



RELISE

*THE SOCIO-TERRITORIAL CONFLICTS BETWEEN RURAL EDUCATION  
AND EDUCATION OF/IN THE COUNTRYSIDE AND THE  
DETERRITORIALIZATION OF PEASANT PEOPLES<sup>1</sup>*

**OS CONFLITOS SOCIOTERRITORIAIS ENTRE EDUCAÇÃO RURAL E A  
EDUCAÇÃO DO/NO CAMPO E A DESTERRITORIZAÇÃO DOS POVOS  
CAMPELINOS**

*Maria Orlandia de Melo Belmiro<sup>2</sup>*

*José Raimundo de Oliveira Lima<sup>3</sup>*

**ABSTRACT**

This article aims to demonstrate the differentiation between Rural Education as a product of Agribusiness and Education in the Countryside as a result of the struggles of peasant communities and social movements for Agrarian Reform, seeking to broaden discussions on this theme regarding the conflict in the Brazilian countryside between the territory of the peasantry and that of agribusiness. This work is centered on theoretical debate and bibliographic review, as well as documentary studies/analyses (legislation on land). As a result, it presents some discussions of paramount importance for the debate about socio-territorial conflicts and deterritorialization, based on the closure of schools in the countryside and the advances of agribusiness, as well as the precariousness of schools in the countryside. In the final considerations, we answered the objective by concluding that between rural education (agribusiness model) and education of the countryside (methodology suitable for rural populations), there are diverse political perspectives and dimensions in debates, whose implications go far beyond nomenclatures, permeating public policies and socio-territorial conflicts, in addition to the implication regarding the deterritorialization of rural workers.

**Keywords:** education of the countryside, territory in dispute, rural education, deterritorialization, socio-territorial.

---

<sup>1</sup> Received on 26/01/2025. Accepted on 18/02/2025. DOI: [doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19370599](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19370599)

<sup>2</sup> Universidade Estadual de Feira de Santana. [nandabelmiro@hotmail.com](mailto:nandabelmiro@hotmail.com)

<sup>3</sup> Universidade Estadual de Feira de Santana. [zeraimundo@uefs.br](mailto:zeraimundo@uefs.br)



RELISE

32

## RESUMO

O presente artigo tem por escopo demonstrar a diferenciação entre a Educação Rural enquanto produto do Agronegócio e a Educação do Campo como fruto das lutas dos povos camponeses e movimentos sociais pela Reforma Agrária, buscando ampliar as discussões sobre esta temática no que tange a conflitualidade no campo brasileiro entre o território do campesinato e o do agronegócio. Este trabalho está centrado no debate teórico e na revisão bibliográfica, bem como estudos/análises documentais (legislação sobre a terra). Como resultado apresenta algumas discussões de suma importância para o debate acerca dos conflitos socioterritoriais e a desterritorialização, a partir do fechamento de escolas no campo e os avanços do agronegócio, bem como a precarização de escolas no campo. Nas considerações finais, respondemos ao objetivo chegando à conclusão que entre educação rural (modelo do agronegócio) e educação do campo (metodologia adequada aos povos do campo), existem perspectivas políticas e dimensões diversas em debates, cujas implicações vão muito além das nomenclaturas, permeando por políticas públicas e conflitos socioterritoriais, além da implicação no que tange a desterritorialização de trabalhadores e trabalhadoras do campo.

**Palavras-chave:** educação do campo, território em disputa, educação rural, desterritorialização, socioterritorial.

## INTRODUCTION

This paper contributes to discussions on issues related to education in/of the countryside and rural education, emphasizing socio-territorial conflicts involving this theme between agribusiness and rural populations, within both the educational and economic spheres. It seeks to clarify the differences between education in/of the countryside and rural education, and how this socio-territorial conflict leads to the deterritorialization of rural workers. Based on this assumption, a question arises: after all, are Education of the Countryside and Rural Education not the same thing?

With the aim of answering this question and relating it to issues concerning agribusiness and the peasantry, the general objective of this study is to present the existing differences between rural education and education in/of the countryside. Drawing on bibliographic records, laws, and decrees, it highlights



RELISE

33

the main controversies surrounding these issues and how they are intensified by socio-territorial conflicts and processes of deterritorialization driven by agribusiness.

This distinction may facilitate further studies on themes that connect schools, education, public policies, territorial conflicts, the peasantry, and agribusiness, all of which are directly linked to the reality of the countryside/rural context in Brazil.

The methodological procedures used were centered on bibliographic and documentary research, especially considering a qualitative approach as the basis for this analysis. In addition to the introduction and final considerations, the article is structured into two sections: the first discusses the concepts of education in/of the countryside and territory, seeking to engage with the notion of “territories of education in/of the countryside”; the second addresses rural education and agribusiness, focusing on the facets of deterritorialization and conflicts with the peasantry.

## **EDUCATION IN/OF THE COUNTRYSIDE AND THE DISPUTED RURAL TERRITORY**

The term “Education of the Countryside” emerged during the First National Conference for Basic Education of the Countryside, held in Luziânia, Goiás, from July 27 to 31, 1998. The event was organized by social movements, educators, and institutions that support agrarian issues and strive to provide a differentiated form of education for rural populations. From that point on, it began to be referred to as Education of the Countryside through the dialogues established during the National Seminar held in Brasília between November 26 and 29, 2002. This designation was subsequently reaffirmed in the debates of the Second National Conference, held in July 2004 (Caldart, 2012).



RELISE

With the objective of establishing this educational approach within the State, the following commitments were assumed:

Education of the Countryside must reclaim the values of the people that oppose individualism, consumerism, [...] and other counter-values that degrade the society in which we live. The school is one of the spaces to anticipate, through lived experience and fraternal correction, human relations that cultivate cooperation, solidarity, a sense of justice, and care for nature [...] Education of the Countryside must pay special attention to the roots of rural men and women, expressed in distinct cultures, and recognize processes of interaction and transformation. The school is a privileged place to keep the memory of peoples alive, valuing knowledge and promoting the production of their own expressions [...] Education of the Countryside, based on practices and scientific studies, must deepen a pedagogy that respects the culture and identity of rural peoples: time, cycles of nature, the mystique of the land, the valorization of work, popular festivities... [...] (Kudlavicz & Almeida, 2008, pp. 24–25).

It was within this context that the terminology shifted from “rural education” to “education of the countryside,” driven by demands for a differentiated form of education grounded in the reality of peasant agriculture.

The expressions “in” and “of” the countryside convey the idea that Education of the Countryside should encompass the values, customs, culture, production, and ways of life of rural populations, rejecting the imposition of an urban-centered education disconnected from peasant communities - in other words, advocating for an education contextualized to the reality of rural peoples. In this sense, the right to Education in/of the Countryside belongs to all who live “of” and “in” the countryside, not being limited only to those who live exclusively “from” it (Cavalcante, 2010).

Although the 1988 Federal Constitution already guaranteed education as a subjective public right, as stated in Article 205 - a right of all and a duty of both the State and the family - it did not establish distinctions between rural and urban curricula. Only with Law No. 9,394/96, the Law of Guidelines and Bases of Brazilian Education (LDB), was education in rural areas addressed, particularly in Article 28, which states:



RELISE

35

Art. 28. In the provision of basic education for the rural population, education systems shall promote the necessary adaptations to suit the peculiarities of rural life and each region, especially: I – curricular content and methodologies appropriate to the real needs and interests of rural students; II – specific school organization, including adjustment of the school calendar to agricultural cycles and climatic conditions; III – adaptation to the nature of work in rural areas.

However, these provisions still did not fully meet the ideal of Education of and in the Countryside envisioned by rural social movements, as they did not effectively guarantee children and young people the right to access and remain in quality education (Bavaresco & Rauber, 2014).

The notion of quality referred to by the author is related to ways of keeping students in rural areas, promoting their social reproduction, valuing their culture and way of life, and recognizing labor itself as an educational principle (Soares, 2012). Thus, awareness is fostered that countryside and city are not isolated from one another, but rather interdependent, requiring trained professionals capable of working in these schools with curricula contextualized to the realities in which these subjects are embedded.

For the full development (education/formation) of these citizens to occur - so that they are able to understand the reality in which they live and, based on their own strengths, fight for their interests and secure their rights - it is essential to ensure an education rooted in and oriented toward the reality of the countryside (Barros & Lihtnov, 2016).

In line with the struggle for the right to Education of the Countryside, Resolution CEB No. 1 of April 3, 2002, established the Operational Guidelines for Basic Education in Countryside Schools. These guidelines apply to all institutions offering this educational modality in the country, regardless of level. Article 2 states:

Art. 2. Sole paragraph. The identity of the countryside school is defined by its connection to issues inherent to its reality, grounded in the temporality and knowledge of its students, in collective memory that points to the future, in the network of science and technology available in society, and in social movements that defend projects linking



RELISE

36

solutions to these issues with the social quality of collective life in the country.

This represented another significant advancement. On April 28, 2008, Resolution No. 2 was issued, establishing complementary guidelines, norms, and principles for the development of public policies for Basic Education in the Countryside. Article 1 states:

Art. 1. Education of the Countryside encompasses Basic Education in its stages - Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, Secondary Education, and Technical Professional Education integrated with Secondary Education - and is intended to serve rural populations in their diverse forms of life production.

This resolution outlines the legal principles and characteristics of Education in the Countryside, clarifying the responsibilities of the State in ensuring this right in accordance with the needs and specificities of rural populations.

As a form of peasant resistance, Santos (2012) highlights the existence of legislation recognizing and legitimizing the achievements of countryside education, including: Operational Guidelines for Basic Education in Countryside Schools (CNE/CEB Resolution No. 1/2002 and No. 2/2008); Opinion CNE/CEB No. 1/2006 recognizing alternating school days; Resolution CNE/CEB No. 4/2010 recognizing Education of the Countryside as a specific modality; Decree No. 7,352 of November 4, 2010 establishing the National Policy for Education of the Countryside and the National Program for Education in Agrarian Reform (PRONERA); and PROCAMPO, created in 2007 by the Ministry of Education.

It is important to emphasize that achieving these decrees, resolutions, and laws required - and still requires- continuous struggle to implement Education of/in the Countryside in practice, alongside agrarian reform. The agrarian question is embedded in broader class struggles within capitalist society. Education of the Countryside emerged from peasant movements' struggles to



RELISE

37

build public educational policies for agrarian reform areas, expanding into broader dimensions of development.

Within this perspective, territorial conflicts in the countryside are linked to historical attempts by governments, corporations, and market forces to impose projects and policies that dispossess rural workers of their identity and social representation (Dos Santos & Garcia, 2020). Thus, the struggle for better conditions, education, and access to land is both necessary and just as a form of resistance to capitalist and neoliberal expansion in rural areas.

Historically, rural working classes have opposed neoliberal capitalist ideals, making the countryside not only a place of life but also a space of resistance against capital.

In opposition, peasant communities have been dismantled through processes that hinder families from remaining in rural areas, such as the closure of countryside schools - reflecting a project aligned with dominant class interests (Dos Santos & Garcia, 2020). According to INEP data presented by the MST (2015), most closed schools belonged to municipal systems, with the North and Northeast regions most affected; in Bahia alone, 872 schools were closed in 2014. According to Santos (2019), based on QEdu data, 1,550 countryside schools were closed between 2015 and 2018.

The process of school closures, intensified by school consolidation, tends to reduce rural communities, as many families relocate to urban areas to accompany their children (Ribeiro, 2013). This negatively affects subject formation, limiting access to transformative educational pathways.

In contrast to the neoliberal model, there are Agricultural Family Schools (EFA), structured around four principles: strengthening associations; alternation pedagogy; integral youth education; and sustainable development (Menezes, 2002).



RELISE

These principles align with peasant identity and territoriality as integral parts of their educational project. Understanding peasant territory is therefore essential for building a theoretical-political-ideological conception of Education of the Countryside, aligned with the material and symbolic reproduction of peasant territoriality.

Haesbaert (2002) notes that the concept of territory is widely used in Geography, often focusing on its destruction, i.e. deterritorialization, without clarifying the underlying concept. Deterritorialization in one place typically leads to reterritorialization elsewhere, forming the Territorialization–Deterritorialization–Reterritorialization (TDR) process.

Costa (2007) argues that encountering a new reality generates symbolic deterritorialization, potentially leading to cultural rupture and behavioral changes, often resulting in conflict.

Caldart (2008) also frames Education of/in the Countryside as an immaterial territory of conflict that can become a material force in political struggles for land, emphasizing that the countryside is a real space of social struggle.

Thus, Education of the Countryside is linked to alternative educational experiences developed by peasant socio-territorial movements (Fernandes, 2005), especially the Landless Workers' Movement (MST), in agrarian reform settlements.

The struggle for Education of the Countryside is sustained by these movements' ongoing efforts to build alternative development models beyond the hegemonic agribusiness-latifundia project (Caldart, 2005, 2012; Camacho, 2014, 2017, 2018).

According to Caldart (2004, 2012), Education of the Countryside emerges from territorial disputes and socio-economic challenges faced by peasants, with pedagogical discussions following from these realities.



RELISE

39

Finally, Education of the Countryside, as a public policy for rural development, focuses on peasant populations deeply connected to the land, but also encompasses those engaged in commodity production, such as agribusiness (Santos & Miguel, 2012).

### **RURAL EDUCATION AND AGRIBUSINESS: FACETS OF DETERRITORIALIZATION AND CONFLICTS WITH THE PEASANTRY**

In Brazil, Rural Education is associated with a prejudiced view of people who live in the countryside, disregarding their knowledge, which is acquired over time and passed down from father to child, from generation to generation. Saquet (2019) states that all people possess diverse and creative abilities, even though, in many situations, the simplest and most humble are rendered invisible, discriminated against, humiliated, and marginalized.

It is precisely from this perspective that Rural Education is conceived, where the domination of local societies and of the subjects' relationship with nature - their beliefs, cultures, and territorialities - leads to the very extermination of these peoples (Saquet, 2019).

Rural Education has imposed changes on peasants that have led them to lose rural autonomy by introducing a type of knowledge that is "foreign" to them, such as new agricultural handling techniques, as well as a different relationship with the market, where peasants must sell their production and/or labor in order to acquire "new" products to improve and increase production. Thus, one of the main criticisms of Rural Education concerns the purpose to which it is oriented.

In this regard, Welch and Fernandes (2008) describe it as a form of control by capital, represented by agribusiness, which has also dominated the processes of knowledge production, technologies, and agricultural policies.

The agricultural system of agribusiness differs from that of the peasantry. In this perspective, Welch and Fernandes (2008) define them as follows:



## RELISE

40

In the agribusiness agricultural system, accumulation, monoculture, wage labor, and large-scale production are key characteristics. In the peasant agricultural system, reproduction, biodiversity, the predominance of family labor, and small-scale production are central features. From this perspective, we affirm that the peasant agricultural system is not part of agribusiness.

However, capital controls technology, holds knowledge, and exercises market power, including the implementation of agricultural policies. Unfortunately, peasants remain subordinate to this hegemony. Although peasants may produce within the agribusiness agricultural system, this occurs within the limits of their own properties, in terms of land size and production scale. Moreover, the participation of peasants in the agribusiness system is determined by capital itself, given its aggressive model.

Thus, if capital - under the banner of agribusiness - seeks total control over people, territory, and production, it would not be incorrect to say that education is also part of this complex. Rural Education, therefore, is situated within the paradigm of agrarian capitalism. The rural sphere is understood as a social relation of the countryside to be integrated into the economic model of agribusiness. In this sense, Rural Education is constructed based on the principles of agrarian capitalism, in which peasants are not protagonists of the process but are subordinate to the interests of capital (Fernandes, 2006).

The first formulation of the concept of agribusiness dates back to Davis and Goldberg (1957). For these authors, agribusiness is a complex system encompassing agriculture, industry, markets, and finance. Over time, it has developed into a model of economic growth controlled by transnational corporations that deal with one or more commodities and operate across multiple sectors of the economy. Consequently, agribusiness transnationals have acquired extraordinary power, enabling them to influence processes across all systems.



RELISE

In contrast to agribusiness, the peasant is a family-based producer whose production is essential for both their own survival and food production. Labor relations are family-based, without wage labor or employer-employee structures. The dimensions of their way of life are directly connected to their territory, culture, identity, values, and forms of struggle and resistance against capital (Welch & Fernandes, 2008).

Therefore, Rural Education is grounded in the interests of capital and is a product of those interests - namely, the expansion of capitalism in the countryside - rather than the improvement of the quality of life of rural populations. It does not correspond to the ideal educational model for peasant communities, as it fails to meet their needs. The industrialization-based model - represented here by agribusiness - drives states to formulate educational policies aimed at supplying a qualified workforce for both industry and agriculture (Ribeiro, 2012; Santos & Miguel, 2012).

Thus, the role of the school becomes merely to train students rather than educate them, focusing on preparing them to meet the interests of elites. In contrast to this neoliberal model, Saquet (2017) argues that:

One of the fundamental aspects is recognizing the centrality of voices and bodies, memories and identities, demands and needs, differences and desires of the people, producing knowledge with them, through their territorialities and temporalities, while simultaneously fostering a consciousness of class and place.

It is understood that the capitalist system moves in the opposite direction of what the author proposes. The objective of agribusiness is to incorporate agrarian reform in a way that neutralizes it, as its interests are aimed at modernizing the countryside through the introduction of machinery, agricultural inputs, management techniques, and other elements. As a result, a certain type of instruction becomes necessary, delivered through education shaped by neoliberal standards. Based on these considerations, the relationship between



RELISE

rural education, agrarian reform, and economic development becomes clear (Ribeiro, 2012).

## **CONCLUSION**

Discussions regarding the themes of Education of the Countryside and Rural Education have been problematized in various critical contexts, based on conceptions that seek clarification grounded in the historicity, complexity, and contradictions through which social struggles are expressed. In this study, we understand that these are not merely terms or conceptions with identical meanings; rather, they carry political expressions of social movements, as well as forms of social organization of a territory and its inherent variations.

Indeed, this research has brought forward reflections of great importance to the debate on socio-territorial conflicts, showing how even immaterial territories in dispute are correlated with knowledge and the production of ideas. These elements, which belong to the realm of immateriality, are directly connected to the material reality embedded in models of rural development.

With regard to territorialization and deterritorialization, the research demonstrated that the closure of countryside schools, along with the precarization of others and the expansion of agribusiness driven by the social classes that compose capitalist society, generates a series of conflicts and challenges for peasants. Even when engaged in family farming, they remain subject to the impositions of agribusiness, which dictates market rules and political directions. In this context, it is important to question: who benefits from the closure of schools, given that Education of the Countryside serves as a vector for strengthening the peasantry? Its praxis is oriented toward valuing knowledge and ensuring the permanence of rural populations in the countryside, thereby reinforcing their culture.



RELISE

Thus, this research achieved its proposed objective by distinguishing between the two educational models. The praxis of Education of the Countryside aims to be grounded in the daily lives of peasants, whereas Rural Education, in addition to not aligning with the needs of rural populations, is part of a neoliberal project aimed at weakening and dismantling education.

Therefore, based on the discussion presented, it is evident that between Rural Education and Education of the Countryside there exist distinct political perspectives and dimensions under debate, whose implications have been examined in this study. Laws, decrees, and other documents reveal controversies surrounding these issues and demonstrate how they are intensified by socio-territorial conflicts and the deterritorialization of rural workers.

## REFERENCES

BARROS, Lânderson A.; LIHTNOV, Dione D. **Reflexões sobre a educação rural e do campo: as leis, diretrizes e bases do ensino no e do campo no Brasil**. Geographia Meridionalis – revista eletrônica do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Geografia da Universidade Federal de Pelotas. Pelotas, v. 2, n. 1, p. 20-37, 2016.

BAVARESCO, Paulo Ricardo; RAUBER, Daiane R. **Educação do campo: uma trajetória de lutas e conquistas**. Unoesc & Ciência, Joaçaba, v. 5, n. 1, p.85-91, 2014.

BRASIL. **Constituição Federal de 1988**. Brasília, DF, 1988. Disponível em: <[http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/constituicao/constituicaocompilado.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/constituicao/constituicaocompilado.htm)>.

\_\_\_\_\_. Decreto nº 7.352, de 4 de novembro de 2010. Brasília, DF, 2010. **Dispõe sobre a política de educação do campo e o Programa Nacional de**



RELISE

44

**Educação na Reforma Agrária - PRONERA.** Disponível em:<  
<http://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/decret/2010/decreto-7352-4-novembro-2010-609343-publicacaooriginal-130614-pe.html>>. Acesso em: 01 out. 2024.

\_\_\_\_\_. Decreto nº 9.613, de 20 de agosto de 1946. **Lei Orgânica do Ensino Agrícola. Brasília, DF, 1946.** Disponível em:<  
<http://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/declei/1940-1949/decreto-lei-9613-20-agosto-1946-453681-publicacaooriginal-1-pe.html>>. Acesso em: 01 out. 2024.

\_\_\_\_\_. ESTADO DO PARANÁ. Resolução nº 02 de 28 de outubro de 2010. **Institui a Educação do Campo como Política Pública Educacional com vistas à garantia e a qualificação do atendimento escolar aos diferentes sujeitos do campo, nos diferentes níveis e modalidades de ensino da Educação Básica.** Curitiba, PR 2010. Disponível em:<  
[https://www.legislacao.pr.gov.br/legislacao/pesquisarAto.do?action=exibir&codAto=69377&in\\_dice=1&totalRegistros=1](https://www.legislacao.pr.gov.br/legislacao/pesquisarAto.do?action=exibir&codAto=69377&in_dice=1&totalRegistros=1)>. Acesso em: 01 out. 2024.

\_\_\_\_\_. Lei nº 12.852, de 5 de agosto de 2013. Institui o **Estatuto da Juventude e dispõe sobre os direitos dos jovens, os princípios e diretrizes das políticas públicas de juventude e o Sistema Nacional de Juventude - SINAJUVE.** Brasília, DF, 2013. Disponível em:<  
[http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/\\_ato2011-2014/2013/lei/l12852.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2011-2014/2013/lei/l12852.htm)>.

\_\_\_\_\_. Lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996. **Estabelece as diretrizes e bases da educação nacional.** Diário Oficial da República Federativa do Brasil. Brasília, DF, 1996. Disponível em:<  
[http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/Leis/L9394.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/Leis/L9394.htm)>. Acesso em: 01 out. 2024.



RELISE

\_\_\_\_\_. MINISTÉRIO DA EDUCAÇÃO. **Conselho Nacional de Educação – CNE**. Brasília, DF, 2018. Disponível em: < <http://portal.mec.gov.br/conselho-nacional-deeducacao/apresentacao>>. Acesso em: 01 out. 2024.

\_\_\_\_\_. MINISTÉRIO DA EDUCAÇÃO. CONSELHO NACIONAL DE EDUCAÇÃO BÁSICA. CÂMARA DE EDUCAÇÃO BÁSICA. Resolução CNE/CEB nº 01, de 03 de abril de 2002. **Institui Diretrizes Operacionais para a Educação Básica nas Escolas do Campo**. Disponível em:< [http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com\\_docman&view=download&alias=13800-rceb001-02-pdf&category\\_slug=agosto-2013-pdf&Itemid=30192](http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&alias=13800-rceb001-02-pdf&category_slug=agosto-2013-pdf&Itemid=30192)>. Acesso em: 01 out. 2024.

\_\_\_\_\_. MINISTÉRIO DA EDUCAÇÃO. CONSELHO NACIONAL DE EDUCAÇÃO BÁSICA. CÂMARA DE EDUCAÇÃO BÁSICA. Resolução CNE/CEB nº 02, 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, 2008. Disponível em:< [http://portal.mec.gov.br/arquivos/pdf/resolucao\\_2.pdf](http://portal.mec.gov.br/arquivos/pdf/resolucao_2.pdf)>. Acesso em: 01 out. 2024.

\_\_\_\_\_. MINISTÉRIO DA EDUCAÇÃO. CONSELHO NACIONAL DE EDUCAÇÃO. CÂMARA DE EDUCAÇÃO BÁSICA. Resolução nº 2, de 30 de janeiro 2012. **Define Diretrizes Curriculares Nacionais para o Ensino Médio**. Brasília, DF, 2012. Disponível em:< [http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com\\_docman&view=download&alias=9917-rceb002-12-1&Itemid=30192](http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&alias=9917-rceb002-12-1&Itemid=30192)>. Acesso em: 01 out. 2024.



RELISE

46

\_\_\_\_\_. MINISTÉRIO DA EDUCAÇÃO. **Pareceres do CNE**. Brasília, DF, 2018. Disponível em:< <http://portal.mec.gov.br/escola-de-gestores-da-educacao-basica/cursos/323-secretarias-112877938/orgaos-vinculados-82187207/12984-pareceres-do-cne>>. Acesso em: 01 out. 2024.

\_\_\_\_\_. MINISTÉRIO DA EDUCAÇÃO. **Plano Nacional de Educação 2014 - 2024**. Brasília, DF, 2014. Disponível em:< <http://www.observatoriodopne.org.br/uploads/reference/file/439/documento-referencia.pdf>>. Acesso em: 01 out. 2024.

\_\_\_\_\_. MINISTÉRIO DA EDUCAÇÃO. **Programa Nacional de Educação no Campo**. Brasília, DF, 2013. Disponível em:< [http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com\\_docman&view=download&alias=13214-documento-orientador-do-pronacampo-pdf&Itemid=30192](http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&alias=13214-documento-orientador-do-pronacampo-pdf&Itemid=30192)>. Acesso em: 01 out. 2024.

\_\_\_\_\_. MINISTÉRIO DO MEIO AMBIENTE. Portaria nº 169, de 23 de maio de 2012. Institui, no âmbito da Política Nacional de Educação Ambiental, o **Programa de Educação Ambiental e Agricultura Familiar- PEAAF**. Brasília, DF, 2012. Disponível em: [http://www.lex.com.br/legis\\_23375580\\_PORTARIA\\_N\\_169\\_DE\\_23\\_DE\\_MAIO\\_DE\\_2012.aspx](http://www.lex.com.br/legis_23375580_PORTARIA_N_169_DE_23_DE_MAIO_DE_2012.aspx)>. Acesso em: 01 out. 2024.

\_\_\_\_\_. MINISTÉRIO DO MEIO AMBIENTE. Recomendação CONAMA nº 11, de 4 de maio de 2011. Recomenda **diretrizes para a implantação, funcionamento e melhoria da organização dos Centros de Educação Ambiental-CEA**, e dá outras orientações. Brasília, DF, 2011. Disponível em:<



RELISE

47

<http://www2.mma.gov.br/port/conama/legiabre.cfm?codlegi=650>>. Acesso em: 01 out. 2024.

\_\_\_\_\_. MINISTÉRIO DO MEIO AMBIENTE. Recomendação CONAMA nº 14, de 26 de abril de 2012. Recomenda a adoção da **Estratégia Nacional de Comunicação e Educação Ambiental em Unidades de Conservação - ENCEA**. Brasília, DF, 2012. Disponível em:<<http://www2.mma.gov.br/port/conama/recomen/recomen12/Recomed142012.pdf>>. Acesso em: 01 out. 2024.

\_\_\_\_\_. MINISTÉRIO DA EDUCAÇÃO; CONSELHO NACIONAL DE EDUCAÇÃO. **Diretrizes Operacionais para a Educação nas Escolas do Campo**. Parecer n. 36/2001 aprovado em 04 de dezembro de 2001. Brasília, DF, 2001. Disponível em: [http://pronacampo.mec.gov.br/images/pdf/mn\\_parecer\\_36\\_de\\_04\\_de\\_dezembro\\_de\\_2001.pdf](http://pronacampo.mec.gov.br/images/pdf/mn_parecer_36_de_04_de_dezembro_de_2001.pdf). Acesso em: 04 Outubro de 2024.

CALDART, Roseli Salete. **Elementos para a construção de um projeto político e pedagógico da educação do campo**. In: MOLINA, Mônica Castagna; JESUS, Sonia M. S. A. de (Org.). Por uma educação do campo: **contribuições para a construção de um projeto de educação do campo**. Brasília, DF: Articulação Nacional: "Por Uma Educação do Campo", 2004. p. 13-53. (Por uma Educação do Campo, 5)

CALDART, Roseli Salete. **Momento atual da educação do campo**. Disponível em: <<http://www.nead.org.br/artigodomes/imprime.php?id=27>>. Acesso em: 02 jul. 2024



RELISE

CALDART, Roseli Salete. **Educação do campo**. In: CALDART, Roseli Salete et al (Orgs.). **Dicionário da Educação do Campo**. Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo: Escola Politécnica de Saúde Joaquim Venâncio, Expressão Popular, 2012.

CAMACHO, Rodrigo Simão. **Paradigmas em disputa na educação do campo**. 2014. 806 p. Tese (Doutorado em Geografia) - Faculdade de Ciências e Tecnologia, Universidade Estadual Paulista, Presidente Prudente, 2014.

CAMACHO, Rodrigo Simão. **A educação do campo em disputa: resistência versus subalternidade ao capital**. Educação e Sociedade (Impresso), jul.2017, vol.38, n.140, p.649-670, 2017.

CAMACHO, Rodrigo Simão. **Educação do campo: o protagonismo dos movimentos socioterritoriais camponeses no PRONERA**. Revista Eletrônica da Associação dos Geógrafos Brasileiros, Seção Três Lagoas, n.26, ano 14, p.216 -229 2018.

FERNANDES, Bernardo Mançano **Movimentos socioterritoriais em movimentos socioespaciais: contribuição teórica para uma leitura geográfica dos movimentos sociais**. Revista Nera, Presidente Prudente: Unesp, ano 8, n. 6, p. 14 –34, jan./jun. 2005.

FERNANDES, Bernardo Mançano. **Os campos da pesquisa em educação do campo: espaço e território como categorias essenciais**. A pesquisa em Educação do Campo, v. XX, p. X-I, 2006.

KUDLAVICZ, Mieceslau; ALMEIDA, R. A. de. **Abrindo caminhos para uma educação que valoriza os saberes do homem e da mulher do campo**. In:



RELISE

PEREIRA, J.H. do V.; ALMEIDA, R. A. de. (Org.) **Educação no/do campo em Mato Grosso do Sul**. Campo Grande: UFMS, 2008.

MEC - CNE/CEB nº 1. **Diretrizes Operacionais para a Educação Básica nas Escolas do Campo**. Brasília, DF, 2013. Disponível em: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/docman/julho-2013-pdf/13677-diretrizes-educacao-basica-2013-pdf/file>. Acesso em: 04 nov. 2018.

MEC CNE/CEB – 1/2002. Ministério da Educação. **Diretrizes Operacionais para a Educação Básica nas Escolas do Campo**. Brasília, DF, 2004. Disponível em: [http://pronacampo.mec.gov.br/images/pdf/mn\\_resolucao\\_%201\\_de\\_3\\_de\\_abril\\_de\\_2002.pdf](http://pronacampo.mec.gov.br/images/pdf/mn_resolucao_%201_de_3_de_abril_de_2002.pdf). Acesso em: 04 nov. 2018.

MENEZES, Raquel Reis. **Pedagogia da Alternância e Novo Paradigma Educativo: Estudo Comparativo entre os Quatro pilares do movimento EFA'S e os Saberes necessários a Educação do Futuro**. Portugal, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, dez.2002.

MST. Movimento dos Trabalhadores Sem Terra. **Mais de 4 mil escolas do campo fecham suas portas em 2014. 2015**. Disponível em: <http://www.mst.org.br/2015/06/24/mais-de-4mil-escolasdo-campo-fechamsuas-portas-em-2014.html>. Acesso em: Ago de 2024.

RIBEIRO, Marlene. Educação Rural. In: CALDART, Roseli Saete et all (Orgs.). **Dicionário da Educação do Campo**. Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo: Escola Politécnica de Saúde Joaquim Venâncio, Expressão Popular, 2012.



RELISE

50

RIBEIRO, Marlene. **Movimento Camponês, trabalho e educação: Liberdade, autonomia, emancipação: princípios/fins da formação humana**. 2. ed. São Paulo Expressão Popular, 2013.

SANTOS, Arlete Ramos, 1970- **“Ocupar, resistir e produzir também na educação!”: o MST e a burocracia estatal: negação e consenso** / Arlete Ramos dos Santos. - UFMG/FaE, 2012.

SANTOS, Valéria Prazeres dos. **A distorção idade-série nas escolas do campo: um estudo sobre os anos iniciais do ensino fundamental no município de Nazaré-BA**. 2019. 197 f. 2019. Tese de Doutorado. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) - Universidade Estadual de Santa Cruz, Ilhéus

SANTOS, Juliano Batista dos; MIGUEL, Thiago Barros. **Educação do campo: um novo paradigma**. Revista Eventos Pedagógicos v.3, n.2, p. 386 – 398. Maio - Jul. 2012.

SOARES, Sália Bona. Vasconcelos. **Educação do campo: uma alternativa para emancipação humana? Uma análise do centro de ensino fundamental Pipiripau II – DF**. In: JORNADA DO TRABALHO. PRESIDENTE PRUDENTE, 13, 2012, Presidente Prudente, Anais... Presidente Prudente: UNESP, 2012. p. 1-20.