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ABSTRACT: This study analyzes the relationship between work and education as an ontological principle for an integral education. It approaches the worker's education according to the perspectives and requirements of the modes of production and accumulation of capital since the process of hegemony and counter-hegemony are constituents of class society. Furthermore, it portrays work as an ontological activity of man based on historical-dialectical materialism. The work was based on bibliographical studies of research in progress in the doctoral course in education, of line 2 – Education, Public Policies and Regional Development, of the Graduate Program in Education, in which the results showed that the processes of education of workers have been configured according to the requirements and processes of restructuring and accumulation of capital.


RESUMO: Este estudo analisa a relação trabalho e educação como princípio ontológico para uma educação integral. Ele aborda a educação do trabalhador de acordo com as perspectivas e exigências dos modos de produção e acumulação do capital, uma vez que o processo de hegemonia e de contra-hegemonia são constituintes da sociedade de classes. Além disso, retrata o trabalho como atividade ontológica do homem, tendo como fundamento o materialismo histórico-dialético. O trabalho baseou-se em estudos bibliográficos de uma pesquisa em andamento, no curso de doutorado em educação, da linha 2 – Educação, Políticas Públicas e Desenvolvimento Regional, do Programa de Pós-graduação em Educação, no qual os resultados evidenciaram que os processos de educação dos trabalhadores têm sido configurados de acordo com as exigências e processos de reestruturação e acumulação do capital.


RESUMEN: Este estudio analiza la relación entre trabajo y educación como principio ontológico para una educación integral. Aborda la educación del trabajador de acuerdo con las perspectivas y requerimientos de los modos de producción y acumulación de capital, ya que el proceso de hegemonía y contrahegemonía son constituyentes de la sociedad de clases. Aborda el trabajo como una actividad ontológica del hombre, basada en el materialismo histórico-dialéctico. El trabajo se basó en estudios bibliográficos de una investigación en curso, en el curso de doctorado en educación, de la línea 2 – Educación, Políticas Públicas y Desarrollo Regional, del Programa de Posgrado en Educación, en los que los resultados mostraron que los procesos de educación de los trabajadores se han configurado de acuerdo con los requisitos y procesos de reestructuración y acumulación de capital.

Introduction

This article discusses work as an ontological activity of man, the connection and rupture of the category of work with educational processes in the different modes of man's production. This is bibliographical research on work as an educational principle, with excerpts from the dissertation “O Ensino Médio nas Escolas de Tempo Integral” as an integral part of this work (FERREIRA, 2012). The study had historical-dialectical materialism as its methodological and epistemological foundation.

Thus, the text was organized into three analytical axes, the first axis addresses “The ontology of work”, with the assumption of work as a founding category of human activity, anchored in Marx (2006; 2008; 2009 and 2011), Engels (2009), Marx and Engels (1998).

The second axis, entitled “The requirements for training from the perspective of capital”, addresses the restructuring of the productive and accumulation processes of capitalism, highlighting the work-education relationship considering the demands and definitions of multilateral organizations regarding the role to be played by the school.

The third axis presents an analysis of Work as an Educational Principle, from a perspective of the integral formation of man. It starts from the assumption that education can strengthen the process of counter-hegemony to the organization of capitalist work, regarding the transformation of this activity into a process of human alienation, since in capitalism access, to goods and objects essential for life and work are taken from the worker. It highlights omnilateralism as an educational principle, a praxis antagonistic to the division of capitalist labor.

The ontology of work

Marx defines man as the subject who transforms nature through work, making the actions between work and education specific. Therefore, it is from man's interaction with nature that work became an instrument of socialization and social cooperation since he began to produce and educate himself in a single process.

Based on this assumption, Marx (2008, p. 211-212, our translation) differentiates human labor from other natural activities:
A spider performs operations like the weaver's, and the bee surpasses more than one architect in building its hive. But what distinguishes the worst architect from the best bee is that he imagines his construction in his mind before turning it into reality. At the end of the work process, a result appears that already ideally existed in the worker's imagination. He does not transform the material upon which he operates; he imprints on the material the project he consciously had in mind, which constitutes the determining law of his way of operating and to which he must subordinate his will. And this subordination is not a fortuitous act. In addition to the effort of the working bodies, it is necessary to have adequate will, which manifests itself through attention throughout the work. And this is all the more necessary, the less the worker feels attracted by the content and method of carrying out his task, which therefore offers him less possibility of benefiting from applying his physical and spiritual strengths.

This confirms that this activity is exclusive to man as a social being. He is not born knowing how to produce himself as a man and, rather, needs to learn how to produce his existence, since work is a process of building knowledge.

From the same perspective, Saviani (2007) clarifies that it is through work that man becomes humanized, that is, “that man is, he is through work”. Based on this conception, the process of developing knowledge occurs through work; Therefore, its mediating role in the social and cultural development of humanity is evident. This is the origin of its nature both, on the historical and ontological planes.

The ontological leap that established social beings was based on man's intrinsic relationship with nature. It was the organic exchange between man and nature that drove the development of the morphological power of the species *homo sapiens* (ALVES, 2005).

Historically, the work-education relationship has undergone profound transformations, even being delinked, and reconfigured according to the interests of hegemonic modes of production. In primitive tribal society⁴, work and education were homogeneous and integrated activities, a process considered essential for constructed knowledge to be shared in the production of the community's existence. This is because there was no division of social classes, and everyone was on an equal footing in the process of collective production.

---

⁴Marx and Engels (1998, p. 21-22), in the Party Manifesto, clarify that “the entire history of humanity (since the abolition of primitive tribal society, with its common ownership of soil and land) has been a history of class struggles, of the struggle of exploiters and exploited, between dominant and oppressed classes; and that the history of class struggles presents a development within which, at the present moment, it has reached a level at which the exploited and oppressed class (proletariat) cannot free itself from the yoke of the exploiting and dominant class (the bourgeoisie) without, at the same time, and once and for all, free society itself from any and all exploitation or oppression, from any difference or class struggle.
With the creation of private property, the social division of labor and the separation of manual work from intellectual work emerged, making it complex and differentiated (ENGELS, 2009). Both in the slave system of Antiquity and in the servile system of the Middle Ages, there was a break in the integrated relationship between work and educational processes, and in this way, it is possible to observe a reconfiguration of the world of work.

In the society of classical antiquity, work was considered an exclusive activity for slaves, in which men were relegated to the condition of objects. Likewise, in feudal society, the labor system was governed by a vassalage contract between landowners and non-landowners. In a similar way to the slave regime, the dominant class of the feudal system exploited the work of the subordinate class, the serfs.

The reconfiguration of work processes is commented on by Marx (2009, p. 577, our translation):

While the work process is purely individual, a single worker performs all functions that are later dissociated. By individually appropriating natural objects to provide for his life, he is the one who controls himself; later it will come under someone else's control. Isolated man cannot act on nature without putting into action his muscles under the control of his brain. Physiologically, the head and hands are parts of a system; in the same way, the work process combines the work of the brain and that of the hands. Later, they separate and end up becoming hostilely opposed. The product ceases to be the immediate result of the activity of the individual producer and becomes the social product, common, of a collective worker, that is, of a combination of workers, with the participation of each of them in the manipulation of the object that concerns the work being direct or indirect.

With the development of capitalism, natural relations began to be predominantly governed through social contracts, that is, hegemony and class submission no longer occurred through natural ties. The Swiss thinker Jean-Jacques Rousseau theorizes, through the contractual approach, the conditions for the composition of the modern social and political order. He emphasizes that through the social pact, individuals constitute themselves as a people and, through such transformation, natural rights emerge as civil rights, that is, “(...) individuals accept losing natural freedom for civil freedom; they accept losing natural possession of goods to gain civil individuality, citizenship and, with it, the civil right to property ownership” (CHAUÍ, 2010, p. 464, our translation).

To this end, the State should ensure the rights of individuals, including freedom and private property, thus breaking the idea of divine, natural, and social hierarchy. Using these liberal assumptions, capitalism materialized its state project, and in it, the ruler would have the defense of civil rights as his main task without intervening in the free market. In short, “in this
type of State, the possibility of formulating policies that directly affect the Economy is excluded” (COUTINHO, 2006, p. 49, our translation).

Based on this conception and organization of State and citizenship, the bourgeoisie boasted the liberation of man from the yoke of servitude. However, capitalism “did not abolish class antagonisms” (MARX; ENGELS, 1998, p. 10, our translation). It only simplified the old social division into two large enemy groups – bourgeois and proletarians –, concentrating social, economic, and political hegemony in the hands of the bourgeoisie.

Liberal assumptions supported the creation of salaried work, a striking characteristic of capitalist production relations, which transformed the worker into merchandise since capital added value to the labor force. For Marx (2006, p. 67, our translation, our translation), the “worker not only has to fight for the physical means of subsistence; he must still fight to achieve work, that is, for the possibility and means of carrying out his activity”.

In this way, the bourgeois class began to live off the exploitation of the workforce of a majority, objectifying the workforce. To understand the contradictions arising from the expansion of capital, it is essential to rescue Marx’s (2008, p. 80, our translation) assessment of the capitalist logic imposed on the worker concerning the conditions of production:

The worker becomes poorer the more wealth he produces. The more his production increases in power and extent. The worker becomes a cheaper commodity the more merchandise he creates. With the appreciation of the world of things (Sachenwelt), the devaluation of the world of men (Menschenwelt) increases in direct proportion. Work does not just produce goods; he produces himself and the worker as a commodity, and this to the extent that he produces, in fact, merchandise in general. This fact expresses nothing more than the object (Gegenstand) that work produces, its product, and confronts it as a foreign being, as an independent power of the producer. The product of work is the work that is fixed on an object, made a thing (sachilich), it is the objectification (Verfentändlichung) of work. The realization (Verwirklichung) of work is its objectification. This effectuation of work appears to the national-economic state as the diseffectiveness (Entwirklichung) of the worker, objectification as loss of the object and servitude to the object, appropriation as estrangement (Entfremdung), as alignment (Entäusserung).

In this way, Marx clarifies that, in capitalism, the worker's creative process is annihilated, his labor power is a simple commodity. At the same time, wage employment has become its main condition for survival since it is in the capitalist mode of production that the separation between producers and their working conditions is created and reproduced.

In this regard, Frigotto (1995b, p. 11, our translation) explains:
The bourgeoisie founded a new class society masked now by a process of exploitation not external, but internal to the social relations of production. The ideology, ahistorical of human nature and, consequently, of abstract freedom, gives the new relations of capital and labor, between capitalist and worker, the basis for a legalization of exploitation.

With this, educational processes become instruments for preparing the workforce for the functions to be performed in the capitalist productive system. Furthermore, educational concepts and practices based on the perspective of instrumental education seek to form a “productive citizen who does well what is asked of him and who does not get involved in what is not his responsibility: discussing the direction of the economy, politics, and your interests. A minimal citizen” (FRIGOTTO, 2004, p. 15, our translation).

Training requirements from the perspective of capital

The contradictions in labor relations, stemming from capitalism have impacted educational processes, as the role of education traditionally fulfilled by the family has been delegated to the school. Moreover, the separation between manual labor and intellectual work, along with the social division of labor, has not only reinforced the duality of education but also intensified class antagonism and the exploitation of one class over another.

Saviani addresses this issue (1994, p. 159, our translation):

The contradiction between classes marks the educational issue and the role of the school. When capitalist society tends to generalize schools, this generalization appears in a contradictory way because bourgeois society advocates the generalization of basic school education. On this common basis, it reconstituted the difference between elite schools, aimed predominantly at intellectual training, and schools for the masses, which are either limited to primary education or, as they continue, are restricted to certain professional qualifications.

The separation between manual and intellectual work, the result of social stratification, in the capitalist mode of production transformed the work process into expropriation of the working class, inverting the “methodological relationship of work-education apprehension” (FRIGOTTO, 1995a, p. 17, our translation).

The reflection of this inversion corroborated with the lack of apprehension of work relationships, determining the foundations and perspective for the formation of consciousness. The emergence of a class that does not work, but exploits another for a living, imposes demands on the structuring of formal education, thus defining the roles to be played by the school.
The universalization of school became a requirement of capitalism, since the appropriation of knowledge was based on formal relationships, to meet the needs and interests of capital. However, the education given to one class was not the same as that offered to the other, showing that the class struggle also permeates the hegemony of knowledge.

In this sense, the training given to the bourgeoisie focused on intellectual conception, in a universalist sphere, while the training offered to the working class was restricted to knowledge to act in capital's labor markets. Any possibilities of access to critical knowledge were denied to the working class.

Faced with this polarization, the State constituted itself as a powerful instrument that concretely integrated, at the superstructure level, the subordinate classes into the dominant hegemonic project. Furthermore, the capitalist system appropriated science and new technologies, incorporating them into the means of production.

Liberalism founded the ideas of the bourgeoisie, in which the State project strengthened the capitalist mode of production. Therefore, the State acquired an important educational character since it mediated the incorporation of the dominant classes into the dominant ideological project, effectively materializing it. In this way, the capitalist educational project imposed mechanisms that guaranteed worker qualifications without running the risk of losing control over the workforce.

With the Taylorist mode of production, created by the American mechanical engineer and economist Frederick Winslow Taylor, at the end of the 19th century, the separation between intellectual work and manual work enabled greater control over the workforce, since this system is “considered one of the techniques of capitalist division of labor and worker control” (HIRATA, 2002, p. 32, our translation). The objective of Taylorist practices was to maximize production by establishing a new organization of work and implementing a form of scientific management in companies.

It didn't take long for the Taylorist management system to be introduced at the school, whose purpose was to equip labor for the job market, ensuring capital new forms of control and domination in the training of future workers. Considering, equally, the impact of another model of the production system, implemented at the beginning of the 20th century, Fordism was used in the automobile industry and promoted the automation of industrial processes, both to increase the productivity of manufacturing units and to reduce production costs.

In this way, the articulation of the Taylorist mode of production with the Fordist production model almost extinguished the intellectual aspect of workers' work since it separated
the elaboration from the execution. Thus, workers, carrying out fast, repetitive, and poorly paid activities, began to be considered simple tools to extend the machines, as production began to be carried out in series, on a more simplified assembly line.

The result of this requirement affected the educational organization, structuring it in two contrasting ways. On one pole, general training schools aimed at promoting intellectual qualifications, and, on the other, vocational schools aimed at providing qualifications linked to the tasks of the production system.

This relationship between education and work ensured not only the interests of capital but also its hegemony, effectively demonstrating that the dominance of scientific and technological advances by the bourgeoisie expropriates the working class, whether on a material or intellectual level.

As a result, workers were denied the possibility of creating and producing their existence since the educational process offered to the working class made it difficult for individuals to develop an awareness of their role in transforming their concrete social reality.

Thus, the Taylorist and Fordist mode of production subjected the worker to maximum conditions of control and expropriation of the workforce, in addition to the payment of lower wages and greater exploitation of surplus value, generating greater mass production and increased profit for the production system.

At the height of the Fordist system, Theodoro Schutz formulated the theory of human capital, which assumes that the higher the level of education or professional qualification, the greater the capacity for work, productivity, and profit. Based on the principles of efficiency, rationality, and greater development of potential at a lower cost, the theory of human capital adjusted the school to the new needs of the world of work, incorporating the principles of bourgeois rationality into pedagogical practices to this day.

With the end of the golden years of capitalism, the “history of the twenty years after 1973 is of a world that lost its references and slid into instability and crisis” (HOBSBAWM, 2014, p. 393, our translation). However, the ideas of current capitalism return to the principles of liberalism, accentuating the class struggle and exploitation of the proletariat, since in the “Short 20th Century, the rich and developed countries would be those whose population would be the first to stabilize” due to through the globalization of financial capital (HOBSBAWM, 2014, p. 546, our translation).

In this way, the accumulation regime of globalized capital has promoted new circles of exploitation and the “polarization of new spaces of wealth” (CHESNAIS, 2005, p. 18, our
Furthermore, the liberalization of markets has made world society hostage to the “iron control of a capitalism dominated by income contracts, a capitalism whose greed and ferocity are as strong as it is parasitic” (CHESNAIS, 2000, p. 488, our translation).

With the dominance of the financialization of capital, a process of productive restructuring and new management was forged, in which the flexibility of the Japanese productive model, Toyotism or Ohnism, impacted the world of work. The combination of productive decentralization, technological advancement, and increased external competitiveness has intensified competition between transnational companies.

Hirata and Zarifian (1991) explain that this Japanese model of organizing and managing industrial relations has become a reference used by employers in Western countries. The reasons for this interest were based on high Japanese productivity, its competitiveness, and its level of efficiency. However, the authors emphasize that the Japanese model was seen as isolated from its context and the social contradictions in which they were generated.

Toyotism brought changes not only to the production of goods but also affected the operations of financial capitalism, in addition to supporting ideological arguments that defended the flexibility and efficiency of work processes, giving rise to the phenomenon of job instability and adaptability of workmanship to different tasks. This restructuring process, in which financial capital gained its dominance, became known as the hegemony of the flexible capital accumulation mode.

Based on the neoliberal thesis, the management model affected the elimination of the Welfare State and the return of unrestricted market laws. This perspective has justified the concept of the lean company, which has triggered the precariousness of work and the social exclusion of the working class, increasing the growth of unemployment and underemployment.

The flexibilization of work uses techno-scientific mechanisms to establish new forms of workforce exploitation. This destructive logic, anchored in total quality, has as its main characteristic a superfluous and destructive production process focused on outsourced part-time work, which has expanded because of this other form of expropriation.

This reconfiguration of capitalism constituted a progressive suppression of the right to work, generating new occupations such as part-time work or work with a fixed-term contract. This made the use and costs of the workforce more flexible, increasing informal work and highlighting the crisis in the work society.

The minimization of labor costs not only made work processes precarious but eliminated guaranteed labor rights. Furthermore, the flexibilization of the capital and labor relationship,
reinforced by macroeconomic policy, promoted employment subcontracting and the destruction of jobs, triggering a social setback in which the benefits went to a few.

Mourão (2006, p. 58, our translation) explains the reflections on the logic of capital’s flexible processes in the world of work:

Transformations in professional content and trades occur with deeper knowledge of the process, developing multi-process competence. There is, therefore, a tendency towards the despecialization of work, which leads to the broadening and deepening of skills. This technical-economic or technical-professional competence is closely linked to the ability to assess the client's context and needs. Here, the most important thing is modifying the relationship between workers and the organization to develop their skills in and about the organization.

The effects of financial adjustments and the neoconservative restructuring of capital were harmful, mainly for the poorest countries, since the uneven development of markets, the indebtedness of national states, and the minimization and withdrawal of social policies considerably expanded the gap between rich and poor countries (HOBSBAWM, 2014).

This process highlighted the submission of national States to globalized financial capital since the indications and guidelines made by multilateral organizations (World Bank – WB, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization – UNESCO and Cooperation Organization and Economic Development – OECD, among others) materialized in financial austerity plans, indications of suppression of social rights and actions to benefit the richest. Confirming the dependence of States on the Market, thus composing the perverse facet of the current capital stage.

It is in this context of the expansion of globalized capital and implementation of neoliberal ideology that the more direct intervention of multilateral organizations in directing social policies was strengthened, as educational policies were aligned with the interests of the international economic order.

This issue is commented on by Maués (2003, p. 83, our translation):

Based on this reality, international organizations began to determine the goals that countries should achieve in terms of education. This is why some organizations have covertly assumed the role of education ministries, especially in developing countries. Some of the institutions that have been at the forefront of defining educational policies in the world are mentioned: the Organization of American States – OAS –, Inter-American Development Bank – IDB –, World Bank – WB –, European Community – EC –, Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development – OECD, United Nations Development Program – UNDP –, Educational Reform Program for Latin America and the Caribbean – Preal.
Based on the logic of financial capital, educational processes based on the principles of total quality management were implemented, through which the school began to be modeled after business standards, modifying its relationship with society. Silva (2000, p. 24, our translation) explains that the concept of education in Total Quality is “a type of administration that has as its fundamental aim the production of docile and submissive bodies to produce a surplus in the market”.

From this perspective, what prevails is a form of management focused on long-term customer satisfaction, a logic originating from the financial market for the school sphere. This perspective encouraged the resumption of pedagogies based on the motto of learning to learn.

For Duarte, this motto aims to train individuals who are predisposed to learn any activity. In this case, the essential condition is that the material to be learned is useful for the individual’s adaptation process to social life governed by market norms. This is how training processes transform the worker into a product, in which the individual thus becomes more easily adaptable to the demands of the labor market and the fluctuations of the dominant ideology, fluctuations that are necessary for the constant recomposition of the hegemony of the dominant classes and the permanent effort to conceal the contradictions of capitalism (DUARTE, 2011, p. 187, our translation).

For Kuenzer (2016), this context gave rise to the pedagogy of flexible accumulation, to train workers with flexible subjectivities, both in the cognitive and ethical aspects, by articulating general education with professional training carried out in a differentiated way by class origin, leads workers to perform multiple tasks in the flexible market.

Marx (2011, p. 54, our translation), in the Grundrisse, records that “capital, for example, is nothing without wage labor”. Hence, the capitalist system needs to guarantee its profitability and profits to seek greater benefits and results from workers. Therefore, establishing resistance processes is a concrete necessity for all workers.

**Work as an educational principle**

Work is the foundational presupposition of human becoming, serving as the fundamental educational principle for forming the human being (FRIGOTTO, 1996). Thus, understanding the relationship between work and education, from a perspective of comprehensive human development, presupposes that education can strengthen the process of counter-hegemony to the organization of capitalist labor.
It is imperative to discuss the relationship between work and education as an ontological principle for comprehensive education, understanding work “as human praxis, and not as productive praxis, that is, as all forms of human action to construct existence, whether material or spiritual” (PICANÇO; TIRIBA, 1995, p. 20, our translation).

Based on the assumption that work is a mediator between humans and nature in the process of creating and reacting to human-social reality, in which the laborious objectification of human beings modifies both nature and humans themselves as part of that nature, Picanço and Tiriba (1995, p. 20, our translation) explain the purpose of the educational process:

[...] Suppose Education aims to contribute to the re-articulation of knowledge about life in society by men and women workers, appropriating the entire work process. In that case, it is necessary to seek within the production itself (whether in its more complex forms or in its simpler forms or modalities) the elements that foster the comprehensive omnilateral formation of a new human being.

In this way, work as an educational principle aims to grasp and articulate material and spiritual goods with the actions and knowledge engendered in the daily lives of men and women. Therefore, the authors highlight the importance of exploring other spaces of human formation, especially those in which capitalism directs and imposes limits, including school.

Thus, one of the biggest challenges is to ensure that workers have educational processes that enable them to have absolute control over their work, guaranteeing both a quality basic education for all and a unitary training school that “contributes to rearticulating the fragmented knowledge resulting from the practice daily unitary; a unique school, in which the appropriation of scientific-philosophical knowledge occurs in line with the knowledge constructed in the production of life itself” (PICANÇO; TIRIBA, 1995, p. 26, our translation).

In Marx, the historical and ontological aspects of human formation occur with the creation of conditions of humanization based on alienated social relations, that is, human formation aims to overcome alienating processes of bourgeois society, to “achieve the full development of free and universal individuality: this is the perspective of communist society” (SAVIANI; DUARTE, 2010, p. 430-431, our translation).

From this perspective, educational processes combine scientific, philosophical, artistic, and technological knowledge with the pedagogical principles of the work-education relationship, not as a simple sum of information, but as integral elements of the historical-ontological centrality of integral human formation.
It is essential, however, to highlight that an integral, omnilateral human formation “depends on the rupture with bourgeois sociability, with the corresponding social division of labor, with relations of alienation and estrangement, with fetishism, with class antagonism” (SOUZA JUNIOR, 2010, p. 84, our translation).

Consequently, Souza Junior (2010, p. 88, our translation) clarifies that omnilaterality is linked “to the breadth of the richness of human development, universal and free, however, it is important to recognize that this definition is much more suggested than rigorously systematized”. In this sense, omnilaterality is a collective praxis, an essential process for life, antagonistic both concerning the division of labor and the transformation of this activity into a process of human alienation, since in capitalism access to produced goods at work is subtracted from the worker.

Souza Junior (2010, p. 91) emphasizes that omnilaterality is a totality of unrelated determinations, based on free social work, collective planning and execution of work, and the fair distribution of work products. For all this, the author adds that it is unthinkable to establish a comparison or correspondence between the omnilateral man and the most evolved individual in bourgeois society.

Marx (2008) makes severe criticisms of capitalism, in particular, the division of labor and the action of expropriation of the product of human labor and the transformation of the worker himself into merchandise – the cheaper the commodity produced for capital.
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Lombardi (2011, p. 221, our translation) emphasizes that Marx and Engels did not make a systematic exposition on school and education, but their theoretical positions developed and were diluted “throughout the vast work they produced, with the educational problem being inseparably articulated to the different issues they addressed”.
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Marx and Engels (1998), in the Manifesto of the Communist Party (1848), censure the oppression of workers, in particular the exploitation of female and child labor. They also denounced the terrible conditions in which education is offered to children and young workers.

Although Marx and Engels did not aim to make an exhaustive analysis of this issue, they nevertheless drew a general picture of the workers' living conditions; showed the precarious conditions of the training and instruction they received; highlighted the emergence of some forms of provision aimed at working-class children, such as “factory schools, midday schools, Sunday schools, evening courses, mutual education, etc.” (LOMBARDI, 2011, p. 219, our translation).

Lombardi (2011, p. 221, our translation) emphasizes that Marx and Engels did not make a systematic exposition on school and education, but their theoretical positions developed and were diluted “throughout the vast work they produced, with the educational problem being inseparably articulated to the different issues they addressed”. 
Marx and Engels highlighted in their works the need for articulation between work and education as processes of production of human existence by the man himself and their contradictory relationship with the capitalist mode of production. Therefore, for the school to promote the integration of humanist training with professional training from a perspective of integral human formation, it must break with the unilateral conception of adaptability and instrumental reproduction of the social division of capitalist labor. With this, paths are opened for the consolidation of a unitary school.

For Gramsci (2006, p. 36, our translation) the assumptions of the unitary school or humanist training need to be understood beyond the traditional sense, or general culture, and must “take on the task of inserting young people into a social activity, after having them elevated to a certain degree of maturity and capacity for intellectual and practical creation and to a certain autonomy in orientation and initiative”.

In this way, ensuring integral human formation is of utmost importance for strengthening the educational process of high school youth, however, this has been one of the biggest challenges of Brazilian educational policies. This is because public policies for basic education have as a parameter the World Bank’s logic of improving education, through which educational processes are analyzed “with specific market criteria and the school is compared to a company” (TORRES, 2009, p. 140, our translation).

Then, it is extremely important to strengthen actions to build clashes against hegemonic capital, among them, educational actions capable of generating integral human formation, which consolidate the necessary praxis to achieve omnilaterality in the relationship between work and education.

**Final considerations**

Man is the creator of his concrete reality through work, occupying the centrality of his becoming. And just as there were transformations in the modes of production throughout history, these also changed the relationship between work and education.

Thus, over a long period, the school had to be built based on these requirements: the *educational principal* of the public school was being constituted by demands attributed to the social and technical division of labor, covering all behavioral, ideological, and normative aspects that are characteristic of them.
The capitalist system has reorganized social relations in its crisis processes according to its convenience, implying the “materialization of intellectual functions in the productive process” (SAVIANI, 1994, p. 163, our translation). The introduction of new technologies in industry induced significant changes in schools, as the production system required specific qualifications from workers to fulfill certain roles, making educational processes targets of domination.

It is not in vain that, to meet such demands, capitalism has demanded a worker profile with a more flexible, efficient, and versatile character, with adaptability being more important than prior qualifications.

This is what this pedagogy – that of flexible accumulation – brought to workers: unilateral and light training. To this end, it used the strategy of hiding its intention, using the discourse of integral education, seeking to associate schooling trajectories with work experience, a link between theory and practice. Therefore, uniting the classic form of the technical division of labor, which assigns operational work to some and intellectual work to others (KUENZER, 2016).

In Brazil, national education public policies have sought to comply with the guidelines made by multilateral organizations regarding the pedagogy of flexible accumulation. It requires the training of workers in a flexible range of subjectivities, “through a general base complemented by training itineraries by area of knowledge, including technical and professional education” (KUENZER, 2017, p. 341, our translation).

This materiality of the pedagogy of flexible accumulation can be evidenced in Brazilian public schools, the scene of dispute over the last twenty years. An example of this is the changes instituted in the training processes in high school, which have constituted perverse strategies of denial and dualization of the school, by making the curricular organization more flexible to reduce costs, contradicting the expansion and duration of this stage of basic education.

Given the above, fighting for a unitary public school, which aims at comprehensive training, from the perspective of human emancipation, is an imperative need to resist the working class. Thus, ensuring access to historically constructed knowledge and knowledge, the development of critical, intellectual, ethical, and technological mastery capabilities become pillars capable of consolidating an education that opposes the adaptive instrumental training, required by the work structure of the capitalist production.
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