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Abstract. If on one hand the ubiquity of the internet allowed the invasion of our privacy, also created a plethora of learning and work opportunities. This is how the Khan Academy got started, to provide a free, world-class education for anyone, anywhere. However, the involvement of customers could be stimulated through a provocative method, known as Socratic, which reflects how human cognition has been developed. Certainly is necessary a rereading, a recycling to adapt it to the needs and current technological possibilities that, so inexorable, refers to the omnipresence of videos and videoconferencing and without which all systems related to digital educational technology remain indifferent to stakeholders.
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Lessons from the past, eventually a bonus for the future
Even the didactic and technological solutions that we can consider correct and brought us to the present day will not necessarily be the same that will lead our education to the future.
More important than trying to develop a new approach, method or solution would be to use effectively of everything that already available, mostly free of charge, even developed by others…
Regardless of the various developments and setbacks, we must always learn lessons from the past, at least to avoid repeating the same mistakes – even though committed by others.

This paper is related to an eponymous chapter and draws on findings from up-to-date research “Building an Immersive Distance Learning Experience beyond Massive Open Online Courses with Web Conferencing, Socratic Method, Problem-Based Learning and Social Networks” funded by CAPES Foundation.

The project was developed and submitted to the funding agency in 2013 and began in March 2014. However, Riffel (2014) published an article with a partially similar name, exploring the “Reloaded”. This is not about reference, just coincidence.
The different inspiration may even have been commonplace, but it is explicit: The Matrix Reloaded, a Silver and Wachowski production (2003a), sequence of The Matrix (Silver & Wachowski, 1999), where the virtual reality system had been reloaded (rebooted) in a less perfect way. At the same time, the film served as a passage for a continuation, a revolution: The Matrix Revolutions (Silver & Wachowski, 2003b), that completed the trilogy of films.

Far from this pretension – that this text becomes a rite of passage, watershed or even lead to any revolution in education – we seek only an update, a simple evolution or even rereading – depending on the approach – not necessarily of less perfect form, but that allows for a better use of all that now we have access, often free of charge – and that, nor for this, we use...

Previously, Gregory (Rebane, 2013) in a criticism, defends the “sage on the stage” claiming that giving up the traditional teacher's role as the “purveyors of knowledge” would be the same as the Socratic method reinvented, something “with no Socrates needed or expected in the classroom”...

This is one absurd statement, from any viewpoint used to analyze the issue. Hypothetically, Socrates never played the role of the “sage on the stage” – on the contrary – and the school, in all its levels, should be a space in constant transformation and not defined lines, which remain unchanged.

Socrates left no written record of his own philosophy. Deliberately, not bequeathed his own texts for posterity, similarly to what would have happened with Jesus Christ and his apostles; or even Buddha.

What we think we know about Socrates are just reflections provided by different mirrors: those who consider themselves disciples and those who provide testimonies, with and without temporal relationship; the detractors, equally close or far apart in the timeline, as well as very few signs and relics. Nothing more than footprints of others...

Our gods never wrote anything, which does not prevent that pseudo-representatives continually evoke the “word of god” (Ancient Aliens, 2008) or, as in this case, the words of Socrates. “Perhaps we will discover the answer when we open our eyes to the possibility that what we think we know is an illusion, and what we think is illusion may very well be real” (Burns, 2013).

According to Moraes (2010), Socrates preferred the thinking in-group than the solitary reflection, the dialogue than the writing. In this way, he can always be considered as an actor whose historic facet appears shrouded in cloudiness, characteristic of everything we think we perceive from a remote past.

The main sources from ancient Greece would come through three different views: the satirical and iconoclastic portrait of the comedy the Clouds (The Clouds, 2001; The Clouds, 2002), directed against the sophists, that the author, Aristophanes, confuses with Socrates – because this is the most prominent philosopher at the time; the idealized and elegiac vision in the works: Memorabilia (Memorabilia, 2005; The Memorable Thoughts of Socrates, 2006),
Apology (The Apology, 1998; Apology, 2005), Symposium (The Symposium by Xenophon, 1998; Symposium, 2005) and Oeconomicus (The Economist by Xenophon, 1998; Oeconomicus, 2005), all of Xenophon – historian, soldier, mercenary and disciple of Socrates; and the numerous dialogues of Plato (Hare, 2010), other disciple, which feature Socrates as the protagonist – although it is questionable whether these texts represent the true thoughts of Socrates, just reflections of Plato's thoughts or even a fantastic piece of his imagination (Burande, 2015).

Some authors (Glenn, 1995; Jarrett & Ong, 1995) believe that Aspasia would have invented the method, because she would have been mentioned by Socrates as being one of the most important people to guide him in his philosophical and intellectual development, especially in the art of rhetoric (Pownall, 2003).

Both in the past as well as present times, absolutely nothing can be considered as absolute truth, definitive or even accepted by everyone without questions, controversies and discussions. Do not agree or disagree is part of human nature and it is exactly this method that we find developed in the Plato's Socratic dialogues (Hare, 2010) – where the truth is born of discussion and not from a former truth stated, created, manipulated or even forged.

Nowadays, when we delude ourselves that we are no longer in times of inquisition, we should all have the right to freedom of thought, association and ideas among others. But try to expose yourself beyond what is permissible, go against the dominant doctrine, reveal criminal actions committed by the so-called democratic countries or even challenge some created truths – without any credible proof to back them up – in some countries, even some considered modern and developed, such as Germany, whose prisons are full of teachers, researchers, scholars, historians and even elderly – languishing for not accepting the absurd official version of rewriting history that was imposed on them “without evidence” through a gag law (Hall, 2015). “The past is erased, the erasure forgotten. A lie becomes truth and then becomes a lie again”.... ...“The past is forbidden” (Perry & Radford, 1984).

A country that has no freedom of expression (or we could say of thought – as if that could be controlled), enjoy no freedom at all...

In the opinion of Malcolm X (1963), “Nobody can give you freedom. Nobody can give you equality or justice or anything. If you’re a man, you take it”.

We live in a world of rules and regulations, controlled by certain groups, institutions, organisms and governments; where any alternative means that arise, aiming the protection and the anonymity of the common users – like Tor, Bitcoin and Deep Web – will always be questioned and discriminated against negatively, with the explicit intent to discredit and criminalize them mainly to connect them with aspects that are considered drawbacks, depending on the point of view (Bowyer, 2013). The internet, whether it is open or protected, will always be a reflection of the world we live in: multifaceted, complex and imperfect, with good and bad aspects.
When some governments use the same means to perform some operations considered illegal, nothing happens – especially if the country is part of the United Nations (UN) Security Council. But when groups or individuals make denunciations of infractions from these same countries – in a public or anonymous way – or use similar procedures and technologies, they are persecuted and often crucified. Even when these arbitrary acts are condemned by an expert panel from OHCHR (2016). The UN and all its appendixes were structures created in the post-Second World War, only for others...

The cases of Julian Assange (WikiLeaks), Edward Snowden (CIA/NSA), Ross Ulbricht (Silk Road), Kim Dotcom (Megaupload/MEGA) and Shawn Fanning (Napster) are totally distinct, but exemplary – when the system feels threatened and tries to crush anyone who acts outside of the dominant order. Moreover, the biggest surprise for the unbelievers seems to be the technological simplicity of surveillance techniques of the governments.

For Alex Winter – Deep Web: The Untold Story of Bitcoin and the Silk Road – “In the digital age, our privacy can no longer be ignored. …You can no longer throw out the ridiculous axiom that ‘if I have nothing to hide, I have nothing to fear’” (Wong, 2015). We live not only in a post-Snowden era, but also mainly in an era post-Sony attack. There are several parallels between the shutdowns of Napster, Megaupload and the Silk Road – when arise several similar services: “Once it’s decentralized, it’s game over”.

Revolutions in the real or virtual world are always seen as a risk to the dominant system. They could be seen – not just in a very optimistic rhetoric – as an opportunity, but usually this is not the case. This is no exception neither in the education sector.

Currently, what we imagine they can revolutions in the area of education (Klein, 2011; Konnikova, 2014; Dasgupta, 2015), with rare exceptions, are only individual proposals or from small groups that do not evolve towards a consensus – are not discussed, are not adopted, are not practiced, are not successful – and, when they do, they earn this status through other merits or reasons, apart from the fact that some pedagogical procedure have really been revolutionized or even evolved.

These possible success cases, which apparently defy the current structure, normally do not develop in universities and, in this way, are not linked to the status quo, nor the traditional sale of knowledge held by public and private institutions – although that eventually also practice the sales knowledge. Currently are initiatives created under the internet infrastructure, strongly supported in the use of videos and videoconferencing, using as a marketing argument and methodological approaches the possible gratuity, the timesavings and the reducing of study period.

If a picture may be worth a thousand words, when we join several images in a sequence with words, making a video, we will always be the best of both worlds (Roth, 2014).
The intensive use of videos and videoconferencing can be considered a trend to be followed by educational institutions; valuable resource to be replicated and an important differential of the outdated support systems education based only on Learning Management System (LMS) – characteristic of an education that is not involved with students, whether it is practiced face-to-face, blended or totally by distance. However, seen in isolation, without a context of use, production logic, interesting content production (carried out in a professional manner); and specific combined methodologies – as the Socratic method and the Problem-Based Learning (PBL) – is still far from being considered as disruptive innovation.

Being initiatives competitors to the established structures and still dominant are not linked or even related to the practiced and illusory monopoly of higher education (Carey, 2012; Ellsberg, 2012), idea created, maintained and erroneously perpetuated by universities and similar institutions, that insist or even still delude themselves that they are in control...

In the past, universities were seen as a possibility to obtain and guarantee a job for many years, or for life (Ellsberg, 2012). These days, a large portion of people that can complete a higher education course surely never going to use the same, not even work in the target area. (Crotty, 2013; Ellis, 2013). The continuous training and the lifelong learning are becoming an increasingly common feature – concepts that should be applied indiscriminately to all of us, even to those who deceive themselves that only teach.

If on the one hand the ubiquity of the internet allowed the invasion of our privacy (Rich & Smith, 2007), also created a plethora of learning and work opportunities. This is how Salman Khan created the Khan Academy (2006), with the mission of providing a free, world-class education for anyone, anywhere. This non-profit venture – as they should be all initiatives related to education – is described by some (Okabe, 2014) as a teaching model, while sharing their free classes through videos. For free. For everyone. Forever.

The Veja magazine (Weinberg, 2012) – always trying to kid ourselves that there is a better world than we can imagine – in addition to promoting it as a phenomenon, mistakenly crowned him as the “best teacher in the world”, for allegedly making the learning more attractive, satisfactory, interesting, productive and he has taught four million students over the Internet.

On the other hand, the Khan Academy has been criticized because Salman Khan would not have training in pedagogy (Danielson & Goldenberg, 2012; Strauss, 2012). This argument was absurd, from any viewpoint used to analyze the issue, but perhaps may help to explain the success – he would not have “learned” how not to do things or even how to do things the wrong way. Steve Jobs (Apple, 1976) has suffered similar criticism. While other technology companies were led by geeks, he was the only in running a business about which he actually knew very little. What he lacked in experience, he made up for in his ability to think outside of established standards. Jobs showed us that, “what I know is less important than how I think” (Crépin, 2012).
Salman Khan probably is not the best teacher in the world, but this fact does not make any difference and neither should be given any importance or significance. Bill Gates (Microsoft, 1975), for example, never was the best programmer in the world – not even close. He did not invent the BASIC language, did not invent the DOS operating system and not the graphical operating systems. He never completed a university course – in the same way that Steve Jobs and Mark Zuckerberg (Facebook, 2004). This did not prevent him from building one of the largest technology companies or even be ahead among the world's richest people (Forbes, 2016) – a fact that cannot be interpreted as being a discouragement to higher education. However, completing a university course does not mean absolutely nothing in terms of success or even guaranty a secure future. Or someone can still imagine that, even in the 21st century, the road to success is linked to the completion of some graduation course or even the universities? Regarding the United States, this thread is just academic, given that “some of the nation's greatest minds never finished college” (Grassy, Parrish, & Winter, 2016).

Being the best in any discipline means first of all fit into a given paradigm, that is, is suitable to certain rules under which we can try to compare the contestants (Ahmed, 2013; HEC, 2008). This never happens in an honest, ethical, reliable, unbiased and transparent manner in the area of education where many resumes are forged, manipulated and constructed without any personal merit. We shared, at the same time, with professors pedagogically and technologically sound; pretentiously modern; and pseudo-educators that replicate methods or ways of trying to teach of the past – without any update, including the materials and books used (Roth, 2015a)... Ferias (2014), for instance, prefers the path of problematization and deconstruction than the finding or even the construction. Rehearses a criticism of differentials, innovative and revolutionary values of Khan methods followed by an unnecessary comparison with Comenius (2006), in whose work Didactica Magna (Great Didactic) would be present the inaugural speeches of modern didactics – the universality, a more effective education (starting from the simplest concepts to get the most comprehensive), the continuous learning (lifelong), the development of logical thinking (rather than simple memorization) as well as the access of poor children and women to school – to, at the end of fourteen pages, to surrender: “...the teaching methods of Khan are a kind of realization of the universalist ideal of Comenius: ‘teach everything to everyone’. ... In 2012 this formula is completely feasible and could be expanded: instead of a master to teach hundreds of students, the megalomaniac project of education via the web made possible to teach not hundreds, but hundreds of thousands of students”. Unlike alleged by the author, most teachers do not have any didactic. Especially the university level ones, have very little – sometimes none – didactic-pedagogical apprenticeship. Rules and principles alone are not sufficient to produce an educator. They do not receive this kind of instruction in the
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universities, much less in education area courses that should train teachers. They go straight from graduate courses to teaching, without prerequisites, often without prior experience, training or even vocation, as if the teaching skill was implicit in the certificates that accumulate during life (Roth, 2015b).

In what kind of serious enterprise – outside the limbo of universities, in “real” life – this is accepted without reservations?

What many of them imagine that it could be didactic or even something like this is just replicated behavior from their “masters”: inefficient, ineffective, criticized (mostly by students – that when they become teachers tend to reuse it, in the absence of good references), outdated or even inappropriate (Ribeiro, 2014), not only to the current times. Comenius (2006) criticized this approach since 1649 and at the same time regrets that the good ideas were not always put into practice.

Our pseudo intellectual supremacy only inhabits these positions, or better, orbit around (Leite, 2015). Many imagine that they are like the wine and that, with time, become increasingly better (Ramos, 2015). They only delude themselves, because the legend that all wine improves with age is not true. Only 10% of red wines from around the world mature well, against only 5% of whites (Porto, n.d.). Eventually, all wines will turn into vinegar.

Naturally, these days, Sal does not produce or present any other video for Khan Academy. In the same way as other technology area entrepreneurs, he found people far more qualified than he to do so (costing much less).

Could still be questioned the certification – that our politically incorrect world tends to give infinitely more importance than the knowledge effectively acquired. However, this recurring issue since the establishment of the universities seems to be with a set expiry date.

Since many years that areas such as computer science do not have the excellence centered in the universities. IT Certifications, such as AWS, Cisco, Citrix, CompTIA, EC-Council, GIAC, ISACA, ISFCE, Microsoft and MongoDB have a much higher value on the market than university courses in the target area (Roth, 2011). Moreover, the certification of this knowledge is not held by universities, but by private institutions such as the Prometric Testing (1990).

After the OCW (OpenCourseWare) and MOOC (Massive Open Online Course) waves, the natural evolution would be the availability of higher-level courses, with certification, totally free of charge and no limit of users.

Free and Open Source College Course (FOSCC) or Free/Libre/Open Source College Course (FLOSCC) is an online university course with certification that is at the same time an open course, free of charge, open source and freely accessible by the general public through the web – from anywhere, anytime, using any suitable device. Derived from the acronym FLOSC (Free and Open Source Course or Free/Libre/Open Source Course) that was coined in 2013 for the project COFUNDRAISING “Sustainability and Latest Revenue Models for

This area is a hotbed of development right now. OCW, MOOC and FOSCC/FLOSCC always have production and maintenance costs and this variable remains a research issue because both the Khan Academy as Coursera and edX universities have not yet found a suitable model of sustainability.

Another case that has also carved out an individual space and seeks differentiating factors is Myngle (2005) of Marina Tognetti, that presents itself as the leading multi-language global platform for live online language learning, although focused for business professionals. This virtual classroom has resulted in students and teachers participating from over 150 countries, but unlike the Khan Academy, the mYngle is not free of charge – presumably because it has not yet found an alternative way to ensure its sustainability.

Certainly it is possible to offer a product, service or even courses – including at tertiary level – at no cost to the end user, by obtaining other funding sources that do not depend on the payment of study fees or public funds. Google and Khan Academy have taught us this lesson...

Wauters (2009) points out some similar proposals. The one offered by Babbel (2000) is similar and also paid. Others present themselves as social networks for learning languages. Like the case of WizIQ (2005), italki (2006), LiveMocha (2007) and Busuu (2007), all with free basic services and premium paid options. The eduFire (2007) was acquired by Camelbak Education Group in 2010 and is offline. And the VoxSwap (2007), only option totally free of charge, is with the domain expired since 30 August 2015.

The Holland Herald (Latten, 2015) inflight magazine, in a quick interview with Marina Tognetti, claimed: “mYngle is just what you’ve been waiting for, language lessons that come to you”, after all, Myngle (2009) states that you can learn any language online with the “best private teachers”. Marina, unlike Sal, apparently always selected people who worked for her and by using this argument to be able to count with the “best teachers” also seems to adopt a trend to get a market advantage in contrast to the bad impression that we have all of us – as students – of those deemed as “traditional teachers”...

Conversely, it would be a good idea – while professors and researchers – hear the calls of the market, not just marketing, but of our customers – our students – who were born in a different reality, with expectations that normally we do not meet the demands...

Serving the business as usual or bending over the absolute and unquestionable truths – including in didactic terms – does not lend support to any personal and professional growth. Does not add any new experience, even for those who delude themselves that they teach much less for those who we intend to educate.
Aldous Huxley (2004) wrote in 1932 that, the “experience is not what happens to a man; it is what a man does with what happens to him”. So, if we were not welcomed with a contemporary vision of education (as learners), it does not seem fair to penalize our students by replicating the old ways of teaching. All educators should position themselves critically in relation to the model through which they were “trained” and not repeat the same mistakes – without experiencing fear for having transgressed a trend.

We do not need to reinvent the Socratic method, not even give up who embodies the role of Socrates, intentionally or not. This is not an act of apostasy, but certainly is necessary a rereading, a recycling to adapt it to the needs and current technological possibilities that, so inexorable, refers to the omnipresence of videos and videoconferencing – and without which all systems related to digital educational technology remain indifferent to stakeholders, always representing an education not involved with students...

The Socratic method, elenchus or dialectical: of the debate, of irony and of maieutics

This model, popularized as the Socratic method, reflects how human cognition has been developed. The method of examining a certain argument from an ignorance position and through rational discussion would have revolutionized the western philosophical thought being considered the first use known of the inductive argument – in which a set of experience-based assumptions would be initially confirmed as true and as a result, would lead to a universal truth. This argumentation form became the basis of all the empirical sciences (Costa, 2013) and has been used many times to question the knowledge of those who considered themselves wise. It starts from the perspective of one who knows nothing and, following on from, exposes inconsistencies observed in the arguments – or even the gaps perceived in the answers – to gradually extract insights or perceptions.

The philosophical activity of Socrates supposedly takes place in stages (Yankee, 2013). He asked, insistently, questions that interested him and, in this way, has developed a new way to investigate what we think we know. Initially, in the part of the process known as irony, the philosopher purposely expressed in the opposite way to what he believed, imagined or even knew about a given subject, forcing the interlocutor to reveal its assumptions, ideas and opinions. With this tactic, Socrates led him to demonstrate his own ignorance on the subject, namely, that in fact this knew very little or almost nothing about the object of discussion.

The next step in the method was known as maieutic, a word that comes from the Greek maieutiké and can be translated as the art of childbirth. Socrates would have said that his mother – who was a midwife – gave birth to children, while he gave birth to the ideas. He could be considered as an accoucheur, not accoucheur of babies but an accoucheur of suppositions, assisting the birth of the true ideas through brainstorming sessions.
Starting from the concepts presented by the interlocutor in the initial stage, Socrates exposed the contradictions and took him to agree with a new set of conclusions, seeking to discover the veracity of the knowledge in question. This method of seeking the truth through dialogue – including the processes of irony and maieutics – receives the name of dialectics, because it develops as a dialogue between opposing views.

To Costa (2013), Socrates did not seek definitive answers or explanations. He possibly believed that to understand who we are would be the primary interest of philosophy and, in this sense, investigating only the basis of the concepts that we apply to ourselves. It would mean the “love of wisdom”, feeling experienced only by those aware of their own ignorance. Its central concern would have been the investigation about life: “The unexamined life is not worth living”. The mission of the philosopher would not be to instruct people or even learn what they thought they knew, but to explore the ideas that they had. All the truly wise man should say that they know nothing. And to get some knowledge about oneself and the world that surrounds it would be necessary to remove the preconceived ideas and understand the limits of your own ignorance. Only in this way, there would be some hope of determining the truth.

**How to argue using the Socratic method**

This method can be used to show someone that he is wrong, imprecise or even get him to agree with statements that contradict their original assertion. Considering that Socrates possibly believed that the first step to knowledge would be the recognition of ignorance, it appears that this methodology is focused not only to prove certain concept, but to deconstruct the opposite with a series of questions (elenchus), leading to the uncertainty. This approach is used to develop critical thinking skills, used in classrooms, training in management and psychotherapy. (Burande, 2015; Come Discutere Utilizzando il Metodo Socrático, n.d.).

Step 1: Locate a statement that summarizes the argument being debated. Apparently, Socrates discovered this statement by asking the person to answer certain question. For example: “What is the color of this table?”. The Socratic method can be employed with respect to any answer or statement in which the person appears to be sure, like, “This table is green”.

Step 2: Analyze the consequences of this statement. Assume that the declaration is false and find an example where it can challenge it. You can provide a scenario, real or imaginary, where this argument is inconsistent. Use this scenario in a new question: “To a blind or colorblind person, is this table still green?”. If the person answers no, proceed to step 3. If the person says yes, ask: “What makes it green and not red to a colorblind? Or any other color to a blind person?”. In other words, “If someone is colorblind or can’t see, what makes the table green?”. This question may well confuse some people who consider the vision as the perception of the human being. If so, go to the next step...
Step 3: Change the initial statement to take into account the exception: “So the table is green only to those that can see normally”. Challenge this new statement with another question. For example, “If the table is in the center of an empty room, where no one can see it, is it still green?”. Eventually, it will be possible to reach an argument with which the person agrees, but contradicts their initial declaration. In this example, you can end up indicating the subjectivity of the perception of color and argue (through questions rather than statements) that color only exists in people’s minds as a result of their individual perception; it is not actually a property of the table. In other words, the table is not green. It is your opponent’s perception of it that makes it green.

Through this method it is possible to create challenging assumptions. If the aim is to argue effectively, this procedure can offer a number of suggestions, including to challenge their own beliefs. The key to using the methodology is to be humble and not assume that you or anyone else knows anything for sure. Each premise should be questioned, since the objective is to examine possibilities, which is done through questions and not answers.

A rereading of the Socratic method

In a debate about the role of social networks in education (Atica & Scipione, 2011), Eduardo Chaves said that “the method of Socrates can be considered not school-related”, that is, cannot be studied or submitted to the learning process in school context. But that could change with the use of social networks. Furthermore, in the same way as happens in Socratic practice, the activities connected to these networks are not likely to be pegged to the curriculum frameworks. There would be, an education in vertical in which “all educate each other” – paraphrasing Freire (1987), “mediatized by the world”. And what the world offers us at this time? The social networks, virtual worlds, instant messaging and gaming systems.

If the school will be able to adapt – appropriating of this possibility and making non-formal educational practices – we will be finally educating us more outside of school than at school.

This is a challenge that depends on the capacity of the institutions – not necessarily the formal – to reinvent themselves towards a new situation that, without the technology, it would be absolutely impossible: to have something that is, at the same time, personal, customizable, and even global-scale.

From the dream of Comenius (2006) to the finding of Freitas (2014), through the vision of Freire (1987) by challenge of Eduardo Chaves (Atica & Scipione, 2011)...

The Socratic method can be considered an educational tool, since Socrates himself turned the marketplace of Athens into a classroom enticing his interlocutors through a dialog whereby they could have their assumptions questioned and at the same time learn, traveling towards new conceptions of knowledge and understanding (Davey, 2008). Probably, this is the first reference we have of a kind of student-focused education, stimulating their own thoughts and impressions of the facts – not accepting ready-made truths, forged, rewritten or imposed, as being absolute and unquestionable truths. Something similar to
the scholastic, which is centered on dialectic with the aim of extend knowledge through inference in the quest to solve the controversies.

This concept is reflected in the UNESCO suggestions – directed to educators and philosophers – to find ways to include philosophy and philosophical inquiry in current education practices, in order to enhance the democratic ways of life (Tchoshanov, 2013). This recommendation is completely consistent with the current proposal that suggests the rescue of the Socratic method, and through a rereading, adapting it to current educational practices – didactic and technologically correct – these days in which the use of the internet has abolished the frontiers. Davey (2008) considers this time as the “arriving at a new beginning” through the “redefining socratic pedagogy”.

However, what often prevents the connection between philosophy and educational technologies is a theory distant from practice and technologies; and a technological practice without any theory. That is, two completely different speeches that does not turn into a transformational practice. Lopes (2005) discusses these antagonisms and proposes to classify the charlatanisms of higher education pedagogy in four areas defined as alpha, beta, gamma and delta. Although in an empirical way, the reflections show a sad portrait of the reality.

Over recent years, a wide range of researches have been carried out on using web conferencing to facilitate student collaboration (Winter & McGhee-Richmond, 2005; Diziol, Walker, Rummel & Koedinger, 2010). Something that Downes (2012) calls cognitivism, that is, “that knowledge is distributed across a network of connections, and therefore that learning consists of the ability to construct and traverse those networks”. The study of Tucker & Neely (2010) explore the use of the Socratic method through web conferencing. Badgea, Saundersb & Canna (2012) brings new tools to visualize student engagement via social networks, where the Socratic method was used. Shahsavari & Hoon (2013) discuss the role of Socratic questions in promoting students’ critical thinking through Web 2.0 tools. In addition, the portal SMRP (2004) – dedicated to advancing the use of the Socratic method – makes available free of charge all teaching perspectives, methods and resources developed for this purpose.

**Videoconferencing and telepresence systems**

Mobility is always something interesting for students and teachers. But it has a cost and usually only includes some, discriminating the others. Not everyone can afford these costs and the scholarships and grants are not enough to meet demand. So it makes much more sense to move Mohammed to the mountain than the mountain to Mohammed. And Mohammed presently can use videoconferencing to be virtually in the “mountain”.

“Every artist has to go where the people are” (Nascimento & Brant, 1981).

According to Wauters (2009), the mYngle advocates the use of Skype for videoconferencing tutoring. This is an option of reasonable quality these days (broadband accesses), simple and free. Klein (2012) argues that the mYngle and
WizIQ use a proprietary technology for virtual classrooms – solution also used by eduFire, as well as Adobe Connect. Suggests two options: Vyew (2005) and BlueTeach, although these remain problems with the use of Flash (Adobe) and discusses some possibilities for the virtual classroom of the future, as the Conceptboard, without the use of Flash.

The ClickMeeting (2006) offers several solutions, all paid, with differentials for nonprofit institutions. On their website there is a specific session suggesting ways to incorporate videoconferencing in a traditional classroom, fostering a more dynamic and engaging learning environment: lectures and classroom presentations; virtual presentation from a guest speaker; recorded lessons for online review; online meetings and webinars; staff meetings and professional development.

The Fuze (1996) is another option, and is presented to the market as the “best” HD videoconferencing including online meeting services, webinar and screen sharing.

PC Magazine (McLaughlin, 2015) compared what they regarded as the “best” videoconferencing services of 2015: ClickMeeting, Join.Me, Adobe Connect, Cisco WebEx Meeting Center, Citrix GoToMeeting, eVoice, Microsoft Skype for Business, Onstream Meetings, StartMeeting and InterCall. In addition to these services, there were comments about CometCall, Drum's ShareAnywhere, Google Hangouts and Zoom.

In recent years, Roth (2007) has discussed, examined and specified video conference systems, as well as accompanied its evolution to telepresence systems (Roth, 2011) and what is perceived is that the ubiquitous availability of broadband in the various types of internet connection and video cameras in all mobile devices only contributed to increase the gap between the reality and the practice of schools and universities.

All active social networks and the dominant Facebook have adapted, by providing additional support (add-ons, plugins and extensions) to the videoconferencing and making the usual and transparent practice, without the need of additional softwares. The same situation was verified in the various LMS (Roth, 2014).


Apparently, these solutions with dedicated hardware-based codecs still offer better quality than software-based codecs, but that is not always important or
even necessary – not to mention that the situation can change rapidly with the availability of a higher bandwidth and cloud computing resources. The costs involved indicate that the best structure must be on the side of whoever produces the contents (videos) or even the person who manages the processes (does the current teacher’s role in videoconferences). Usually only one person speaks at a time – with the exception of the Italians (parlare tutti insieme). In this sense, even the solutions considered more modest and without acquisition costs may be suitable.

The differential should not be focused on technology (best system and with better quality), much less in technological dependence, but in the effective use of solutions that are already available in more than one vendor – absolutely nothing lasts forever– if possible free of charge, as an affordable means of natural and transparent use.

Try to give emphasis to technology or even consider it not as a means, but as an end sends us to the fears of society entering a new era. To Gale Anne Hurd, the vision in the Terminator was that human arrogance has led to the complete destruction of civilization, because we placed all our trust in technology (Southwell, 2014).

What could change, of course, should be the involvement of customers (students) through a provocative method – so that they get out of inertia. One of the main goals of education has been to strengthen the relationship between long-term memory and intelligence, helping people to store information to subsequently use them in problem-solving (Hielkema et al., 2012). Soon, regardless of where they are these clients, videoconferencing will always be a means to distribute tasks, since the Socratic method can and should be associated with PBL methodology.

Stop & Go
The year 2015 can, in a sense, be regarded as the year in which the internet lost definitely their innocence. We passed the boosterism of the Free (Anderson, 2010), to the unfulfilled promises of cloud computing (Seshachala, 2015; Henthorn-Iwane, 2015) – with all of the coupled traps, until we reach the total lack of privacy and security, as demonstrated in all Google episodes and by latest Microsoft OS version (Windows 10) with several definitions that not only simplify, but try to impose the “socialization” of the user. Not to mention the trend of intelligent virtual assistants who want to know all of your life and always inform the owners (Apple Siri, Microsoft Cortana, Google Now, Amazon Eco Alexa, etc.). The dream of having a J.A.R.V.I.S. (Just A Rather Very Intelligent System) at home can always become a nightmare.

George Orwell would have commented about his book, 1984, that “In times of universal deceit, telling the truth is a revolutionary act” (Müller, 1989, p. 106).

The documentaries Facebook Follies (Peill & D’Eon, 2011) and Deep Web (Winter, 2015) exploit these facets of “modernity”. The exacerbated exposure on one side and the quest for anonymity and privacy of another, considered
politically correct or not, depending on the time in which we are living. But in both cases we witnessed astonished governments considered democratic – as of the United States, and in the Obama era – acting contrary to rights and basic and fundamental guarantees on behalf of copyright protection, the drug enforcement, or of the so-called terrorism – and they do it through something much worse, something created by themselves: the state terrorism (Roberts, 2004; IPE, 2011).

From “yes we can” to “yes we scan”. Common place in history when a society makes the transition from freedom to dictatorship and just one more of the contradictions of a country with a discourse of respect for human rights, but that does not submit nor even the decisions of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR).

According to Siddiqui (2008), “The same jihad which was acclaimed as a holy war of liberation and was supported in terms of money, weapons, training, manpower and moral support is now seen as terrorism in a world where ‘war on terror’ is the slogan of the day”. Scapegoats are created (Osama Bin Laden, Saddam Hussein, Shawn Fanning, Ross Ulbricht) to manipulate the masses and create exemplary executions, which can serve as an “example” and spread the fear: “When the mob governs, man is ruled by ignorance; when the church governs, he is ruled by superstition; and when the state governs, he is ruled by fear” (Hall, 1928).

Schröder (2002) points out the risks of a greater intervention by the modern civil state and a weakened right of defense for the accused – whoever they may be. In this way, by the completely arbitrary definition of terrorism it is very easy to realize that “the war on terror has little to do with combating terrorism and instead has as its primary objective the erosion of fundamental rights in the EU”. What often we tend to classify as terrorism may well be a last gasp of freedom.

The real terrorism is always implicit in immoral actions and unfortunately in both situations we will always have innocent victims. This limit position is just another consequence or even proof of our inability to solve our conflicts.

The modern definition of terrorism could be something like: everything that others do to try to survive or even to not submit to the actions and desires of the powerful – against which has no chance to fight under the same conditions. Powerful states that create laws and international courts to others, because they are the first to ignore these limitations or even international treaties which have acceded and signed...

But what could be the way to ensure security, privacy and at the same time universal access to information, training and opportunities that the internet can offer without any kind of persecution, overexposure or discrimination?

The businessman Jorge Paulo Lemann, currently the richest man in Brazil (2016), pondered that idealistic speeches don’t help to build practical solutions: “There’s a lot of people in Brazil who thinks that equality is a beauty. I think equality is a
beauty too, only it doesn't work. Equality of opportunity, that is true. Now, equality for equality... People are not equal” (Frias & Bilenky, 2015).

Surely people are not equal, but many of them can count with a family background or even with an initial financial support and privileged information, not always obtained honestly and transparently. Most do not have access to the same level of education; to the personal, professional and government contacts in certain places that allow leverage their individual possibilities exponentially, in a short time and put them in prominent positions with minimum effort – and many times none. In this way, of course, they can't count on the same opportunities...

But where there is equal opportunities and inclusion for all persons, without any kind of favoritism or discrimination? At Lemann Foundation, or even in companies captained by Jorge Lemann? Of course not. In these places a given profile is exploited or even searched – at the detriment of others – of workaholic entrepreneurs, who according to his own words should save Brazil (Instituto Millenium, 2016). The opportunities are created just for some few privileged people, and despite the capitalist logic of the creature, does not match with the public discourse of the creator. It is just another fallacy of meritocracy...

Jorge Lemann (Lemann Foundation) and Bill Gates (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation) are supporters of the Khan Academy, but it is not a matter of collective funding (crowdfunding). The full list (2014-2015), which includes many foundations, can be verified in Our Supporters (2016). Probably the support for this kind of venture – really free of charge and within everyone's reach – is derived from a sense of guilt. “There's a correlation between generosity and guilt. But, you got the money. Break as many eggs as you like” (Feige & Russo, 2016). At the same time, there is always an untold story, different from the official, which hides the tracks of those who fell by the wayside, in climbing to success. “The things that we’ve done to survive they don’t define us” (Miller & Showalter, 2014).

Although it is laudable the work of some foundations and institutes, it is not any favor. Basically, they don’t do anything with their own resources, but from donations, deductions, and taxes not paid directly to governments, applied in their own social programs (Guerreiro, 2012). Something similar to what the Lions Clubs International (2001) always did: success with the money of others – in this case, with the tax money, which theoretically should be to the benefit of all citizens.

Why not create opportunities for everyone, not only of study, but also of access to knowledge and subsequent application? “A hierarchical society is only possible on the basis of poverty and ignorance” (Perry & Radford, 1984). When we tried to fetch only a certain profile at the expense of others, when we begin to choose “the best” – often in a subjective and biased manner, to the detriment of all or even any one – this possibility of giving specific destination to resources that should be public fails blatantly...

© 2016 The author and IJLTER.ORG. All rights reserved.
Only a state committed to social equality and free of the corruption in essential sectors would be able to give exactly the same opportunities, without discrimination of any kind, for everyone. Considering that a market – where really are created the professional opportunities and where companies and states hire labor – able to select personnel in a transparent way.

The problem is that this issue is theoretical and even in socialist or communist utopias was never able to materialize – since the discriminatory employment practices are always present.

Even in the European Union who built his unit under the difference and as a product of a long historical construction – receiving the Nobel Peace Prize (EU, 2012) – the policy of protection against discrimination cannot fulfill its role (EC, 2015; Equinet, 2015).

The instinctive reaction of all creatures with fear is to retreat to a safe place. However, for a large portion of legal immigrants (or even “real” refugees) the European dream of today – or the American dream of the past – remains an urban legend. Suddenly, the dream so desired becomes a nightmare...

Even citizens of member states coexist with intolerance and discriminatory acts that constrain, mistreat and ignore human and community rights. In the background seems to persist the fear by changes in lifestyle, the dispute by the labor market or even the access to health and education. After all, following the implementation of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), the European university courses all look the same (independent from the university), though some are fully or partially paid and other totally free of charge (Roth, 2015a).

What is the subjective importance (always discriminatory) that can be attributed to its origin, to the country, you are in; to university in which you have studied, the publisher in which you print your books or the journal you publish your papers?

Many researchers provide their papers to publishers like Elsevier, JSTOR, Sage and Springer because they consider that have a study published in these magazines brings prestige and recognition by the scientific community. Directly, they do not earn anything with this and do not receive no portion of the money collected through exorbitantly high charges. These publishers simply take ownership of the content, for which they do not pay (Oswald, 2016). They create their own systems of indexing and impact factor – something that only reflects your edits ignoring the open access journals. Such global indices – as the Science Citation Index, Scopus or Web of Science – include a small number of journals and tend to favor publications in English – considered the global scientific language (Altbach, 2014) – something that can be characterized as neo-colonialism. Thus they handle only what interests them and feeds the wicked system. In this sense they discriminate what may or may not be published, who can or cannot publish, the pseudo-subjective quality or even the validity of publications – in accordance or not with certain editorial line. They live from this system where they imagine that only they have the right to do so and then charge what they imagine – without the payment of any copyrights.
Notice the sequence: take ownership, adapt and not pay for the use. This practice is so absurd as the rankings that imagine evaluate the quality of universities and, in some countries, could be characterized as larceny and formation of gangs. But count on the connivance of the universities, which seem to be engaged in a global arms race of publication, of researchers “hostages” of this system or even of a corrupt and compromised system of “justice”.

For many students and researchers, the website Sci-Hub (2011, 2015), (Tor: scihub22266oqcxt.onion) – the equivalent to The Pirate Bay for academic research – is the only way to gain access to certain content that should be in the public domain, but which are subject to exploitation, privatization of knowledge, trading and a false elitism in the scientific sphere.

“The world, although round, has many corners” (Abreu, 2013). In this sense, merit should always be something individual and own of personal production and not derivative, discriminated or even pegged to an imaginary differential of quality or tradition...

The Khan Academy and the mYngle can and presumably will always be criticized by people and institutions who are part of the dominant system and see their lifestyle threatened. It is always easier and comfortable criticizing who does that at least trying to do. However, they can be considered as contemporary models, efficient, effective and successful – of the market differential and the effective use of videos and videoconferencing – to leverage ventures and educational initiatives through the internet.

Marina and Sal basically did not create anything new. They just reused everything that was already available, even if developed by others and for free. Probably this is one of the keys to success: take ownership of an idea, adapt and not pay for the use. This simple modus operandi is part of absolutely every business success stories – that we so admire. Just check the cases of Microsoft, Apple, Facebook or even some publishers that are parasites of science.

Many people who have created or developed something original – like Kane Kramer, the real inventor of the iPod – will not have gained any money from this (Boffey, 2008).

In Brazil, it has become fashionable to discuss the legacy of Jorge Paulo Lemann and his business partners – Carlos Alberto Sicupira and Marcel Herrmann Telles – however there is also that the ideas were never of them. To Claudio Haddad, president of Ibmec São Paulo, “Jorge Paulo is not a genius in an ivory tower”. This was one of the striking features of “developed culture” at Bank Garantia: its ease in copying the good examples. According to Carlos Alberto Sicupira, “The great advantage of Brazil is that you can copy what is being developed elsewhere and do here. You can copy everything, no need to be reinventing the wheel”. “What we have done for the entire life? Only copied. We did not invent anything. Still well. Inventing things is a danger darn”. 

© 2016 The author and IJLTER.ORG. All rights reserved.
Copy and implement – and do not innovate or even create – have always been the favorite words in this group. Jorge Lemann confirms, “Worth much more a good logic, a good execution, than any brilliant innovation”. “You have to worry about innovation. But if someone is doing well, best not to spend too much time looking for how to do it. Go there, look and adapts to their way, and ready”. (Teixeira, Hessel & Oliveira, 2008).

What lessons can we take of the mega ventures of William Henry Gates III, Steven Paul Jobs, Mark Elliot Zuckerberg or even of Jorge Paulo Lemann? Practically no teaching.

No one replicates success stories, because the temperature and pressure conditions are never the same. However, we learn more from our mistakes and from the mistakes of others – than with our possible achievements or even with the achievements of others...

Probably Salman Amin Khan and Marina Tognetti have much more to show us than our representative icons of certain exceptional situations – not always clearly demonstrable and exempt from criticism...

Our false heroes are always better at everything: are richer, more intelligent, are better-looking, more resourceful or simply are considered better than us, without any superficial adjective. In this context, modern heroes are amenities missing, at least, through a paradoxical perspective (Sapelli, 2011).

José Abelardo Barbosa de Medeiros, known as Chacrinha (2009), was a great radio communicator and one of the biggest names in Brazilian television. Was the author of the famous phrase: “Na televisão, nada se cria, tudo se copia” (In television, nothing is created, everything is copied) – probably parodying the statement of Antoine Lavoisier (2001): “Rien ne se perd, rien ne se crée, tout se transforme” (Nothing is lost, nothing is created, everything is transformed) or Giordano Bruno (Kessler, 1900): “Il tempo tutto toglie e tutto dà; ogni cosa si muta, nulla s'annichila” (Time gives all and takes all away; everything changes but nothing perishes).

This concept of lack of originality can be taken without risk to everything that relates to the Internet, especially education – even that considered technologically correct – where the copy and paste many times means the practice rather than the exception.

Be ahead of its time is a capacity that almost never gives any advantage to its possessor. Lavoisier was convicted of treason and lost his head on the guillotine. Giordano Bruno was called a heretic and burned at the stake by the “holy” inquisition. Malcolm X was murdered before he had time to develop their new ideas. Socrates was forced to drink hemlock for pissing off many people.

The premise credited to Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, that “When a human being awakens to a great dream about and it throws all the strength of his soul, the whole universe conspires in your favor” is false, because the human element is always perversely present. We always destroy our heroes.
The reality that prevails, corrupts and marginalizes all those who oppose the established truths makes many thinkers remain hidden with fear of rejection or ridicule (Roth, 2015c).

Faced with several notorious practices, observed in several amazing schools around the world, Roth (2015a) pointed out good examples that could be followed, copied or even reused with proper adaptation: the secret ingredient. Any cake recipe when replicated requires the use of this supplement that is neither explicit nor described. In the case of the deployment of a new idea will always be the previous sensitization, persuasion, participation, and agreement of the parties involved. Without pressure or obligation to those who will actually use every day a new process or way of working. Without this small detail, there will always be some kind of boycott and any action in this regard will be subject to the low level of adoption, as verified in all pretentiously modern universities.

Among these special cases, the *Escola da Ponte*, from Portugal, became known among those that should be considered hors-concours. And it is exactly this model of non-formal practices that will be tested (Souza, 2016) in a pilot project, in a pilot project, by two public schools in the Brazilian state of *Mato Grosso do Sul*: without assessment tests and without formal classes...

When we want to carry out some movement forward in educational terms we always have the opportunity to skip steps and go straight to the current state of the art. Learn from the experiences of others. Although this can be verified in some schools of Brazil, cannot be generalized. In March 2016 took place the Open Education Week (Open Education Week, 2011), with the support of the Paraná Program for Open Education Practices and Resources (Rea Paraná, 2014), an interinstitutional action created in 2014 by the Federal University of Paraná and the Federal Technological University of Paraná.

Open Educational Resources (OER) and the inception of repositories never formatted or delivered any product (full course, with or without certification – only lessons of courses). It can, in a way, be considered as an evolutionary stage, but it is an outdated view, at least fourteen years. Although there are verified experiments since 1999, the OCW movement really took off with the launch of MIT OpenCourseWare in 2002 (OpenCourseWare, 2007). The MOOCs were a step forward – they were formatted as courses (they could use OCW materials), but never reached the level of FLOSs. Not to mention that all this requires some level of authorship, something unthinkable for anyone who does not create, only copies or appropriates. In the videos and in video conferencing this changes, but imagine that the model of the Khan Academy will be the next step remains an open question. The really public universities (without tuition fees) is that should evolve to take this step forward.

The Khan Academy and mYngle, how they were developed, would not have existed without the current internet. Without the use of videos and videoconferencing not left the commonplace, would not have gained such visibility, recognition, and attracted so many users. For sure is a refreshing
change, recycling the same old material that has always been rehashed. The main attraction of the Khan Academy is the fact of being free of charge and the promise of so remain for future – Besides, of course, the quality of the currently produced material. The mYngle, by contrast, faces many competitors with similar strategies. Which business model will be able to survive is a matter of time, for the future.

There is no an apparent didactic innovation – in reference only to those considered correct today – in none of the initiatives. What exists is a good use of available technology and a good selection of teachers, not only based on inflated resumes, who you know (recommendation letters) or even dishonest competitions. While the mYngle applies the traditional concept of maintenance (who pays the bill are the users) does not represent a serious risk to the status quo. On the other side the Khan Academy appears defending opposing ideas to those of the establishment, and applies the maximum of the Free (Anderson, 2010), that is, that someone will surely pay the bill, but need not be the end user. In the case, currently who pays the costs are several foundations, individual donors (who earn the right to expose its name as benefactors) and anonymous donors (who do it out of conviction and do not seek this form of promotion).

In these two ventures the effects are much more noticeable, because the actions are not limited to a particular country or language, since the internet – usually – does not impose borders. This concept – of not only globalization or internationalization, but of universality – should be replicated by all universities in the world, to keep up to date and adapt to changing times in order to finally meet the beautiful revolutionary, democratic and constitutional rule of “education universal, compulsory and free” for all. This is not a reality, not even in Europe. Ferrer (2001) said fifteen years ago that “And the European Union has the moral and political obligation to provide the financial resources necessary to achieve free education for all between now and 2015”. And since last year this deadline is not met – without which the objectives have been achieved.

In this context, Downes (2011) tells stories about open source, open content and open learning – through the lens of the person who wants access to these resources, rather than the provider’s vision. We have to somehow, go through this learning curve. Sherman (1982) wrote that “You can’t go back and make a new start, but you can start right now and make a brand new ending”. We still cannot go back in time, but we can all take a step back and then take two steps forward and make a new choice.

An important question that should be reviewed and continues to move away the academic environment from the business community is an alleged false pretense or even a pseudo-referential of originality that permeates the publications and practices of the educational milieu (Silva, 2011; Dey, 2006). Fake, because in daily practices, subtly, manipulated or even explicit manner, prevails in the copy, the
plagiarism, the unethical practices (as to include co-authors without participation and after have this favor reciprocated) and the reuse of materials without update, by professors. The writers have always known that “books always speak of other books, and every story tells a story that has already been told” (Eco, 1984).

We should not be forced or pressured to create useless academic papers, theses, dissertations or even supposedly scientific papers, that have as justification only fulfill some imposed precondition, not practical or even constitute some number abstract to be able to reference some level of production under the false aegis of the quality or even giving some merit to its supposed author (DORA, 2012). More important than this would be the adaptation, the applicability and the massive use – and this has been, demonstrably, the recipe to get good results...

Parodying Umberto Eco (1989), this is an open work, and as such should be seized and enriched by each one of us. More complex paths could be traveled by with creativity, knowledge and competence – qualities not always present in who clings to certain jobs and positions without the intention or even pretension to enable change, regardless of fads. There is therefore a special need to promote the formation of the new generation of teachers who, in the near future will be in educational key positions.

The background should always be the belief in the need to democratize education, provide access for all; and in the capacity that we have many of us, educators, trained or not, to do an education with high standards of quality, regardless of distances (Roth, 2013). Then we can move forward, without turning the issue into another sensationalist story or continue putting forever the blame on our colonizers (Filho, 2015).

At Ca’ Foscari University of Venice (UNIVE) the few references related to the Socratic method are found in the book “Capire e dissentire, Cicerone e la filosofia di Epicuro” (Maso, 2008), in the course “Problemi Particolari di Didattica delle Scienze Sociali” (Gozzo, 2009), in the degree theses “Marco Aurelio: filosofia e potere” (Dei Rossi, 2012) and “Sviluppo, valutazione ed analisi delle competenze trasversali nell’high education” (Pisanello, 2013) and in the doctoral thesis “Platone e la scrittura di dialoghi socratici: strategie, interlocutori e finalità” (Candiotto, 2011). Just another one of the gaps of a traditional university with a misleading discourse of modernity and technological security (current policy requires changing passwords every 180 days), but that hosts its institutional emails on Google (Roth, 2015c).

**Conclusion**

Far from being unanimous, the Socratic method has always been a fit topic for polemics and various speculations, being worshiped by some and hated by others. Throughout history this approach went through several steps, since a questionable usage (for its supposed creator), followed by a misinterpretation (of his detractors) to what we can consider as their redemption and consequent adoption, in the days of today. This is not a new discovery, only a rediscovery.
Many times the secret is in the simplicity. In the movie The Martian (Kinberg & Scott, 2015), “there are moments in which the protagonist seems to be Brazilian, as he is always taken by that spirit of never give up and lives finding a way for everything” (Zarour, 2015). Should not be this the common place? The spirit which guides us and keeps us active in the market? “The reversal of discourse on the one hand challenges some created truths, facts, common sense and ideologies, and on the other offers alternative truths and facts” (Siddiqui, 2008).

We do not need to expose to ridicule any person, much less our students. But the practice would not all bad if applied to many who consider themselves teachers, subcelebrities who insist on ascending to the throne or even refuse to come down from the pedestal, without any right or even personal merit – “conquered” and not acquired through financial resources or third-party indications. Help them put on the sandals of humility and to accept that, with very few exceptions, we are not special and we do not know anything with certainty.

Merit should not be something that you can buy through articles for paid publications, small print runs of books (the unethical side of the “Portuguese knack”) – through a growing number of vanity publishers that will publish books for a fee (Altbach, 2014) – or even by participation in events industry very little or no “scientific”.

As that living a waking dream, in a Matrix outside of reality, we delude ourselves and we imagine that we know. We think, we feel and even believe we know, but we do not know – It is a dangerous trap thinking that way. In this sense, Socrates was the truly wise, because he had the full notion of their “learned ignorance” (docta ignorantia). Back to the Socratic paradox: “ipse se nihil scire id unum sciat”, that is, “I know that I know nothing” or “I know one thing: that I know nothing”…
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