty in which they discuss themes and people in their text. Certainly not to impose to the counselee one’s own way of studying, analysing, citing and consulting documents, but to support the counselee’s proceedings or to make one’s contrary position clear which can’t be imposed. (Freire, 2019, p. 262, stressed by us)

We believe that this is another example of Paulo Freire’s praxis, in which he defends the counselor’s role as “friendly guides”, a reference we make to Gramsci (2001) in his thinking about the teacher’s role in the students intellectual maturity phases, when he talks about the creation school, in his unit principle. Thus, we emphasize the need of an educational dimension in counseling practices (Severino, 2007). In other words, the counseling task does not include only the period of research that will result in the written text, but, above all, the teaching period, the teaching-learning period.

I would like now to insist in my refusal to a certain type of criticism of scientifist nature, which, to the least, suggests an absence of rigor in the way I discuss problems and in the language or syntax “excessively” affectionate that I use. The passion with which I get to know, and I speak or write don’t reduce the commitment with which I make announcements or denounce something. I am whole and not a dicothomy. (Freire, 2012, p. 28, stressed by us)

Ana Maria Araújo Freire also says that Paulo Freire’s critics demanded a certain “systematization” of his mode of thinking, as if his work could be gathered in a text filled with academic rigor. He, however, denied to “those that demanded ‘more formality’ from him”, and to those that would bind themselves to merely formal rules for a ‘schematized’ text [...] this merely formal purport of writing deliberately, ‘letters’, and denied this interpretation by making poems out of his writings” (p. 303). A sombra desta mangueira (Under the shade of this mango tree) is one of the books that, among his repertoire, reverberate the beauty of his writing.

In a democratic perspective – as his own denomination – Paulo Freire (2011a) demonstrates how writing with rigor and writing beautifully are two compatible things, which is something he also defends, for example, in A pedagogia da esperança (Pedagogy of Hope). For him, the intelecual’s intervention is promoted by one’s democratic and dialectic position, which is a sine qua non position for his task, and includes a counseling process based on dialog. In this sense, Paulo Freire (2019) refers to the Academy’s responsibility in promoting the search, the criticism, the question, and the plurality of thought, allowing the students to take risks even in the writing processes.

Therefore, we presented here – in dialog with Paulo Freire, thinking about his and our own writings, about our processes of democratically saying in the limits of the school-university –, an essay about the many thoughtful paths he opens as doors for other dialogs. In his books-pedagogies, in the narratives that abound from his thinking about the experiences, in the sheet writing processes he would take everywhere (in his pockets, and note-taking during lunch or dinner, as he tells in Pedagogia da esperança (Pedagogy of Hope)), in the afternoons by the mango tree shade, Paulo Freire reassures us, empowers us and guides us, as a “good teacher” would do, using his own praxis towards the demanding and pleasant way of writing, a part of our struggle.

**Other dialoggs**

People like and have the right to like different things. I like to write and read. To write and read are have made part of as important moments of my personal struggle. I used this likeness and placed it in service of a certain design in society. In order to fulfill this, I have
been participating along with a countless number of fellows under my possibilities. The essential part of this likeness I talk about is in favor of whom and of what it fulfills itself.

(Freire, 2006, p. 144)

It is not possible to write with Paulo Freire without carrying along the praxis he defended, lived by and shared. We deeply hope that this essay has been a conversation about him and with him, and about some of the meanings in his work, in his praxis in the world’s four corners. To engage in dialog about the importance of his praxis in the writing processes was, for us, teachers and researchers, revigorating and encouraging, specially if we are to consider the pressure we all suffer for the fast writing – a writing that is domesticated by the productive time, as well as by the life that is rushed in constant academic publishing.

In A educação na cidade (Education in the City), during his time as Secretary of Education in the City of São Paulo, Paulo Freire reasserts the coherence between what he said and what he did, and emphasizes that the reading-writing processes, while inseparable, were present during his whole life, from the shades of his childhood trees in Recife – inseparable from his existence. This consciousness on language in language that the educator echoes in his texts seem to be a central element in the way of thinking of this prominent character. Thus, we are sure of how important it is to keep debating about the reading and writing processes in the intellectual development of teachers and researchers that are not mere lesson ans research makers for the neoliberal economy society.
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