

COUNTRYSIDE EDUCATION IN THE FRAMEWORKS OF CONSTITUTIONAL
LAW: LEGALITY, RESISTANCE AND MATERIAL EXISTENCE

*EDUCAÇÃO DO CAMPO NOS MARCOS DO DIREITO CONSTITUCIONAL:
LEGALIDADE, RESISTÊNCIA E EXISTÊNCIA MATERIAL*

*LA EDUCACIÓN EN EL CAMPO EN LOS MARCOS DEL DERECHO
CONSTITUCIONAL: LEGALIDAD, RESISTENCIA Y EXISTENCIA MATERIAL*



Vanderlei AMBONI¹
e-mail: vanderlei.amboni@unespar.edu.br

How to reference this paper:

AMBONI, V. Countryside education in the frameworks of constitutional law: Legality, resistance and material existence. **Rev. Educação e Fronteiras**, Dourados, v. 13, n. 00, e023011, 2023. e-ISSN: 2237-258X. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30612/eduf.v13i00.16262>



| Submitted: 25/08/2022
| Revisions required: 17/03/2023
| Approved: 22/05/2023
| Published: 03/10/2023

Editor: Prof. Dr. Alessandra Cristina Furtado
Deputy Executive Editor: Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

1 State University of Paraná (UNESPAR), Paranavaí – PR – Brazil. Coordinator of the Study and Research Group on Education in Rural Diversity [GESPEDIC, UNESPAR]; Member of the Study and Research Group on Rural Education [GEPEC, UFSCar]. Assistant professor, Department of History.

Rev. Educação e Fronteiras, Dourados, v. 13, n. 00, e023011, 2023.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30612/eduf.v13i00.16262>

e-ISSN:2237-258X

1

ABSTRACT: This work examined the social struggles favoring rural education as a human-social right, exploring how these struggles led to the attainment of this right, the forms of resistance employed, and the significance of the physical presence of schools in rural areas as a constitutional right. The study was based on the hypothesis that only through struggle is it possible to achieve and secure the legal existence of rural schools within the scope of rural education. It relied on documents produced by social movements, acquired legislation, and historiography on rural education. To achieve this, we adopted Historical-Dialectical Materialism to investigate the subject, enabling a deeper understanding of the historical process and economic factors that play a role in class struggles. The research results demonstrated that social efforts are redefined and evolving to achieve and expand the rights to rural education, which is crucial for the unity and enrichment of rural communities.

KEYWORDS: Constitutional right. Field education. Material existence. Social movements. Resistance.

RESUMO: *Este trabalho analisou as lutas sociais em prol da educação do campo como um direito humano-social, explorando como essas lutas levaram à conquista desse direito, as formas de resistências adotadas e a importância da existência material das escolas no campo como um direito constitucional. O trabalho partiu da hipótese de que somente através da luta é possível conquistar e garantir a existência legal das escolas no campo no âmbito da educação rural. O estudo se baseou em documentos produzidos por movimentos sociais, legislações conquistadas e na historiografia sobre a educação no campo. Para isso, adotamos o Materialismo Histórico-Dialético como método de investigação do objeto, permitindo uma compreensão mais profunda do processo histórico e dos fatores econômicos que desempenham um papel nas lutas de classes. Os resultados da pesquisa demonstraram que as lutas sociais são ressignificadas e estão em evolução para a conquista e ampliação dos direitos à educação no campo, crucial para a unificação e enriquecimento das comunidades rurais.*

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *Direito constitucional Educação do campo. Existência material. Movimentos sociais. Resistência.*

RESUMEN: *Este trabajo analizó las luchas sociales por la educación en el campo como derecho humano-social, su conquista, formas de resistencia y la existencia material de las escuelas en el campo como derecho constitucional. El trabajo partió de la hipótesis de que sólo la lucha conquista y garantiza la existencia legal de la escuela en el campo en el marco de la educación rural. El estudio se realizó sobre documentos producidos por movimientos sociales, leyes conquistadas e historiografía sobre la educación rural. Para ello, utilizamos el Materialismo Histórico-Dialético como método de investigación del objeto, cuyo movimiento trae consigo la comprensión del proceso histórico y los determinantes económicos que se mueven en las luchas de clases. Los resultados mostraron que las luchas están ressignificadas y en marcha en la conquista y ampliación de los derechos a la educación en el campo, cuya escuela trae unidad y vida en la comunidad campesina.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Derecho constitucional. Educación de campo. Existencia material. Movimientos sociales. Resistencia.*

Introduction

In the human world, two fundamental processes are inseparable from people's lives: work and education. They represent crucial links in the modes of production of human material existence, created throughout history by humanity itself and sustaining social reproduction. In this process, not only do inherent social contradictions emerge, but also possibilities for counter-hegemonic projects, representing forms of colonial resistance to the established principle by the dominant class. The reproduction of life is a continuous act of labor, which includes necessities such as food, clothing, and shelter. However, this production under human conditions is only possible through the production and dissemination of knowledge generated by humans throughout their existence, making it a continuous process in human history.

In the material existence of human beings, there is also the material existence of work and education, under which society reproduces itself in social contradiction. Education is a social process of socialization through which language and knowledge produced by social groups are transmitted to individuals, enabling them to live in society. As Pinto (1987, p. 17, our translation) argued, "education is the process by which society shapes its members in its image and pursuit of its interests". The material existence of humans is linked to educational existence, the materiality of which is an inherent process in social life and occurs wherever the individual is present.

Despite this, social reproduction is intrinsically linked to society, as it operates from an individual's birth and shapes them into a social individual. In other words, humans learn to live in the given conditions found in the social environment, and through this process, they act on this environment, transforming it while transforming themselves. It is a dialectical process, both of nature and of social being.

In this context, a movement for education in rural areas emerges, where the individuals who inhabit fields, waters, and forests make history, produce material life, and create conditions for social reproduction through social education. They transform social education into school content because "[...] all knowledge is historical, not because it emerges in a certain era, not because it passes through time, but because it derives from the flow of time, from the past existing in each present moment [...]" (PINTO, 1969, p. 519-520, our translation).

In Brazil, education in rural areas has always faced tensions and pressures from urban education, often stigmatized and underestimated, denying rural residents access to quality schooling. The material existence of schools in rural areas is situated in a secondary position, and their presence and permanence depend on the resistance of social groups inhabiting rural

territories. In the social reproduction of rural areas, schools are a vital necessity for this population, although they are not on the political agenda of the dominant classes.

Rural education emerged from civil society in the 1980s, consecrated as a constitutional right, and consolidated in Law No. 9394/96. Its nature stems from social struggles to meet the aspirations of the rural community, which seeks a school that redefines education provision in terms of content, methodology, and school calendar, considering respect for the seasonality of work. In this process, "it is the school that must adjust, in its form and content, to the subjects which need it; it is the school that must reach out to the learners, and not the other way around" (CALDART, 2003, p. 63, our translation).

Our focus of study is rural education from the constitutional law perspective, seeking a public policy that recognizes the workplace as a place of residence and, therefore, extends the right to education to where people live. This is valid for all rural communities, whether they are people of the forests, waters, or the countryside, collectively known as rural communities². Public education policy must be present where the people are, with it, the structure that guarantees the necessary conditions for Accessed in to and retention in schools. In this perspective, an investigation will be conducted through readings and reflections on legislation, social movements, and academia without constitutional illusions.

The text will be divided into three parts to present the work in a more pedagogical manner. In the first section, social mobilization in the construction of rural education will be addressed, highlighting the social struggles that resulted in the inclusion of the right and duty of the State in education for all in the 1988 Federal Constitution. Next, the achievement of rural education in Law No. 9394/96 will be explored, which enshrined an educational approach that integrates work and education.

In the second section, investigations and presentations will be made regarding the legislation that the State has produced to ensure the effective implementation of rural education as part of the schooling process for young people residing in these areas, respecting cultural diversity and various modes of material life.

² We designate as rural peoples those who occupy "spaces in the forest, livestock, mines, and agriculture, [...] fishing areas, coastal communities, riverside communities, and extractivists" (BRASIL, 2002, p. 4-5). Presidential Decree No. 7,352, dated November 4, 2010, reaffirms in its Article 1, Paragraph 1, that the following are considered rural populations: I - rural populations: family farmers, extractivists, artisanal fishermen, riverside dwellers, settlers, and campers from agrarian reform, rural wage laborers, *quilombola* communities, coastal communities, forest peoples, *caboclos*, and others who derive their material conditions of existence from work in rural areas (BRASIL, 2010).

Finally, in the third section, the investigation will focus on the presence of schools within communities, a crucial aspect that reflects the unity of communities in defending the interests of rural communities, incorporating memories and values generated by rural life. Within rural communities' diversity, eating, drinking, dressing, and sheltering create a culture of work and social life production. These individuals seek to value these traditions through rural education, whose essence is expressed in community life, strengthened by the presence of schools, as it translates into spaces of sociability and amplifies energy in the community.

Thus, this article aims to explore and analyze this exposition and offer a deeper understanding of rural education and its importance for rural communities in Brazil.

Society in the Construction of Rural Education

All education is a conscious action of society in which individuals determine what they desire and how they desire it. In class-divided communities, education is an instrument of power for the ruling class, as this class holds material control. Education is, therefore, an instrument of social reproduction that allows the ruling class to maintain the existing status quo. Its existence is linked to the hegemonic social reproduction of the ruling class and is fraught with contradictions and social struggles. According to Federici, Mori, and Santos (2008, p. 147, our translation):

A society based on exploiting the working class does not perpetuate itself automatically; the reproduction of social relations that naturalize and legitimize the expropriation of labor and the mechanisms necessary for capital accumulation is essential for its continuity. To this end, the superstructure of society and its apparatuses are created, and schools are inserted into the community as one of these instruments of capitalist system hegemony.

The uprising of social movements and the precariousness of rural schools have given rise to a social struggle for education in these areas, organized and coherent with the guidelines laid down in the conquest of the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education, Law No. 9.394/96, and the movement created by the conference *Por uma Educação Básica do Campo* (For a Basic Education in the Countryside) and the birth of the "National Articulation for Rural Education." This unity and social mobilization allowed the rural communities to build an education proposal based on the principles of work and culture that characterize these communities in their uniqueness and the production of their material existences.

In the organizational process, Gryzbowski (1987, p. 59, our translation) states that social movements enable workers to take a dual action:

[...] Practical learning how to unite, organize, participate, negotiate, and fight.
[...] The elaboration of social identity, awareness of their interests, rights, and demands, and finally, a critical understanding of their world, practices, and social and cultural representations.

Nascimento (2006) emphasizes that when questioning the reality of rural schools, the precarious conditions of physical structures and low educational quality for rural individuals become evident. These schools do not serve the interests of the community located there because they do not reflect the reality of rural life or transform the lives of its residents. In this context, Nascimento (2006, p. 869, our translation) points out that:

[...] Rural education is called upon to construct humanistic matrices for rural people with a view to human emancipation. [...] In rural education, everyone is a subject and a builder of memory and history, that is, everyone is a social and cultural subject. In formal education, however, schooling, presented as the only pedagogical model for all Brazilians, reduces students to approved or failed, newcomers or repeaters, special or abnormal laggards, and creates a dichotomy between educator and learner.

Rural education, built by social movements, is a proposal that materializes in rural communities and consolidates itself as a school that opposes the hegemony of capital. Being an education achieved through social struggles, its nature and interests are intrinsically linked to the people who conducted it, materializing a project based on schooling aligned with the processes of life and work present in the countryside. It represents a distinct culture and way of life from each other and from urban spaces, where material and cultural aspects are constructed, with land as a central element, often the object of conflict between capital and labor.

However, the presence of agribusiness compromises the socio-environmental development of rural communities. Therefore, Ribeiro (2015, p. 81, our translation) reflects that "rural education is not guided by a finished model defined from the outside but is built in the struggle for agrarian reform or land for work, without which it is impossible to materialize this rural education," because Brazil is a culturally diverse country. In this perspective, Caldart (2003, p. 73, our translation) argues that

The educational environment is born from this reading of the pedagogical movement that occurs outside the school, in social practices, in social struggles, and needs to be reworked within the school so that it produces rather than reproduces the necessary learning for the formation of the subjects who are there.

In this process, "there is a pedagogical movement that is specific to the school but is only constituted when linked to the pedagogical movement of social relations that occur outside

it" (CALDART, 2003, p. 73, our translation). Indeed, Nascimento (2006) states that "rural education is characterized by the gestures and languages of peasant culture, contrasting with current educational dimensions with pedagogical matrices forgotten by the predominance of pedagogy of speech, transmission, and the teacher's discourse to silent students" (NASCIMENTO, 2006, p. 868, our translation).

In the continental dimension, Brazilian social formation has landownership linked to its origin and continuity, a reality that Paulo Mercadante (1980) summarizes in two categories: conciliation and conservation. These terms are fundamental for understanding Brazil without political illusions. These links persist in Brazilian society, and in the dance of power, agrarian elites maintain their influence over the agrarian structure and control of land to the detriment of social interests in agricultural reform. Therefore, in a society with these characteristics, the existence of rural education that confronts agribusiness represents social progress and recognition of education for rural individuals. And this process is only realized through social struggles.

In the struggle for survival, rural communities bring their culture and production modes as symbols of resistance. In this struggle, training and schooling align with constitutional frameworks. In this context, the State is summoned to fulfill the constitutional precept that establishes education as the right of all and the duty of the State. Despite being a capitalist institution with class hegemony, "[...] but it is also a possible space for the construction of counter-hegemony" (FEDERICI; MORI; SANTOS, 2008, p. 145, our translation).

The struggle for the right to education of rural people within the context of their material culture and ways of producing life ensures their right to an education that the rural inhabitants themselves mold. As Arroyo (2006, p. 104, our translation) observed:

The school bears the marks of the inequalities suffered by the subjects who have the right to it. It does not only maintain the effects of income inequalities, conditions, Fundeb, Fundef, or population distances and dispersion. The rural school fundamentally bears the marks of subjects marked by differences turned into inequalities. This shame of inequality based on social, racial, and ethnic disparities in the countryside accompanies our entire history of rural school construction.

In this sense, Arroyo (2006) argues that rural education is a historical construction made by marginalized people in an educational system structured around social inequalities. Therefore, only through struggle can rural education be conquered and guaranteed within the framework of rural education. Nevertheless, Carnoy and Levin (1977, p. 46, our translation) emphasize:

Education, as part of the functions of the State, is also a field of social conflict. In capitalist democracies, it is considered that the State is responsible for promoting justice and equality to offset the inequalities that arise from the social and economic system. The role of education is seen as improving the social position of disadvantaged groups by providing them with essential knowledge and credentials that enable them to participate. At the same time, the capitalist State and its education system must reproduce capitalist relations of production, including the division of labor and class relations that are part of that division. The tension between the reproduction of inequality and the production of greater equality is intrinsic to public schools, just as social stress is intrinsic to all institutions structured by class, race, or gender. The basis of this tension is not ideology but ideology as it relates to the concrete reality of social position, material wealth, and political power.

Between rights and reality, the latter is indelibly imposed under the primacy of offering secondary education to rural people. In this process, "the dominated do not free themselves unless they come to dominate what the dominators dominate. So, dominating what the dominators dominate is a condition of liberation" (SAVIANI, 2002, p. 69, our translation).

In the dynamics of republican social life, legal norms direct and regulate the activities of the State for the whole of social life, which is always a tangible expression of the ruling class, without exception. In the social contradiction, the working class moves, organizes, and mobilizes society to achieve rights. The struggle for rights includes rural education and highlight the *Encontro Nacional dos Educadores da Reforma Agrária* (National Meeting of Educators of Agrarian Reform -ENERA-1997) and the *Conferências Nacionais por uma Educação do Campo* (National Conferences for Rural Education -1998 and 2004).

In resistance and social mobilization, Nascimento (2006, p. 874, our translation) points out:

[...] There are social movements and popular organizations that are trying to react by adopting the proposal of primary rural education, such as the EFAs (Family Agricultural Schools), the MEB (Movement for Basic Education), which works on the literacy of young people and adults (FREIRE, 2001), the MST, with settlement and camp schools, as well as having specific teacher training, the MAB (Movement of People Affected by Dams) with its resettlement schools, indigenous schools, along with *quilombo* communities, as well as experiences in various grassroots communities fighting individually.

The social struggle for rural education was a fight where social forces in rural areas joined together in search of educational unity, recognizing rural individuals as subjects who educate themselves in producing material life with distinct organizational work methods, each with its particularities of education and labor. In this act, individuals move and shake the

structures of the State in the pursuit of the right, with the goal of rural education that values culture, memory, and work in the uniqueness of rural communities.

The Achievement of Educational Legislation for Rural Education

The role of the State in society is mediated by legislation, and in a bourgeois republic, laws are universal, recognizing social contradictions but also allowing internal struggles for new rights. They reflect the *modus operandi* of the legal process. The rural school dates back to the 1920s when there was concern among landowners about keeping the rural workforce tied to the land in the face of urbanization in Brazil. Thus, agrarian elites sought to create means to keep people in the countryside, and one of the consequences was the establishment of rural schools by the State. However, these schools often had an urbanized approach, contributing to reproducing the denial of education.

Education is a social right and part of individuals' integration into society. In this perspective, GPTEC/MEC (a governmental program) advocated for quality education for all because " [...] education, as an organizer and producer of a people's culture and produced by a culture - rural culture - cannot continue to follow the logic of excluding the right to quality education for everyone" (BRASIL, 2004, p. 33, our translation). Santos (2011, p. 19, our translation) observes that:

In Brazilian legislation, rural education is treated as rural education, with spaces in the forest, livestock, mining, and agriculture. However, it goes beyond these by incorporating fishing, extractive, riverine, and coastal areas. Thus, the countryside is considered a space of interrelation between human beings and practices that build and rebuild specific conditions of their social existence permeated by the human dimension.

In the era of universalizing social rights, rural education is still a utopia in many regions of Brazil. In areas where it exists, the majority of the educational offerings remain urbanized, and the essence of agricultural work is not considered in the school calendar. In the era of neoliberal capitalism, rural education is still a school of resistance and confrontation due to the absence of adequate public policies for rural communities. Indeed, Nascimento (2006) argues that rural education, historically, did not enter the country's political agenda because " [...] rural education, ignored and marginalized, was reduced to rural schools, unqualified teachers, and masses of illiterate people. It is evident that educational policies regarding the rural reality have been lacking for a long time [...]" (NASCIMENTO, 2006, p. 868, our translation). Fernandes and Molina (2004, p. 36, our translation) support this idea:

Historically, the concept of rural education has been associated with precarious, backward, low-quality, and resource-poor education. It had as its backdrop a rural area seen as inferior and archaic. The timid programs in Brazil for rural education were designed and developed without their subjects, without their participation, but ready for them.

In this process, a sociological nature is defined by the class character of the State, whose mode of production is based on wage labor in labor relations. In this perspective, rural schools serve a dual function: first, as compensatory to maintain individuals in rural areas, and second, for the reproduction of capital, whose essence is given and established in the capitalist mode of production. Lemes demonstrates this relationship:

Rural education was proposed by the country's rural elites as a compensatory action, treating rural individuals as ignorant people, not understanding that these individuals did not have the opportunity to acquire more excellent knowledge, and what they know are experiences acquired in their lives. In the same way as the economic sector, education is organized and divided into classes corresponding to their needs and interests. In the capitalist mode of production, education does not aim to serve the collective well-being but the conditions of expanded production/reproduction of capital (LEMES, 2010, p. 1325-1326, our translation).

In this precarious context, there is a reality that Nascimento (2006, p. 873, our translation) questions and answers:

But what kind of public school is offered to the rural population? It is a school abandoned, derogatorily called an isolated school. It is a school that ceases to exist when municipalities adopt a cost reduction policy, bringing children to study in the city on cattle trucks or vans, on poor roads, with hours of travel. In addition to excluding rural children and separating them into different classrooms, they must adopt the values of the city, or else they are called backward by their peers or even by their teachers.

Given this, it is possible to observe that the State is class-based, and its social contradictions are expressed in the interests that the dominant group defends for its class. In it, the hegemony of agribusiness over education and the diversity of the countryside is manifested through public policies issued by the State. Its nature is ideological because it presents education oriented towards the urban-centric, Eurocentric, and ethnocentric triad. It is urban-centric as it does not consider the meanings of life and the interests of rural communities. It is Eurocentric because it views modernity as a principle and values the city as a place of modernity and the countryside as a place of backwardness. It is ethnocentric because it projects the past of Western Europe as superior in terms of civilization and culture.

In this context, schools are in dispute among hegemonic projects in which the State, as the organizing entity, assumes the task of the dominant class, prioritizing large landholdings and agribusiness over rural education. This results in rural education being subordinate to the economic and ideological interests of the State. On the other hand, rural social movements act against these interests, redefining rural education and rural schools based on valuing labor and rural communities' culture. This approach places social work and nature preservation at the center of education and organizes around collectivity.

In the field of promulgated law, the State establishes norms for schools in rural areas, but the right to rural education is not fully realized because the absence of public policies keeps schools poor and secondary to the diversity present in rural areas.

The school is a space of human sociability that synthesizes a form of social organization in rural areas that bothers the dominant class. This dominant class maintains power, seeking reconciliation and preserving its hegemony over the land and the lives of rural people. However, this hegemony suffocates the emerging rural education and the integration of the lives of rural people with their productive culture and values that permeate the relationships in community life with both individuals and the land, water, and forests of rural areas. Community life plays an essential role in this perspective, with two forms of social interaction. The relationship between humans and nature continues to be one of production and conservation because they know that land and water are primary sources of life.

In the context of the reproduction of material life, humans build educational relationships, and class contradictions become evident in education. Even as people work the land, those in rural areas also struggle for education, but it is a complex struggle because social movements seek a rural school that respects their values and meets the real needs of rural residents. The social achievement of Law No. 9394/96, known as the LDB (Brazil's Education Guidelines and Framework Law), brought a uniqueness regarding rural schools. Articles 23, 26, and 28 propose a school that caters to the peculiarities of rural areas, including appropriate curricular content and methodologies, as well as a school organization that adapts the school calendar to the phases of the agricultural cycle, climatic conditions, and the nature of work in rural areas in general (BRASIL, 1996). Article 28 is particularly innovative as it considers the social diversity of labor and peasant culture as central to the pedagogical organization. In this pedagogical act, "education recreates the countryside because it renews the values, attitudes, knowledge, and practices of belonging to the land" (BRASIL, 2004, p. 33), since

In Brazil, the proclaimed universal right to education has been a hard-won achievement of social movements, especially public education workers at the federal, state, and municipal levels, with reference to the 1988 Constitution and, more recently, Law No. 9394/96, as a legal milestone in this process of affirming education in the field of human and social rights (BRASIL, 2004, p. 33, our translation).

This small step taken for rural schools is significant for rural people. The LDB brought a rural perspective by including "education for rural areas" in its norm and pointing to rural education, as it ensures the values of culture and work.

In 1998, the National Conference *Por uma Educação Básica do Campo* (For Basic Education in the Countryside) took place to boost efforts to redefine rural education. From it emerged a movement in defense of rural education called *the National Articulation For Basic Education in the Countryside*, which brought reflections on teaching and rural development from the perspective of rural people. In this conference, it was defined that

The term 'countryside' will be used instead of the usual 'rural' to include a reflection on the current meaning of peasant work and the social and cultural struggles of the groups trying to ensure the survival of this work in the process. But when discussing rural education, we will be addressing education that is directed at all workers in the countryside, including peasants, *quilombolas*, and indigenous nations, including the various types of wage earners linked to life and work in rural areas (KOLLING; NERY; MOLINA, 1999, p. 9, our translation).

Marschner (2011, p. 42, our translation) emphasizes that the successive debates on rural education came to represent the demands for schools in rural areas, a process that assumed "[...] a broad agenda of analysis about a specific space in Brazilian society, with a set of actions and demands aiming at the redefinition and transformation of rural areas." In this context, there is a clear indication that this process is constituted in "[...] the semantic field: discourses and representations about social space begin to reject the idea of 'rural,' replacing it with 'countryside' as a more appropriate concept for the space" (MARSCHNER, 2011, p. 42, our translation). As a result, rural education gained specific legislation with the approval of the Operational Guidelines for Basic Education in Countryside Schools³, whose materiality is evident in its normative acts, which Santos (2011, p. 21-22, our translation) summarizes as:

3 Law approved by the National Council of Education (CNE) through Resolution CNE/CEB No. 01, dated April 3, 2002. The law had the participation of social movements, indigenous peoples, *quilombola* communities, and so on.

I - **The identity of rural schools.** Article 2 - The rural school needs to be inserted into the reality of the rural environment, in the knowledge of the community, and social movements.

II - **Curriculum organization** (what and how to teach in the school). Articles 4 and 5. The following elements stand out: the topics to be addressed must be linked to the world of work and rural development; the methodology must also be suitable for the rural environment, recovering the materials available in the natural environment. This methodology rescues the richness of experiences, different teaching procedures, various teaching resources, and diverse learning spaces.

III - **Government responsibility** regarding educational provision and regulation of guidelines. Articles 3, 6, and 7. The municipal system must offer early childhood and elementary education in rural communities, settlements, or the municipality's headquarters.

IV - **School organization.** Article 7, Paragraphs 1 and 2. The school can organize classes in different ways (multi-grade course, cycle, alternation, or grades), and the rural school calendar can be arranged according to the reality of each location, provided it does not harm the students in terms of the number of school days.

V - **School Management.** Articles 10 and 11. Families and social movements have the guaranteed right to participate in discussions about the school's operation, the pedagogical proposal, and the use of financial resources and their allocation. This participation can occur in various spaces, such as the Municipal Education Council, School Council, Management Committees (School Fund, Meals, FUNDEF), Education Conferences, and in other ways, such as movements and unions participating in the preparation of the Municipal and State Education Plans.

VI - **Teacher Training.** Articles 11, 12, and 13. The municipal or state education system must guarantee the training of teachers who do not yet have normal (teacher training) or higher education, and the training programs must include specific knowledge that helps teachers work in line with the rural reality. It must also guarantee in-service continuous training and the qualification of untrained teachers in the classroom.

This same author further argues:

The concept of rural education recovers the view of education as a human formation of which the school is a part; it retrieves the perspective of education as a social process, highlighting the relationships between education and productive life, between social formation and culture, and between education and history. It is a process of constructing an education project for rural workers, gestated from the perspective of peasants and the trajectory of the struggle of their organizations (SANTOS, 2011, p. 19, our translation).

Thus, a legal framework regulates the right to education under rural education guidelines, highlighting articles 23, 26, and 28 of Law 9.394/96, which address the specificity and diversity existing in rural areas. This framework considers rural populations' social, cultural, economic, and other aspects nationally.

Furthermore, the State establishes normative guidelines for the right to education for rural populations, which are outlined as follows:

1. Opinion CNE/CEB No. 36, dated December 4, 2001, issued by Rapporteur Edla de Araújo Lira Soares, on the Operational Guidelines for Basic Education in Rural Schools, states:

Rural education, referred to as rural education in Brazilian legislation, has a meaning that encompasses the spaces of forests, livestock, mines, and agriculture but goes beyond by embracing fishing areas, coastal communities, riverside communities, and extractive communities. In this sense, rural areas, more than just non-urban territories, represent a field of possibilities that enhance the connection of human beings with the production of the conditions of social existence and the achievements of human society (BRASIL, 2001, p. 1, our translation).

This recognizes rural education as a process that objectively establishes education milestones for rural populations, with a link and foundation in the organization of work and culture related to the land.

2. Resolution CNE/CEB No. 1, dated April 3, 2002, which establishes Operational Guidelines for Basic Education in Rural Schools, states:

[...] The identity of rural schools is defined by their connection to issues inherent in their reality, rooted in the temporality and knowledge of students, in collective memory signaling futures, in the network of science and technology available in society, and in social movements advocating for projects that link solutions to these issues with the social quality of collective life in the country (BRASIL, 2002, p. 1, our translation).

3. Opinion CEB/CNE/MEC No. 1, dated February 2, 2006, establishes, exposes, and approves the days considered as instructional in the Pedagogy of Alternation:

3 – The Family and Agricultural Education Centers (CEFFA) meet legal requirements for the duration of the school year, as they integrate periods experienced in the educational center (school) and the socio-professional environment (family/community), considering as instructional days and hours activities carried out outside the classroom but within each student's study plan.

4 – Each Family Education Center for Alternation shall organize its political-pedagogical proposal in accordance with the National Education Guidelines Law (LDBEN), whether as a Family Agricultural School, Rural Family House, or Rural Community School, submitting it to the competent education system.

5 – It is recommended that the Political-Pedagogical Project of each CEFFA adopts the characteristics of the Pedagogy of Alternation in the concept of integrative or copulative alternation to allow for the comprehensive education of students, including further studies, and to positively contribute to integrated and self-sustainable rural development, particularly in regions/locations where family agriculture prevails (BRASIL, 2006, p. 9, our translation).

4. Presidential Decree No. 6,040, dated January 4, 2007, establishes the National Policy for Sustainable Development of Traditional People and Communities, recognizing them as:

[...] Traditional People and Communities: culturally distinct groups that recognize themselves as such, have their forms of social organization, occupy and use territories and natural resources as a condition for their cultural, social, religious, ancestral, and economic reproduction, using knowledge, innovations, and practices generated and transmitted by tradition (BRASIL, 2007, our translation).

Regarding this, the following principles are highlighted:

I - recognition, valorization, and respect for the socio-environmental and cultural diversity of traditional people and communities, taking into account, among other aspects, ethnicity, race, gender, age, religiosity, ancestry, sexual orientation, and labor activities, as well as the relationship of these aspects within each community or people, in order not to disrespect, subsume, or neglect the differences of these same groups, communities, or people or to establish or reinforce any relationship of inequality;
XIV - the preservation of cultural rights, the practice of community activities, cultural memory, and racial and ethnic identity (BRASIL, 2007, our translation).

5. Opinion CNE/CEB No. 3, dated February 18, 2008, reexamines Opinion CNE/CEB No. 23/2007, addressing the consultation regarding the necessary support for rural education and establishing a conceptual debate on the definition of rural schools, ultimately defining the legal guidelines for rural education support (BRASIL, 2008b).

6. Resolution CNE/CEB No. 2, dated April 28, 2008, establishes complementary guidelines, rules, and principles necessary for the development of Rural Education, defines criteria for school clustering, and ensures intracampus and rural-to-urban school transportation, aiming to provide educational opportunities close to the learners' residences (BRASIL, 2008b).

It establishes and regulates the provision of rural education as follows:

Article 1: Rural Education comprises Basic Education in its stages of Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, Secondary Education, and Integrated Technical Education and is intended to serve rural populations in their various forms of life production, including family farmers, extractivists, artisanal fishermen, riverside communities, settlers and landless individuals from Agrarian Reform, *quilombolas*, coastal communities, indigenous people, and others.

Paragraph 1: Rural Education, the responsibility of the Federative Entities, which should establish forms of collaboration in its planning and execution, aims to universalize Accessed in, retention, and educational success with quality at all levels of Basic Education.

Paragraph 2: Rural Education shall be regulated and offered by the States, the Federal District, and the Municipalities within their respective priority areas of operation.

Paragraph 3: Rural Education shall preferably be developed through regular education.

Paragraph 4: Rural Education shall, through appropriate procedures, cater to rural populations who have not had Accessed in to or have not completed their Elementary or Secondary Education studies at the proper age.

Paragraph 5: Education systems shall take measures to ensure that children and young people with special needs, who are the subject of Special Education, residing in rural areas, also have Accessed in to Basic Education, preferably in regular schools in the education system (BRASIL, 2008b, our translation).

7. Decree No. 7.352, dated January 4, 2010, establishes the Public Policy for Rural Education and the National Education Program in Agrarian Reform - PRONERA, with the following principles of Rural Education standing out:

I - respect for the diversity of rural areas in their social, cultural, environmental, political, economic, gender, generational, racial, and ethnic aspects;

II - encouragement to formulate specific political-pedagogical projects for rural schools, stimulating the development of school units as public spaces for research and the integration of experiences and studies aimed at socially, economically just, and environmentally sustainable development in coordination with the world of work;

III - the development of policies for the training of education professionals to address the specificity of rural schools, considering the concrete conditions of the production and social reproduction of life in rural areas;

IV - the valorization of the identity of rural schools through pedagogical projects with curricular content and methodologies suitable for the real needs of rural students, as well as flexibility in school organization, including adapting the school calendar to the phases of the agricultural cycle and climatic conditions; and

V - social control of the quality of school education through the effective participation of the rural community and social movements (BRASIL, 2010a, our translation).

8. Resolution CNE/CEB No. 4, dated July 13, 2010, defines General National Curricular Guidelines for Basic Education, and Section IV addresses rural primary education in accordance with Article 35, defining three essential guidelines for the organization of pedagogical action:

I - curricular content and methodologies appropriate to the real needs and interests of students in rural areas;

II - school organization tailored to the rural context, including adaptation of the school calendar to the phases of the agricultural cycle and climatic conditions;

III - alignment with the nature of work in rural areas (BRASIL, 2010b, p. 12, our translation).

In the regulation of rural education, Article 36 of Resolution CNE/CEB No. 4/2010 reaffirms the primacy that deals with identity and defines it. In it,

The identity of rural schools is defined by their connection to issues inherent in their reality, with pedagogical proposals that encompass their diversity in all aspects, such as social, cultural, political, economic, gender, generational, and ethnic' (BRASIL, 2010b, p. 12, our translation).

Consequently, it reaffirms the uniqueness and specificity of rural primary education and determines the rules for its provision, as the norm states:

Forms of organization and methodologies relevant to the rural context must be embraced, such as the pedagogy of the land, which seeks pedagogical work based on the principle of sustainability to ensure the preservation of the life of future generations, and the pedagogy of alternation, in which the student participates concurrently and alternately in two learning environments/situations: the school and the workplace, presupposing an educational partnership in which both parties are co-responsible for learning and student formation (BRASIL, 2010b, p. 12, our translation).

Regarding legislation, rural education is ensured at the national level, with subnational entities being subject to it. Between the right and duty of the State are the individuals seeking rural education, whose legal nature is already established, but the process of schooling based on educational principles is still within the framework of legality and far from reality. The letter of the law has reached rural areas precariously and secondarily.

School and Rural Education: life in the community

Teaching is a necessary community act to reproduce human-social life, and its foundation is rooted in work. The school in rural areas symbolizes community life, strengthening bonds of coexistence and enabling socialization. There is a multiplicity of schools in rural areas to cater to the diversity of rural people, as they are present in indigenous territories, *quilombola* communities, islands, land reform settlements, landless camps, and municipal districts. All share the mission of redefining the values of life, work, and the culture of community life.

In this mission, solidarity and communion are expressed as a common good, and as Caldart (2003, p. 63, our translation) asserts in the context of the rural education commitment, '[...] it is the school that must adjust, in its form and content, to the subjects who need it; it is

the school that must meet the students, not the other way around.' And this implies assuming an educational project that engages in dialogue with its surroundings so that the school's presence can fulfill its role as an anchor in the process of learning and socialization because '[...] there is an educational movement that is specific to the school, but it is only constituted concerning the pedagogical movement of social relations that happen outside of it' (CALDART, 2003, p. 73, our translation).

In the same perspective, Nascimento (2006, p. 869, our translation) argues that '[...] rural education is called upon to construct humanistic frameworks for rural people with a view to human emancipation. [...] In rural education, everyone is a subject and builder of memory and history, that is, everyone is a social and cultural subject,' so they are educational subjects whose lives are redefined in the pedagogical act because 'educational action implies interference in people's lives, so it has pedagogical intentionality, it is not improvised in any way, from the simplest actions of daily life to the most complex, including education and school [...]' (APEC, [21--], p. 6, our translation). In this perspective, the Permanent Working Group on Rural Education, established by the Ministry of Education Ordinance No. 1.374 of June 3, 2003, states that:

Building rural education means thinking about a school supported by the enrichment of life experiences, obviously not in the name of permanence or the reduction of these experiences, but in the name of a reconstruction of ways of life-based on the ethics of human appreciation and respect for differences. A school that provides its students with conditions to choose, as citizens, where they want to live. This ultimately means reversing the logic that one only studies to leave the rural areas (BRASIL, 2004, 39, our translation).

With the same view, Caldart (2003 reaffirms the unique nature of rural education since the rural school is not a different school, '[...] but rather it is the school recognizing and helping to strengthen rural people as social subjects, who can also contribute to the process of humanizing society as a whole, with their struggles, their history, their work, their knowledge, their culture, their way of life [...]' (CALDART, 2003, p. 66, our translation). This aspect is unique because life in rural areas brings a peculiarity: the rooting of humans and their constitutive nature as a social group. In this process, 'the rural school is a concept linked to the reality of the subjects, a reality that is not limited to geographical space, but mainly refers to the sociocultural elements that shape the ways of life of these subjects' (BRASIL, 2004, p. 38, our translation).

In this way, the rural area is a place of belonging for humans linked to nature, just like a tree that germinates, creates roots, and lives. In this workspace, the locus of sociability is present. In this place, rooting is a necessity in human beings, and '[...] to have roots, she tells us, is to participate actively and really in a community that keeps certain treasures of the past and certain premonitions of the future alive. A rooted individual has bonds that allow them to look backward and forward [...]' (WEIL, 1943 apud CALDART, 2003, p. 70, our translation).

In the constitutive rooting process, work and education are poles of excellence, but they need to be redefined in school life, whose materiality, combined with legislation, is the formulation of the political-pedagogical project (PPP) empowered for rural schools. As a public school, rural education is redefined in its values and substantiated in the act of material existence through the political-pedagogical project built collectively by the school community. The PPP is the act and organizational instance of the school, and the school community is called upon to make it. It is the foundation for the pedagogical process that the school desires, and therefore, it is also a space of dispute, as it emanates from the project that will guide the pedagogical directions to be followed in human formation and the forms of community participation in the school. In effect, APEC ([21--], p. 2, our translation) states that:

The construction of the Political-Pedagogical Project (PPP) requires rigorous reflection on the role of the school and collective commitment to redefining the pedagogical practice of public schools from the perspective of a class choice. There is no possibility of remaining neutral. Although it is understood that there is an external intervention in the definition of the PPP, it is considered possible to build a counter-hegemonic movement, putting the PPP at the service of the working class in the sense of constituting itself as a class. For the production of the Political-Pedagogical Project, it is necessary to consider that:

It is **PROJECT** - a plan, a planning to be followed, construction, design, law, human capacity - to project (to dream);

It is **POLITICAL** - art, science, guides, governs, skill in human relations, assumes a position, posture, it is a dispute;

It is **PEDAGOGICAL** - it has a method, form, theory, science, teaching, content, it has guidance.

There is, therefore, an understanding of the nature of rural education as a counter-hegemonic school, whose existence is assured by laws, but for its effectiveness, it requires the intervention of the subjects who make them (the community and the school) as a link that connects them to the interests and materiality of work, culture, and socialization that the rural areas bring. School in rural areas means life in the community, and life in which work and education must be a school community commitment to education. In this sense, it brings the

struggles of social movements in rural areas for rural education in the 1990s, whose connection is '[...] with a project of society in which the rural areas are seen as places of life, work, and culture. It is based on the logic of effective participation of rural people in school issues and considers every formative process linked to work in the world of work as educational [...]' (APEC, [21--], p. 02, our translation).

From this perspective, rural education is a project in dispute, whose nature is manifested in its particularity because it brings the singularity of the rural areas where its subjects are builders of their memory, their historicity, in which men and women build their material culture through work and in the material living conditions in which rural people find themselves, live, produce their material life, and socially reproduce. In effect, Nascimento (2006, p. 869, our translation) asserts:

Thus, rural education is called upon to construct humanistic frameworks for rural people with a view to human emancipation. The projects between rural education and the formal and banking education of the Government are paradoxical. In rural education, everyone is a subject and builder of memory and history, that is, everyone is a social and cultural subject. In formal education, schooling, presented as the only pedagogical model for all Brazilians, reduces students to: pass or fail, newcomers or repeaters, unique or abnormal deficiencies, and creates a dualism between educator/and learner.

The school brings aspects of a new sociability to community life based on its social organization, which values the learning subject as a subject of collective memory from the perspective of cultural reproduction. The school is a space of educational action that materializes in learners' schooling without the anomalies of urban schools. The symbolic act of rural education is its unity with the life and work projects of the learner, which is associated with the social environment of life and culture production. In it, rural subjects build collective memory as a link to community survival, which they bring to the learning environment. In this aspect, community life adds to school life and merges into a historical-dialectical unity, in which people produce material life and school culture under the elements of historical-dialectical agreement, which values the act of creating life in the diversity and singularity of the rural population.

Final considerations

Men and women make history in the world by being objectified by work. It is in this world that work relationships are established, separating the producer from the means of production, turning them into a workforce under the dominion of the ruling class in each social formation created under the social division into antagonistic classes, which live in social contradictions and move within them, making history and inscribing it with indelible letters of blood. In history, the Brazilian countryside carries this reality, which persists.

Historically, the peasant soil gave birth to the struggle for land and education. In social battles, the rural areas gain social support for their historical demands. These hands are calloused by work in the social organization of the subjects who inhabit the fields, waters, and forests. Without this organization and social struggle for land, without the historical movement that propels them, society also does not move. What drives society are social contradictions, whose agrarian basis is grounded in large landholdings, in which the ruling classes unite to maintain hegemony over land through the agrarian structure established in Brazil.

Within this social contradiction, in the struggles for land (land reform, indigenous and *quilombola* territories, collective land tenure, etc.), there is unity around the need for organized work for an education that redefines the values that each social group in rural areas holds. Within this unity, the struggle for rural education was born, mobilizing civil society to defend the interests of rural people in qualified education for rural areas under the leadership of rural people.

From the unity in the struggle for education, the State recognizes rural people in their singularity as subjects of rights and, therefore, entitled to rural education, with an education that redefines rural people in their particularities of social existence and ways of producing material life. In this process, the legislation created by the State ensures forms of schooling that consider the necessary alternation (school time - community time), respecting work time (planting - harvesting), and incorporating religiosity, culture, and social life.

Through organization, mobilization, and social struggles, the rural subjects have achieved rural education. However, the achievement of education in legislation does not guarantee its effective implementation. Only the constant mobilization of rural people can ensure the fulfillment of the right to rural education under the principles stated in the legislation, which has been inadequately implemented. As the normative and regulatory body of social life, the State is still absent in promoting rural education with the presence of schools in rural areas.

In educational provision, rural people are only partially served in their rights, as the precariousness and closure of rural schools are routine in Brazil.

For social movements, having schools in rural areas is not enough. What is expected is rural education with its specificity of work and culture, which values rural schools as places of life because the rural is not an extension of or in opposition to the urban. The rural is the locus where social groups live, producing material life under given, found, and transformed conditions by the actions of their subjects as they move, construct, and reconstruct their earthly existence in rural resistance. In resistance, the rural is positioned as a place of life and social culture in its singularity in an objective form.

REFERENCES

APEC. Alerta: escolas públicas do campo do Paraná: o que e como fazer! **Boletim nº 2 da APEC**. Articulação Paranaense por uma Educação do Campo. [21--].

ARROYO, M. G. A escola do campo e a pesquisa do campo: metas. *In*: MOLINA, M. C. **Educação do campo e pesquisa**: questões para reflexão. Brasília, DF: Ministério do Desenvolvimento Agrário, 2006. p. 103-116.

BRASIL. [Constituição (1988)]. **Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil**. Brasília, DF: Senado Federal, 1988.

BRASIL. **Lei n. 49.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996**. Institui as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República. Available at: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/seed/arquivos/pdf/tvescola/leis/lein9394.pdf>. Accessed in: 10 Mar. 2023.

BRASIL. **Parecer CNE/CEB n. 36/2001, aprovado em 4 de dezembro de 2001**. Dispõe sobre diretrizes operacionais para a educação básica nas escolas do campo. Brasília, DF: MEC, 2001. Available at: https://normativasconselhos.mec.gov.br/normativa/view/CNE_PAR_CNECEBN362001.pdf?query=calendario%202021. Accessed in: 10 Mar. 2023.

BRASIL. **Resolução CNE/CEB n. 1, de 3 de abril de 2002**. Institui diretrizes operacionais para a educação básica nas escolas do campo. Brasília, DF: MEC, 2002. Available at: http://pronacampo.mec.gov.br/images/pdf/mn_resolucao_%201_de_3_de_abril_de_2002.pdf. Accessed in: 10 Mar. 2023.

BRASIL. Referências para uma política nacional de educação do campo. *In*: RAMOS, M. N.; MOREIRA, T. M.; SANTOS, C. A. dos. (coord.). **Caderno de subsídios**. Brasília: Secretaria de Educação Média e Tecnológica, Grupo Permanente de Trabalho de Educação do Campo, 2004.

BRASIL. **Parecer CNE/CEB n. 1/2006, aprovado em 1 de fevereiro de 2006.** Estabelece dias letivos para a aplicação da pedagogia de alternância nos centros familiares de formação por alternância (CEFFA). Brasília, DF: MEC, 2006. Available at: http://portal.mec.gov.br/cne/arquivos/pdf/pceb001_06.pdf. Accessed in: 10 Mar. 2023.

BRASIL. **Decreto Presidencial n. 6.040, de 7 de fevereiro de 2007.** Institui a política nacional de desenvolvimento sustentável dos povos e comunidades tradicionais. Brasília, DF: Casa Civil, 2007. Available at: http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2007-2010/2007/decreto/d6040.htm. Accessed in: 10 Mar. 2023.

BRASIL. **Parecer CNE/CEB n. 3/2008, aprovado em 18 de fevereiro de 2008.** Reexame do Parecer CNE/CEB nº 23/2007, que trata da consulta referente às orientações para o atendimento da educação do campo. Brasília, DF: MEC, 2008a. Available at: http://portal.mec.gov.br/cne/arquivos/pdf/2008/pceb003_08.pdf. Accessed in: 10 Mar. 2023.

BRASIL. **Resolução CNE/CEB n. 2, de 28 de abril de 2008.** Estabelece diretrizes complementares, normas e princípios para o desenvolvimento de políticas públicas de atendimento da educação básica do campo. Brasília, DF: MEC, 2008b. Available at: http://portal.mec.gov.br/arquivos/pdf/resolucao_2.pdf. Accessed in: 10 Mar. 2023.

BRASIL. **Decreto Presidencial n. 7.352, de 04 de novembro 2010.** Dispõe sobre a política de educação do campo e o Programa Nacional de Educação na Reforma Agrária – PRONERA. Brasília, DF: Casa Civil, 2010a. Available at: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/docman/marco-2012-pdf/10199-8-decreto-7352-de4-de-novembro-de-2010/file>. Accessed in: 10 Mar. 2023.

BRASIL. **Resolução CNE/CEB n. 4, de 13 de julho de 2010.** Define diretrizes curriculares nacionais gerais para a educação básica. Brasília, DF: MEC, 2010b. Available at: https://normativasconselhos.mec.gov.br/normativa/view/CNE_RES_CNECEBN42010.pdf?query=AGR. Accessed in: 10 Mar. 2023.

CALDART, R. S. A escola do campo em movimento. **Currículo Sem Fronteiras**, v. 3, n. 1, p. 60-81, jan./jun. 2003. Available at: www.curriculosemfronteiras.org. Accessed in: 13 Apr. 2021.

CARNOY, M.; LEVIN, H. M. **Escola e trabalho no estado capitalista.** São Paulo: Cortez, 1987.

FEDERICI, C.; MORI, C. M.; SANTOS, S. V. Escola, comunidade e estado nas experiências de educação do campo. *In*: MACHADO, C. L. B.; CAMPOS, C. S. S.; PALUDO, C. **Teoria e prática da educação do campo: análises de experiências.** Brasília, DF: MDA, 2008.

FERNANDES, B. M.; MOLINA, M. C. O campo da educação do campo. *In*: MOLINA, M. C.; JESUS, S. M. S. A. (org.). **Contribuições para a construção de um projeto de educação do campo.** Articulação Nacional “Por Uma Educação do Campo”. Brasília, DF: 2004. n. 5.

GRYZBOWSKI, C. **Caminhos e descaminhos dos movimentos sociais no campo.** Petrópolis, RJ: Fase – Vozes, 1987.

KOLLING, E. J.; NERY, I. J.; MOLINA, M. C. (org.). **Por uma educação básica do campo.** Coleção por uma educação básica do campo. Brasília, DF: UnB, 1999. n. 1.

LEMES, M. S. **Educação do/no campo:** concepções e conceitos. [S. l.]: UFMS, 2010.
Available at: <http://www.ndh.ufms.br/wp-anais/Anais2010/Aceitos%20em%20ordem%20alfabetica/Mariana%20Santos%20LEMES.pdf>. Accessed in: 16 Oct. 2020.

MARSCHNER, W. Lutando e ressignificando o rural em campo: notas epistemológicas. **Interações – Revista Internacional de Desenvolvimento Local**, Campo Grande, v. 12, n. 1, p. 41-52, 2011.

MERCADANTE, P. **A consciência conservadora no Brasil.** 3. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 1980.

NASCIMENTO, C. G. do. Educação e cultura: as escolas do campo em movimento. *In:* **Fragmentos de Cultura**, Goiânia, v. 16, n. 11/12, p. 867-883, nov./dez. 2006.

RIBEIRO, M. Reforma agrária, trabalho agrícola e educação rural: desvelando conexões históricas da educação do campo. *In:* **Educação e pesquisa**, v. 41, n. 1, p. 79-100, jan./mar. 2015.

SANTOS, E. V. Educação do campo: identidade em construção. *In:* SANTOS, E. V. (org.). **Educação do campo:** construindo identidade. 2. ed. Belo Horizonte: FETAEEMG, 2011.

SAVIANI, D. **Escola e Democracia.** 35. ed. Campinas, SP: Autores Associados, 2002.

PINTO, Á. V. **Sete lições sobre educação de adultos.** São Paulo: Editora Cortez, 1987.

PINTO, Á. V. **Ciência e Existência.** Rio de Janeiro: Editora Paz e Terra, 1969.

CRediT Author Statement

Acknowledgments We would like to express our gratitude to the study and research groups for the dialogue established among their members and for their promotion and organization of events to disseminate the studies and research conducted, which have greatly benefited the researchers. We also extend our thanks to the Araucária Foundation, which is committed to promoting the social, economic, and environmental development of the State of Paraná through investments in science, technology, and innovation. Additionally, our appreciation goes to the FAFIPA Foundation, which seeks resources to support Scientific Initiation, improve the University's teaching staff, and provide support for Education and Social Inclusion projects for disadvantaged communities.

Funding: This research did not receive any specific financial support.

Conflicts of interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Ethical approval: As this study is based on documentary and bibliographical research, it follows the research and presentation standards in accordance with ABNT (Brazilian Association of Technical Standards) guidelines and textual coherence.

Data and material availability: No specific data or materials are available for this study.

Authors' contributions: Vanderlei Amboni conducted research using official state documents, textual productions by social movements, and relevant historiography related to rural education. He investigated the relationships between the conquest of rural education through social struggles, forms of resistance, and the presence of schools in rural areas as a unifying aspect of the community within the school, whose motto is "*School is life in the community.*" The work presented here is the result of these investigations.

Processing and Editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação..

Proofreading, formatting, normalization and translation.

