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ABSTRACT: This survey discusses citizenship in a recurrent perspective by means of a critical-reflective analysis in the light of historical materialism and in four sections. In the first section we discuss the historical backgrounds of citizenship, the constraints and values which dealt with man and his comprehension of reality. In the second section, Citizenship and contradictions: senses and meaning, as a kaleidoscopic dimension we distinguish the structural elements of consolidation of the term citizenship, as well as the contradictions arising from its reflection. Later, in “Educational policy and citizenship” we debate the outlines and reflections on citizenship nowadays. Finally in the forth section, we problematize the challenges and courses of action on the importance of citizenship in education in Brazil and vice versa. The study points out that the sense of a citizenship corresponding to the democratic perspective improves the educational courses of action so that its implementation gives meaning to the constitution of citizens who live and claim the social space as a universalized and humanized conquest even if it is a reality to be built.
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RESUMEN: Este estudio aborda la ciudadanía en una perspectiva recurrente mediante un análisis crítico reflexivo a la luz del materialismo histórico y en cuatro secciones. En la primera sección se discuten los antecedentes históricos de la ciudadanía, las limitaciones y los valores que trata con el hombre y su comprensión de la realidad. En la segunda sección, ciudadanía y contradicciones: sentidos y significados, como una dimensión caleidoscópica distinguimos los elementos estructurales de la consolidación de la ciudadanía de término, así como las contradicciones que surgen de su reflexión. Más adelante, en “la política educativa y la ciudadanía” debatir los contornos y reflexiones sobre la ciudadanía en la actualidad, finalmente, discutimos los retos y cursos de acción sobre la importancia
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de la ciudadanía en la educación en Brasil y viceversa. El estudio señala que el sentido de una ciudadanía correspondiente a la perspectiva democrática mejora los cursos de acción para que su aplicación de sentido a la Constitución de ciudadanos que viven y buscan el espacio social como una conquista universalizada y humanizada, ou sea si es una realidad que se construirá com basis democrática.
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**RESUMO:** Esta pesquisa discute a cidadania numa perspectiva recorrente por meio de uma análise crítica-reflexiva, à luz do materialismo histórico e em quatro seções. Na primeira seção, vamos discutir as origens históricas da cidadania, restrições e valores em relação ao homem e sua compreensão da realidade. Na segunda seção, cidadania e contradições: sentidos e significados, como uma dimensão caleidoscópica, podemos distinguir os elementos estruturais da consolidação da cidadania a partir do termo, bem como as contradições decorrentes da sua reflexão. Mais tarde, “políticas de educação e cidadania” debatemos os contornos e reflexões sobre cidadania nos dias de hoje. Finalmente problematizamos os desafios e linhas de ação sobre a importância da cidadania na educação no Brasil e vice-versa. O estudo ressalta que o sentido de uma cidadania correspondente à perspectiva democrática melhora a educação e os cursos de ação para que sua aplicação dê significado para a formação de cidadãos que vivem e reivindicam espaço social como uma conquista universalizada e humanizada, mesmo que isso seja uma realidade a ser construída.
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**INTRODUÇÃO**

The property of a kaleidoscope is to show many faces of the object and possible combinations, thus, the images formed from perspective present particularities to the observer. However, in these terms, without the intention of handling or using up all combinations, the aim of this article is, using a delimited kaleidoscopic sight, gathering clues to question some social senses and meanings of citizenship in contemporaneity, its contemplation in educational policies and some courses of action as for the challenges to be faced to the reach in full sense. As for methodology, we understand that the reflective criticism through historical materialism analysis (MARX and ENGELS, 1996; LIMA, 2003) is more appropriate to the treatment of the object.

The historical materialistic perspective, within its dimensions, appeals to dialectics to build its questioning universe and in that, the unity and fight of the opposing sides is one of the main points to understanding the object. In these terms, we’ll use the perspective of the fight of the opposing sides in the analysis of the social construction of citizenship in Pinsky and Pinsky (2010); Guarinello (2010); Funari (2010); Hoornaert (2010) and Zeron (2010) contributions as a point of departure to the
contextualization of some background of citizenship and of the revealing milestones of material conditions of existence, expressed by ethical-religious manifestation, or by structural arrangements in the production mode and its unfolding between senses and meanings.

The constitution of the senses and meanings of citizenship in the dimension of the contradictions of the production mode between linearism and the recurrence (MARSCHALL, 1967, SAES, 2012; AFONSO and RAMOS, 2007; MARTINS, 2000) are main points of the debate on the context of its implementation in constant transformation; either by policies as a whole that ensure appropriate conditions to its achievement, or specific policies, as the educational ones which, among other points have been emphasizing “the education of the social agent to the exercise of citizenship” over the years.

We have some urgent issues in this kaleidoscope requiring at least a possible answer, namely: if it wants to educate men to the exercise of citizenship, what citizenship is it talking about? What kind of man to educate and for what kind of society? Thinking about reality, what courses of action and challenges must be faced not only for the questioning, but also for citizenship assurance in a full sense? All these questions are the object of this study which understands that the democratization and humanization dimensions cannot be untied from the horizontal nature of justice and legality in a universal and material sense from what is understood about citizenship.

We organized four sections in order to reflect the thematic unity. In the first section “Historical background of citizenship”, we covered the first essays of a citizenship idea from antiquity to contemporaneity; followed by the second section “Citizenship and contradictions: senses and meanings” where they arguments about the linear social senses proposed as a citizenship constitution and its contestation are presented, given the distinct conditionings that show contentious solicitations and non-harmonious meanings in the process of distinct social interests. In the textual explanation, we observe in “Educational policy and citizenship” the outlines and reflections of citizenship to the Brazilian reality and finally in the third section we discussed the “courses of action and challenges about “citizenship dimension to education in Brazil”.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF CITIZENSHIP

The issue citizenship has been object of reflections from countless scholars from human and social sciences in search to question this subject area in order to deepen knowledge about this category.

Although the concept of citizenship is traditionally related to the bourgeois revolution, with the implementation of the individual freedom, it
is necessary to understand the previous human organization which somewhat, helped its manifestation in the referred period and going beyond it, understanding in what aspects the man’s new ways of being and to producing required the establishment of regulatory milestones about his social life.

Some authors point the occurrence of citizenship manifestations, even before its existence or in good French terms avant la lettre, described as the prehistoric period of citizenship. Thereby, such approach requires a brief historic explanation about its development process. As we know, through a historical itinerary, in the didactic delimitation texts, some choices must be made, including the risk of not involving some manifestations also important.

We do not intend to unfold the history of art of the historical background of citizenship, which is an audacious and impossible mission to work, we have chosen to “touch” some contexts which could contribute for the discussion of citizenship in a more general perspective, even before its constitution. For this purpose, we will use the contributions of the work of Pinsky and Pinsky (2010), from which we will try to identify the sights of citizenship and its historical background (PINSKY, 2010; JAEGER, 1995; LIMA, 2012; GUARINELLO, 2010; FUNARI, 2010; HOORNAERT, 2010; ZERON, 2010).

Jaime Pinsky (2010), in an attempt to identify the most remote historical bases about citizenship, explains that these can be found in the Hebrew people. Not in Christianity or monotheism, but:

[…] concept of a God who is not satisfied in helping the army, but requires an ethical behavior by his followers. A God who is not worried about being the object of idolatry from people and with the sacrifice of animals in His holocaust, but much more committed with problems related to social exclusion, poverty, hunger, solidarity (p. 16).

Pinsky tries to detect in history a peculiar characteristic of the Hebrew people that culminated in a technique, which terms “ethical monotheism”, and explains that “[…] the indoctrination of the so-called social prophets establishes the foundation of the ethical monotheism, […] and it is, perhaps, the expression which was first documented and politically relevant (even because of its historical consequences) of what we could call of citizenship pre-history.” (p. 17).

He reveals that when analyzing texts of distinct Jewish authors, from different places and times, we notice their pride when showing a behavior of low numbers of drunks, thieves and murderers. We can detect, still, a mutual group pressure in which the threat of marginalization prevails against those who behave in an inadequate way. So,” […] since the first
letter to the rabbinate seminaries, it was taught that each Jew should assert the values of justice and fraternity established by God and accomplished by their ancestors. In the ethical practice the main difference between a Jew and a non-Jew would reside” (p.18).

We should observe that the induction to the maintenance of this idea was made by the Hebrew conviction and faith, passed from dad to child as a demonstration of the transcendental will, hence the acceptance of the given communal conditions and the legitimacy of the tribal lords about their dominated ones. Although there was an entire ethic of religious value, the feeling of ideological dominance was a situation not perceived as a problem, or it was accepted or rejected. As the education was directed to the confirmation of the arrangement “Inculcated” by the religious men since the child was born, there was no contestation to the “normal”. established.

From Simon Dubnow (an important historian), Pinsky highlights that a nation may pass by 3 stages: the tribal, the political-territorial and the historical-cultural. For Dubnow, only the Jews reached the last stage, because extrapolated the territorial links and kept them as a nation, even scattered in the world. However, there is still a question: who created the ethical monotheism? And it responds that it is a creation of the prophets, which almost became a conquest of the entire humanity. The primacy and morality doctrine is Intrinsic in the individual.

PINSKY runs through the texts written by the prophets Isaiah and Amós (in a period when the monarchy was divided in Israel and Judah) to reveal the political character in the mind of the prophets, which the author calls “revolutionary”. Once with boldness (and with the direction of God) dared to face their time, their kings and their religious costumes and selfless practices. So, “give up the God of the temple, of any temple, and create the God of citizenship” (p. 27).

We cannot state, however, that the cares with the moral living or the establishment of the Jew moral statute set themselves as ample and unrestricted, once that it serves in a major amplitude level to the Jews and the freely converted. The hierarchy of domination was made by the war and the capacity of territory extension. The servitude relation was not a question of social justice or anything like that, I mean; it was not a problem in its organization, given the complete rule for those who have the theocentric and economic hegemony. The same was applied to women, conditioned as proprieties of their husbands, just like the education they received about their social role, and assert the same principle to their servants and children.

The principle of fortune extension, rights and social prerogatives to the “men of polis” has a strong recurrence in the Greek men, however, the modus of knowledge in the polis was given on birth or in aristocracy, and the transcendental value as a thruster spring, but we cannot deny the form of
representativeness which starts to draft the “resources” of its democracy, of the discussion arena and cultural manifestation, as Jaeger says (1995, p.5):

[...] Greece represents, in face of the great peoples of the East World, a fundamental “progress”, a new “stadium” in everything which refers to men’s life in community. This is based on completely new principles. The more elevated we judge the artistic, religious and political realizations of the ancestors; the history of what we can call culture with certainty only begins with the Greek.

About this Lima (2012) complements that the sense of culture, education and pedagogy to the Greek education assumes one other meaning in relation to the previous peoples, because the fagent of rationality about the world and its conditioner happen from the Greek, being the contemplative knowledge or the relation lived, or even with emphasis in the articulation of the former ones. In this sense, the Greek rationality (Logos) emphasizes another kind of education and pedagogy focused on the education of the of the whole man, but even so it would not say that everyone has the same horizontal conditions to constitute himself “citizen” of the polis, as highlighted previously, even in face of an education focused on aristocratic values, at the expense of a nearly or no education for those who did not belong to the high level of the social pyramid.

Guarinello (2010), when discussing the Greco-Roman contributions to the cities in the Classical Antiquity, reveals that understanding citizenship requires knowledge regarding to a long historical process where the Roman Empire is the obligatory point of transition. He points out that in this process, an evolution in the idea of citizenship occurred, which has its genesis in the belonging to a small agricultural community (City-State), and subsequently, it becomes the source of claims and conflicts, when they clashed in different conceptions of rights and duties of the citizens:

[...] the participation in Power, law equality, but also in the economical ones were the terms in these conflicts and eliminated from community citizenship, progressively, its capacity of a potential source of claims (p.45-46).

The Hellenistic culture, which was present in the Roman Empire, would consider the form and disposition of the laws, some social benefits applied to the Roman citizens. However, according to Lima (2012), the cultural content, mobilized by its form of social organization, by the systematized appearance of philosophy made the Greek education a hallmark in the education history and the pervasive Roman pedagogical thought in the ‘civitas’. Even medieval age will not ignore, but, delimited each human segment by its birth condition, social hierarchy, and others.
The Roman legacy contributed a lot to the actual concept of citizenship, as demonstrated by Funari (1010), in which exposes that the Roman experience, used to present characteristics really similar to the modern notions of citizenship and popular participation. The author highlights that “[…] the founding founders of the USA took the Roman republic construction as a model, with a combination of Senate and Chamber (substituting the ancient assemblies)” (p. 76). Another point of contribution was the use of the secret voting which Funari considers the bedrock of the citizen freedom. He still highlights forums characterized as a major symbol of the citizenship participation.

In Roman society, especially in the Christian communities in the first centuries, there was another element which promoted the bases of citizenship, according to Hoonaert (2010). However, this affirmation is not apparent in documents which support the idea of Christianity articulating citizenship, it is necessary “[…] read between the lines, interpret, the implied, investigate from a new optics, once that the intellectuals of that time did not demonstrate interest of what was going on within the Christian movement” (p. 83).

In his opinion, the extraordinary development in the Christian communities in a short-time did not happen (as stated in the current literature on this subject), to the martyrdom; the miracles or the evangelization, but to the education of an associative link between the marginalized populations, “[…] which covers a social area, which was fully neglected by the Roman administration, i.e., the organized fight for citizenship (avant la lettre, of course) within the Roman society” (p.82).

With the growing of strengthening of the Christianity in the Roman Empire, the idea of “citizens of the Kingdom of God” was focused on the education of the people and children, preparing the new converted to the baptism, or to the general worship, as a model of ethical and moral instruction. But still under the legitimating view of the status quo established “to Cesar what is Cesar’s”, although little by little it was the demands of new Christians were tackled...

This organized fight comes from a series of services in the social and humanitarian fields made by the Christians and in a short time received a solid popular support while it was spreading. In this way, the services provided, like charity or benesse, “[…] we translate, afterwards, in law advances, political power and cultural prestige” (p.82). Then, the author says:

[…] Christianity did not win by evangelization of its apostles or bishops, neither by the undaunted testimony of martyrs, by holiness of its heroes, virtue neither by the miracles of its saints. It won by a persistent and brave work in the basis of
social and political construction in the society. [...] It provided a real citizenship to many people and many groups, although limited and really modest in terms of global society (Ibid, p. 94).

In the medieval period, the Christian contributions because of the feudal society became diffuse and there is a dominance of power of the feudal lords and the strengthening of nobility, being the servants and slaves not cared. In relation to Renaissance, Zeron (2010) highlights that there is a renewal of the valuing of men as a discoverer of himself and of the world which surrounds him. Then, they will highlight an education to the new restored Christian ethics and, in its initial phase, the artistic and cultural manifestations and still, the boost to the construction of another world perspective by the strengthening of bourgeoisie.

The latter will contribute as a conditioning basis to the new idea of the man to be formed, under the economic disposition overseas and that, even tried to break with the interests of the traditional church. So, it is worth mentioning the protestant reform that, supported by the main German princes, among others, will have as a necessary and indispensable condition meeting the social demands of the needy and the education for the knowledge of the Word of God. This was one of the initiatives of the public school, like in the Republic of Weimar in later. (LIMA, 2012).

Even so, the sense and meaning of citizenship did not correspond to what we understand today, although the beginning of the modern age (17th century) with the scientific revolution, however, with the economical transformations of the 18th century, the strengthening of bourgeoisie and Enlightenment, but the late 18th century and the entire 19th century, with the industrial revolution would have to establish parameters to think how man should be formed in the typology of the present society. It will happen mainly because of the relations of production and regulation of the work force. Then, little by little, in the relations of class struggles, way of production, structural form of the new society, it would have to establish the demarcation of rights and duties and, consequently, starting the senses and meanings of citizenship, as term and social category.

It is not the capitalist society which will establish the parameters of citizenship, of its senses and meanings, but the struggle within it, mobilized by multiple determinations in the relation between ways of production and work strength as we will highlight.

**CITIZENSHIP AND CONTRADICTIONS: SENSES AND MEANINGS**

According to Marshall (1967), citizenship is the act of participating, in a general way, in the political community, being manifested by the loyalty to the present standards of civilization and access to the well-being...
and the material safety. Nevertheless, the participation in the political community presupposes rights and duties. The individual rights amount to indicators of citizenship in which the State recognizes the production and work spheres; of political activity and of consumption.

As such, Marshall understands that citizenship manifests itself in three axes, namely, civil, political and social rights. These elements interact to compose the citizenship tripod. We should explain each element.

The civil rights, according to Marshall, are those which concretize the individual freedom (free thought; to the acquisition or maintenance of property): “The civil element is composed by the necessary rights to individual freedom – freedom of movement, freedom of the media, thought and faith, the right to property and of valid contracts and the right to justice (MARSHALL, 1967, p.63).

In this view, in relation to the right to justice, there must be tools which guarantee the defense and maintenance of all previous rights, that is why he “[…] differs from others because it is the right of defense and affirm all the rights in terms of equality with the others and the due lawsuit work (ibid, p.63).

The political rights are a possibility of participation in political power (participate of a government, be elected, choose the government, vote). Marshall clarifies: ‘[…] the right of participating in the exercise of the political power, as a member of an organism with political authority or as a voter of the members of such organism” (ibid, p.63).

The social rights can be explained with the State guaranteeing minimum access to the well-being and material security. Social rights can be understood as an access of all the individuals in participating in the current civilization standard:

Social element refers to everything which goes from the right to a minimum of economic well-being and security to the right of participating, completely, in the social inheritance and live like a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in society. The most intimate institutions linked to an individual are the educational system and the social services (Idem, Ibid, p. 64).

We should point out that, according to Marshall, the civil, political and social rights are materialized if they extrapolate the legal texts and are implemented in the everyday life of the social individuals. Then, for the fact, such rights could be implemented: to the fulfillment of the civil rights, it becomes necessary the access to public attorney, or financial resources to the payment of lawyers, law services to the ones unable to pay such service, independence of the Supreme Court in face of the private, economic and
social pressures. To the fulfillment of the political rights it is necessary the existence of conditions of voting and being voted. To the implementation of the social rights, the State must have enough financial conditions to provide a minimal social well-being.

Marshall, still, in a compelling way affirms that these elements which constitute the guarantee of citizenship were so far through the time that it is possible to affirm that each one has its genesis in different centuries: the civil rights come from the 18th century, the political ones from the 19th century and the social rights come from 20th century. However, he explains that these periods must be “[…] treated with a reasonable elasticity, and there are some connections especially in the last two cases.” (Idem, ibid, p.66).

To better understand the evolutionary process of the rights and, concurrently, the implementation of citizenship, we should consider Marshall:

I’ve tried to demonstrate that the civil rights appeared, in first place, and established itself in a very similar way of the modern form assumed before first Law of Reform in 1832 came into force. The political rights followed the civil ones, and their enlargement was one of the main characteristics of the 19th century, although the principle of universal political citizenship was not recognized until 1918. The social rights, otherwise, almost disappeared in the 17th century. Their reappearance started with the development of the primary public education, but it was not until the 20th century that they reached a plan of equality with the other two elements of citizenship (ibi, p.75).

However, Saes (2012), on the search of the word citizenship, explains that the development of the rights is not linear and simply evolutionary, as Marshall proposes. The implementation of such rights occurs within social struggles, once that, if the working class, in order to implement its citizenship, assume a dynamic and progressive action, the ruling class tend to be stagnatists and even regressive, causing conflicts in the creation of new rights, however, not contradictory. From Göran Terborn, Saes concludes that “[…] it would be the popular fights, if potencialized by the internal dissentions of the ruling classes in the national and international plans, the determining fagent in the global fagent in the creation of rights in a capitalist society”.

Saes also appeals to Jean-Claude Delaunay, who understands the term citizenship in “Initial effective citizenship” and “developed effective citizenship”. The first refers to the civil rights, necessary to the implementation, reproduction and expansion of the relation between capital and paid work, as an agreement of an individual’s will. The second relates
to the political and social rights. The evolution of the initial citizenship to developed effective citizenship is resultant from the popular struggles when imposing the implementation of new rights to the ruling class. The concession of such rights does not destroy the capitalism, but they are not wished by the capitalists.

Similarly, Afonso and Ramos (2007) on the sense and meaning of the term, explain that citizenship is, above all, a conquest from the popular classes and not a mere concession of the State. So, the social struggles are the protagonists in the process of strengthening the social rights:

Thus, the social struggles were produced through History, have a stronger expression between the 19th and 20th centuries, and conduct a conception of enlarged citizenship, meaning not only civil and political rights, but also social rights to the workers. (p. 81).

However, the implementation of citizenship or the citizen status has, as prerogative, the linking with the State/nation as regulator of social life. We should explain that it is only in the 18th century that the modern State and Nation get together to form the State/nation (MARSHALL, 1967; HABERMAS, 1995 & AFONSO and RAMOS, 2007). And, in this way, we have, in determined territorial space, the organizing unity of a State with its own specificity, national identity. However, according to Afonso and Ramos (2007, p.80), “State and nation are different realities, sometimes with past, sequence, direction and really distinct protagonists, which may or may not have long term connections, but always with their own histories”.

In any case, the connection between the citizen subject and the State/nation is prerogative to the implementation of the citizen status, what is also explained by Benevides (1998):

Citizenship and its rights concern a determined juridical-political order in a country or state, in which a constitution defines and guarantees who are the citizens, what rights and duties they will have in function in a series of variables such as age, status quo, mental health and the own idea of citizenship are not universal in the sense that they are fixed to a special and determined juridical-political order. Then, we identify Brazilian, North-American and Argentine citizens, and we know that vary the rights and duties of a citizen vary from country to country (p.04).

In this respect, the author emphasizes that citizenship is also connected with political decisions, of a determined government, for example. Then, citizenship can be altered according to political decisions, when modifying rights and duties of the citizen, for example, when modifying the criminal code modify the civil code (equality of rights among
genders, changes in the family code, rights and duties of the spouses, offspring etc.). All of this concerns citizenship.

However, through its historical process, the term “citizenship” has been used in many meanings, including antagonistic ones among them. According to Martins (2000), citizenship can be characterized, at least in three manifestations: a) as an economic value; b) as a gnoseologic value and c) as an eminently ethical and political value.

Citizenship, as an economical value refers to the overlap of the economical questions in relation to the other social facets, making the reduced to a mere client, or a consumer of state services.

A gnoseologic value refers to the citizen who simply knows his rights and duties, especially the ones which are related to consumption. In the latter, the individual adopts a position of uncritical passivity, he does not participate in the formulation process of the rights and duties, neither question its principles and its objectives.

In a broader concept, which surpasses the economic and gnoseologic dimensions it is presented with ethical-political value, in which the citizen is subject to his own historical destiny, is detached from individual condition entering the political struggle, knows his rights and duties and participates in a conscious and transforming action of society and men, which will result in a new social situation (MARTINS, 2000).

In relation to the Educational Policy, the same author points out that, since the traditional theories until the contemporary ones affirm that the objective of education is the education of the citizen, however, with fully distinct characteristics in each of them, once that the social policies are characterized as a State interference with the objective of maintaining social relations, or the status quo. Then, in a class society, the citizen is educated according to the pre-established limits of the dominant powers. Reflecting the relation of the educational policy with citizenship is the objective of the next section.

EDUCATIONAL POLICIES AND CITIZENSHIP

The exercise of citizenship requires knowledge of the rights and duties and an eminently defensive political posture and enlargement of the rights by public policies, resulting in a collective conscience as a non-linear tool of the “social context” which, in the actual social structure, although it is not a ruling axis, it has been demonstrating presence and strength in the new educational policies in the citizen construction with ethical-political values.

To Afonso and Ramos (2007), the construction of the citizen linked to certain interests, values and particular ideas, was strengthened by the
historical typology of the Brazilian public school. These authors use citizenship restricted to State-nation logic nomenclature to designate, in a certain moment of the human history, situations and social-economic policies in which a non-democratic or authoritarian was characterized, once the rights legally constituted and respected were scarce or embarrassed.

However, the educational role in the construction process and strengthening of citizenship are considered important:

[…] the construction of citizenship or the process to be a citizen is also an epic and historical process which is related to the victory facing the power and that, surely, is related with education and with the capacity of having voice and using the word, and acting according to it (p. 82).

However, in the context of globalization and educational reforms, in which the educational systems are delimited from the changes of the capitalist system, in which we see the educational policy focused on meeting the needs of the production systems, citizenship as a dimension of collective consciousness is not always privileged in school arena.

Afonso and Ramos (2007) affirm that democratic citizenship and social cohesion emerge in this context, conversely, because citizenship is considered an antidote to the growing neoliberal vulnerability of social rights which increase the inequality and social exclusion. Hence the need of the school being a public space of democracy and citizenship, as a place of hegemonic confrontations.

Although it is undeniable that economical rationality influenced the Brazilian educational policy, according to Sobral (2000), we cannot ignore the social conception of education, once that the development of educational policy enlarges the educational access opportunities, which concurrently, can decrease the social inequalities and for this reason, education also promotes citizenship.

Sobral (2000) emphasizes that education promotes development of the individuals, including the increase of competitiveness among them, meeting the demands of the companies and of the country in the international market. However, do the National Education Guidelines and Framework Law, in a dualist logic, let education promote citizenship and competitiveness?

Education to citizenship seems to be weakened, as demonstrated by Jacobi (2008). The author highlights the detachment between the centralized powers and the social realities which highlights the limits of the formal, vertical, and corporative and client mechanisms, which were made to permit/prevent the participation of the citizens in public affairs.
In this way, there is an urgent need to the citizenship be taken as a central role in the institutionalization of the citizens participation in decision making process in public interest, whether in the context of educational policies, or the other structural and infrastructural policies. The main challenge will be to strengthen the deliberative spaces and modernize the tools of management and articulation.

So, it is required the guarantee of assessment of information, mainly to the most vulnerable populations to strengthen the citizenship education practices and provide a major commitment in joint responsibility practices of management and of the public thing, which guarantee the expression and representation of the collective interests.

**CHALLENGES AND COURSES OF ACTION ABOUT THE DIMENSION OF CITIZENSHIP TO EDUCATION IN BRAZIL**

Thinking over the challenges and course of action of the Educational Policy to the implementation of citizenship, surely, it is a complex task, because there are many challenges to be faced, as already highlighted by many authors. We remember Moacir Gadotti’s (2008) contribution, which points out the need of building a school which can be public, universal, or in other terms, equal to all the individuals and respect the regional, local and multicultural specificities, which he calls citizen school, whose formulation must undertake efforts to understand that:

To this author, the main current challenge, in respect of public school, is to provide a universal quality standard, i.e., equal to all, and at the same time, respecting the regional peculiarities. The same explains that this challenge is result of the nationalization of schools by bourgeoisie. He exposes that in order to implement the citizen school, it is necessary to “join the national with the regional, inserting the popular in the public, overtaking the national and state school to reach the popular school” (ibid, p.52).

To Gadotti, the creation of the citizen school is a historical creation project, a horizon, a belief that can be built from a Decalogue:

1) the autonomous public school is, before everything else, democratic (for all) in its management, […] assessment and permanence […] has communitarian social character […]. 2) to be autonomous, it cannot be dependent of middle bodies which design policies from which the school is a mere executor […]. 3) the citizen school must value the 40 hour contract of full time teachers: 4 class hours per day and 4 hours for other activities (interdisciplinary group) […]. 4) Direct action. Value the personal initiative and school projects […]. 5) the autonomous school cultivates the curiosity, passion for the study, pleasure for reading and writing […]. 6) it is a disciplined school […]. 7) School is not a closed space
anymore. It is linked to the world in terms of work [...]. 8) the school transformation doesn’t happen without conflicts. It happens slowly. [...]. 9) There are not equal schools. Each school is a result of the development of its contradictions. 10) each school should be sufficiently autonomous to organize its work whatever it wants […] (ibid, p.52, 53, 54).

Thereby, the author questions what force could construct the citizen school, and answers, the transformation of the school should join two historical movements, the movement for the public education and the movement for a popular education.

Vaidergorn (2000, p.21) alerts that “[…] basic education, presented as a right of citizenship conquered by the masses and incorporated as a liberal value, is not more than a way of securing social inequality on behalf of rights equality”. Hence, the knowledge about the kind of citizenship that the Educational Policy presupposes.

Citizenship, in capitalist social arrangement, is a tool of social stratification, in which the using the benefits of civilization and possibility of overcoming differences of class. And to the conservatives as a control element of mass rebellions, pointing it to the totalitarianism” (Ibid, p.21).

Then the importance of education as a possibility of constitution or education to a full citizenship. Thereby, Valdemarin (2000), based on Rousseau’s texts, tries to show the connection between policy and education, and points out a course of action in the pedagogical actions, “[…] need of individual strengthening to avoid dependence on the social rules and values, and not the exacerbated and selfish individualism practiced nowadays, but the practice of one’s own potentialities” (p. 51), so that in the moment of the social contradictions, the collective consciousness has sufficient basis e and contestation force and consistence in its claims.

This transforming education promotes conscience through the view of the students, teachers, improving the educational policies manifesting the democratic dimension to citizenship and the recognition that everyone is part of a history constituted by one’s turn, voice and vote and more than that, the knowledge which are acquired and the results begin to have another flavor: an emphasis in the constitution of men as a social agent and not as passive subject who must, simply, consume a linear intellectual knowledge (LIMA, 2010a). That is the big challenge, so: education in and for full citizenship.

To this author, the principle is still a guideline to education today is the one which allows the development of capacities and autonomy, in which the individual is capable of not being subject to the powers established without a previous judgment.
Not being subject to established powers, mainly if they come from an authoritarian society, which, according to Marilena Chauí (1994), is the Brazilian society. In this society, citizenship is a “class privilege”, according to the author.

Nogueira (2000) when questioning the violence question (another challenge to be faced in school), explains that the same happens today, in the Brazilian policy there is still the relation between protection and favor. This makes the public space receive a private treatment from governors. In this public space the school is not a place where citizenship is constructed and rights acquired, and become a place of private political promotion, offered as a favor to the people by politicians:

The quality of this education is regarded as avoid failing at school and dropout rates, ignoring the pedagogical aspects, its values, importance, methods, objectives and the most important the concern with the whole education of a future citizen.

The great challenge nowadays is education which allows and implements citizenship. The courses of action are related only to the of public policies, which emphasize education as one of the assurances of the citizen right, it is also true the experience and the understanding of citizenship as a conquest by the education, the marks be memorial of the same, in the perspective human, democratic and universal dimension.

**FINAL CONSIDERATIONS**

We observed in this study that the senses and meanings of citizenship are full of contradictions, although the term citizenship is, long-established, being debated about distinct points of life. The sense of a citizenship which corresponds to the democratic perspective improves the courses of action of the educational policies in order that its implementation gives meaning to the constitution of citizens which live and claim the social space as a universal and humanized conquest. This is the biggest challenge of the contemporary societies because of the predominance of the structural arrangement of capitalism.

The recognition that education and acquisition of knowledge is fundamental to the construction of citizenship with ethical-political value is undeniable, but it is also true that the school alone is unable to translate the desired complete and structural changes, in particular, in the Brazilian society. Conversely, according to Lima (2010b) the integration of multiple voices constitutes the dimension of totality in human learning, whether in the school life or the school of life or facing the realities of social inequality or injustice. This non-linear process requires that men live together resignifying values, i.e., by the establishment of what is important and/or a
priority to the human group or society, the assumptions, which will guide the social practice, just like the notion of ethics and morality between the subjects. Here is a search and courses of action that the educational policies need to handle with a recurrently.
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