



Brazilian cultures and pedagogical practices for rural education

Brazilian cultures and practical practices for rural education

Elizarégia Reis de Castro

Submitted on: 03/05/2023

Approved on: 03/06/2023

Published on: 03/20/2023 DOI

10.51473/ed.al.v3i1.498

SUMMARY

This Buscando study sought to investigate the process of closing rural schools, as well as identify the resistance strategies adopted by movements and organized social groups. As well as, analyzing education policies for rural people, taking as a reference the field and education projects in dispute; Understand the role of the State in realizing the right to education; Discuss the closure of rural schools, locating in which regions and municipalities this policy has gained more strength in recent years; Investigate how social movements and rural organizations position themselves in the face of the closure of rural schools. The methodology of this research involves a qualitative and quantitative approach. It was concluded that The Rural education has its bases in social movements, whose achievements, especially in relation to legislation, are the result of the permanent struggle of organized social movements, which collectively seek to overcome the inequalities imposed on peasants throughout Brazilian history.

Keywords: culture, pedagogy, rural education.

ABSTRACT

This study sought to investigate the process of closing schools in the countryside, as well as to identify the resistance strategies adopted by movements and organized social groups. As well as analyzing education policies for rural people, with reference to the field and education projects in dispute; Understand the role of the State in realizing the right to education; Discuss about the closure of rural schools, locating in which regions and municipalities this policy has gained more strength in recent years; Investigate how social movements and rural organizations are positioned in the face of the closure of rural schools. The methodology of this research involves a qualitative and quantitative approach. It was concluded that rural education has its bases in social movements, that the achievements, especially in relation to legislation, are the result of the permanent struggle of organized social movements, which collectively seek to overcome the inequalities imposed on peasants throughout Brazilian history.

Keywords: culture, pedagogy, rural education

1. INTRODUCTION

In the Brazilian field there is a dispute over projects. The capitalist mode of production, which is hegemonic in the current context, through its rural development model, based on business agriculture that aims to meet the production interests of capital, expropriates rural people from their territories, devastates the natural resources and annihilates human beings in order to maintain the supremacy of the latifundium. As a form of opposition and resistance, rural people¹, organized in Social Movements, have opposed this model from a project that conceives the countryside as a living space, from the conception of peasant agriculture, seeking to implement agroecological practices.

Among the strategies of struggle, the Rural Social Movements construct Rural Education as part of the political and social project under construction of the organized working class, understanding that the struggle for the land is linked to education and other essential rights that make the countryside a territory of human formation. Therefore, Rural Education combines the fight for education, for land, for Agrarian Reform, for the right to work, culture, food sovereignty, and territory. "In the logic of its subjects and their relationships, a Rural Education policy will never be only about education in itself nor about school education, although it is organized around it" (CALDART, 2012, p. 263-264).

Rural education emerges from the experience of struggle and organization of rural workers through

¹By people of the Brazilian countryside we mean: small farmers, quilombolas, indigenous people, fishermen, peasants, settled and resettled people, riverside dwellers, forest people, caipiras, farmers, roceiros, landless people, aggregates, caboclos, sharecroppers, boia-frias (CALDART, 2004).



Social Movements that denounce exploitation and oppression. Forged in the struggle of peasants, Rural Education was born with the perspective of rupture with the current hegemonic model of agriculture, marked by the concentration of land, business agriculture and exploitation of workers.

As it is the result of the contradictions caused by the social division generated by the capitalist system, rural Education is constituted within the class struggle, intrinsically linked to a society project under construction by the Rural Social Movements in conjunction with workers' organizations. The foundations of Rural Education are in the "[...] (class) clash between field projects and between agricultural logics that have implications for the project of the country and society and the conceptions of public policy, education and human formation." (CALDART, 2012, p. 259).

Therefore, it is identified that there is an incompatibility of origin between capitalist agriculture and Rural Education, because the first survives on the exclusion and death of peasants, who are the main subjects of the second (CALDART, 2005). The class character assumed by Rural Education managed by Rural Social Movements differ from rural education, which is based on a colonizing vision.

Its pedagogical bases for the training of rural subjects are structured based on the needs of the agricultural and livestock production chain of agribusiness which, historically, has been linked to the State's educational initiatives. In this logic, according to Fernandes (2006), the countryside is understood only as a space for agricultural production. Only economic production and technical aspects of agricultural work are considered. To the author:

The countryside can be thought of as a territory or as a sector of the economy. The territorial meaning is broader than the sectoral meaning that understands the field simply as a space for the production of goods. Thinking of the countryside as a territory means understanding it as a living space, or as a type of geographic space where all dimensions of human existence take place. The concept of the countryside as a space of life is multidimensional and allows us to have broader readings and policies than the concept of the countryside or rural areas only as a space for the production of goods. The economy is not a totality, it is a dimension of the territory. When the production of goods is analyzed as a totality, outside of territorial multidimensionality, it constitutes an extremely partial and, at times, mistaken analysis of reality (FERNANDES 2006, p. 29).

This conception of rural education, which considers the countryside merely as a territory of economic production, does not consider the historical-social space and its social and political relations. Furthermore, it values agricultural work and technical instruments for training labor for all sectors of agricultural business. The educational proposal is worked on from urban industrial references, which impose on the education of rural people the conception of education developed in urban space. This perspective, which considers the countryside as a symbol of capital accumulation, strengthens exclusions and inequalities in rural areas. In this project, where Brazilian agribusiness is seen as one of the most representative in the world, especially with regard to export dynamics, the peasant population is seen as something extinct.

The rural education paradigm understands that the countryside is not just a place for agricultural and agro-industrial production, large estates and land grabbing. The Brazilian countryside brings heterogeneity in the way life is organized and produced. It is the territory of the peasants, the people from Faxinal, the campers and settlers of the agrarian reform, the small family farmers, the faith healers, the quilombolas, the riverside dwellers, among many others. It is the field of forests and waters, where several indigenous nations live, where food is produced that makes the sovereignty of a nation possible. For all these reasons, the countryside is a place of work, life and, above all, education (FERNANDES, 2005).

The existence of the school in and around the countryside is a crucial element in the (r)existence of the peasant population. However, we are currently experiencing the reality of the closure of rural schools in Brazil, a phenomenon that is not current.

According to Folha de São Paulo, "[...] every day, on average, eight schools in rural areas are closed in our country". The newspaper's article highlights that 32,500 rural schools have been closed in the last ten years. AND, In 2013 alone, 3,296 schools were closed, and in 2014 there were 70,800 rural schools.

In 2003 there were 103.3 thousand rural schools in our country.

Marrafon, (2016) discussed the process of nucleation and closure of rural schools in the region of São João da Boa Vista in the state of São Paulo. It deepened the historical, political, socioeconomic and educational context, especially the transformations that occurred in agriculture in the State of São Paulo, which resulted in the expulsion of thousands of rural workers, due to the process of agricultural mechanization driven by the expansion of agribusiness.

From this situation, the author sought to discuss and understand in the service of what or who rural schools were created? How did this happen and what was the cause of the nucleation and, consequently, the closure of the

two

rural schools? Thus, the study presents two categories considered inseparable: the capitalist mode of production and the schooling of the rural population.

Mazur, (2016) investigates the general and specific determinants of the closure of schools in the countryside, as well as identifying the resistance and challenges of schools in the countryside. He sought to present the transformations in the Brazilian countryside from 1950 onwards and their relationship with the reduction in the rural population; contextualizes and differentiates the concepts of rural education and rural education in the national scenario; seeks to understand the processes of closing schools in the countryside in the national and local context; It describes the process of implementation and cessation of offering the final series/years of Elementary Education in the countryside based on a completed case of closure and one in the process of closing.

It found that the main causes that led to the closure of rural schools were: the naturalization of the countryside as a place of backwardness; the understanding that school education is not necessary for workers' children, who are only responsible for education for work; the influence of agribusiness and the emptying of the countryside. The study also denounced the lack of effectiveness of legislation that deals with the closure of rural schools given the lack of information from communities, which are often pressured into agreeing to the closure of their schools.

Cordeiro, (2013) examines educational policy regarding education in rural spaces - school nucleation, a policy that generates conflicts and contradictions with regard to the fight for the right to education in the countryside. It presents the dichotomy between rural education and rural education, discusses the role of the State, which seems to co-opt the concept of social movements, giving new meaning, despite accepting some of the demands, at the same time that it legitimizes the process of closing schools in the countryside, radicalizing the conflict.

Education is a right for everyone and a duty of the State. However, we witnessed an opportune disregard for the fulfillment of the constitutional duty of public authorities. The violation of this right is often naturalized by rural communities. Paradoxically, the increase in this phenomenon occurs precisely in a period in which rural education policy is implemented and ensured by educational legislation. Furthermore, with the closure of schools, the right to participation of civil society, through its organizations and social movements, in the debate and management of public educational policies, as well as in pedagogical and administrative planning, is postponed.

Considering these elements, this research seeks to answer the following research questions: What are the positions and coping strategies of movements and organized social groups in the face of the closure policy? Seeking to respond to these research problems, we aim to investigate the process of closing rural schools, as well as identify the resistance strategies adopted by movements and organized social groups.

Specifically, we will seek to: Analyze education policies for rural people, taking as a reference the field and education projects in dispute; Understand the role of the State in realizing the right to education; Discuss the closure of rural schools, locating in which regions and municipalities this policy has gained more strength in recent years; Investigate how social movements and rural organizations position themselves in the face of the closure of rural schools.

The methodology of this research involves a qualitative and quantitative approach.

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 The countryside, education and the role of the state in the construction of public policy

Brazilian agriculture is organized around two distinct projects, clearly in dispute. On the one hand, there is agribusiness, linked to the capitalist system, which involves large-scale grain production, as well as the appropriation of natural goods to satisfy the international market and obtain economic returns. On the other hand, we have peasant agriculture based on food production, based on relationships family, cultural, with respect and care for life and nature. A production system that seeks to preserve human and environmental health, biodiversity, soil cycles and biological activities (CARDOSO, 2022).

This antagonism also permeates and manifests itself in the educational debate. Linked to the perspective of peasant agriculture, the concept of rural education, which has its historical bases in rural social movements, organizes the school from the peasants onwards, based on a counter-hegemonic project that seeks the emancipation of subjects. In the conception of rural education, the education model does not consider the specificities, identities and culture of the countryside. It is an education submitted to the needs of industrial capital,

of agribusiness, aiming to train people to execute, undertake and operate technologies. It is focused on the agricultural and industrial market and its efficiency is achieved through management and commercialization.

Education is established through educational policies, which leads us to reflect on the role of the State. This analysis is based on the studies of Antônio Gramsci (1975, 2000), based on historical materialism, understanding society through the metaphor of the building: infrastructure and superstructure. Infrastructure is the set of production relations, that is, the class relations established in society.

Economic base of society, where, according to Marxists, labor relations occur, marked by the exploitation of the workforce within the process of capitalist accumulation. The superstructure is organized on this economic structure, which corresponds to forms of social consciousness, such as politics, philosophy, culture, sciences, religions, arts, etc. (CARDOSO, 2022).

In the superstructure, ways of thinking, world views and other ideological components are organized. logic of a class. Ideology is in the superstructure, as is the State understood as a political society, including the police, the army, the laws, the courts and the bureaucracy. The concept of hegemony is essential to understand how the relationship between the State and civil society is established. The concept of hegemony brings to mind the function of intellectuals and culture - the role of school and the media as hegemonic instruments.

2.2 Projects in dispute in the education of rural people

Education in rural areas, for a long time, was treated with neglect, as the ideology was spread that manual work did not require the historically systematized knowledge provided in schools. According to the Countryside Education Dictionary, rural education is that offered to the agricultural population, however, “[...] in the same modality as that offered to populations that reside and work in urban areas” (CALDART, 2012, p 295), without any concern about adapting the rural school to the needs of the peasants. Still on what is taught and learned, in this school model the objective is “[...] to offer elementary knowledge of reading, writing and simple mathematical operations.” (CALDART, 2012, p. 295).

Historically, rural education was relegated to marginal spaces in the processes of elaboration and implementation of Brazilian educational policy. One of the possible interpretations for this aspect - although not the only one - concerns the solid borders between urban space and rural space marked by hegemonic cultural constructions that consider the urban as modern and the countryside as backward. According to ARROYO; CALDART; MOLINA (2004, p. 56), “[...] the school, in rural areas, was treated as a residue of the Brazilian educational system and, consequently, the rural population was denied access and the guarantee of the right to basic education”. Also according to LEITE (1999, p. 14),

Rural education in Brazil, for sociocultural reasons, has always been relegated to lower levels, and had as its ideological rearguard the accentuated elitism of the educational process, installed here by the Jesuits and the political-ideological interpretation of the agrarian oligarchy popularly known in the expression: “people from roça does not need studies. That’s a city-people thing.”

Education in rural areas was used to satisfy economic development, there is no educational need for the subjects. He prioritized the Brazilian development model, based on industrialization in urban centers to the detriment of rural areas. Also according to Ribeiro,

Understood within the social relations of capitalist production, the school, both urban and rural, has its purposes, programs, contents and methods defined by the industrial sector, by the training demands for work in this sector, as well as by the languages and customs associated with it. connected. Therefore, the school does not incorporate issues related to productive work, either because, in this case, agricultural work is excluded from its concerns, or because its nature is not to train for a concrete job, since the existence of unemployment does not guarantees this or that job for those who study. (2012, p. 296).

In the 1920s and 1945, educational changes occurred for rural populations, previously neglected, gained visibility and debate began across the country, in defense of a differentiated curriculum. During this period, there was the consolidation of a current of thought called *Pedagogical Ruralism*, with the aim of propagating schooling that integrated men into regional conditions and established them in the countryside. Ruralists sought to keep men and women in the countryside through education linked to work to put an end to the immigration of foreigners and contain the rural exodus^{two}. Accordingly

4

twoRural exodus is the term used to describe the abandonment of the countryside by its inhabitants who, in search of better living conditions, move from regions considered to have less sustainable conditions to others, which can occur from rural areas to urban centers. This phenomenon occurred in large proportions in Brazil in the 19th and 20th centuries and was always accompanied by the misery of millions of refugees and their death by the thousands, from hunger, thirst and diseases linked to malnutrition.

with Ribeiro,

Those who proposed a different pedagogy for rural populations, identified with “pedagogical ruralism”, defended the existence of a school that prepared farmers' children to stay on the land and that, for this very reason, was associated with agricultural work and adapted to the demands of rural populations. However, this conception, like others full of “good intentions”, remained only in the discourse (2012, p. 298).

Campos (2022) explains that the rural exodus appeared in a special way in Brazil and the jobs available were the activity that denotes underemployment, in terrible working conditions, in which men, women and children who fled from the interior gathered on the outskirts of the city

It was an education proposal aimed at rural workers, without aiming at their development of all their economic and social needs. According to BEZERRA NETO (2003, p. 15),

This ruralist education project sought to develop the ideology of fixing men in the countryside through pedagogy. For this purpose, ruralist pedagogues understood that it was essential to produce a school curriculum that was aimed at responding to the needs of rural people, aiming to serve them in what was an integral part of their daily lives: the school curriculum should be aimed at providing knowledge that could be used in agriculture, livestock and other possible daily needs.

In view of the constant changes introduced in the production processes, some courses were offered, and/or the entire rural school, was responsible for training students, making them more productive for the work they would perform; thus, the school was responsible for training rather than educating. Rural extension and job training programs fall within this proposal, although they do not value agricultural work (CALDART, 2012, p. 298). Currently, rural education has clearly incorporated the interests of the ruling class and its hegemonic Brazilian agrarian model. For Caldart,

[...] specific research efforts are important on the activities of capitalist companies or corporations with peasant communities, through projects with education departments and direct impact on public schools, to verify the progress of what we could identify as practices of a “corporate rural education” (CALDART, 2014, p. 158).

The author presents the ideological hegemony of agribusiness present in education. The advancement of corporate rural education is already a reality. To illustrate, we briefly mention two actions developed by agribusiness. One of them is the partnership signed between ABAG³Ribeirão Preto in the state of São Paulo that develops the Educational Program *Agribusiness at School*. It establishes partnerships with the Municipal Education Departments in the Ribeirão Preto region.

The ABAG Program has existed since 2001 and has been working on topics related to agribusiness for 18 years with teachers, coordinators and students in the final years of Elementary School. It provides training for teachers and coordinators through lectures and visits to agro-industrial companies in the region.

After training, teachers develop the topic in an interdisciplinary way with their students throughout the school year. Its objective is to present fundamental concepts of agribusiness to students, through visits to associated companies, demonstrate the importance of the sector for the economy and value local agro-industrial activities.

According to Schwendler, “[...] as Rural Education becomes institutionalized, it is disputed, invaded by a concept of Rural Education, based on the new demands of capital” (2017, p. 69). Therefore, educational institutions linked to agribusiness have invested in educational programs to spread and strengthen their ideology. Through these programs, agribusiness imposes its hegemony on public schools, seduces its intellectuals and they take on its project, to the point where private interests interfere in the political pedagogical and curricular project of schools. In this way, the interference of the ruling class in the public educational system also materializes.

For Gramsci, “[...] one of the most striking characteristics of every group that develops towards dominance is its struggle for assimilation and the “ideological” conquest of traditional intellectuals [...]” (GRAMSCI, 2011, p. 206). The school is an efficient ideological apparatus in constant dispute, where intellectuals develop their ideology. In order to consolidate its ideology, agribusiness has been entering this space and assertively using this place to train children and young people, especially the children of workers who study in public institutions. A situation that demonstrates that the school curriculum is being disputed by agribusiness. For Saviani (2000), the construction of the school curriculum is a space for political dispute, which expresses the correlation of forces that are present in the school environment. Arroyo (2011)

5

³Brazilian Agribusiness Association. <http://www.abag.com.br/institucional/historiamissaovisao>.

also understands that the curriculum is not just a territory of theoretical disputes. The school is disputed, the teachers are also disputed, as are their consciences, which express teaching practice.

In this dispute, on the other side, representing a counter-hegemonic project, are the Rural Social Movements, which articulate school and society to think about an educational project where the school institution is a place for the appropriation of scientific knowledge, as well as human emancipation. To achieve this, formal knowledge must be articulated with the subject's reality, their history, culture, work and needs, with the knowledge of peasant social practice.

The expression "Rural Education" appears in the 1st National Conference for Basic Rural Education that took place in Luziânia, Goiás, in 1998. It came to be called Rural Education from the National Seminar held in Brasília in 2002 and legitimized from the discussions that took place around the topic, at the II National Conference for Rural Education and at the National Forum for Rural Education (CALDART, 2012). It was born with the challenge of:

[...] think of it in its constitutive specificity, but seeking to compose the historically possible universality in each period, to build the working class society project. And always considering the particularity of Brazilian social formation in the analysis and configuration of the struggles necessary for this construction. (CALDART, 2017, p.1).

Some characteristics of Countryside Education were exposed in the Countryside Education Dictionary by Roseli Caldart. According to the author, the rural education movement fights for access to education that should belong to the peasants, designed by them, based on their specific reality, seeking totality, against the political and pedagogical tutelage of the State. And in this context, educators occupy an important position as pedagogical formulators and school transforming agents. "In the logic of its subjects and their relationships, a Rural Education policy will never be only about education in itself nor about school education, although it is organized around it" (2012, p. 263), because the struggles and reflections pedagogical challenges are a challenge for the appropriation and production of knowledge; essential items in the training of workers that goes beyond the school walls. Still according to CALDART(2017, p. 3),

Rural Education has been built as a national articulation of the struggles of rural workers for the right to education and as cooperation between different educational practices that develop based on the social interests of rural workers, in particular, peasants or families and communities linked to peasant-based work. From the point of view of the conception of education, we integrate a theoretical tradition that considers the nature of education linked to the destiny of work, which brings us closer to a pedagogical tradition with a socialist perspective, precisely due to the accumulation of this tradition in thinking about the link between education and work from an emancipatory perspective.

The term rural education is recent in the Brazilian educational scenario. Its origin is in social movements, elaborated in action and reflection, in contradictions, in the class struggle between landless peasants and the Brazilian land structure. Therefore, rural education was not born as an educational theory, under the tutelage of some renowned intellectual. It was and is conviction and practice shaped by the boldness and courage of the workers. Its embryonic perspective is emancipatory, linked to a historical project of social transformation.

Rural education combines with the fight for land, the right to work, culture, food, health, among others. It recognizes and values the social and human richness of the diversity of its subjects in all dimensions, reaffirming the identities of these subjects, seeking to overcome the contradictions imposed by capitalist relations.

Rural education conceives the countryside as a space of life and resistance, where peasants fight for access to land and the opportunity to remain on it. It comprises the diversity of social subjects – farmers, settlers, riverside dwellers, caiçaras, extractivists, fishermen, indigenous people, remnants of quilombos, in short, all the people of the Brazilian countryside. Recognizes the importance of family farming (CARDOSO, 2022).

According to Seganfredo (2014), Rural Education is opposed to rural education, because it values the identity of rural people. It is designed based on training dimensions, including work and culture; work as a social practice, generator of knowledge and culture, as well as, "[...] contests and discusses pedagogical practice, methodology, teaching material, evaluation and curriculum of rural education" (2014, p. 80). Rural education, with the liberation of the working class as its horizon, seeks to understand the complexity of the struggle for human emancipation and the transformation of social relations constitutive of capitalism. It is more than school education, it is a social practice, which is carried out on a daily basis. According to Molina (2010 p. 140):

Rural Education is not just an educational project, a teaching modality; it is a perspective of social transformation, a horizon of change in social relations not only in the countryside, but in Brazilian society, projected by the collective subjects of law who lead it.



Rural Education was constituted in the fight for school, but did not allow itself to be trapped by the walls from school. It is synonymous with resistance, it contains in its genesis the germ of relationship and interrelation capable of dialoging with different realities, containing within it the perspective of change, combined with the continuous process of awareness and collective construction. According to the movement “For rural education”, a rural school is:

The one that works on the interests, politics, culture and economy of the different groups of workers in the field, in their different forms of work and organization, in their dimension of permanent process, producing values, knowledge and technologies from the perspective of equal social and economic development of this population. (FERNANDES; CERIOLI; CALDART, 2004, p. 53).

It is more than school education, it is a social practice, which is carried out on a daily basis, facing its contradictions. The rural school is guided by a Political Pedagogical Project that aims for an education with an emancipatory, humanizing character, capable of reading elements of the local context, producing knowledge from the problematization, resignification of rural culture from the perspective of non-subordination, non-discrimination and overcoming fragmentation and banking transmission of knowledge.

The organization of a school that meets the principles of rural education cuts across several spheres. In addition to its organization, teachers, students, community, the State needs to take on this concept and provide conditions for it to be put into practice. The rural school's premise is to overcome the fragmentation of knowledge, to promote an emancipatory education that breaks with the dichotomy between manual and intellectual work, valuing and dialoguing with culture.

For Iasi (2007, p. 69), “[...] human emancipation requires that human beings assume conscious control of their existence, overcoming the mediations that prevent the perception of their history as the result of human action”, which will be achieved by overcoming social inequalities, providing equal rights for all, including the right to education.

The originality of rural education and its rural school proposal lies in the pedagogical practice that combines knowledge and realities integrated with social relations and other educational processes that permeate society and its contradictions, with special emphasis on valuing peasant culture, in order to build the foundations of another society, one that contrasts with capitalist society. For Caldart:

School is a right for everyone. It has a specific educational role in the modern world, to the point that those who do not go through it are effectively in an unequal social condition today. But recognizing this is not/does not need to be the same as absolutizing school education, as if only it “counts” in people's lives and, worse, considering school as the only reference for thinking about all training processes. This is a misleading reductionism of what actually is the reality of current capitalist society itself. Reductionism that is aggravated by the dissemination of an equally simplistic view of school, as if the school educational process were equal to the dimension of instruction or teaching. The educational project that helps support the form of society we have has never been just a school project. (2008, p. 80).

In this sense, it can be said that not every school in rural areas is from the countryside. A school in and around the countryside has some characteristics: It is built from the perspective of rural social movements, their drivers and, therefore, is part of the struggle and construction of a development project for the Brazilian countryside based on peasant agriculture. Among its challenges, this project seeks to overcome the economic, political, social, cultural and cognitive inequalities that exist in Brazilian society. The rural school has its own unique identity. Dialogues with family, community and social movements. It articulates knowledge present in the daily lives of students, culture and the official curriculum. Added to this understanding of Education is the understanding that:

The identity of the rural school is defined by its connection to the issues inherent to its reality, anchored in the temporality and knowledge of students, in the collective memory that signals futures, in the network of science and technology available in society and in social movements in defense of projects that associate the solutions required by these issues with the social quality of collective life in the country. (OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES, Art. 2, sole paragraph).

7

The educational processes developed in rural schools are the result of political choices. There is no educational neutrality, especially in school education. The subjects involved have conceptions and projects of life and society. Therefore, rural schools make their choice by developing educational processes where education contributes to the processes of transforming society.

In order to guarantee rural education, it was necessary to request public policies to implement its educational proposal in its various training dimensions. It was necessary to request a set of legislation, which was established through norms, ordinances and resolutions to ensure the legality of rural education.

2.6 Rurality – rural cultural pedagogies

The countryside and the city have always been seen as two geographically distinct places, with the countryside being popularly considered as that peaceful place, where rural activities are carried out, and located in the interior of the states. The city, represented by the state capital, has always been seen as a space for urbanization, a commercial center.

Marques (2002), in relation to the interpretation of the relations between the countryside and the city, considers two currents, the first being the dualistic and dichotomous view, which opposes the rural space to the urban space, with the countryside reflecting backwardness, while the city reflects progress. The second current mentioned by the author is the *rural-urban continuum*, which is based on the idea that the advancement of the urbanization process represents significant changes for the entire society, also affecting rural areas, bringing this space closer to urban space.

This last current, *rural-urban continuum*, it is the one that best adapts to today, given that it brings the countryside and the city closer together, reinforcing the constitution of identities related to spatial differences and the feeling of belonging to the rural environment (Wanderley, 2000).

It is noteworthy that in the current of the *rural-urban continuum*, according to Wanderley (2000), there are two more interpretations, the urban-centered one, where there is spatial and social hegemonization that points to the end of rural reality.

And another, which considers the *rural-urban continuum* with the proximity between the countryside and the city, with similarities between them, the peculiarities of each are not excluded, therefore, there is no possibility of the end of the rural space.

To analyze the relationship between the countryside and the city, Marques (2002) mentions the theory of Lefebvre, a French geographer, who considers these two spaces as constitutive parts of a totality that is formed in diversity. For this geographer, rural space is increasingly enveloped by the urban fabric. Rua (2005, p. 50) explains that:

[...] the urban fabric does not strictly designate the built domain of cities, but the set of manifestations of the city's dominance over the countryside. In this sense, a second home, a highway, a supermarket in the middle of the countryside are part of the urban fabric.

As can be seen, there is an expansion of urban space when using the term urban fabric, the authors include circulation roads, transmission towers, energy networks, in short, technical objects that are present in rural spaces, but that actually have urban characteristics.

Santos (1996) emphasizes the modernization of agriculture, considering it as a factor that brings the countryside and the city closer together. The author explains that:

In the current conditions of the technical-scientific environment, the factors of cohesion between the city and the countryside have become more numerous and stronger [...] modern agriculture, based on science, technology and information, demands productive consumption whose response, immediate, must be found in the nearby city (Santos, 1996 p. 227).

In this context, the city begins to play an important role in agricultural production as a result of modernization and the emergence of new technologies made available for the production, storage, packaging and circulation of what is grown in the field.

With globalization, agricultural specialization based on science and technology includes the modernized field in a competitive logic that accelerates the entry of rationality into all aspects of productive activity, from the reorganization of territory to exchange models and even invades relationships interpersonal. Participation in the world of competitiveness leads to the deepening of new technical relations and new capitalist relations. (Santos, 1996, p. 242).

It should be noted that the peculiarities existing between the social actors of rural and urban spaces need to be verified empirically, since the rural population has been presenting relationships social relations with the city and urban ideology. Alentejano (2003) explains that it is of great importance to demystify that rural space is synonymous with backward space and that urban is a space in progress, a modern space, since the mastery of technique and artificiality is not exclusivity of urban space.

Mattei (2008) highlights that the emergence of new technologies and the intensive use of capital in agriculture has made farmers dependent on non-agricultural factors, such as machinery, equipment, and chemical inputs, not to mention the agro-industrial complexes that have been integrated, progressively reducing its role in rural areas.

Mattei (2008) also draws the reader's attention to the fact that there was an increase in the labor productivity combined with the growth in global food production, as well as the decrease in populations occupying rural areas. According to the author, it was from there that a series of ruptures in the classic model of agrarian development unfolded, which impacted the family production system with greater intensity, forcing the search for new forms of reproduction.

Delving deeper into the subject discussed here, the following topic makes a study of the rural world and rurality, highlighting this search for new forms of reproduction.

The rural world underwent several transformations with the entry of capitalism, but without losing its importance. In ancient times, the rural production process was a form of sustenance and work relations were not only based on market laws but on exchanges between families, relatives and neighbors (Martins, 1975).

With the advancement of modernization, agricultural productivity grew substantially and with it came the proliferation of companies providing services in soil preparation, harvesting, spraying, among others.

Meanwhile, rural space began to be valued by industries as a means of minimizing costs due to the proximity of raw materials and obtaining cheaper, non-unionized labor. Furthermore, it also began to be sought after as a form of leisure and housing for middle and upper class urban families.

It is noteworthy that economic development provided rural workers with access to services in the city, reducing the physical and social distance between populations. Furthermore, the countryside is no longer just an agricultural space but has become a leisure environment for city dwellers looking for a better quality of life away from congestion and urban pollution. (Wanderley, 2000).

The fact is that this modernization and technological innovations bring about an advancement in society at the same time that they encourage excessive consumerism. There is a disparity in social class, a dependence on the dominant worlds.

Consumerism and competitiveness lead to the moral and intellectual weakening of the person, to the reduction of personality and worldview, also inviting us to forget the fundamental opposition between the figure of the consumer and the figure of the citizen (Santos, 2000, p. 24).

This phenomenon causes a mixture of peoples, races, cultures, tastes, which if it were not for the interest in producing capital, would be an important foundation for social and political transformations. (Santos, 2000).

However, what occurs is a rupture in the identity of rural workers, which is the interaction of the "self" with the "other" influencing the values, beliefs and ideologies of the individual, as an action in successive development and constant change, with a effective process associated with changes in relation to time and social space of reference.

Rurality can then be seen as an ambivalent rural process that involves the construction of ruralities in the urban world, with a separation between the imaginary and reality, for example, the June festival in Brazil is an urban image of the rural, in other words, rurality (De Paula, 2001).

Discussing the concept of ruralities, the authors Candiotta and Corrêa (2008) mention that the term is mentioned by two currents, the first of which sees rurality as a process of valuing rural areas, which is disseminated by global institutions through financing and public policies. According to the authors, the expansion of capitalist relations through agricultural and non-agricultural activities in rural areas is embedded in this interest of institutions.

Candiotta and Corrêa (2008, p. 232) state that:

From this perspective, the new rurality is not something socially constructed by the rural population, but rather an idea imposed by power-concentrating bodies, crystallized in discourse, but often not implemented, which starts to be used and propagated by various researchers as new aspects of reality of rural space.

9

The second current that conceptualizes rurality prefers to treat it as an empirical reality, constructed, above all endogenously, that is, internally. To demonstrate the concept of rurality of this second current, Candiotta and Corrêa (2008, p. 233) cite Moreira (2005) stating that "ruralities would be composed of objects, actions and representations peculiar to the rural, with emphasis on rural representations and identities of individuals and social groups".

In this way, the identity where the rural and the urban can be inserted into the same social actor, producing urban elements in rural areas and expanding the modernization project, comes into question (Moreira, 2002).

It is worth mentioning that rurality also occurs among the urban population, who are attracted by the media to the countryside, seeing this space as synonymous with nature and quality of life, thus, Lima (2005) highlights that



there are elements of rurality in urban and urbanity in rural areas.

Regarding this subject, the author Biazzo (2007, p. 19) explains that:

[...] in both spaces social identities are manifested that configure rurality and urbanity. In rural and urban landscapes (forms, sets of objects) there are urbanities and ruralities (contents – heritages, origins, habits, relationships, set of actions) that combine, generating new territorialities, assuming that each place or region can harbor different overlapping territorialities, relating to different social actors.

In view of the above, it is understood that the term “rural” is no longer just about a space, but rather expresses the social relations inserted in it and “rurality” comprises a socially shaped rural area.

In this sense, cultural pedagogy allows us to understand how the rural environment can be articulated with other forms of work so that we can learn to live with nature through routine activities in this space.

Rurality linked to pedagogy can, for example, teach how to obtain a better quality of life free from pesticides (Wandscheer; Teixeira, 2010). In the words of Amaral (2000, p. 170):

Educators tell us about the possibility of reconstructing relationships between culture/nature through environmental education, and businesspeople sell us images of nature (advertising), nature packages (tourism), (...) all these different instances of cultural production they also end up reorganizing, redirecting, giving new meaning and restricting the possibilities of cross-fertilization between the world of culture and the world of nature.

Therefore, an ecological ethic is established proposing the principle of the universal destination of creation goods and the promotion of essential goods for life, relating to how the rural community lives with nature without damaging it.

In the words of Luchiari (2000, p. 87): “contemporary rural areas are the result of a bundle of relationships that add local particularities to the global demands that cross them”. Teixeira (2005) mentions that nature is the greatest learning tool, in which guides and the community as a whole function as translators of this “other world”.

Wandscheer and Teixeira (2010) add that rural spaces are given a new meaning, no longer being seen as a backward environment to being understood as a privileged space in contact with nature, where you can eat natural foods, explore trails and climb. rocks.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

LDB/96 was an advance in relation to rural education, as it outlined the main ideas that guide this educational education proposal.

However, for other advances to occur, coordination between the community and social movements was necessary. In this case, the MST (Landless Rural Workers Movement), with other Rural Social Movements and entities, stood out, which strengthened and strengthened the organization of communities to fight for the effectiveness of the right, giving life and voice to education. from Camp.

At a national level, the Operational Guidelines for Basic Education in Rural Schools were established (Opinion CNE/CEB 36/2001 and Resolution CNE/CEB 1/2002), aiming to guarantee the universalization of basic education and professional education at technical level at the rural population (BRAZIL, Opinion n° 36/2001, Article 3).

Although many schools have assumed themselves as rural schools, it cannot be said, however, that the schools have assumed their identity and principles.

Therefore, it is concluded that the Rural education has its bases in social movements, whose achievements, especially in relation to legislation, are the result of the permanent struggle of organized social movements, which collectively seek to overcome the inequalities imposed on peasants throughout Brazilian history.

10 REFERENCES

ALENTEJANO, R. (2003). **City-country relations in Brazil in the 21st century**. Terra Livre, São Paulo, v.2, n.21, p. 25-39, Jul/Dec.

AMARAL, Marise Basso. *Nature and Representation in Advertising Pedagogy*. In: COSTA, Marisa Vorraber (org). **Cultural Studies in Education: media, architecture, toys, biology, literature, cinema...** Porto Alegre, RS: Ed. Universidade/UFRGS, 2000.



ARROYO, Miguel G.**Curriculum, territory in dispute.**Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2011.

ARROYO, Miguel Gonzalez; CALDART, Roseli Salete; MOLINA, Mônica Castagna.**For a rural education.** Petrópolis: Voices, 2004.

BEZERRA NETO, L.**Advances and setbacks in rural education in Brazil.** Doctoral thesis. Campinas, SP: [sn], 2003.

BIAZZO, Pedro Paulo. (2007). Countryside and Rural, City and Urban: necessary distinctions for a critical perspective in Agrarian Geography. In: MARAFON, Gláucio José; PESSÔA, Vera Lucia Salazar (Org.).**Geographic Interactions:**the interinstitutional connection of research groups. Uberlândia: Rome.

BRAZIL (1996).*National Education Guidelines and Bases Law, nº 9394/96.*Brasília: MEC, 1996.

BRAZIL.**CNE. Resolution CNE/CEB 1/2002.**Official Gazette of the Union, Brasília, April 9, 2002. Section 1, p.32.

CALDART, Roseli Salete.**Popular agrarian reform and research.**In: ALENTEJANO, PR R; CALDART, RS (orgs).**MST:**university and research. SP: Expressão Popular, 2014.

CALDART, Roseli Salete.**Rural Education and the construction of Socialist Pedagogy.**Seminar Historical construction of Socialist Pedagogy: Legacy of the Russian Revolution of 1917 and current challenges. São Paulo, Guararema,July, 2017.

CALDART, Roseli Salete.**Countryside Education Dictionary.** / Organized by Roseli Salete Caldart, Isabel Brasil Pereira, Paulo Alentejano and Gaudêncio Frigotto. – Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo: Escola Politécnica de Saúde Joaquim Venâncio, Expressão Popular, 2012.

CALDART, Roseli Salete.**Countryside Education:**notes for a path analysis. Work, Education and Health. Rio de Janeiro: v.7, n.1, p. 35-64, Mar/Jun 2009.

CALDART, Roseli Salete. About rural education. In: SANTOS, CA (Org.).**Rural education.**field, public policies, education. Brasília: INCRA, 2008. (Series For Rural Education, n.7).

CAMPOS, Selma Aparecida Araújo. Childhood in slavery.**RCMOS – Multidisciplinary Scientific Journal O Saber.** ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo-SP, year II, v.2, n. 2, Jul./Dec. 2021. DOI: 10.51473/rcmos.v2i2.340

CANDIOTTO, Luciano Zanetti Pessoa; Correa, Walquíria Kruger. (2008).**Ruralities, urbanities and the technicalization of rural areas in the context of the city-country debate.**In:*FIELD-TERRITORY:*agrarian geography magazine. v.3, n. 5, p. 214-242, Feb. 2008. Available at: < <http://www.campoterritorio.ig.ufu.br>> Accessed at: Mar. 2023.

CARDOSO, Aparecida Mendes. Family farming and public development policies in Vale do Ribeira in SP.**RCMOS – Multidisciplinary Scientific Journal O Saber.**ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo-SP, year II, v.2, n. 2, Jul./Dec. 2022.

CORDEIRO, Tássia Gabriele Balbi de Figueiredo e.**No schools closed! The impacts of school nucleation on the clash between rural education and rural education.**Dissertation (Master's) - State University of Rio de Janeiro, Faculty of Teacher Training. – 2013.

DE PAULA, Silvana. (2001). When the countryside becomes an urban experience.**Agriculture Society Studies**,n. 17, Oct.

DOMINGUES, Tais De Moraes Affonso. Barriers and challenges faced by teachers in implementation of the distance learning method in rural schools in the city of Pelotas/RS.**RCMOS – Scientific Magazine Multidisciplinary Tific Knowledge.**ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo-SP, year II, v.2, n. 2, Jul./Dec. 2022. DOI: 10.51473/rcmos.v2i2.45

FERNANDES, BM; MOLINA, MC**Social relations at school and worker training.**In: BAUMAN, Z. Identity. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar Ed. 2005.

FERNANDES, Bernardo Mançano.**The Territorialization of the MST - Landless Rural Workers Movement - Brazil.**Website: Agrarian Reform in data. Available in:<http://www.reformaagrariaemdados.org.br/sites/default/files/1495-4357-1-PB.PDF>. Access at sea. 2023.



FERNANDES, Bernardo Mançano. **The MST and agrarian reforms in Brazil.** In: FERNANDES, Bernardo Mançano. The fields of research in Rural Education: space and territory as essential categories. In: MOLINA, Mônica Castagna. (Org). Rural Education and research: questions for reflection. Brasília: Ministry of Agrarian Development, 2006.

FERNANDES, Bernardo Mançano; CERIOLI, Paulo Ricardo; CALDART, Roseli Salete. **"First National Conference 'For basic rural education': preparatory text"**. In: ARROYO, Miguel Gonzalez; CALDART, Roseli Salete; MOLINA, Mônica Castagna. For a rural education. Petrópolis: Voices, 2004.

GRAMSCI, Antonio. **Prison Quaderni.** Torino: NuovaUniversaleEinaudi, 1975, p.763-764.

GRAMSCI, Antonio. Gramsci's Reader. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Civilização Brasileira, 2011.

IASI, Mauro Luís. **The metamorphoses of class consciousness.** São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2007.

LEITE, **SCRural School:** Urbanization and educational policies. São Paulo: Cortez, 1999.

LIMA, EN **New ruralities, new identities.** Where? (2005). In: MOREIRA, Roberto J. (Org.). Social identities: ruralities in contemporary Brazil. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A, p. 41-65.

MARQUES, Inez Medeiros. (2002). *The concept of rural space.* Terra Livre Magazine, São Paulo, year 18, n. 19, p. 95 to 112.

MARRAFON, Andrea Margarete de Almeida. **The process of nucleation and closure of rural schools in the region of São João da Boa Vista (SP).** Dissertation (Master's) – Federal University of São Carlos, 2016.

MARTINS, José Souza. (1975). **Capitalism and Traditionalism.** *Studies on the contradictions of the Agrarian Society in Brazil.* São Paulo: Pioneer.

MATTEI, Lauro. (2008). Pluriativity in the context of contemporary rurality: historical evolution of debates on the topic. **Northeast Economic Magazine.** Fortaleza, vol. 39, nº 3, Jul-September.

MOLINA, MC (Org.). **Field education and research II:** questions for reflection. Brasília: MDA/MEC, 2010.

MOREIRA, Roberto José. (2002). **Ruralities and globalizations:** rehearsing an interpretation, Cadernos CPDA – Ruralidades. Rio de Janeiro: CPDA/ UFRRJ, n. 1. nov. 38p.

RIBEIRO, Marlene. **Rural Education.** In: CALDART, Roseli S. et al. (Org.). Dictionary of rural education. Rio de Janeiro: IESJV, Fiocruz, Expressão Popular, 2012, p. 295 -301.

RUA, J. (2005). The resignification of the rural and city-country relations: a geographical contribution. **ANPEGE Magazine,** Rio de Janeiro, n. 2, p. 45-66.

SANTOS, Milton. (2000). **For another globalization.** From single thought to universal consciousness.

SANTOS, M. (1996). **The nature of space.** São Paulo: HUCITEC.

SAVIANI, Nereide. **School and didactic knowledge:** problems of the content/method unit in the pedagogical process. 3rd ed. Campinas, SP: Associated Authors, 2000.

SCHWENDLER, SF **Public Rural Education Policies Today:** advances and contradictions. Sapelli, Marlene Siebert e Silva, Jefferson Olivatto. (Org.). A Face of the Capitalist Hydra: Criticism of Educational Policies for the Working Class. 1 Ed., Curitiba, Editora Prismas, 2017, p. 69-99.

12

SEGANFREDO, Katia Aparecida. **State rural education committee: the materialization of the political struggle within the scope of rural education in Paraná.** Doctoral Thesis – Tuiuti University of Paraná, Curitiba, 2014.

WANDERLEY, Maria de Nazareth Baudel. The emergence of a new rurality in advanced modern societies – the “rural” as a singular space and collective actor. **Society and Agriculture Studies,** Rio de Janeiro, n.11, p.87-146, Oct. 2000.