



HUMAN EMANCIPATION AND EDUCATION: PROSPECTS TO THE SCHOOL FORMATION

EMANCIPAÇÃO HUMANA E EDUCAÇÃO:
PERSPECTIVAS PARA A FORMAÇÃO ESCOLAR

EMANCIPACIÓN HUMANA Y EDUCACIÓN:
PERSPECTIVAS PARA LA FORMACIÓN ESCOLAR

Fernanda Bartoly Gonçalves de Lima¹
Kátia Augusta Curado Pinheiro Cordeiro Silva²

ABSTRACT: This paper aims to discuss the limits and possibilities of the school education corroborate to the formation that aligns with the proposal of human emancipation. For this, it performs a literature review from the perspective of dialectical historical materialism, of classic works of Marx and Engels, as well as works of Marxist writers who talk about the issue of human formation. Seeking to clarify the concept of emancipation in the Marxian perspective, is remembered the understanding of human nature based on Marxian categories that explain the constitution of the social being. In this perspective, the emancipatory possibilities are in human's capacity to transform the world around them, which rejects the emancipation expectations without changing social reality. In this sense, education could not directly carry out the emancipation of humanity, but it constitutes an important superstructure for this purpose when considering its potential for promoting the appropriation of human knowledge in its radical historical understanding and positioning itself through the perspective of the proletarian class.

KEYWORDS: Human emancipation. Schooling education. Knowledge.

RESUMO: O presente trabalho pretende discutir os limites e as possibilidades de a educação escolar corroborar com uma formação que se alinhe com a proposta de emancipação humana. Para isso, se realiza uma análise bibliográfica, na perspectiva do materialismo histórico dialético, de obras clássicas de Marx e Engels, além de obras de autores marxistas que discorrem sobre a questão da formação humana. Buscando esclarecer a concepção de emancipação na perspectiva marxiana, retoma-se a compreensão de ontologia humana, com base em categorias marxianas que explicam a constituição do ser social. Nessa perspectiva, as possibilidades de emancipação se encontram na capacidade do homem transformar o mundo a sua volta, o que rechaça as expectativas de emancipação sem se alterar a realidade social. Neste sentido, a educação escolar não poderia, diretamente, realizar a emancipação da humanidade, mas se configura como uma importante superestrutura para este fim, quando se considera sua potencialidade para a promoção da apropriação do conhecimento humano, em sua compreensão histórica radical, se posicionando pela perspectiva da classe proletária.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Emancipação humana. Educação escolar. Conhecimento.

RESUMEN: El presente trabajo pretende discutir los límites y las posibilidades de que la educación escolar corrobora con una formación que se alinee con la propuesta de emancipación humana. Para ello, se realiza un análisis bibliográfico, en la perspectiva del materialismo histórico dialético, de obras clásicas de Marx y Engels, además de obras de autores marxistas que discurren sobre la cuestión de la formación humana. Con el fin de esclarecer la concepción de emancipación en la perspectiva marxiana, se retoma la comprensión de la ontología humana, con base en categorías marxianas que explican la constitución del ser social. En esa

Submitted on: 08/09/2-017 – Accepted on: 18/03/2018 – Published on: 05/06/2018

© Rev. Educ. Perspec.	Viçosa, MG	v.9	n.1	p.6-28	Jan./Apr. 2018	eISSN 2178-8359
-----------------------	------------	-----	-----	--------	----------------	-----------------



perspectiva, las posibilidades de emancipación se encuentran en la capacidad del hombre para transformar el mundo a su alrededor, lo que rechaza las expectativas de emancipación sin cambiar la realidad social. En este sentido, la educación escolar no podría, directamente, realizar la emancipación de la humanidad, pero se configura como una importante superestructura para este fin, cuando se considera su potencial para la promoción de la apropiación del conocimiento humano, en su comprensión histórica radical, posicionándose por la perspectiva de la clase proletaria.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Emancipación humana. Educación escolar. Conocimiento.

INTRODUCTION

The idea of school education as a way of fostering emancipation, in the sense of freedom for students, is recurrent in educational ideals, in political discourses, in academic studies and even in common sense, being positioned as if the path between the educational process and emancipation were something that could occur readily. Hence there are innumerable pedagogic suggestions on how to achieve emancipation, but leaving doubts on what would be emancipation itself. Thus, there is a swelling in the proposals of essential paths for the teacher to carry out the emancipation by the education, giving the appearance that this would be something that could be solved only in the educational social sphere.

However, the issue of emancipation runs through a deeper problem, and it is a lighthearted thought to seek full emancipation from individuals, disregarding the fact that there are human beings which do not have access to basic supplies to maintain their lives. Fleck (2014) indicates that the number of hungry people in the world has stabilized at a very high level: 870 million people, according to data from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in 2013. Already the number of people living below the poverty line (remembering that this term is used to describe the level of income in which a person can not afford all the resources needed to live), reaches a quarter of the world's population, something close to 1.8 billion people. Even those who would be above the poverty line, the daily struggle for primordial supplies is the main concern of the great mass of the population due to the lack of guarantees of access to human achievements such as electricity, water, gas, sanitation. Emancipation, in this sense, goes through an earlier stage, which is simply to be part of the population that is not at risk of dying of cold, hunger, war, and that has the possibility of daily essential public services.

Trying to allow the other to "emancipate" without considering that the structure of this society results in conditions of social risk for a large part of humanity seems, therefore, a euphemism for the neglect of real needs of individuals. It is understood that an "emancipation" that does not require changes from the concrete plan of social life, consists of something extremely subjective and separated from the real conditions of social life.



Therefore, as a fundamental question, the concrete emancipation of all human beings is defended, understanding that the material conditions are determinant for this emancipation.

In this sense, the question of emancipation assumes the Marxian meaning, which qualifies human emancipation as primordial. The concept of human emancipation refers to a real emancipation (MARX, 2009), adding in itself all the expectations of emancipation possible to humanity. In this perspective, it is understood that humanity already has the level of development necessary to fight for a society in which there is no inequality, oppression, exploitation, envisaging a full emancipation that integrates and surpasses all the proposals of emancipation already idealized / realized. From the free access to all goods produced by mankind to an autonomous and conscious subjective relation with the world, human emancipation because it is total and radical, can only be done when it is for all, without exception.

In this way, the article aims to trace the understanding of human emancipation in the Marxian perspective, in an auxiliary way in the reflection on a pedagogical praxis that is aligned with this emancipatory project. For this, a bibliographical study of classic works of Marx (1818-1883) and Engels (1820-1895) and works of important Brazilian Marxist authors dealing with human formation, through an analysis in the perspective of materialism dialectical history. It is hoped to incite the discussion of this theme and, thus, to align efforts for a human formation consistent with the Marxian project of emancipation.

HUMAN EMANCIPATION: AN ONTOLOGICAL POSSIBILITY

The ontological study of humanity starts from the questioning of what differentiates human beings from other beings, and yet, what would be the human essence. Refusing a transcendental view of humanity, Marx's understanding of ontology seeks the foundational category upon which a structural rupture occurs from one form of being to another, which is understood as an ontological leap. Lessa (2015), supported by the work of the Marxist Lukacs (1885-1971), explains that the inorganic sphere is the first ontological sphere of being, in which its essential activity is limited to transforming from one mineral to another. The ontological leap from the inorganic sphere to the biological sphere occurs when the being starts to reproduce itself, the biological reproduction itself. With operations far more complex than inorganic matter, biological life essentially consists of being born, growing, reproducing, and dying. Biological life is, therefore, a constant production of the same, with an act on nature in order to maintain this reproduction. Transformations about nature and about itself, in the biological sphere, take place at the natural evolutionary step, and not by a conscious pre-defined action. It is precisely at this point that the social being has its ontological leap: in



order to supply its needs, mankind accomplishes a production of the world around it, in a consciously oriented way.

A spider performs operations similar to those of the weaver, and the bee shames more of a human architect by building the combs of their hives. But what distinguishes the worst architect from the best bee beforehand is that he built the honeycomb on his head before building it in wax. At the end of the work process one obtains a result that already existed in the imagination of the worker, and, therefore, ideally (MARX, 1996, p. 298).

Humanity is particularized by the ceaseless production of the new, thus creating the social world. This human activity of world transformation does not negate its biological action, much less its inorganic material composition. But it gives the social being a new quality that can not be reproduced by any other animal: humanity stands out by constantly transforming the world around it, building a human culture - language, art, religion, science, education, etc. However, the foundational category of this ontological leap occurs from a material transformation of the world around it, in order to meet its needs. On this, Marx and Engels (2009, p. 24) elucidate:

We can distinguish men from animals by conscience, by religion - by whatever we want. But they begin to distinguish themselves from animals as soon as they begin to produce their means of subsistence (Lebensmittel), a step which is required by their corporeal organization. By producing their means of subsistence, men indirectly produce their own material life.

All other animals adapt to nature, humankind adapts nature to itself (DUARTE, 1992). The human being is capable of giving material existence to objects previously non-existent in nature, through his activity as a work:

But the existence [...] of every element of material wealth not existing in nature, has always had to be mediated by a special productive activity, suited to its purpose, which assimilates specific elements of nature to specific human needs. As creator of use values, as useful work, is the work, therefore, a condition of man's existence, independently of all forms of society, eternal natural need to mediate the metabolism between man and nature, and therefore, of life (MARX, 1996, p. 172).

This means that work is constituted as the activity that is present in all human history, from primitive to present-day societies. Marx (1996) explains that, in the course of the history of humanity, there is no distinction between what is done, since there is always work, but how it is done and with what means, so that human productions are always in transformation. The continuous process of development of production is profoundly related to the development of human needs, for "the very first need already fulfilled, the action of satisfaction and the instrument already acquired of satisfaction, leads to new needs - and this production of new needs is the first historical act "(MARX, ENGELS, 2009, p. 42). The emergence of human needs, which would not naturally exist, gives mankind the ability to self-develop from its action on the world. As a promoter of the development of the human world and of humanity



itself, "work [...] is the basic and fundamental condition of all human life ... to such a degree that, to some extent, we can say that work created man himself" (ENGELS, 2013, p. 13). Work would then be an exclusive activity of humanity, and yet, the ontological category of this, thus summarized:

First and foremost, work is a process between man and nature, a process in which man, by his own action, mediates, regulates and controls his metabolism with Nature. He himself confronts natural matter as a natural force. He sets in motion the natural forces belonging to his corporeality, arms and legs, head and hand, in order to appropriate natural matter in a useful form for his own life. By acting through this movement on external Nature to it and modifying it, at the same time modifies its own nature (MARX, 1996, p. 297).

By putting his physical capacities in motion from a previous ideation, in order to manipulate the world around him in his favor, the human being accomplishes a transformation of the world and of himself, in his subjectivity. The subjectivity of the human being is in deep relation with the world around him, in the sense in which the real objective focuses on the different subjectivities, in which affect the objective world, transforming it, into a dialectical process. In this aspect, it is common to make a mistake when it comes to subjectivity in the Marxian perspective, "from which Marx and Marxists would have placed the full weight of their analysis in the economic structure, reducing subjectivity to mere reflection of material determinations" (SAVIANI, 2014, p. 22). An impoverishing and adulterated reading of Marx's theory leads to an understanding that absolutizes the material world and does not give the consciousness a decisive role.

The central point of this question is that "men make their own history, but they do not do it as they wish; they do not do it under the circumstances of their choice, but under those they face directly, bequeathed and transmitted by the past" (MARX, 2002, p. 06). That is, the human being makes his own history, but he does it in certain circumstances, which are independent of his/her will. It is a question of considering determinations, which differs from determinism. Being deterministic, there arises the need to displace one pole that would be dominant over the other, generating two equally false propositions: the subjectivity of the individual determines the circumstances of his life, or the opposite, the real world determines the formation of his subjectivity. In a Marxian dialectical view, it is understood that human beings determine the circumstances at the same time as they are determined by them.

Considering the dialectical relation between subjectivity and concrete reality, the essential characteristic of humanity, in the Marxian perspective, is precisely to make history. Humanity is thus qualified to give existence to products that were not created by a natural force, but by a human force itself, generating capacities, understandings, attributions that are not biologically passed, but must be incorporated socially. Therefore, the act that gives life to the human being is configured as a social action, an action that highlights the being of a



natural evolution for a social being, which accomplishes its own development. Thus, human strength is a social force. The ontological leap that generates the humanity is configured with the emergence of the social being: humanity and society are ontologically congeners. In this sense, human individuality is founded on society, which means that without society there is no individual (DUARTE, 1992).

An individuality that precedes society is a mistaken abstraction, arising from historical configurations that put a human being in opposition to another human being, giving the false perception of an independent and contradictory existence between individual and society. Thus, the idea that the individual finds his freedom in his privacy, outside of society, is a counter-claim. For it is only in social development that humanity has a choice between concrete alternatives.

Human labor arises in order to satisfy human needs, such as eating, drinking, sheltering, dressing. With the development in the ways of satisfying these immediate physical needs, mankind finds the realm of freedom, by creating concrete options of choice for the continuation of its action in the world, being able to freely perform work, which is the activity that humanizes it. In this way, the social force is effectively what allows the human being to find the realm of freedom. For in nature there are no possibilities for choices, the possible paths are already given, they are those that guarantee the survival of each species.

It is true that the animal also produces. It builds for itself a nest, habitations, like the bee, beaver, ant etc. However, it produces only what it needs immediately for itself or its offspring; produces unilateral [mind], while man produces universal [mind]; the animal produces only under the domain of immediate physical deprivation, while man produces even free of physical deprivation, and produces only, first and truly, in [his] freedom [in relation to] it; the animal only produces itself, while man reproduces the whole nature; [in the animal,] his product immediately belongs to his physical body, while the man confronts free with his product. The animal forms only according to the measure and the lack of the species to which it belongs, while man knows how to produce according to the measure of any species, and knows how to consider everywhere the measure inherent in the object; man also forms, therefore, according to the laws of beauty (MARX, 2008, p. 85).

Animal production, safeguarding its spectacularity, is performed to supply what is strictly necessary for oneself or the offspring, under the determination of immediate physical needs, action that occurs repetitively from one generation to the next generation. Human production develops independently of immediate physical needs, and with each generation, production is transformed and promoted. Thus, the possibility of freedom exists only for the social being, the being that has intentionality, which with its activity on nature redefines the alternatives for its survival. A freedom which, as a result of human action, related to its ability to transform reality around it, it's intrinsically linked to the historical situation of mankind: "Man is then able to overcome the constraints of the situation; it is not fully determined; is an



autonomous being, a free being. [...] freedom is always a situated freedom" (SAVIANI, 1989, p. 40).

In this sense, considering the human characteristic of making history; the social development that establishes an individuality that can aim for freedom; and its essence closely linked to the processes of transformation in reality, one can conclude that the presuppositions for a human emancipation are present ontologically. Humanity begins to transform nature according to its needs, subjugating the world around it according to its will, within its historical capacities. For being the creator of its own reality, it opens the possibility of not having to resign himself to it. But this is a historical process, beginning with the gradual liberation of mankind to the intemperances of nature and the ever more assured satisfaction of its immediate physical needs. The development of humanity, perceived through the course of history, enlarges the concrete possibilities of choices for the human being, which means the prosperity of his freedom.

This is not an affirmation that goes back to a beneficial wild state, such as the Rousseauan proposal. The return to ontology, as an affirmation of a human emancipation, seeks to value all the human development that has been effected, with the growth and complexity of society, besides indicating that this process can go forward, in the sense of overcoming all forms of operating companies. The ontology of the social being matters to rescue the human possibility of surpassing, even, the capitalist society. On these theoretical pillars, the proposal of overcoming of capitalism towards a communist society, as defended by Marx and Engels (2008), is rescued.

The present critique of capitalist society, which is based on the Marxian work, points out that humanity has the possibility of producing all the necessary goods for its survival with relative ease, and still produce cultural riches that demarcate the infinity of human development. However, since it is inherent in the private appropriation of human goods, and with it social inequality, capitalist social organization is marked by the discrepancy between the possibilities of the human race and the reality of each individual. Freedom, as a possibility of choice, from among concrete alternatives, to the one that satisfies you the most, is not fulfilled. For example, although mankind has already produced many forms of transportation, it is not all individuals who may decide to move from one place to another in the easiest way possible. More seriously: although mankind is able to produce enough food for all humans, many of them are hungry. These contradictions demonstrate a social organization in which at the same time that the material productions necessary for a complete freedom were developed, it realizes a deep alienation of humanity in relation to its ontological activity, resulting in its own dehumanization. With this understanding, what would be the prospects for human emancipation in education?



HUMAN EMANCIPATION AND SCHOOL EDUCATION: A REVOLUTIONARY RELATION

Considering school institutionalization as an advance in the form of human formation, it is sought here to reaffirm it and to understand it in its revolutionary potentiality. Not that school should be the only form of human formation, but it is understood that it is necessary in overcoming capitalism and in the prospect of consolidation of a communist society. With this perspective, we intend to discuss the characteristics of the present educational complex that could collaborate with the subversion of bourgeois society, but without entering the merit of specific pedagogical forms of accomplishment of the school activity. It is only a matter of seeking a better understanding of school education, and its revolutionary possibilities. It is understood that a revolutionary perspective of education is the only way to understand the school as a participant in the project of human emancipation.

Remembering that the materiality of the world acts decisively on consciousness - "It is not the consciousness that determines life, it is the life that determines consciousness" (MARX, ENGELS, 2009, p. 32) not being able to form by education, emancipated beings in the absence of a society based on exploitation, alienation and fetishism. After all, the possibilities of human emancipation, in the Marxian perspective, are linked to the prospect of a communist society. In this way, the Marxian perspective is not linked to the pedagogical optimism of non-critical theories (traditional, Escolanovista, technicist), which expects education to solve social problems. With the ontological perspective of education, it is possible to perceive that it is based on the category of work which, in capitalism, takes place in an alienated way, structuring an educational base on its contradictory foundations.

However, in making the critique of education that is built on bourgeois organization, Saviani (1987) points out pedagogical proposals that go to another extreme, non-dialectic, which he calls critical-reproductivist theory. Being critical, they advocate the need to overcome capitalism, denouncing the ways in which education reproduces the relations of domination. However, they consider education as completely determined by the society of alienation and discrimination that underlies it and would reproduce these characteristics in full. Consequently, they do not present pedagogical proposals, other than to combat any one that presents itself, leaving the leftist educators who work in capitalism, with no prospects - the only honest alternative would be to abandon the educational action, which would always be a reproductive of the prevailing conditions and of relations of domination. As representatives of these theories, Saviani (1991) highlights Bourdieu and Passeron with his work *A reproduction*; Baudelot and Establet with the dualistic school theory; and the Marxist



Althusser, in which school education would have no subversive perspective, since it was the principal Ideological Apparatus of the State and its function would be to reproduce the dominant ideologies, as was the Church during the Middle Ages.

In this sense, in denouncing the materiality of life as a determinant of consciousness, one must ponder the dialectical relation between these spheres, so as not to neglect the revolutionary potential of education, fostering pedagogical skepticism. It agrees with Duarte (1992, p. 04), when he states that "education is a dialectical, historical process, so it is not reduced to the reproduction of capitalist social structure". The revolutionary perspective of education is, therefore, far removed from the two poles: that of the redemptive bias of education, characteristic of bourgeois ideological decadence; and those that presuppose that education alone, and only, would be able to reproduce the interests of capital. Historically, these two extremes have dominated the educational ideology: "nowadays it attributes to education a merely reproductive character, or the capacity to lead the transformation of society. The pitiful thing is that, due to these erroneous interpretations, the child is thrown away, together with the bath water" (TONET, 2005, p. 41).

In this way, the basis of a perception of the subversive potentiality of education starts from the own dialectical historical materialist understanding. In this perspective, it is not affirmed that education could achieve human emancipation, while denying the educational importance to the revolutionary process. For this, it is important not to lose sight the fact that in a society in which work is carried out in an alienated way, its ontological precedence intends education to its equally alienating bias. However, it is important to emphasize that work is determinant for education, but it does not determine it. "Education is a social complex founded by work and, like other social complexes, establishes with it a relation of ontological dependence and relative autonomy" (LIMA, 2009, p. 103). Education, as well as politics, art, language, do not derive directly and immediately from the economic complex, but mediated by human activity, from the needs generated in the work activity, and its historical complexity.

This complexification, which has one of its most important moments in the division of labor, implies that throughout the process, there arise needs and problems which ultimate origin is at work, but which can not be answered or solved directly in the sphere of it. Hence the birth of other spheres of activity - such as language, science, art, law, politics, education, etc. [...] In turn, the fundamental structure of these activities is the same as the work structure. However, neither it is reduced nor are directly deductible from it. All of them have an ontological dependence on work, but the function to which they are called to exercise requires that they have a distance - base of relative autonomy - without which they could not fulfill it. Hence its specificity (TONET, 2005, p. 41).

This Lukacsian understanding, which is structured around his "complex complex" theory, understands work as an ontological matrix that articulates with all other social dimensions. It is a logic that has nothing deterministic, even collaborating with the correction of a



misunderstanding of the Marxian work, which confers to the economic structure a kind of immunity to other social spheres. In this misunderstanding, one understands the work of Marx as an economist, for conferring to the economic complex all the social prescription, in a one-way street. Therefore, it is substantial to recapitulate that all his work is organized on a dialectical view of reality. From this point of view, we must realize that the field of superstructure (ideological, political, educational, etc.), plays a crucial role in the maintenance (and also subversion) of the economic structure.

To go deeper in this matter, it is taken the theoretical elaborations of the Italian Marxian thinker Antonio Gramsci (1891-1937). Outstands one of his important theoretical elaborations – the reformulation of the concept of the *historical block*. In this acception, it is considered that there is among the social structure and superstructure na organic and dialect relation. Thus, the political dimentions, educational, ideological, that compose the superstructure of society, have a relation of reciprocity with an economic complex, that is, the social structure.

This concrete value theme about the superstructure in Marx should be very well studied. Recalling the concept of Sorel of the “historical block”. If men become concient of its duty in the field of superstructures, that means that among structures and superstructures there is a vital and necessary link, as in the human body among the skin and skeleton: it would be outrageous to affirm that man is erect on the skin and not the skeleton, but this does not mean that the skin is something merely appearent (GRAMSCI, 1999, p. 149, free translation).

The perspective of the historical block makes it possible to understand that the economic structure is determinant in the formations at the superstructure level, but, at the same time, actions on a given superstructure, considering the mediated totality of reality, has repercussions that affect the socioeconomic structure. That is, originating, ontologically, the economic complex, superstructures come to possess a material existence in the articulated social whole, not just a reflection of the economic structure. As Frigotto (2009, p. 168) explains, "it is not conscience, theory and language that create reality, but they are produced within and from a historical reality, being and becoming, however, themselves, part of this reality". In this sense, it is possible to take social manifests, scientific discoveries, artistic movements, among other events at the superstructure level, as social forces that have a peculiar power when considered in totality, at a given social moment, in its historical block. Particularly on science, Gramsci (1999, p. 142) explains.

Science is also a superstructure. But in the study of superstructures, science occupies a remarkable place, because its reaction on structure has a character of greater extension and continuous development, especially from the eighteenth century, when science was given a special place in the appreciation general.

That is, the educational complex, which today takes on the dominant form of school education, is configured as a superstructural space resulting from the capitalist economic structure. In this understanding, the educational spheres, which emerge from the needs of the



economic complex, also play an intervening role in this. However, in order to understand the specificity of its social possibilities, it is important to resume the structuring of the school complex in capitalism, which has, in a dialectical way, coherent and contradictory elements in relation to the society that underlies it. With the understanding of how and in what school is necessary for the maintenance of the capitalist system is expected to become clearer on how this could be insurgent.

Bourgeois society has in its knowledge, science, and human reason the innovative impulses of its mode of production. Innovations that need to be constantly fed, on one hand, by the development of science, and on the other hand, by the deepening of the forms of exploitation of the working class. Thus, the capitalist configuration requires a dynamic society, unlike previous societies, which were sustainably static. Hence, bourgeois human formation needs the constant development of knowledge, scientifically elaborated, at the same time as it demands the lack of knowledge about the social totality. It requires the highest specialization of science in favor of production, together with the mystification of reality that allows an exploration of an efficient humanity without great resistance.

Therefore, for the maintenance of bourgeois society, at the same time as the expansion of education is necessary, it must be minimized to what is strictly necessary for the productive system and its corresponding social relations. For when this level is transcended, proper knowledge can become the necessary stimulus to challenge the bourgeois order. In this way, the contradiction is generated in qualifying individuals for the capitalist productive world, while it can not allow access to the full understanding of this same world.

In other words, at the same time that the productive process demands the elevation of the intellectual level of the workers so that they can accompany the technological changes, this elevation of the intellectual level needs, from the perspective of the ruling classes, to be limited to the aspects more immediately linked to the process of reproduction of the workforce, avoiding at all costs that the domain of knowledge will become an instrument of struggle for a radical transformation of social relations of production (DUARTE, 1992, p. 06).

In order to achieve this necessary minimum of transmission of knowledge, keeping its specialized and mystified form, the bourgeois school maintains its traditional formatting, with particularized disciplines, compartmentalized classrooms, specific class times, and other characteristics related to the school form. The bourgeois school form remains the same throughout its history, yielding the following reformist criticism (however pertinent): if teacher XIX century were transported to a classroom of the XXI century, this would not have great problems, therefore it would be easy recognize the same elements, such as the blackboard, the queued portfolios, the call list, anyway, all according to your usual format (ANDRÉ, 2014). The point is that the school form can not be ignored in relation to its human formative potentiality - form also forms (FREITAS, 2016). In this sense, by pointing out the



problems related to school content, related to the fragmentation that occurs on knowledge, it is equally important to bring questions about the form that constitutes school education. At this point, Freitas argues (2013, p. 75):

This did not free us from the mistake of analyzing the “school form” in a non-historical way, as if in this way did not have historical marks of its own capitalist system and could be redeemed in the name of the theoretical instrumentalization of the working class. The argument proposes that the capitalist school becomes adequate if the workers have access to it and learned its contents – being enough, for this, add a pinch of critique to its content. Nothing against the access of the working class rural and urban to its content, but the capitalist schooling form did not arise, as Marx would say, from a lightning from the sky.

The author observes that the teaching attempts to allow students to appropriate knowledge in an integrated way to the social reality, at one time or another find their limits precisely in questions about the school form - class time, physical space, possibility of collective teaching organization etc. The disregard of the conservative role of the school form obscures the difficulties that arise in the commitment of a school practice that is able to truly transmit knowledge about reality. It should be remembered that it is even more difficult to question something totally veiled, since school form is not officially determined in any instance, but all schools follow this same configuration (FREITAS, 2016).

In this way, it is perceived that in order to propose a transmission of knowledge that has the capacity to enable the understanding of the real, a double questioning is required: form and content. The pedagogical act carried out in schools, necessary to the capitalist system, finds in the questions of form and content the security to develop and transmit knowledge without it becoming a revolutionary element. That is, there is, in the fundamental object of education - knowledge - a subversive potential that has been strongly controlled, otherwise it becomes harmful to the maintenance of capitalism. As Löwy explains (1998, p. 202):

Knowledge of truth can have profound consequences (direct or indirect) on the behavior of social classes, on their relation of force, and therefore on the outcome of their confrontations. Revealing or concealing objective reality is a powerful weapon in the field of class struggle.

After all, with an understanding of the engendering of capital, it is possible to glimpse the need for a society beyond capitalism, fueling the revolutionary struggle. It is in this perspective that the revolutionary capacity of the appropriation of knowledge for the subaltern classes is claimed, that it can become subversive to the system, because it allows the unveiling of the real by the proletarian class. The struggle for communism coincides, therefore, with the struggle for the school to fulfill its intrinsic function: the socialization of knowledge (SAVIANI; DUARTE, 2012). Clearly, in order to accomplish the development, transmission and appropriation of knowledge, in an integral and therefore revolutionary way, it is necessary to search for alternatives about school form and content, a task that has been



carried out by established Marxist pedagogues. Thus, it would be the function of school education to enable students to move from a "fragmented, incoherent, disjointed, implicit, degraded, mechanical, passive, and simplistic conception to a unitary, coherent, articulate, explicit, original, intentional, active and cultivated" (SAVIANI, 1989, p. 10).

It is true that school knowledge to be transmitted and appropriated originates in the bourgeois social form, but this does not detract from its revolutionary character when treated in its historical roots. For, historically, its genesis is linked to the need to clarify the real, rejecting any mystifying formulation. The problematic question is not the production of knowledge that has blown itself together with a revolutionary bourgeoisie, but its parking, concealment and distortion in a post-revolutionary context. Thus, the appropriation of bourgeois knowledge and culture, when carried out in a radical way, moves in the opposite direction of a "bourgeoisization". In this sense, one seeks the reaffirmation of scientific knowledge, without denying that it is a bourgeois heritage.

For this reason, it is worth the effort to analyze how to carry out school education, valuing knowledge as its central object, and, at the same time, questioning the entire historical structuring of the school. As Freitas clarifies (2013, p. 77-78):

This school form, therefore, does not serve us - although the "foundations of science" do. To change the school form does not mean to throw away, along with it, the content of the sciences [...]. It is not enough to take the content of the critical bourgeois school, because the "content" of the school is not exhausted in the school content of the classroom. [...] But equally, it is not enough to stay with the "content" of the social relations experienced in its interior, forgetting the content of the classroom. At the same time, the whole "content" of the school, the entire capitalist school form, must be changed.

In addition, the communist revolution is linked to knowledge in a special way because, unlike the bourgeois revolution, overcoming the capitalist system has the specificity to demand a subjectivity that has developed a high degree of objective knowledge. "The victory of bourgeois forces against the feudal world did not require an objective knowledge of historical and social reality [...]. The proletariat, on the contrary, was placed by history before the task of a conscious transformation to reality" (LÖWY, 1998, p. 132). The appropriation of the objective knowledge about the real is, therefore, configured to foster the formation of a consciousness capable of perceiving the whole and understanding its mediations, a revolutionary consciousness. Revolutionary consciousness thus has a synchrony in relation to knowledge, demonstrating the subversive junction between proletarian class, knowledge and consciousness.

Thus, it is not claimed that theoretical knowledge would be sufficient for social revolution and thus human emancipation. The Marxian perspective understands that the transition from theory to reality requires the mediation of a social practice, which is "theoretical-practical: theoretical rather than mere contemplation, since it is theory that guides action, and practice,



or action guided by theory" (VÁZQUEZ, 2007, p. 144). By retaking knowledge about reality as the object of education, it becomes one of the components of the revolution. It is important to emphasize this part: one of the components of the revolution. After all, the Marxian perspective centers praxis as transforming the real, for "the most revolutionary theory never ceases to be mere theory until it is realized or materialized in acts" (VÁZQUEZ, 2007, p. 158). For this reason, it is important to emphasize the historical subjects to realize, effectively, the revolution that can emancipate humanity. Thus, revolutionary praxis demands the revolutionary theoretical contribution in conjunction with the subject that realizes the material support of the social world. As can be seen in Marx (2010, p. 156-157, italics of the author):

Just as philosophy finds its material weapons in the proletariat, the proletariat finds in philosophy its spiritual arms, and as soon as the lightning of thought has penetrated deeply into this naive soil of the people, the emancipation of men will be completed. [...] The head of this emancipation is philosophy, the proletariat is its heart. Philosophy can not take place without the supra-assumption [Aufhebung] of the proletariat, the proletariat can not surmount itself without the realization of philosophy.

Since knowledge about the social world is a revolutionary element, which Marx points out as being philosophy, then it is a matter of considering education as the enabler of this necessary component of emancipation. A crucial component, however, is insufficient when isolated from praxis.

The proletariat can not emancipate itself without going from theory to praxis. Nor can theory itself emancipate it, nor can its social existence guarantee its release by itself. It is necessary for the proletariat to become aware of its situation, its radical needs and the necessity and conditions of its liberation. This consciousness is precisely philosophy; more precisely, his philosophy (VÁZQUEZ, 2007, p. 118).

At the other extreme, a practice that is rewarded by practice itself, could never be revolutionary either. For a greater degree of objective knowledge about society is substantial in order to make it possible to understand the constitutive ties of the real, in addition to simplistic explanations that contribute to alienation. Therefore, understanding that education can not be held accountable for human emancipation means understanding, too, that without it, the prospect of change shifts away. Education is not the driving force of history, but humanity itself - humanity that is formed in several spheres, among them, the educational process. Thus, the specificity of human formation to be realized in school education finds its subversive gap due to its relative autonomy added to its ontological function.

In this sense, educational formative processes could help to develop a revolutionary consciousness for the emancipatory struggle. It is understood, therefore, that the expectation of human emancipation rests with education when in a perspective of formation of critical revolutionary consciousness. The efforts engendered in the sphere of education are based on



forming the most conscious individual possible within these contradictory conditions, which would be substantial for the struggle for human emancipation. This is not a simple task because,

The formation of the revolutionary consciousness in capitalist society is hampered by the relations of alienation and fetishism, as well as by the strong ideology that produces the naturalization of unequal social relations and, often, the conformism and the passivation of the individuals in front of this societal order (ÁLVARO, 2013, p. 375).

The school is, therefore, situated in a potentially mystifying social totality, mediated by various ways of concealing the concrete reality. The contradiction generated by the necessity of the appropriation of knowledge to perpetuate bourgeois society, together with the risk of allowing the understanding to question and claim the transformation of the real, marks the school development. Thus, school is at the same time sustained and sabotaged. This demonstrates what, and who is interested in the various obstacles found in the school environment. The difficulties that permeate the school complex are supposedly known reasons, such as: lack of interest among students, lack of teacher preparation, lack of teachers, lack of schools in certain regions, exploitation of child labor, difficulties in accessing school (or the right to study, for reasons sexist, racist etc.), precarious material conditions, generating an endless list. But the point is that these problems are not the causes of the school problem, but the reflexes of the contradictory needs of the capitalist system in relation to education, since it is not beneficial to capitalism a school education that manages to fulfill fully its function of human formation.

Thus, the bourgeois model does not need the school to impose itself as a dominant class. The school is necessary for capitalism to maintain the bourgeois mode of production. And for this, it is interesting that the school is the space of superficial knowledge, or strictly technical, in its complacent appearance, that is, only place of instruction. On this, Gramsci (1975, p. 255 *apud* SAVIANI, 1989, p. 14) states that:

We can not state in good conscience that the bourgeoisie makes use of the school in the sense of its class domination; if she did so it would mean that the bourgeois class has a school program to be fulfilled with energy and perseverance; school would be a living school. This does not happen: the bourgeoisie, a class that dominates the state, disinterested in the school, let the bureaucrats do what they want, let the ministers of education be chosen at random from political interests, intrigues, "conchavos" of parties and arrangements of offices.

School education serves the maintenance of the capitalist system, therefore, in its devaluation, in a way that does not generate inquiries about society, but at the same time enables the human being to articulate within this mode of production. It is necessary for capitalism to be an efficient human being with skills and abilities and, at the same time, to accept bourgeois ideologies as absolute truths. Hence the contradiction between providing



knowledge, for the empowerment of the individual, and limiting knowledge, so as not to fuel social questions. Consequently, the more school education ceases to work knowledge in its historical radicality, the more it will be reinforcing the presence and consolidation of the ideologies within it.

This is not unimportant because bourgeois ideology fulfills a vital task for capitalism by mystifying the contradictions of the system, preventing the roots of human alienation from becoming clear. As Hungaro explains (2008, p. 57-58):

Ideology is any and all ideal elaboration which, although saturated with material interests, is not recognized in this way. They are ideal formulations that ignore their socio-historical conditions and, therefore, present themselves as authors of history (protagonists of history). That is why they end up distorting (falsifying) the understanding of history [...]. Because they do not know (by ignoring) their historical determinants, ideologists offer an interpretation that is one-sided, partial, in synthesis, a false consciousness. However, although this is a false consciousness, this does not mean that it does not operate historically. Ideology collects elements of reality and reconfigures them without establishing the links between this re-configuration and the represented reality (the socio-historical conditions it intends to represent). By operating in this way, it appears to us as a construction that can not be questioned from within. Consequently, ideology is much more than a false consciousness in itself, it is a false self-legitimizing consciousness.

Ideologies, like superstructures that cement the social structure, are strong counterrevolutionary foundations. It is in this sense that Löwy (1998) speaks of an "ideological cement" that attributes a strengthening to social structures. The author explains that medieval ideology, using cosmogony, was crucial to maintaining social relations, which explains the strong repression given to the scientific discoveries that served to weaken the politico-social justifications of the Middle Ages. The development of the natural sciences was something subversive to feudalism, which encouraged the collapse of the acceptance of the then social order. In the same way, the capitalist system demands "an ideological cement of an economic-social and political type" (LÖWY, 1998, p. 198), which seeks to naturalize capitalist social relations, reducing reality to only that which exists and, consequently, a pragmatic and utilitarian view of the world. This necessary reduction of the understanding of reality for the maintenance of the "ideological bourgeois cement" focuses on school education in the form of innumerable obstacles to the performance of its function. Including the current persecution of teachers who historically and politically position school knowledge, with the famed movement "School without a party" that preaches that knowledge must be worked in its "neutral" form.

It should be stressed that there is no knowledge, positioning or neutral ideas. Neutrality is an appearance generated by a conformation to the maintenance of the thus existing. As Marx and Engels (2009) explain, the mystification is created that there would be neutral interests in the capitalist system that would be common to all regardless of social classes. In this way, imposed ideologies fulfill the task of leading all subjects to act in accordance with the



interests of the ruling class, believing that they are doing so for their own sake. Thus, a "neutral" education corresponds to a bourgeois education.

The so-called education sciences, which believe that giving school education an impartial function of human formation, with a focus on biological and psychological issues, helps to perpetuate the current exploitation-based society. Even if it is presented in its supposedly secluded forms of social affairs, the maintenance of bourgeois society is strengthened. It should be remembered that school education is not related to hominization but to humanization and, therefore, is organically social. With this apprehension, Pistrak (2005, p. 29) explains that:

To the extent that school is not an absolute end, it can not have absolute educational goals, and therefore it would not be able to create an abstract harmonic individuality, based on invariable methods dictated by the science of the child (psychology and pedology) to accomplish their goals.

For an emancipatory education, as opposed to trying to remain "neutral" by exempting itself from the necessary class struggle, it would be up to the school to position itself from the perspective of the struggle for concrete work, which humanizes the world and itself. A revolutionary education, for the sake of human emancipation, must therefore be situated, from the point of view of the revolutionary class, the proletarian class. It is not a formation destined only to the proletarian class, but an education situated on its revolutionary point of view. This is due to its specific social positioning, which makes its point of view privileged in relation to the other classes. Löwy (1998, p. 205) explains that "certain points of view are relatively more favorable to objective truth than others, that certain class perspectives allow a relatively higher degree of knowledge than others". And which class would be most conducive to objective knowledge? Going back to the Marxian formulation, Löwy (1998, p. 206) states that "at every epoch the revolutionary class represents the maximum consciousness possible; this privilege, which was in the past of the revolutionary bourgeoisie, now belongs to the revolutionary class of our age: the proletariat". The greater objective knowledge about reality, capable of revealing mystifying ideologies, is situated from the point of view of the proletarian class. It is not a subjective, individual point of view, but a class perspective for oneself.

This understanding disputes any proposal for untying class issues at school. It is not intended, therefore, to relativize all human knowledge produced, but to reveal that all human knowledge is relative to a historical situation.

The same men who established social relations according to their material productivity also produce the principles, the ideas, the categories, according to their social relations. So these ideas, these categories are as timeless as the relations they express. They are historical and transitory products (MARX, 1985, p. 106, emphasis added).



It is, therefore, to go against a false conception that knowledge would have an autonomous existence, independent of the system of material production of social life. All ideas are abstractions produced in accordance with the interests of a particular social group. The battle of ideas (HUNGARO, 2008), therefore, is part of the revolutionary movement, on which intellectuals play an important role.

On this issue, Gramsci (2001) makes an important contribution to the role of intellectuals in society, elaborating the concepts of traditional organic and intellectual intellectual: the first would position their ideas maintaining their relationship with the social class to which it relates; the latter would become neutral, resulting in a process of acceptance of the current social situation, as if the interests of the ruling class were universal interests. On the latter, Gramsci (2001, p. 17) elaborates:

They place themselves as autonomous and independent of the dominant social group. This self-position is not without consequences of great importance in the ideological and political field (all idealistic philosophy can be easily related to this position assumed by the social set of intellectuals and can be defined as the expression of this social utopia according to which intellectuals believe to be "Independent", autonomous, endowed with their own characteristics, etc.

In this sense, traditional intellectuals fulfill the function of maintaining the co-optation of the whole society to a social situation in which few are beneficiaries. Gramsci (1999) portrays the concept of hegemony, when dealing with an ideology that has a pre-eminence in a society, winning the label of being in the service of the "common good". In hegemonic ideology, the contradictions of the capitalist system are treated as simple contingencies, which could be suppressed in favor of an expected (but unfounded) harmony.

In this way, Gramsci (2001) assures the importance of school education being able to prepare organic intellectuals, who understand that any theoretical formulation must assume its material origin related to the form of production. For the appearance of neutrality of the social situation would constitute an impediment to the formation of the revolutionary subject, who should understand the roots of the misery lived by the mass population. Thus, class domination was not only due to explicit violence, but also, and mainly, through the co-optation of hegemonic ideas. In his view, the struggle for the establishment of a communist society therefore requires a hegemonic turn to be made by the organic intellectuals to the working class. Thus, returning the importance of school education to the revolutionary movement.

Considering that "any relation of hegemony is necessarily a pedagogical relation", education should be understood as an instrument of struggle. Struggle to establish a new hegemonic relation that allows to constitute a new historical block under the direction of the dominated fundamental class of the capitalist society - the proletariat. But the proletariat can not erect itself in hegemonic force without raising



the cultural level of the masses. The fundamental importance of education is emphasized here (SAVIANI, 1989, p. 11).

Given these considerations, it is possible to perceive that criticisms of school education, which take place in the capitalist system, do not invalidate the potential of a school institution when one thinks of the development of a more just and egalitarian society. The Marxian perspective of education coincides with the current educational process that creates and promotes the school as a space destined to this end.

His pretension is not to end the school to return to a natural education [...] Marx and Engels do not intend to go back, but to go forward; they do not intend to return to the crafts, but to overcome capitalism, and this overcoming can only be achieved from capitalism itself, accentuating its contradictions, developing its possibilities (LOMBARDI, 2011, p. 11).

In this perspective, movements against school education that dismiss the school institution as socially necessary may have the appearance of subversion, but are conservative (for example, movements through de-scholasticism or learning without school, which have a Rousseauian bias of domestic education). At this point it is important to make clear that the need for school transformation, and even the valuing of non-formal education spaces, which have a greater margin of freedom in relation to the traditional school form, is defended. The criticism is made in relation to the bourgeois perspective that the family would be sufficient to carry out all the formation of its heirs, an option clearly not available to the working class, that does not have concrete conditions for such an undertaking, like, for example, free time.

With a discourse of adapting to social changes, in which the school would no longer fit, the current superficial movements against the school denounce the pedagogical absurdities that take place inside the school. However, criticizing school education is necessary, which differs from denying school education. The institutionalization of the school, as a space of knowledge, is an achievement of the capitalist system, which could even collaborate to overcome it. In this sense, this topic ends with the illuminating exposition of Duarte (2010, p. 48):

A communist society must be a society superior to capitalism and it will have to incorporate everything that, having been produced in capitalist society, can contribute to the development of the human race, to the material and intellectual enrichment of the life of all human beings. It is about: overcoming the limits of the Enlightenment without denying the emancipatory character of knowledge and reason; to overcome the limits of bourgeois democracy without denying the necessity of politics; to overcome the limits of science put at the service of capital without, however, denying the indispensable character of science for human development; overcome the bourgeois conception of social progress without denying the possibility of making society progress towards more evolved forms of human existence. In pedagogical terms, it is a question of overcoming negative pedagogies, that is, it is necessary to overcome school education in its bourgeois forms without denying the importance of transmitting, through the school, the most developed knowledge that has already been produced by humanity.



FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

With the understanding of an education that could realize the appropriation of human knowledge, in its radical historical understanding, positioning itself by the perspective of the proletarian class, which would have a historical mission to consciously launch a revolution, establishes the possibility of a revolutionary education. In this sense, the relation between school education and human emancipation is given by the perspective of the revolution, which requires the appropriation of reality, from the point of view of the proletariat, to the formation of revolutionary consciousness. By this way, it would be possible, even in this society, to opportune that individuals take ownership of human patrimony; that makes your senses be human senses; reestablishing its connection with the genre; favoring them to relate to other individuals not as opponents; and allowing them to identify with all matters relating to humanity simply because they are also human beings.

Evidently this education would not solve the problem of alienation, because in the human ontological activity, the work would still be carried out in an alienated way, in the sense that the individual does not have control of the production of the goods that he produces and, likewise, have full access to their results. The work, for him, would not yet be a process of his self-construction, but only to supply his physiological needs. The space for its humanization would continue to be found primarily when its daily expedient closes. However, because it has had access to an education in which cathartic moments have taken place, it becomes possible for the individual to be aware that his work, still alienated, is what makes the development of his society. And with this consciousness, it becomes easier to perceive the world as indeed a humanized world, that is, created by mankind and capable of being transformed by it. As Duarte explains (1992, p. 194),

The complete overcoming of alienation requires the overcoming of alienated social relations [...]. This assumption invalidates any attempt at analysis of the individual which presupposes that total overcoming of alienation on the individual plane is possible. In other words, if an individual lives within the social relations of domination, I insist, if he lives in an alienated society, however much he develops in the sense of building an individuality for himself, this does not mean the elimination of alienation in your life. What happens is that he will maintain an ever more conscious relationship with the ways in which, subjectively and objectively, he reproduces in his life both alienation and humanization, and will be in constant process of overcoming the forms of production and reproduction of the alienation of which it has already become aware.

From this perspective, the function of school education is found in the formation of humanity in the most radical way possible, that is, the search for humanization, which is denied by the



social configuration of work in the capitalist system. A revolutionary school education has, therefore, the pretension of human formation that rescues the ontological sense of being human - the being that has the concrete possibility of transforming the reality in which it finds itself, being able, even, to build a society beyond capitalism.

REFERENCES

ÁLVARO, Mirla Cisne. **Feminismo, luta de classes e consciência militante feminista no Brasil**. 2013. 408f. Tese (Doutorado em Serviço Social) - Faculdade de Serviço Social, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2013.

ANDRÉ, Simone. Entrevista concedida a documentário. In: LIMA, Anderson; LOVATO, Antonio; PEREZ, Raul; *et al.* **Quando sinto que já sei**. Brasil, 2014. Disco Digital de Vídeo (DVD). 78 min.

DUARTE, Newton. O debate contemporâneo das teorias pedagógicas. In: MARTINS, Lígia Márcia; DUARTE, Newton. (Orgs.). **Formação de professores: limites contemporâneos e alternativas necessárias**. São Paulo: Cultura Acadêmica, 2010.

DUARTE, Newton. **A formação do indivíduo e a objetivação do gênero humano** (categorias iniciais de uma reflexão sobre o processo de formação do indivíduo numa perspectiva histórico-social). 1992. 238f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Faculdade de Educação, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 1992.

ENGELS, Friedrich. Sobre o papel do trabalho na transformação do macaco em homem. In: ANTUNES, Ricardo (Org.) **A dialética do trabalho: Escritos de Marx e Engels**. 2 ed. São Paulo: Expressão popular, 2013.

FLECK, Amaro. Marx ou Habermas? Comentário crítico ao livro Marx e Habermas: Teoria crítica e os sentidos da emancipação, de Rúrion Melo. **Cadernos de Filosofia Alemã**. v. 19, n. 2, p. 165-181, jul./dez. 2014.

FREITAS, Luiz Carlos de. **Desenvolvimento da forma escolar**. Palestra realizada em ocasião do 4º Seminário de Práticas contra-hegemônicas nas escolas do campo. FUP-UnB, novembro de 2016.

FREITAS, Luiz Carlos de. A luta por uma pedagogia do meio: revisitando o conceito. In: PISTRAK, Moisey M. **A escola-comuna**. São Paulo: Expressão popular, 2013.

FRIGOTTO, Gaudêncio. A polissemia da categoria trabalho e a batalha das ideias nas sociedades de classe. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, v. 14, n. 40, p. 168-194, jan./abr. 2009.



GRAMSCI, Antonio. **Cadernos do Cárcere**. V. 2. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2001.

GRAMSCI, Antonio. **Cuadernos de la cárcel**. Tomo 2, Cuadernos 3, 4 e 5. México, D.F.: (coedición Ediciones Era/Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, 1999.

HUNGARO, Edson Marcelo. **Trabalho, tempo livre e emancipação humana: os determinantes ontológicos das políticas sociais de lazer**. 2008. 264f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação Física) - Faculdade de Educação Física, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas-SP, 2008.

LESSA, Sérgio. **Para compreender a Ontologia de Lukács**. São Paulo: Instituto Lukács, 2015.

LIMA, Marteano Ferreira de. **Trabalho, reprodução social e educação em Lukács**. 2009. 128f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) - Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação, Universidade Estadual do Ceará - UECE, Fortaleza, 2009.

LOMBARDI, José Claudinei. Introdução. In: MARX, Karl; ENGELS, Friedrich. **Textos sobre educação e ensino**. Campinas: Navegando, 2011.

LÖWY, Michael. **As aventuras de Karl Marx contra o Barão de Münchhausen**. São Paulo: Cortez, 1998.

MARX, Karl. Crítica da filosofia do direito de Hegel – Introdução. In: MARX, Karl. **Crítica da filosofia do direito de Hegel**. São Paulo: Boitempo Editorial, 2010.

MARX, Karl. **Sobre a questão judaica**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2009.

MARX, Karl. **Manuscritos econômico-filosóficos**. São Paulo: Boitempo editorial, 2008.

MARX, Karl. **O 18 Brumário de Luís Bonaparte**. Versão para e-Book. 2002. Disponível em: <<https://www.marxists.org/portugues/marx/1852/brumario/>>. Acesso em: 10 abr. 2016.

MARX, Karl. **O Capital: crítica da economia política**. São Paulo: Nova Cultural, v. 1, 1996.

MARX, Karl. **A miséria da filosofia**. São Paulo: Global, 1985.

MARX, Karl; ENGELS, Friedrich. **A ideologia alemã**. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2009.

MARX, Karl. **Manifesto do partido comunista**. Porto Alegre: L&PM, 2008.

PISTRAK, Moisey Mikhaylovich. **Fundamentos da escola do trabalho**. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2005.



SAVIANI, Dermeval. Perspectiva marxiana do problema subjetividade-intersubjetividade. In: DUARTE, Newton. **Crítica ao fetichismo da individualidade** (Org.) Campinas, SP: Autores Associados, 2014.

SAVIANI, Dermeval. **Pedagogia histórico-crítica**: primeiras aproximações. São Paulo: Cortez Editora; Autores Associados, 1991.

SAVIANI, Dermeval. **Educação**: do senso comum à consciência filosófica. São Paulo: Cortez Editora; Autores Associados, 1989.

SAVIANI, Dermeval. **Escola e democracia**: teorias da educação, curvatura da vara, onze teses sobre educação e política. São Paulo: Cortez, 1987.

SAVIANI, Dermeval; DUARTE, Newton (Orgs.). **Pedagogia histórico-crítica e luta de classes na educação escolar**. Campinas-SP: Autores Associados, 2012.

TONET, Ivo. **Educação, cidadania e emancipação humana**. Ijuí: Unijuí: 2005.

VÁZQUEZ, Adolfo Sánchez. **Filosofia da práxis**. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2007.

NOTES

Available at <<http://www.gazetadopopo.com.br/economia/um-quarto-do-planeta-vive-abaixo-da-linha-da-pobreza-b5cpvb7e743hhpczk3trvlwlq>>. Accessed on 04 Apr. 2016.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

¹*Fernanda Bartoly Gonçalves de Lima*: Doctorate and Master in Education - PPGE/UnB. Teacher of the Instituto Federal de Brasília. – E-mail: fernanda.lima@ifb.edu.br – ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8425-1269>

²*Kátia Augusta Curado Pinheiro Cordeiro da Silva*: Phd in Education - Universidade Federal de Goiás. Teacher of the Universidade de Brasília. E-mail: katiacurado@unb.br - ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9808-4577>