

## **Education in the MST before the State and public policy of Rural Education under the influence of multilateral organizations**

Vagner Luiz Kominkiewicz<sup>1</sup>, Adriana D'Agostini<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina - UFSC. Programa de Pós-Graduação em Educação. Rua Padre Salvador, 875. Florianópolis - SC. Brasil. <sup>2</sup>Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina - UFSC.

Author for correspondence: [vagnerluka@gmail.com](mailto:vagnerluka@gmail.com)

**ABSTRACT.** This article deals with the Education of the MST in its relationship with the State and multilateral organizations, synthesized in the Rural Education Policy. Our research was based on the analysis of the documents of the MST, the State and multilateral organizations, interviews and questionnaires. From this study we come to the conclusion that the class character of education in the MST is subsumed to the consensus that starts from the I ENERA, focused on the struggle for education focused on the public policy of Rural Education, representing a consensus between antagonistic class fractions. We support the need for an education of the working class, which in this moment is given with limits and contradictions, but we recognize it as necessary for the construction of experiences for an accumulation of future forces.

**Keywords:** MST Education, Rural Education, Class Struggle, State, Public Policy.

## **A educação do MST diante do Estado e da política pública de Educação do Campo sob influência dos organismos multilaterais**

**RESUMO.** Este artigo trata da Educação do MST em sua relação com o Estado e os organismos multilaterais, sintetizada na política de Educação do Campo. Nossa investigação fundamentou-se na análise dos documentos do MST, do Estado e dos organismos multilaterais, entrevistas e questionários. A partir deste estudo, chegamos à conclusão que o caráter de classe da educação no MST fica subsumido ao consenso que se inicia a partir do I ENERA, focado na luta pela educação centrada na política pública de Educação do Campo, representando um consenso entre frações de classes antagônicas. Apontamos para a necessidade de uma educação da classe trabalhadora, que neste momento se dá com limites e contradições, mas a reconhecemos como necessária para a construção de experiências para um acúmulo de forças futuro.

**Palavras-chave:** Educação do MST, Educação do Campo, Luta de Classes, Estado, Política Pública.

## **La educación en el MST del Estado y la política pública de Educación Rural bajo influencia de los organismos multilaterales**

**RESUMEN.** Este artículo trata de la Educación del MST en su relación con el Estado y los organismos multilaterales, sintetizado en la política de Educación Rural. Nuestra investigación se basó en el análisis de los documentos del MST, del Estado y de los organismos multilaterales, entrevistas y cuestionarios. A partir de este estudio llegamos a la conclusión que el carácter de clase de la educación en el MST queda subsumido al consenso que se inicia a partir del I ENERA, enfocado en la lucha por la educación centrada en la política pública de Educación Rural, representando un consenso entre fracciones de clases antagónica. Aponemos para la necesidad de una educación de la clase trabajadora, que en este momento se da con límites y contradicciones, pero la reconocemos como necesaria para la construcción de experiencias para una acumulación de fuerzas futuras.

**Palabras clave:** Educación del MST, Educación Rural, Lucha de Clases, Estado, Política Pública.

## Introduction

This article is a result and part of a master thesis that approaches the trajectory of the MST<sup>ii</sup> education in its relationship with the State, Multilateral Organizations and the public policy of Rural Education. The aim was to analyze in what extent MST education keep its class perspective in its relationship with the State, Multilateral Organizations and the public policy of Rural Education, pointing out to possibilities in course. Based on Minayo (2004), the study was supported by bibliographical and documental research, interviews and questionnaire.

In order to present the research by means of this article, we divided the text into three parts. In the first one, we demonstrate that MST education arises from a need for the land struggle and consolidates itself as a tactical formulation in the struggle for Agrarian Reform. Although MST education presents contradictions in its formulation, it bears in mind a class perspective and a link with the goals of this movement. In the second part, we demonstrate that the class perspective of MST education is reduced to the consensus that arises subsequently the I ENERA, focused on the struggle for education centered on the public policy of Rural Education, representing a consensus between antagonistic class fractions.

Following the national conferences “Por Uma Educação do Campo” (For a Rural Education), the consensus arises. And we conclude pointing out some tendencies for MST education in the face of the class struggle.

## The construction of MST education proposal

First discussions related to the struggle for school began after land occupation in the *Encruzilhada Natalino* farm in 1981, as a consequence of parents concerned with camped children. The first steps of struggle for school are anchored in the basic need for school to children camped with their families in the primary encampments (MST, 2005, p. 13).

For Paludo (2006, p. 16), education for children, youth and adults was a concern since the early years of the MST. In 1980, the initial concern was with the early years of children's education. Already, “in 1981, the first isolated experiences in youth and adults literacy also began” (Paludo, 2007, p. 16, our translation<sup>iii</sup>). According to the author, education was not only a concern of parents and teachers, but also of “of leaderships and agents of mediation, mainly linked to Liberation Theology and combative syndicalism”<sup>iv</sup> (Paludo, 2007, p. 16).

Gradually, education and school articulate themselves to the struggle for land. According to Dalmagro (2010, p. 168), they arose and are can be understood by the need for the school claimed by the struggle. This would be the initial feature of the school in the MST. The links between school, MST struggle and the realization of Agrarian Reform were established in the late 1980s when school is articulated to the landless struggle. It is when one advances to the understanding that the school has the role of linking knowledge and the educational process to the organization of the settled<sup>v</sup> and to the forms of work and organization.

According to Paludo (2007, p. 16), in the beginning of MST education construction, were laid the foundations to strengthen the struggle for education as a right in Brazilian society. Also, in this period, were constructed basis for discussions concerning what kind of school was pursued for the settlements.

Based on the analysis of the MST documents related to education, we observe a convergence of ideas focused on school linked to work and to development of the settlements. Although we initially pay attention that school was mainly related to the struggle centered on social transformation and to the formation of MST militants, for us it seems to be a focalization in the claims of the settlements

internal work. This seems more evident when we analyze the document *Boletim de Educação* (Education Bulletin) No. 4, *Escola, trabalho e cooperação* (School, work and cooperation), published in 1994. It expresses the intention to base theoretically the proposal of MST education, presenting the link work and education as fundamental “pillar”. There is a defense of constructing a school based on work dimensions and cooperation, a school “of the worker, of the working class”<sup>vi</sup> (MST, 2005, p. 89).

The document clearly defends foundations on which the school should help to build the settlement through education related to work and cooperation. Linked to the goals and challenges posed to the MST in the period related to cooperation and development of the settlements, it defends that the school “needs helping to make the settlement works”<sup>vii</sup> (MST, 2005, p. 94). Also, school should educate to agricultural cooperation; prepare to the work and enable technically the settled, and develop in children the “love for work and for work in rural area”<sup>viii</sup> (MST, 2005, p. 95). In that document, there is a defense that school should contribute to socialism construction, preparing new generations to fight for a “society without exploited workers or exploiters”<sup>ix</sup> (MST, 2005, p. 95).

The trajectory of the school in the MST goes from the struggle for school in the settlements and encampments to the State denial as educator of the people. The State denial is based on the need to construct a differentiated education from the MST perspective. MST considers insufficient the education offered by the State for understanding that it does not comply with the claims of the settled families to overcome poverty, as well as it does not improve the necessary consciousness for the MST social struggles.

Analyzing the periods of education and school in the MST, Dalmagro (2010) demonstrates that important elements are presented from the 1990s. They highlight a proposal for MST education that breaks with the fundamental pillars of the bourgeois school.

The rescue of the school issue in the MST thus far allows us to identify that the foundations for a reversal of the school perspective in the political and pedagogical aspects are laid. In the first, because the school ceases to form for bourgeois citizenship, on the contrary, it aims the consciousness formation to change the world. If it continues to form for work, it is no longer intended to be submitted to the capitalist market, but seeking for other social relations. Pedagogically, the socialization of knowledge is no longer taken as neutral and stagnant. The construction of new appropriated knowledge to a new development model also appears as a challenge. Changes are also proposed in the

organization of the school. Finally, with more or less emphasis, the fundamental pillars of the bourgeois school are being rethought<sup>x</sup> (Dalmagro, 2010, p. 175).

According to D'Agostini (2009, p. 115), after the elaboration of the *Princípios da Educação* (Principles of Education) in the MST, by the National Sector of Education in 1996<sup>xi</sup>, it is possible to notice the class political position presented in the humanist and socialist principles, elements of the Marxist theory, of counter-hegemonic pedagogies (especially in the work *Pedagogia do Oprimido* by Paulo Freire; the influence of the Russian pedagogues and the Cuban José Martí) and socialism as historical horizon. In the document, we found the indication of “works of some classical authors” that influenced in its construction.

For Dalmagro (2010, p. 179), after the elaboration of the *Princípios de Educação*, by the sector of MST education, the school notion is broadened, going beyond primary school of encampment and settlement, as well as of the sector of education itself. There is not a break with the fundamental guidelines before produced by the sector of education. Dalmagro analyzes that the change related to the prior documents about the basis of the MST education proposal is in the enlargement of the way of seeing the

perspectives. "It is also broaden because school goes to be seen based on an array of educative practices that happen outside it, even the educative actions produced by MST struggle"<sup>xii</sup> (DALMAGRO, 2010, p. 179).

The Principles of MST education are oriented by actions proposed by the Movement. They result of practices previously carried out by the MST and that, accumulated, point out to two linked assumptions: the philosophical and pedagogical principles. The philosophical principles refer to worldview, to general conceptions related to human being, to society and to MST understanding about education. They refer to the strategic goals of the educative work of the MST whereas the pedagogical principles refer to the way, to the method that aims to carry out the philosophical principles.

Conforming to Dalmagro (2010, p. 179), it is after the elaboration of the Principles that the MST recognizes that its proposal of education should contribute to class struggle. The author also highlights other new ideas that arise with the elaboration of principles or new emphases that are attributed, such as: massive education or education as right for all; *omnilateral* education, or focused on the various dimensions of the human being; education for new values that affirm the socialist perspective.

Following the Principles, it is possible to affirm, in agreement with D'Agostini (2009, p. 117), that:

The MST and its education have their actions guided by class struggle in rural area and the conviction of the construction of a new society and, consequently, of a new education based on socialist and humanist foundations/values such as: collectivism, collective work, socially useful work, work as an educative principle, solidarity, organization and self-organization of students, the link theory and practice, among others.<sup>xiii</sup>

For Santos (2011, p. 173), class struggle in rural area is the guiding principle of the MST educational project, added to the need to construct new social relations of production. Thus, education should be based on socialist and humanist values. As described in the philosophical principles of MST education, "education for social transformation. This is the horizon that defines the perspective of MST education"<sup>xiv</sup> (MST, 2005, p. 161). There is undoubtedly an intentionality, a political perspective centered on the struggle for social transformation.

The concern to construct an education that opposes the State as educator of the people and that is an element of tactical formulation of the MST in the struggle for Agrarian Reform and for social transformation in which socialism is the horizon, points out to a class education.

“It is rather to affirm an education related to a class that aims at a horizon of social transformation; an education that opens up an universal range for knowledge”<sup>xv</sup> (Kominkiewicz & Dantas, 2013, p. 120).

Dealing with educational and political reforms based on neoliberalism, D'Agostini (2009, p. 166) considers that in the 1990s the MST assumes a position of resistance to neoliberal policies with a class-based education proposal.

In 1996, MST education was improved with the elaboration and publication of MST educational principles. Its proposal assumes a class perspective when presents itself predisposed to the struggle for social transformation. However, other elements/contradictions compose the MST education proposal besides its class perspective. In agreement with D'Agostini (2009), we stress that “the theory treated as secondary and the theoretical fragility of the MST education proposal allow deviations in the political and educational practice”<sup>xvi</sup>, mainly regarding the theoretical eclecticism and the fragmentation of pedagogical practice. Araujo (2007, p. 316) also considers the “lack of theoretical deepening of the MST own pedagogical proposal” as a problem. These elements of contradiction allow opening to other educational conceptions and to educational policies of the 1990s multilateral organizations to enter into the

formulations of educational policies and also of social and popular movements.

Besides the inherent limits in education, the 1990s present an environment of expansion of the MST to society. The relevant fact is the foundation of *Via Campesina*, in 1993 (Ribeiro & Sobreiro Filho, 2012), of which the MST is inserted and gains international projection. The articulations are broadened – international partnership –, allowing greater visibility of the MST to society. This expansion of the MST to society enabled partnerships not only with fractions of the same class. In 1995, for instance, there is approximation of the MST with fractions of antagonistic classes, as we shall see later. In the next section, we try to demonstrate how the class perspective of the MST education proposal is reduced after the relationship with multilateral organizations and how the conceptions of the general policy of these organizations go towards MST education, resulting in the Rural Education.

### **The consensus about Rural Education**

After the “*I Encontro Nacional das Educadoras e Educadores da Reforma Agrária* (I ENERA) (First National Meeting of the Agrarian Reform Educators)”<sup>xvii</sup>, in 1997, the MST committed to the struggle for education



based on public policies, and defended Rural Education as a tactic to access education, in order to strengthen the correlation of forces in the struggle for hegemony within society.

Although a range of researches has been defended and worked with the ideas that the formulation about MST education is identical to the Rural Education formulations and practices, we defend the difference between them. We corroborate with D'Agostini (2009, p. 122) that, although Rural Education is grounded on MST education, it is based on peasants education in the sense of social and human development in rural area and of their subjects, whereas MST education, as we have seen, is a class education, based on the class struggle for the specificity of the struggle for the land.

Under the context of neoliberal policies of the 1990s, discussions about what would be Rural Education arose. According to Dalmagro (2010, p. 180), from 1998, the debate about Rural Education was inserted in the MST and, from then on, it continues and marks the education perspectives of the Movement. For the author, the MST, linked to *Via Campesina*, gradually resumes the concepts of rural area and peasantry, "pointing out that there is a culture, a way of peasant life that should be respected and, in a certain way, resumed as a form of

assuring the survival of the peasant population"<sup>xviii</sup> (Dalmagro, 2010, p. 180).

For Kolling (2005, p. 23), the Itaú-Unicef prize, granted to the MST in 1995, publically recognized and increased its work in education area to future partnerships, enlarging its responsibility with education and the struggle for public policies. Even, according to this author, the unfolding of this prize resulted in the accomplishment of the I ENERA.

In an interview for Anhaia (2010, p. 74), Caldart argues that the multilateral organizations symbolically represent the legitimacy of the MST to society. Also, that there are two important factors to accomplishment of the I ENERA: the above-mentioned prize, that recognized the MST work in the encampments and settlements; and the results of the *III Congresso Nacional do MST* (Third National Congress of the MST), in 1995, with "Reforma Agrária: uma Luta de Todos" (Agrarian reform: a struggle for all) as motto, i.e., of the MST to society.

In the first volume of the collection *Por uma Educação Básica do Campo*, we found a mention to the I ENERA related to partnerships and challenges to the meeting promoters. Among the challenges, one is accomplished by the UNICEF representative, Ana Catarina Braga that convenes the promoter entities, mainly the

MST, to expand the work that had being developed in education.

The enthusiasm with the success of the I Enera led the UNICEF representative, Ana Catarina Braga, to challenge the promoters and supporters of the event for a wider work on education based on rural world, taking into account the rural context in terms of its specific culture concerning the way of seeing and relating with time, space, the environment and the way of living, of organizing family and work<sup>xix</sup> (Kolling, Nery & Molina, 1999, p. 13-14).

In the sequence of the document is demonstrated that the challenge pointed out by the UNICEF representative was assumed by the promoter entities of the meeting, resulting in a *Conferência por uma Educação Básica do Campo* (Conference for a Rural Basic Education). Roseli Caldart presents more details about the UNICEF representative provocation in accomplishing an event beyond the settlements of the Agrarian Reform and the expansion of its proposal of education for “other subjects that work in rural area”.

It was exactly the closing speech of the UNICEF representative, Ana Catarina, that publicly provoked the MST to convene a similar event that was not only for the Agrarian Reform settlements, but which involved the rural area as a whole. She even talked to us informally, we thought, who are we to take something wider? It was an informal conversation, and suddenly, at the closing table she said: ‘The MST does not have the

right to argue only with itself’ in the sense that the MST, by its accumulation, for its struggle for right, has an obligation to articulate other subjects of rural area to have a broader debate on education in rural area. It must bring together other subjects who work in rural areas (Anhaia, 2010, pp. 79-80, excerpt of the interview with Caldart).

The I ENERA promoted the idea of a national conference that became the “I Conferência por uma Educação Básica do Campo” (First Conference for a Rural Basic Education), in 1998. Challenged by the UNICEF representative in the I ENERA to “raise a broader discussion on education in Brazilian rural area”, the discussions concern the “preparation of the base document of the First Conference, concluded in May 1998, where are presented the “baptism arguments” of what would be Rural Education (Caldart, 2012, p. 260).

During the I ENERA, participants elaborated the “*Manifesto dos Educadores e Educadoras da Reforma Agrária*” (Agrarian Reform Educators Manifesto). We highlight the defense expressed in the Manifesto, in a broader sense, of “public, free and quality school for all, since child education to University”, affirming the need to build a “self-identity of rural schools” considering new forms of rural area development, “based on social justice, agricultural cooperation, respect for the

environment and valorization of peasant culture” (MST, 1997).

The unity established in the I ENERA between fractions of distinct classes (workers represented by Landless, Rural Trade Unions, Universities and Bourgeoisie represented by Multilateral Organizations, as UNESCO for instance), has the struggle for public policies for rural education as a common point. Caldart expresses this contradictory relationship of interests that result in the struggle for education right, arguing: “we had different ideas among people who were there, even different political positions, but we found identification at the Mystical moment <sup>xx</sup>, for example”<sup>xxi</sup> (Anhaia, 2010, p. 81, excerpt of the interview with Caldart).

In the interview, Caldart clearly demonstrates that the unity established in the I ENERA between fractions of distinct classes only concerns to struggle for education right. She also demonstrates her understanding about the international organizations – UNESCO and UNICEF – in aiming to “ease the conflicts”, and to establish harmony between classes in order to keep the class struggle over control.

There is not an alliance in the sense of a project. We know the role of these organizations ... If we analyze the positions of UNICEF and UNESCO, mainly UNESCO, we can see how the capitalism crisis are, because it just demonstrates the intention to ease conflicts, what it is

done to avoid stronger conflicts. In the face of a tension in rural area, there is support to certain initiatives, in agreement with the way we act in order to avoid unsustainable situations. It even can be in favor of Agrarian Reform to this does not become something effectively destabilizing to society. The role of these organizations is not circumstantial, it is structural. What kind of adjustment is done in the capitalist society to keep it capitalist? For that, it is necessary to keep the struggle class over control, without considering it evidently as class struggle (Anhaia, 2010, p. 79, excerpt of the interview with Caldart).

In relation to this unity made in between distinct classes, Santos (2011) argues that there is an agreement in the plan of the pedagogical and political formulations between the Rural Education foundations. For him:

It is possible to argue that are specific alliances to construct a wider movement that cover several “actors” considering that the political conditions of the time to formulations of a rural education with the exclusive presence of movements of social struggles would be impossible. However, this argument is not justified because, in terms of pedagogical and political formulations, the foundations of the Rural Education and the interpretations of the reality of most of the organizational entities of the rural workers struggle are in agreement with the formulations of the New School updated in the motto “learn to learn”, advocated and disseminated by institutions such as UNESCO (Santos, 2011, p. 188)<sup>xxii</sup>.

Reporting by means of interview about the Rural Education trajectory, the member of the education sector of the MST (Interview D2) emphasizes that the relationship established with the partners of I ENERA, UNESCO, UNICEF, *Conferência Nacional dos Bispos do Brasil* (CNBB) (National Conference of Bishops of the Brazil), UNB, is the result of a given context of struggle against the State, represented in the government policy of the then President Fernando Henrique Cardoso (FHC). Since the establishment of the National Education Sector of the MST, in 1987, during the First National Meeting of Educators of the MST in the State of Espírito Santo, the MST has constructed its education proposal when, in 1997, “was in the ENERA facing a context in which the FHC government of was closing schools”<sup>xxiii</sup> (Interview D2). Following this context, with the high rate of school closure, the member of the education sector of the MST analyzes that the enlargement of MST education beyond the movement itself was a matter of survival in the face of FHC political offensive.

Another member of the education sector of the MST, interviewee by us, also considers relevant the political context related to FHC government offensive. The reason of the union with UNESCO, UNICEF, CNBB and UNB, in the face of conjuncture of that time, was to bring to

debate the rural problems in the Brazilian society as well as the educational perspectives and Rural Education.

In that conjuncture, to strengthen the struggle, the tactic was the construction of partnership between MST, other social rural movements, State and Multilateral Organizations. We understand that, in that process, the MST treated its educational proposal as secondary in which it is more important for it, the theoretical and revolutionary formulation. The member of the education sector of the MST considers it as a way to advance:

In that moment, it was more to bring partnership together than to propose a theoretical and revolutionary proposal. Actually, in that moment, the MST retreated a little bit more its theoretical proposal in order to bring partnership together. Its partners were politically more backward than the MST itself, to say so. The problem was delaying, retreating years ago and then you can't push yours partners to the combative field. For me, it seems that the problem it is to stay in the field of the more reformist hegemonic constitution instead of advance in a more offensive and revolutionary field<sup>xxiv</sup> (Interview D3).

Bearing in mind the structural divergences or the position of classes of the social movements and the international organizations, the unity between fractions of distinct classes occurred by means of struggle for education right. In the *I Conferência Nacional por uma Educação*

*Básica do Campo* (First National Conference for a Rural Basic Education) documents, in July 1998, we perceive the elements that unify the promoting entities in the construction of Rural Education, as well as point out elements that constitute the Rural Education trajectory.

The First Conference dealt with the following themes: a) rural development and education in Brazil: challenges and perspectives; b) the situation of rural education in Brazil and Latin America; c) public policies in education in Brazil: municipalization; d) financing of education; e) educational policy for indigenous schools; f) searching for a new development project for Brazil; g) popular development project for rural area; h) basic education for rural area; i) our commitment as educators in rural area (Kolling, Nery & Molina 1999, p. 17-18).

In an excerpt of the document No. 1 *Por uma Educação Básica do Campo*, it is signed the unity about the specificity of the Rural Education, as we present below:

Since the beginning, there was a consensus about the specificity of the “basic rural education”, i.e. considering the culture, the features, the needs and dreams of who live in the rural area and of the rural area. Another promoters consensus is related to the link to the basic rural education with a popular project of Brazil and with a popular project of the rural area development<sup>xxv</sup> (Kolling, Nery & Molina, 1999, p. 15).

Moreover, it is signed the unity about education as a right and as an inclusion strategy. Another unity element we highlight between promoter entities is related to the conceptions and pedagogical principals of a rural school. The document defends a transformation in the scholar pedagogy based on the choice of learning in progress, pointing out to “learn to learn” (UNESCO, 2010).

Suggesting a transformation in the scholar curriculums for rural schools in agreement with the UNESCO policies and guidelines, the document follows “affirming the importance of learning to learn, what means learning to transform information into knowledge or into

position in the face of certain life situations”<sup>xxvi</sup> (Kolling, Nery & Molina 1999, p. 68). These guidelines rescued of the multilateral organization – constructed in a set of documents designed to carry out the process of “worldwidening” of education, aiming the active consensus of the governed (Gramsci, 2007) – “begin to guide the theoretical production and the political-pedagogical elaboration”<sup>xxvii</sup> (Titton, 2010, p. 188).

After the First Conference, it is constituted the National Articulation for a Rural Education, having as motor the UNICEF, UNESCO, MST and UNB. The National Articulation for a Rural Education represented an increase of the “subjects”

that joins the struggle for the Rural Education. Besides, as Molina argues, the established union via National Articulation is centered on the perspective of the struggle for specific public policies to the rural area.

With the National Articulation, the possibilities of partnership between fractions of the same class are expanded – for instance, MST and *Confederação Nacional dos Trabalhadores na Agricultura* (CONTAG) (National Confederation of Agricultural Workers) – even partnership between distinct classes - MST, CONTAG, Multilateral Organizations and the State. The criteria of action of the Rural Education construction that we observe above considers social movements, entities and organization of peasants and others that are worried or interested in the rural education cause. In that array of partnership concerning Rural Education was possible the negotiation between distinct fractions of classes constituting a wider movement for implementation of public policies for the Rural Education. The agenda and actions carried out by the National Articulation for a Rural Education involve different and even antagonistic class subjects. On the other hand, it constitutes a strong movement towards the realization of the intended actions. Maintaining the characteristics of consensus between

classes, the National Articulation carries out some actions in favor of Rural Education.

We emphasize that one of the achievements of the Movement for a Rural Education was the promulgation of the *Diretrizes Operacionais para a Educação Básica nas Escolas do Campo* (Operational Guidelines for Basic Education in the Rural Schools), Resolution CNE/CBE No. 1, April 03, 2002. The Guidelines elaboration represents a moment closer of the State. Based on the Guidelines proposals, which CONTAG had greater participation - which does not reduce the relevance of the MST participation in this process (Anhaia, 2010) -, the State and society dialogue for the regulation of the Guidelines.

The unity established between forces that struggles for Rural Education goes beyond social movements and trades union. The State begins to control the Rural Education policies based on the Guidelines. Contradictorily, the State begins to compose a unit with Social Movements and trade unions in favor of the legalization of the Rural Education policies. However, what we see is a convergence of fractions of distinct and antagonistic classes that becomes “regulated” by the State, in agreement with the strategies of the Capital. Anhaia (2010, p. 91) argues that “a political force that fits

with the materialization of Rural Education is, contradictorily, the need imposed by the capital to universalize basic education, expressed in the motto Education for all<sup>xxviii</sup>.

After enlargement of the participation of entities aiming at the regulation of the Rural Education policy, it opens to the direct intervention of the State by means of public hearings<sup>xxix</sup> with the purpose of elaborating the Basic Education Guidelines. Regarding public hearings, Anhaia highlights its importance in the relationship between civil society (entities of social and trade union movements) and the State:

The hearings were important instruments to promote the debate with civil society and with the State and to establish some basic concepts defended by both, emphasizing that, to a certain extent, the State accepts the propositions of civil society, especially when those who propose are subjects organized collectively, whether in social movements or trade unions (Anhaia, 2010, p. 91).

The State begins to control the propositions to be regulated, determining what is allowed or not to be transformed into law, obviously in order to guarantee the interests of the class that represents, after all, the State represents the interests of the dominant class (Marx & Engels, 2007).

Analyzing the I ENERA deployment, Oliveira e Dalmagro (2014, p. 107) consider that there is a process of generalization and specificity of Rural Education for moving the education of the struggle for Agrarian Reform, the main instrument of struggle of the MST, to the specificity of rural area.

It highlights the perspective that in rural area there is another way of life, culture and work, different from others spaces of social life. It is supposed that in this reformulation had occurred or reinforced education displacement in a context of struggle for Agrarian Reform to an education centered on “specific rural culture”, generically defined<sup>xxx</sup> (Oliveira & Dalmagro, 2014, p. 107).

The Rural Education policy implementation, related to the normative milestones, is given after the promulgation of the *Diretrizes Operacionais para a Educação Básica nas Escolas do Campo*, Resolution CNE/CBE No. 1, April 03, 2002, under the government of Fernando Henrique Cardoso – *Partido da Social Democracia Brasileira* (PSDB) – based on the Opinion No. 36, December 4, 2001. The Resolution CNE/CEB No. 2, April 28, 2008, under the government of Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva (2003-2010) – *Partidos dos Trabalhadores* (PT) – by means of Decree No. 7.352, November 4, 2010, reformulates, enlarges and regulates the

Rural Education Policy after Resolution CNE/CBE No. 1, April 03, 2002.

In other words, the political struggle of social movements, especially the MST, takes a new perspective in the Lula government. For the member of the education sector of the MST, “with the Lula government there was a possibility to advance significantly in the public policy of Rural Education<sup>xxxix</sup> (Interview D2). I.e., with the PT electoral victory in 2002 for the Republic Presidency, represented by Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, the MST begins to believe in the possibility of advances in the struggle for the Rural Education public policy.

In this sense, the MST claims an agenda with a vindication for “a department in the MEC<sup>xxxix</sup> to deal with the Rural Education policy. It was given a coordination of Rural Education within the Department of Continuing Education, Literacy and Diversity<sup>xxxix</sup> (Interview D2).

The first struggle attempts for a Rural Education policy in the PT government were frustrated e already indicate the government position in the face of the rural workers struggle. The member of the education sector of the MST stresses that the implementation the normalization of the Rural Education policy meant “a displacement from Rural Education, having as a mark the second

conference that no longer exists and that debate will now take place in institutionalized spaces, committees and forums, and became an academic debate<sup>xxxix</sup> (Interview D2).

From 2008, there is an incorporation of the struggle for Rural Education by the State. The incorporation of a specific/different education for rural area, guided by social movements, resulted in its “imprisonment in politics<sup>xxxix</sup> (Titton, 2010). This represents that the Rural Education policy is definitely under the dictates of the State, moving social movements away from a more significant interference in politics. According to the member of the education sector of the MST, in interview, the *Programa Nacional de Educação na Reforma Agrária* (PRONERA) (National Program for Education in Agrarian Reform), created in April 16, 1998, through Ordinance No. 10/98, in order to increase the formal schooling levels of settled rural workers<sup>xxxix</sup>, loses its proximity to social movements. She points out that “the PRONERA, a program that directly responded in its formulation and execution the link between university and social movements, now loses its feature of effective subjects participation in its elaboration<sup>xxxix</sup> (Interview D2).

Insofar as Rural Education was institutionalized, it was also incorporated



by the State. “It is to surrender to incorporate. And, today, not only concerning incorporation, but also the defeat we have undergone in the Rural Education policy”<sup>xxxviii</sup> (Interview D2). This “defeat” is more evident after the Programa Nacional de Educação do Campo (PRONACAMPO) (National Program of Rural Education) in 2010, under Decree No. 7.352/2010. After the Program,

all policies implemented in Rural Education undergone operations, either suppression or reconfiguration, and then the PRONACAMPO was postponed several times for it does not dialogue with the *Fórum Nacional de Educação do Campo* (FONEC) or with *Comissão Nacional de Educação do Campo* (CONEC) and there is no budget for it<sup>xxxix</sup> (Interview D2).

The PRONACAMPO construction represents a distance of the organized social movements from the possibility of intervention on the educational policy for rural area. Social participation forums such as FONEC and CONEC did not participate in the discussions surrounding the creation of the Program. The Rural Education policy is subject to State control while it is institutionalized away from the participation of society and social movements.

Analyzing the Operational Guidelines for Basic Education in the

Rural Schools, Santos (2011) points out that the perspective of Rural Education expressed in the document stresses the formalist idealism when separating rural area and city. The documents contradicts “when names idealistic vision the process of industrialization and urbanization of rural area by means of transnational corporations that control and define the production, including small producers”<sup>xl</sup> (SANTOS, 2011, p. 190). The author follows pointing out the absent of objective and current questions of rural area in the document:

Seasonal migrations turn farmers in wanders searching for temporary occupation; besides the questions related to slavery and child labor in rural area are not mentioned in the report, corroborating the abstract perspective of rural and rural education predominant in the propositions on this subject (Santos, 2011, p. 190).

For Santos, the phenomenal feature of the approach made in the opinion of the National Council of Education, excludes class struggle and the inherent problems to the objective and historical nature of the capital by reducing them to a question of life choices and diversities in rural area (Santos, 2011, p. 190). In this way, the opinion itself expresses the understanding it has about the rural area, when considering:

The heterogeneity of rural area, highlighting economic diversity due to the engagement of families in agricultural and non-agricultural activities (multiple activities), the presence of fecund social movements, multiculturalism, claims for basic education and the dynamics that are established in rural area based on the interaction with communication and literate culture<sup>xli</sup> (Brazil, 2012, p. 8).

There is a search for attending the differences and diversities intimacy related to the circumstantial need to enable a minimum of schooling to the entire Brazilian population. According to Santos (2011, p. 190), this document complements the Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação (LDB) (Law of Guidelines and Bases of Education) concerning the right for differentiated education and diversity.

The legislation about Rural Education and the theoretical formulations about the theme, regarding the main references used in approaches and researches that deal with this modality of education, affirm the centrality “of culture, daily, students interests, identity and difference. Work, class struggle, universality are denied or treated as secondary”<sup>xlii</sup> (Santos, 2011, p. 192).

Following the analysis of the Guidelines, Jesus, Rosa e Bezerra (2014) stress that the conceptions that guide public policies of Rural Education are based on postmodern because when walk

together to the epistemological and cultural relativism deny totality. For the author, the speech expressed in Rural Education that “suggests new methods, new sources e new problems – search analyzing and valuing the micro, the fragmentary, the daily, the singular, the imaginary”<sup>xliii</sup> (Jesus, Rosa & Bezerra, 2014, p. 207).

In this sense, the struggle for education right, by means of the specificity of Rural Education, becomes its opposite, whereas, in the field of appearance, the implementation of the Rural Education policy represents an achievement within the law, as instrument that allows access to education, it is a strategy for the “unequal” be replaced by “the specific” or “the different”.

For Jesus, Rosa, Bezerra (2014), the strategy expressed in the Rural Education policy aims the fragmentation of the working class by means of “the different”, “the specific”. This fragmentation of education for workers in specific modalities entails serious risks for its organizations as class. Besides, the specific education is also a way of restricting access to systematized knowledge historically constructed by humanity. The authors also warn against the fragmentation of the working class when disregarding the peasant student as part of the working class.

It is also emphasized that the peasant student is understood as different, or bearer of specificities, by the fact of residing in rural area; it is disregarded that this student belongs to the working class (we are referring here to all workers, that is, all those who are forced to sell their labor force and not only the rural workers) that has been deprived of the cultural and scientific patrimony historically elaborated by humanity<sup>xliv</sup> (Jesus, Rosa & Bezerra, 2014, p. 208).

In this sense, Jesus, Rosa e Bezerra (2014, p. 2010) argue that the Rural Education conception, expressed in the legal documents that guide public policies, is to fulfill the claims of the Capital, to the detriment of the work claims, bearing in mind it defends a specific education for students of rural area.

Based on the Rural Education policy, the authors stress the need for understanding the contemporary rural school and its education project by means of the understanding of the productive processes of the capitalist system. That is due to the intrinsic relationship between the educative processes and the productive processes. Also, it refers to the organization of materiality and objectification of work; to the class struggle and to the dispute of historical projects between the working class and the bourgeoisie (Jesus, Rosa & Bezerra, 2014, p. 210).

In these terms, they affirm the need for “a counter-hegemonic conception of

society, education, human being, child, student”<sup>xlv</sup>. And this conception is expressed in the writings of Marx and Engels, in the vast production of Russian pedagogues (Makarenko, Pistrak, Krupskaja, etc.) and contemporary Marxist authors (Jesus, Rosa & Bezerra, 2014, p. 210).

According to D'Agostini (2009, p. 23), Rural Education assumes a State perspective that, guided by international organizations, synthetically aims “education as security and alleviation of poverty”.

In the State perspective, rural education is one of the tactics to reach established goals that emphasize Basic Education for the majority of the population. It favors the development of skills or competences based on learning to calculate, read and write, minimally enabling individuals to be “included” in the productive organization in time and in the way necessary for the survival of the capitalist system. Most of the State documents on Rural Education identify its orientation in a set of focal and fragmentary State policies in its neoliberal phase, whose basic function is easily identifiable with the recommendations of the international organizations: education as security and alleviation of poverty<sup>xlvi</sup> (D'Agostini, 2009, p. 23).

Based on this analysis, we can see that the Rural Education policy is a tactic of the Capital to include workers in the

productive organization, guaranteeing the “survival of the capitalist system”.

Dealing with the formulation of the Rural Education conception, D'Agostini (2012) affirms the categorizations that support it – such as culture, identity and differences – are, in a certain way, denying or treating as secondary the category of work as founding of the social being.

Analyzing the propositions for Rural Education by entrepreneurs, State and MST, D'Agostini e Vendramini (2014, p. 318) point out that there is a predominance of the entrepreneurship and State perspectives for a technical, fragile and fragmented education, forming a worker with precarious formation. According to the authors, Rural Education “is embedded and imprisoned in politics through the formation of consensus”<sup>xlvii</sup> (D'Agostini & Vendramini, 2014, p. 318). They defend an education that is both universal and classical, but also critical and differentiated in relation to capitalist education.

For D'Agostini (2012, p. 464), although Rural Education aims to be an education for the purpose of human emancipation, when developed in the capitalist society, it incorporates the general contradictions between work and the capital. These contradictions are expressed both in the materialization of public policies that are in agreement with the guidelines of the Multilateral

Organizations, and in the pedagogical work, mainly through the split between theory and practice.

Vendramini (2010, p. 134) points out to a denial of the class perspective in Rural Education and an affirmation of culture, identity and difference, what reveals a reality in itself to the detriment of a connection between the general, the specific and the particular, resulting in a denial of the work. In this way, the author concludes defending the necessity of historical-dialectical materialism as a reference for analysis and intervention (Vendramini, 2010, p. 134).

As we can see in Titton (2010, p. 167), Rural Education was a MST strategy to advance in the achievement of public policies. Nevertheless, this process braked the theoretical-pedagogical debate for a class education.

For the author, one of the central limits imposed on rural education is its imprisonment in politics, especially through State and government (Titton, 2010, p. 208). He concludes:

The possibilities of essence to articulate the educational project of the rural people to a strategy of overcoming of the capital, and for Rural Education contributes for that, are in breaking with the illusions that the overcoming of the problems can occur via conciliation within bourgeois society<sup>xlviii</sup> (Titton, 2010, p. 211).

The authors mentioned throughout this paper converge in their analysis when showing that Rural Education policy is based on categories and conceptions such as difference and diversity, culture, identity, postmodernity, epistemological and cultural relativism. For the authors, the centrality of politics emphasizes the micro, the fragmentary, the daily, the singular, the imaginary, the specific and the different, technical, fragile and fragmented education, security and alleviation of poverty, inclusion policy in the productive organization of the capital. Thus, Rural Education denies universality and class struggle (Santos, 2011); totality; unity of the working class (Jesus, Rosa & Bezerra, 2014); the category of work (D'Agostini, 2009, 2012); the class perspective, totality, and work (Vendramini, 2010); class education (Titton, 2010).

Also, according to the analyzed authors, Rural Education policy assumes a State perspective guided by international organizations (D'Agostini, 2009, 2012); of the entrepreneurship and of the State (D'Agostini; Vendramini, 2014); of the State Policy and government (Titton, 2010).

In the propositions field, Jesus, Rosa e Bezerra (2014) consider a counter-hegemonic conception of society, education, human being, child, and student by means of a class education; Vendramini (2010) and D'Agostini (2009) point out the

necessity of historical-dialectical materialism as a reference for analysis and intervention; and Titton (2010) proposes breaking with the illusions that the overcoming of the problems can occur via conciliation within bourgeois society.

In this way, Rural Education is more to attend the goals of the capital and the State than to attend the claims of the working class. If we consider only the point of view of the access to education, we can affirm that there were important advances for the working class in its struggle for Rural Education. However, when we consider the conception and the feature of education based on Rural Education, it has fulfilled the claim for "qualification or training of workers" as well as "the ideological needs and of workers formation in the field of bourgeois sociability" (Oliveira & Dalmagro, 2014, p. 113).

The context we demonstrated in our research allows us to point out the contradictions in the MST education trajectory based on the class struggle and the representatives of the capital, highlighting the Multilateral Organizations UNICEF and UNESCO and the State, on the other hand, the social movements, mainly the MST.

## Conclusions

We show that the MST education trajectory, until the mid-1990s, is a tactical formulation inserted in the MST struggle, mainly for its class perspective. Although it did not arise with this perspective, the linkage of the MST education proposal with the struggle for Agrarian Reform and the strategy of social transformation elevated MST education to a class perspective, which class struggle is the guiding principle of the proposal of education.

In the face of the offensive of the Brazilian State, by means of FHC government, which resulted in the closure of schools in settlements of the Agrarian Reform, the MST sought to strengthen its struggle through partnerships as an alternative to guarantee the achievements and to advance in this field. The First ENERA enabled an approximation of the policies and international guidelines of the Multilateral Organizations with the education in the MST. The representative of UNICEF proposed an extension of the MST experience for the construction of a proposal of education for all people of rural area. This proposal is assumed by social movements representing a consensus among the forces and resulting in the enlargement of access to education. We observed in the document “*Por uma Educação do Campo*” that besides the enlargement of access to education, there

was an internalization of general policy and international guidelines for education and emptying of the class perspective present in the MST education proposal.

We understand that, besides the unfavorable conjuncture, another decisive element that allowed the emptying of the class perspective of the MST education proposal by means of the relationship with the Multilateral Organizations and the State was the theoretical fragility present in the MST education proposal due to the theoretical eclecticism and a lack of deepening in Historical and Dialectical Materialism as the basis of theoretical support for its pedagogical proposal.

The focus on the struggle for Rural Education after 1997, in the sense of enlargement of the struggle for public policies through partnerships with class representatives of the capital (UNICEF, UNESCO), postulates a specific education for rural area, adding the strategies of the Multilateral Organizations. The struggle for Rural Education led to the normalization of policies that were imprisoned in politics (Titton, 2010), controlled by the bourgeois State. In these terms, the class perspective expressed in the MST education proposal is reduced to Rural Education. In the same way, we verify that based on the standardization of the Rural Education policy, which is now controlled by the State, reinforcing the

perspectives of diversity, on the Capital/State and entrepreneurship.

In the last years, Rural Education has been the main strategy of the MST in the struggle for public education. The focus on the struggle for education in the sense of public policy, influenced by State offensive – namely the closure of schools – , as we had seen above, resulted in a repositioning of the class perspective of MST education. Whether, on the one hand, “MST struggle against the closure of more than 38,000 schools in the last decade is necessarily a working class struggle”<sup>xlix</sup> (Leher, 2014, p. 88), on the other hand, “limiting the right to the struggle for education access just in the context of rights, the efforts of the MST are closed in the limits of rights and not in the emancipation”<sup>1</sup> (Araujo, 2007, p. 316).

We argue that the workers perspective in social movements that aims a class education is reduced in the face of the consensus between the distinct class fractions that composed the First ENERA. Thus, Rural Education represents an important struggle to guarantee basic rights for workers in rural area in times of fiscal adjustment. We notice that by means of a range of achievements in the educational field: schools achievements, enlargement of the access to education in all levels. However, its limit, for those who aim a class education as a tactical formulation for

the class struggle, is precisely in the possible reform within the order of the bourgeois State.

Our research points out that Rural Education is constructed based on a consensus and repositioning of class. The first elements of the consensus appear after the Itaú/Unicef prize, in 1995, as a public recognition of the existence of a different education, precisely recognized in the MST. The consensus formulation becomes public following the implementation of the First ENERA with funding from UNESCO and UNICEF. Although it is justified that the participation of these organizations has been limited to the opening and closing of the First ENERA, we have shown in this research that the participation of UNESCO and UNICEF went beyond the lines and the financial resource, because it resulted in an articulation which the financing, public recognition of MST education and the strategic prepositions from the UNICEF representative and assumed by the social movements should be considered.

The politic struggle of the social movements within the State, in the terms of the regulation of the Rural Education policy, as well as the conceptions that base it, represent a defeat for the fractions of the working class that propose to construct an education for the working class with class perspective.

One of the challenges is precisely in overcoming the limit of politics within bourgeois rights. In this educational context, one of the necessary measures for the resumption and strengthening of a class education is to break with the consensus on Rural Education established in the 1990s. We agree with D'Agostini and Vendramini (2014) about the need for mobilization concerning an education for the working class, which is both universal and classical, but also critical and differentiated in relation to capitalist education.

We live a moment in the history of the class struggle where there is a hegemony of the capital over the work. This reflects the limits of pointing out the future prospects for the working class. In education, this is not different. Currently we see in *Todos pela Educação*, a class articulation, of the ruling class, which sees in education “a great business”.

The present of the MST education is characterized by the confrontation of the class struggle between the capital and the work. Education in the MST is an expression of the capital offensive under the work, mainly after the 1990s and the consensus between distinct fractions of class in the construction of Rural Education.

Although MST stands as a fraction of the working class in the struggle against the capital, the forces in the context of the

class struggle have tended to weaken their education proposal and to reposition class education for education in the struggle for right within the logic of the bourgeois State.

To point out prospects to the future in the current political and circumstantial context is not an easy task when defending a working class education, especially if we consider the ebb of class struggle and the offensive of the capital over work that have led to the fragmentation of the working class, tending to corporatist struggles as a focus. In dealing with future prospects, we emphasize the immediate and historical need to overcome class society. Thus, we stand for the defense of a class education that contributes to the transformation of social relations and to human emancipation.

We point out to the need for a working class education that is given with limits and contractions in this moment, but that we recognize the importance of defending it and constructing experiences to accumulate forces. In this sense, we highlight the importance of the experiences carried out by the MST in the ITERRA (*Instituto de Educação Josué de Castro*) and by means of Travelling Schools that, although its limits in this society, are meaningful and possible experiences for a scholar reorganization based on workers perspective. It is also necessary the



overcoming of the false dualism between rural area and city present in the formulation of Rural Education, which limits the understanding of the unity of workers as a class, allowing fragmentation and making unity difficult.

## References

Anhaia, E. M. (2010). *Constituição do Movimento de Educação do Campo na luta por políticas de educação*. (Dissertação de Mestrado). Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, 2010.

ARAÚJO, M. N. R. (2007). *As contradições e as possibilidades de construção de uma educação emancipatória no contexto do MST*. (Tese de Doutorado). Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador. Recuperado de: <http://www.reformaagrariaemdados.org.br/sites/default/files/TESE - MARIA NALVA>

Brasil. (2012). Secretaria de Educação Continuada, Alfabetização, Diversidade e Inclusão. *Educação do campo: marcos normativos*. Brasília, DF: SECADI.

Caldart, R. S. (2012). Educação do Campo. In Caldart, R. S. et al. (Orgs.). *Dicionário da Educação do Campo* (pp. 257-264). Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo: Escola Politécnica de Saúde Joaquim Venâncio, Expressão Popular.

D'Agostini, A. (2012). A educação do campo na educação brasileira: contradições e perspectivas. *Revista de Educação*, 37(3), 453-468. Recuperado de: <https://periodicos.ufsm.br/index.php/reveducacao/article/view/4172/3971>.

D'Agostini, A. (2009). *A educação do MST no contexto educacional brasileiro*.

(Tese de Doutorado). Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador.

D'Agostini, A. & Vendramini, C. R. (2014). Educação do campo ou educação da classe trabalhadora? A perspectiva do empresariado, do Estado e dos Movimentos Sociais organizados. *Reflexão e Ação*, 22(2), 299-322. Recuperado de: <https://online.unisc.br/seer/index.php/reflex/article/view/5194/3694>.

Dalmagro, S. L. (2010) *A Escola no contexto das lutas do MST*. (Tese de Doutorado). Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis.

Gramsci, A. (2007). *Cadernos do Cárcere: Volume 3 - Maquiavel. Notas sobre o Estado e a política*. 3. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.

Jesus, A. C., Rosa, J. M., & Bezerra, M. C. S. (2014). Educação do Campo e Política Educacional em Debate: apontamentos sobre a formação da classe trabalhadora rural na atualidade. *Revista HISTEDBR On-line*, 60, 200-214. Recuperado de: <https://www.fe.unicamp.br/revistas/ged/histedbr/article/viewFile/5723/5913>

Kolling, E. J., Nery, I. I. J., & Molina, M. C. (Orgs.). (1999). *Por uma Educação do Campo: memória*. Brasília: Universidade de Brasília.

Kolling, E. J. (2005). *O MST e a construção de Políticas Públicas de Educação do Campo*. 2005. (Monografia de Especialização). Universidade de Brasília, Brasília. [Mimeografado].

Kominkiewicz, V. L., & Dantas, J. S. (2013). Escola Nossa Senhora Aparecida: um movimento histórico de luta por escola. *Revista PerCursos*, 14(26), 187 - 213. Recuperado de: <http://www.periodicos.udesc.br/index.php/percursos/article/viewFile/1984724614262013187/2570>.

Leher, R. (2015). *Grandes grupos econômicos estão ditando a formação de crianças e jovens brasileiros*. Entrevista concedida para Luiz Felipe Abulquerque. Recuperado de: <http://www.brasildefato.com.br/node/32359>.

Leher, R. (2014). *Organização, estratégia política e o plano nacional de educação*. Recuperado de: <http://marxismo21.org/wpcontent/uploads/2014/08/R-Leher-Estratégia-Política-e-Plano-NacionalEducação.pdf>.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2007). *A ideologia alemã: crítica da mais recente filosofia alemã em seus representantes Feuerbach, B. Bauer, Stirner, e do socialismo alemão em seus diferentes profetas, 1845-1846*. São Paulo: Boitempo.

Minayo, M. C. S. (Org.). (2004). *Pesquisa Social: Teoria, Método e Criatividade*. 23a edição. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.

Molina, M. C. (2003). *A contribuição do PRONERA na construção de políticas públicas de educação do campo e desenvolvimento sustentável*. Tese. (Tese de Doutorado). Universidade de Brasília, Brasília.

MST. (1999). Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra. *Princípios da Educação no MST*. São Paulo: MST. (Caderno de Educação nº 08).

MST. (2005). Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra. *Dossiê MST Escola: documentos e estudos 1990-2001*. São Paulo: Expressão Popular. (Caderno de Educação nº 13).

MST. (1997). Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra. *Manifesto das educadoras e dos educadores da reforma agrária ao povo brasileiro*. Recuperado de:

[http://www.btdt.ndc.uff.br/tde\\_busca/arquivo.php?codArquivo=35](http://www.btdt.ndc.uff.br/tde_busca/arquivo.php?codArquivo=35).

Oliveira, M. A., & Dalmagro, S. L. (2014). A questão Agrária, a Educação do Campo e os projetos em disputa. *Reflexão e Ação*, 22(2), 94-119, Recuperado de: <http://online.unisc.br/seer/index.php/reflex/article/view/5193/3684>.

Paludo, C. (2007). Da raiz herança da educação popular à pedagogia do movimento e a educação do e no campo: um olhar para a trajetória de educação do MST. In Seminário Nacional de Pesquisa em Educação, 30. Caxambu/MG. *Anais...* Caxambu: Anped. Recuperado de: [file:///C:/Users/Home/Downloads/PALUDO+Edu+Popular%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/Home/Downloads/PALUDO+Edu+Popular%20(1).pdf).

Ribeiro, L. N., & Sobreiro Filho, J. (2012). Formação da Via Campesina no mundo e atualidade das ações no Brasil (2000-2011). In Encontro Nacional de Geografia Agrária, 21, Uberlândia MG. *Anais*. Uberlândia MG: UFU. Recuperado de: <http://www.reformaagrariaemdados.org.br/sites/>.

Santos, C. E. F. (2011). *Relativismo e Escolanovismo na formação do educador: uma análise Histórico-Crítica da Licenciatura em Educação do Campo*. (Tese de Doutorado). Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador. Recuperado de: [www.gepec.ufscar.br/.../relativismo-e-escolanovismona-formacao-do-educ](http://www.gepec.ufscar.br/.../relativismo-e-escolanovismona-formacao-do-educ).

Souza, R. L. (2013). Educação do campo: Análise das reivindicações dos trabalhadores do Campo e das propostas dos Governos de Luiz Inácio da Silva e Dilma Rousseff. *Revista Tamoios*, 9(2), 5-28. Recuperado de: <http://www.epublicacoes.uerj.br/index.php/tamoios/issue/archive>.

Titton, M. (2010). *Os Limites da Política no embate de projetos da educação do campo*. 2010. (Tese de Doutorado).

Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis. Recuperado de: <https://repositorio.ufsc.br/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/93937/279656.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>.

UNESCO. (2010). *Organização das Nações Unidas para a Educação, a Ciência e a Cultura. Educação um Tesouro a Descobrir*. Brasília: UNESCO. (Relatório para a UNESCO da Comissão Internacional sobre Educação para o século XXI). Recuperado de: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0010/001095/109590por.pdf>.

Vendramini, C. R. (2010). Educação do Campo na perspectiva do Materialismo Histórico-Dialético. In Molina, M. C. et al. (Orgs.). *Educação do Campo e Pesquisa II: questões para reflexão* (pp.127-135). Brasília: MDA/MEC. Recuperado de: [http://www.mda.gov.br/sitemda/sites/sitemda/files/user\\_arquivos\\_64/EUCA%20C3%87%C3%83O%20DO%20CAMPO%20e%20pesquisa%20II.pdf](http://www.mda.gov.br/sitemda/sites/sitemda/files/user_arquivos_64/EUCA%20C3%87%C3%83O%20DO%20CAMPO%20e%20pesquisa%20II.pdf).

---

<sup>i</sup> Program Scholarship UNIEDU Pós-Graduação.

<sup>ii</sup> Brazil's Landless Workers Movement - Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra (MST) in Portuguese.

<sup>iii</sup> All translated quotes (from Portuguese to English) are our translation. [em 1981, iniciam-se, também, as primeiras experiências isoladas em alfabetização de jovens e adultos].

<sup>iv</sup> [das lideranças e de agentes de mediação, principalmente vinculados à Teologia da Libertação e ao sindicalismo combativo].

<sup>v</sup> People settled in the lands that were supposedly owned by landowners or, according to the Brazilian law, does not comply with its social function.

<sup>vi</sup> [do trabalhador, da classe trabalhadora].

<sup>vii</sup> [precisa ajudar para que o assentamento dê certo].

<sup>viii</sup> [amor pelo trabalho e pelo trabalho no meio rural].

---

ix [sociedade sem explorados nem exploradores].

x [O resgate da questão escolar no MST até aqui já nos permite identificar que estão postas as bases para uma inversão na perspectiva de escola nos aspectos políticos e pedagógicos. No primeiro, porque a escola deixa de formar para a cidadania burguesa, pelo contrário, visa à formação da consciência para mudar o mundo. Se ela continua formando para o trabalho, este já não se pretende mais submetido ao mercado capitalista, mas buscando outras relações sociais. Pedagogicamente, a socialização do conhecimento não é mais tomada como neutra e estanque. Também aparece como desafio a construção de novos conhecimentos adequados a um novo modelo de desenvolvimento. Na forma de organização da escola também se propõem alterações. Enfim, com maior ou menor ênfase, os pilares fundamentais da escola burguesa estão sendo repensados].

xi The Education Book (Caderno de Educação) No. 8: principles of education in MST, is a result of a new edition of the Education Bulletin (Boletim da Educação) No. 1, "How should be a settlement school" (Como deve ser uma escola de assentamento), written in August 1992 (MST, 1999, p. 03).

xii [Amplia-se também porque a escola passa a ser vista com base num conjunto de práticas educativas que ocorrem fora dela, inclusive as ações educativas produzidas pela luta do MST].

xiii [O MST e sua educação têm como eixo orientador de suas ações a luta de classes no campo e a convicção de construção de uma nova sociedade e, conseqüentemente, de uma nova educação pautada nos fundamentos/valores socialistas e humanistas como: o coletivismo, o trabalho coletivo, o trabalho socialmente útil, o trabalho como princípio educativo, a solidariedade, a organização e a auto-organização dos estudantes, a relação teoria e prática, entre outros].

xiv [Educação para a transformação social. Este é o horizonte que define o caráter da educação no MST].

xv [Trata, isto sim, de afirmar uma educação vinculada a uma classe que objetiva um horizonte de transformação social; uma educação que abra um leque universal para o conhecimento].

xvi [a secundarização da teoria e a fragilidade teórica da proposta de educação do MST permitem desvios da prática política e educativa].

xvii The First National Meeting of the Agrarian Reform Educators, as the name points out, brought together educator of the Agrarian Reform from all Brazil. It was promoted by the MST together with so-called partner entities: Universidade de Brasília (UNB), UNICEF, UNESCO e CNBB (Kolling, Nery & Molina, 1999, p. 13).

xviii [apontando que há uma cultura, um modo de vida camponês que deve ser respeitado e em certa medida retomado como forma de assegurar a sobrevivência da população campesina].

xix [O entusiasmo com o êxito do I Enea levou a representante do Unicef, Ana Catarina Braga, a desafiar as entidades promotoras e as que apoiaram o evento para um trabalho mais amplo sobre a educação a partir do mundo rural, levando-se em conta o contexto do campo em termos de sua cultura específica quanto à maneira de ver e de se relacionar com o tempo, o espaço, o meio ambiente e quanto ao modo de viver, de organizar família e trabalho].

xx It is a kind of artistic activity that aims to raise awareness to the moment.

xxi [tínhamos ideias diferentes entre pessoas que estavam lá, posicionamentos inclusive políticos diferentes, mas, por exemplo, conseguiu-se em momentos da mística uma identificação].

xxii [Poder-se-ia argumentar se tratar de alianças pontuais para a construção de um movimento mais amplo, que abrangesse vários “atores” haja vista que as condições políticas da época para a formulação de uma educação do campo com a exclusiva presença dos movimentos de lutas sociais seria impossível. Contudo, este argumento não se justifica, pois, no plano das formulações pedagógicas e políticas, as bases que fundamentam a Educação do Campo e as interpretações da realidade da maioria das entidades organizativas da luta dos trabalhadores no campo estão em consonância com as formulações escolanovistas atualizadas no lema “aprender a aprender” defendido e divulgado por instituições como a UNESCO].

xxiii [vai se deparar no ENERA com um contexto em que o governo de FHC estava fechando escolas].

xxiv Era muito mais juntar parceiros neste momento do que você produzir uma proposta teórica e revolucionária. Na verdade o MST naquele momento histórico recua um pouco mais a sua proposta teórica para poder se juntar a seus parceiros. Os seus parceiros eram até mais atrasados politicamente, se é que podemos colocar

assim, do que o próprio MST. O problema foi atrasar, recuar alguns passos atrás, e depois você não puxar os parceiros para frente, para o campo mais combativo. O problema me parece ficar nesse campo da constituição hegemônica mais reformista do que você avançar em um campo mais ofensivo, mais revolucionário.

xxv [Desde o começo, chegou-se a um consenso sobre o específico da “educação básica do campo”, ou seja, que leve em conta a cultura, as características, as necessidades e os sonhos dos que vivem no campo e do campo. Outro consenso entre os promotores referiu-se à vinculação da educação básica do campo com um projeto popular de Brasil e com um projeto popular de desenvolvimento do campo].

xxvi [afirmando a importância do aprender a aprender, o que significa aprender a transformar informações em conhecimentos ou em posturas diante de determinadas situações da vida].

xxvii [passam a orientar a produção teórica e a elaboração político-pedagógica].

xxviii [uma força política que coaduna com a materialização da Educação do Campo é, contraditoriamente, a necessidade imposta pelo capital de universalizar a educação básica, expressa no lema Educação para todos].

xxix Public hearings were adopted by the CNE/CEB to elaboration of the all Basic Education Guidelines (Anhaia, 2010, p. 91).

xxx [Enfatiza-se a perspectiva de que há no campo outro modo de vida, de cultura e trabalho, diferente de outros espaços da vida social. É de supor-se que nesta reformulação tenha ocorrido ou reforçado um deslocamento da educação num contexto de luta por Reforma Agrária para uma educação centrada na “cultura específica do campo”, definida de modo genérico].

xxxi [com o governo Lula havia uma possibilidade de se avançar significativamente na política pública de Educação do Campo].

xxxii Ministry of Education.

xxxiii [a criação de uma secretaria no MEC que lidasse com a política de Educação do Campo. O que foi ofertado ... era uma coordenadoria de Educação do Campo dentro da Secretaria de Educação Continuada, Alfabetização e Diversidade].

xxxiv [um deslocamento de lugar da Educação do Campo, tendo como marco a segunda conferência



que não passa mais a existir e esse debate vai se dar agora em espaços institucionalizados, nos comitês e nos fóruns, e virou um debate acadêmico].

xxxv [aprisionamento na política].

xxxvi INCRA. Educação no Campo: Pronera. 2015. Available in <<http://www.incra.gov.br/proneraeducacao>>.

xxxvii [o PRONERA, um programa que respondia diretamente na sua formulação e na sua execução a relação direta entre universidades e movimentos sociais, agora perde este caráter da participação efetiva dos sujeitos na sua elaboração].

xxxviii [é um ceder para incorporar e, hoje, não só do ponto de vista da incorporação, mas da derrota que a gente vem sofrendo na política de Educação do Campo].

xxxix [todas as políticas que estavam sendo executadas na Educação do Campo vão sofrer operações, ou de supressões ou de reconfiguração e aí foi adiado várias vezes o lançamento do PRONACAMPO visto que ele não era dialogado com o Fórum Nacional de Educação do Campo (FONEC) e nem com a Comissão Nacional de Educação do Campo (CONEC) e não saía no orçamento].

xl [ao chamar de visão idealista o processo de industrialização e urbanização do meio rural por meio das empresas transnacionais que controlam e definem a produção, inclusive dos pequenos produtores].

xli [O campo como espaço heterogêneo, destacando a diversidade econômica, em função do engajamento das famílias em atividades agrícolas e não-agrícolas (pluriatividade), a presença de fecundos movimentos sociais, a multiculturalidade, as demandas por educação básica e a dinâmica que se estabelece no campo a partir da convivência com os meios de comunicação e a cultura letrada].

xlii [da cultura, do cotidiano, dos interesses dos alunos, da identidade e diferença. Trabalho, luta de classes, universalidade são negados ou secundarizados].

xliii [sugere novos métodos, novas fontes e novos problemas – busca analisar e valorizar o micro, o fragmentário, o cotidiano, o singular, o imaginário].

xliv [Sublinha-se também que este é entendido como diferente, ou portador de especificidades, pelo fato de residir no meio rural; desconsidera-se o fato deste aluno pertencer à classe trabalhadora (aqui nos referimos a todos os trabalhadores, isto é,

todos aqueles que são obrigados a vender sua força de trabalho e não apenas os trabalhadores rurais) que tem sido privada do patrimônio cultural e científico historicamente elaborado pela humanidade].

xlv [uma concepção contra-hegemônica de sociedade, educação, homem, criança, aluno].

xlvi [Na perspectiva do Estado, a educação do campo é mais uma das táticas para atingir as metas estabelecidas que atribuem ênfase à Educação Básica destinada à maioria da população e que privilegia o desenvolvimento de aptidões ou competências assentadas no aprendizado do cálculo, da leitura e da escrita, instrumentalizando minimamente os indivíduos para que sejam “incluídos” na organização produtiva no tempo e do modo necessário para a sobrevivência do sistema capitalista. Na maioria dos documentos do Estado acerca da educação do campo identifica-se sua orientação no conjunto das políticas focais e fragmentárias próprias do Estado em sua fase neoliberal, cuja função básica é facilmente identificável com as recomendações dos organismos internacionais: educação como segurança e alívio da pobreza].

xlvii [é incorporada e aprisionada na política por meio da formação do consenso].

xlviii [As possibilidades de essência para articular o projeto educacional dos povos do campo a uma estratégia de superação do capital, e para que a Educação do Campo contribua com isso, está em romper com as ilusões de que a superação dos problemas pode ocorrer via conciliação no interior da sociedade burguesa].

xlix [a luta do MST contra o fechamento de mais de 38 mil escolas na última década é necessariamente uma luta da classe trabalhadora].

l [limitar o direito à luta pelo acesso à educação escolar no âmbito apenas dos direitos, os esforços do MST se encerram nos limites do direito e não na emancipação]

#### Article Information

Received on May 23th, 2018

Accepted on July 11th, 2018

Published on August 30th, 2018

**Author Contributions:** The authors were responsible for the designing, delineating, analyzing and interpreting the data, production of the manuscript, critical revision of the content and approval of the final version to be published.

**Conflitos de interesse:** Os autores declararam não haver nenhum conflito de interesse referente a este artigo.

**Conflict of Interest:** None reported.

**Translation:** Naylane Araújo Matos

#### Orcid

Vagner Luiz Kominkiewicz

 <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5818-7184>

Adriana D'Agostini

 <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1347-4198>

#### How to cite this article

APA

Kominkiewicz, V. L., & D'Agostini, A. (2018). Education in the MST before the State and public policy of Rural Education under the influence of multilateral organizations. *Rev. Bras. Educ. Camp.*, 3(2), 705-734. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.20873/ufc.2525-4863.2018v3n2p705>

ABNT

KOMINKIÉWICZ, V. L.; D'AGOSTINI, A. Education in the MST before the State and public policy of Rural Education under the influence of multilateral organizations. **Rev. Bras. Educ. Camp.**, Tocantinópolis, v. 3, n. 2, may/aug., p. 705-734, 2018. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.20873/ufc.2525-4863.2018v3n2p705>