Translated from Portuguese to English - www.onlinedoctranslator.com

RCMOS – Multidisciplinary Scientific Journal O Saber.
ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo-SP, year II, v.2, n. 2, Jul./Dec. 2022.

Marx's true revolution for education for love

Marx's true revolution for education for love

Fidelino Cordeiro Dias[1]

Submitted on: 10/19/2022
Approved on: 10/19/2022
Published on: 10/20/2022 DOI:
10.51473/rcmos.v2i2.366

SUMMARY
Understanding love as the greatest force in Nature, being the only one capable of destroying all the hatred, selfishness and greed that plague the planet. In this brief article, we intend to begin a study and foundation for an even greater claim. What would it be like to carry out a true revolution through love in which the end of the exploitation of man by man in the vision of Karl Marx is used? This author believes that if the studies, still so current, left by Marx and Engels were based on love, and not on an armed revolution, they would be capable of carrying out an inversion of rules imposed by the Bourgeoisie, implementing the submission of the power of Capital and its social injustices for the true revolution for and education for love.
Key words: Karl Marx. True revolution. Revolution for love

ABSTRACT
Understanding love as nature's greatest force, being the only one capable of destroying all the hatred, selfishness and greed that plague the planet. We intend in this brief article to start a study and rationale for an even greater claim. What would it be like to carry out a true revolution for love in which the end of man's exploration by man in Karl Marx's vision is used? Believing this author that if the studies, still so current, left by Marx and Engels were grounded in love, and not on an armed revolution, they would be able to perform a reversal of rules imposed by the Bourgeoisie, concretizing the submission of the power of capital and its social injustices by the true revolution for and education for love. **Keywords:**Karl Marx. Real revolution. Revolution for love

1. INTRODUCTION

Believing in the power of a true revolution through education for love makes me feel confident when trying to put a part of my life experience into a text; not only academic but also personal and professional. Why not love the work you do? Why can't decent, well-paid work have a place in capitalism? Why wouldn't the oppressor, who was often oppressed and could be educated to love, break the cycle of exploitation by the owners of property and the means of production?

We believe that an education for love could reduce the abyss, which savage capitalism enhances.
lizes and improves, by systematically encouraging the concentration of wealth by a few, and the misery of many. What frightens us most as Educators is seeing this abyss happening more and more in the forms of encouraging ignorance, permitting violence established in ghettos, disrespect for the human person, existence, imperative neglect; that has settled in, especially those we hope to take care of.

For example, the neglect instituted in public health during the pandemic and in essential services. Because people are tired of so much corruption, they are capable of acting in two ways; the first believed them to be fortunate and without opportunity, as if destiny forced them to accept the financial slavery of modern times; or angry people who no longer accept the rules and laws necessary for good social coexistence, being on the margins, whether in attitudes,
as in dialogues in which corruption and neglect are increasingly common and institutionally normal.

1.1 JUSTIFICATION

At the beginning of my life, I had a very humble origin. We were four brothers in a room in a simple house in Jacarepaguá. My father was privileged at the time, he had two jobs. I remember him leaving at 5am in the morning to work at the bank, doing public service at night and returning home around 11pm. 1

UCP. Email: fidelino.dias@uol.com.br

This is an article published in Open Access under the CreativeCommons Attribution license, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, as long as the original work is correctly cited.

Oppressed by the hard work at the bank and favored by the little opportunity he had to study English as a teenager; She was always tirelessly dedicated to ensuring that her children were encouraged to study. In a loving way, within the upbringing he had, he was thrilled with each of our achievements in terms of academic progress. Today I see in my father's attitude an opportunity to break a family cycle of difficulty that marked his existence and oppressed him.

My father is the grandson of slaves. His grandmother was bought from the slave quarters for 1.5 Contos de Réis, by a rich owner of lands, who placed her in the big house as his wife and having 5 children with her. One of them is my father's father. This contrast marks my family and Brazilian society. On one side, the land-owning heir and on the other, the submissive humility of the Afro-descendant woman submitted to the whims of the Lord of Engenho. And where this equation worked.

What I believe in is the love between the two that was capable of overcoming prejudices, breaking chains, creating a family in which Little Sinho had the courage to face prejudices out of love.

Marx is precise and perfect in placing the exploitation of man by man in his time. A position no longer occupied by royalty, but by the ruthless bourgeoisie. Marx describes in his time that until the 16th centuries, an individual had to work only three months of the year to pay their taxes, the remaining months of work were used for barter and production for their own benefit.

Marx in his time, was revolted because man starts to work 13 to 16 hours a day, in an alienating way, where it was necessary to work 12 months of the year to maintain the capitalist system, what he called slavery of capital, as described in the preambles of the Communist Manifesto (1846).

Perhaps because it was not in the context of Marx's time, another facet of capitalism was not considered in his work. Care through love was done at home by mothers who canceled themselves out, but dedicated their lives to taking care of their children, in a way similar to slavery; but in a way uncharacterized by the bonds of love that involve children and mothers, which disguised what we believe to be the rules of the game at the time.

There was no work for men and women in the same way, and the employer and family paying for childcare or boarding schools was not a reality that was achievable for everyone. Therefore, female care and work still have the traces of having to be done in a pejorative and almost charitable way. The lack of recognition not only of care but of its obligation out of love, in a certain way, may have made us despise society and care in such a deep-rooted way.

But we do not intend to only cross the path of female work, nor do we intend to affirm other considerations that deviate from our objective, we just intend to present a social profile that leads us to believe in Marx's failure to consider an energy that has always existed and minimizes Wild Capitalism. , even though often, this is appropriated to obtain greater profits, such as Fetishism for Christmas, Mother's Day, Valentine's Day. The consumerism implicit in these dates cannot be denied; but if we understand the feeling that leads to this consumption, the appeal is made by the love relationship that we believe is necessary to be remembered on a date that the remembrance of the date means care.

There is, therefore, in every society a predisposition towards potential love, but subject to the whims of Capitalism, for now, but which true education for love would certainly be capable of immobilizing. We have the values of attraction to care for and care for the human person, as more important than any advertising. What mother wouldn't prefer a rose stolen from her own garden and a sincere kiss from a son who strives to be a good citizen than a latest iPhone?

two

When we talk about forces of Nature and love, we have different forms of love, as Leo Buscaglia (1990) illustrates in his book with the same title Love. He describes love in different ways, such as mother's love, charitable love, submissive love, passionate love.

In the third-to-last paragraph of this text, we emphasized a mother's love as it is unconditional and unique. Same that Human Nature insists on the exceptions of mothers who sometimes act against the grain due to neglect of their children. Unanimity leads us to criticize these acts in the most vehement and majority way.

Education for Love as a way of adopting a change in attitude, mainly aided by the tools of pain and regret, as preached by Western and Eastern religions, whether ancient or not, or simply

This is an article published in Open Access under the CreativeCommons Attribution license, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, as long as the original work is correctly cited.

as part of human intuition, it is the formula that we believe must be used by man, to break the hegemony of neglect and the interest of obtaining profit at all costs. This formula was even described by Einstein in his letter and which greatly encouraged us to discuss this topic.

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Here we address Karl Marx's criticisms of theories related to income distribution that have emerged over time.

the term *political economy* originated from Greek *politeia* It is *oikonomika*. Adam Smith and David Ricardo, the greatest representatives of Political Economy, believed that it comprised the set of social relations that emerged in the crisis of the Old Regime, that is, the institutions of Western feudality. (NETTO; BRAZ, 2008, p. 17).

In this context, classical political economy was not just a scientific discipline, but rather consisted of understanding how a society functioned in the feudal era.

Between the years 1825 and 1830 and 1848, there were crises in classical political economy, where the relationship between the bourgeoisie and enlightened culture was modified, which synthesized a project of human emancipation, conditioned by the premise: freedom, equality, fraternity. In fact, there was a political emancipation and not a human emancipation, since political freedom was not possible under the bourgeois regime.

The bourgeois revolution really provides more freedom to society, but far from what it promised to be the *Kingdom of Freedom*, which ended up resulting in class dominance of the bourgeoisie.

As a result, in the middle of the 19th century, the movement of social classes waged a series of clashes between the bourgeoisie and the workers, triggering rebellions and revolutions, reflected in the revolution of 1848.

The bourgeoisie is no longer part of the enlightened culture and starts to propose emancipatory alternatives, becoming a conservative class, and the revolutionary proletariat embraces the enlightened principles.

From the second half of the century onwards, classical political economy completely fell apart, becoming considered ed by the thinkers of the bourgeois order only *Economy,* and by the intellectual proletariats led by Karl Marx as *Critique of Political Economy.*

With this simple nomenclature, economics becomes what Smith and Ricardo never considered: a scientific discipline exclusively specialized in historical, social and political issues of a scientific-academic nature, emerging as “A body of professionals accredited to act as managers in capitalist companies and in public administration” (NETTO; BRAZ, 2008, p. 23), economists.

The greatest revolutionary of the proletariat, Karl Marx (1818-1883) conceptualizes the critique of political economy as a critique of totality, an expression of the class struggle of the proletariat, based on the objectives of capitalist society, where Marx's ideal was and will be maintained for his followers to fight against the exploitation of the world bourgeoisie.

Regarding history, Marx identified the process of political organization of social forces, giving the proletariat the responsibility for historical transformations that led to a new civilizational stage.

Marx's work, *The capital*, did not mean a denial of the theory of the classics, nor could it since the critique of political economy was only possible due to a structural theoretical analysis of the bourgeois economy. Thus, classical political economy needed to exist for Marx to find the necessary elements for his methodological perspective on capital.

Therefore, in the 20th century, several followers of Marx sought to clarify these phenomena, thus creating Marxist Political Economy. However, at the same time that these analysts achieved great advances in terms of knowledge, entered into several clashes of ideas about even the very element of political economy Marxist.

The exploitation of work is evidenced by Karl Marx when he defines surplus value and its relationship with variable capital, surplus value is the value of work not paid to the worker, that is, it consists of the exploitation exercised by capitalists over their employees. (LESSA; TONET, 2008).

Labor power for Marx is like any commodity, whose value is determined by the means of life necessary for the worker's subsistence, if he works beyond a certain number of hours, he will not only produce the value corresponding to that of his labor power , but also an additional value, an excess value without con-

This is an article published in Open Access under the CreativeCommons Attribution license, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, as long as the original work is correctly cited.

trapartida. For him, the rate of surplus value defines the degree of exploitation of the worker (MARX, 2004).

Capitalist production is not just the production of goods, it is essentially the production of surplus value. The value of the elements of production is equal to the value of the advanced capital, this capital, which Marx called capital C, is formed from a sum of money used in the means of production and a part destined to the payment of labor power, its original equation is as follows C = c + v, where C = capital, c = constant capital and v = variable capital. However, the production process generates a surplus, modifying the original equation to the following C = c + v + m where (m) is the surplus value.

Marx defines that the proportion in which the working day is prolonged increases the value of variable capital, capital appropriates the surplus work carried out by the worker, determining the relationship between surplus value and variable capital to this proportional appreciation of capital, Marx called it the rate of surplus value or rate of profit.

The value of the price of labor power cannot be compared with the surplus value, as this moves towards productivity. An increase in productivity and work intensity causes a decrease in the value of labor power, in turn, the value of labor power can only vary due to a variation in labor productivity.

The rate of surplus value is, therefore, the exact expression of the degree of exploitation of the labor force by capital or of the worker by the capitalist.

The abyss that separates the living conditions of the worker and the capitalist is a well-known fact. Labor power is bought and sold at its value. Its value, like that of any other commodity, is determined by the working time necessary for its production. It is worth noting that the capitalist is the one who defines the value of labor power. Marx affirms the conditions imposed by capital. (MARX, 2004, p. 347).

The capitalist mode of production is cruel to those who sell their labor power, it transforms society's life into a fetish focused on acquiring superfluous things, it imposes on the economy businesses aimed at anarchic competition, it is not concerned with waste or the environment. environment.

In this model, what the worker gains in work, he loses in quality of work. The use of force work and the plundering of it are inherent to working class life.

The workforce, that which the system considers free is a necessary condition for the valorization of the capitalist economy, the forms of exploitation of working time, occur with the constitution of the division of labor into two parts: the necessary work (that which provides the replacement of vital conditions for the worker) and surplus work (the part that remains for the capitalist as unpaid work).

Marx shows the unlimited exploitation in the English industry. In these industries, children, women and adults are exploited. The level of exploitation in these industries ranges from the unprecedented increase in working time or surplus work, to precarious workplace installations (LESSA; TONET, 2008).

For him, this additional unpaid working time to the worker gradually extends and in one year makes a big difference in favor of the capitalists. Children are sacrificed by imposing heavy tasks and subjected to long working hours. Working conditions are often unhealthy and dangerous, causing many illnesses.

The capitalist is interested in profit, he is indifferent to the consequences suffered by the worker. In order not to lose their profits, they take over other people's work, sucking as much as they can. Founding its logic on the exploitation and exclusion of a large part of the population from the world of work, causing an enormous amount of harm, violence and damage to the environment.

Marx does not omit and denounce: for him, capital is also a social relation of production. It is a bourgeois relation of production, a relation of production of bourgeois society. Capital is not just a sum of material products, it is also a sum of commodities, exchange values, social quantities.

Marx (2004) demonstrates how capital does not care about human life, how capitalists steal working time. For the capitalist, 24 hours a day are for the appreciation of capital, for the expansion of profits. Capital is not concerned with the suffering of the working generation that surrounds it, with the future rot of humanity, nor even with the environment.

This is an article published in Open Access under the CreativeCommons Attribution license, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, as long as the original work is correctly cited.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

From the analysis, Marx makes it clear that capitalist production is essentially the production of surplus value. It is the theft of surplus labor from the worker, it is exploitation carried out in different ways, especially with the extension of the working day to the level of the most perverse exhaustion.

Capital dominates the means of production with overwhelming force, imposes a regime of forced labor, manipulates and controls the production process and also counts on the support of the state, as was the case with the English Factory Laws. I confused surplus work with necessary work.

It determines the volume of labor production, which must be increased so that the production of the same quantity of merchandise requires a smaller quantity of labor.

The consequence of the increase in productivity and surplus labor, with the technical and social conditions of the production process being modified, is the devaluation of work, this occurs with the introduction in the industrial sectors of the increase in productive force, aiming to increase the volume of goods produced without this process meeting the conditions necessary for a good level of subsistence for the life of the working class.

Such a mechanism does not contribute in any way to the valorization of labor force, since the capitalist's objective is to increase the productive force of labor to reduce the price of the merchandise, generating the necessary conditions to obtain a greater volume of sales and ease in mastering a greater share of the market.

It is the worker who pays this difference and not the capitalist. The worker has the obligation to carry out his/her tasks in the shortest possible time. As for the capitalist, he has nothing to worry about, as his only purpose is to obtain more profits.

REFERENCES

BUSCAGLIA, Leo.**Love,**Rio de Janeiro: Record. nineteen ninety.

LESSA, Sergio; TONET, Ivo.**Introduction to Marx's philosophy.**São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2008.

MARX, K.**Misery of philosophy**. São Paulo: Ícone, 2004.

NETTO, José Paulo; BRAZ, Marcelo.**Political economy:**a critical introduction. São Paulo: Cortez, 2008.

This is an article published in Open Access under the CreativeCommons Attribution license, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, as long as the original work is correctly cited.