

## Anarchist education: A Proposal



<https://doi.org/10.56238/interdiinovationscresce-041>

**Hilson Santos Olegario**

Master in Philosophy Teaching  
Federal University of Pernambuco – UFPE

### ABSTRACT

This article addresses part of a research carried out by the Professional Master of Philosophy at the Federal University of Pernambuco - UFPE. The intervention was practiced in a classroom of the first year of High School during the discipline of philosophy, seeking to favor the learning of philosophical themes by the student through a teaching considered anarchist, which aims to favor the autonomy and responsibility of the student in building your own learning in connection with your reality. Conceived as a possibility to avoid a homogeneous and authoritarian education, this experience was based on the conceptual horizon of the French thinker Gilles Deleuze, within his

perspective pointed out with anti-hierarchical, which he called rhizomatic as opposed to the arborecent model; along with this we will see some criticisms from anarchist thinkers in relation to capitalist education and its reproduction of exploration. We use commentators like Silvio Gallo, as they help us to make a conceptual shift of Deleuzian works in an adaptation to the Brazilian reality. We will thus work with deterritorializations, reterritorializations and updates as continuous processes of thought, which result in the learning itself with its criticism and conceptual creation. The classroom is observed from an understanding of minor education, distant from instances of higher education such as coordination, secretariats and ministry, its function is to prevent the reproduction of homogeneity and heteronomy of what should and when to learn found in traditional education.

**Keywords:** Philosophy, Education, Deleuze.

### 1 INTRODUCTION

In this text written for the **III Philosophical Hinterland**, we will work part of my research in the Professional Master's Degree in Philosophy, an intervention carried out with the **1st year B Of Our Lady of the Presentation State School**, in the state of **Alagoas**, in the city of **Bald Harbor**, in the year of **2018**, in the months of **March** and **April**. To carry it out, we adopted as a parameter the thought of the French **Gilles Deleuze**, based on his work **What is philosophy?** In this work, we will find the exposition of how we arrived at this thinker, as well as demonstrate an example of how his **concepts** and your **philosophy** can be applied in the context of the teaching of philosophy, aimed at the public of the **Brazilian High School**.

The time has simply come for us to ask what philosophy is. We had never stopped doing so, and we already had the answer that did not vary: philosophy is the art of forming, inventing, fabricating concepts. But it would not only be necessary for the answer to accept the question, it would also be necessary to determine a time, an occasion, circumstances, landscapes and characters, conditions and unknowns of the question. It would be necessary to formulate it "among friends", as a confidence or a trust, or in the face of the enemy as a challenge, and at the same time reach that hour, between the dog and the wolf, when one really distrusts one's friend. It's the time when you say, "That was it, but I don't know if I said it well, or if I was



convincing enough." And it is perceived that it matters little whether he said it well or was convincing, since it is our question now anyway. (DELEUZE, 2010, p. 10).

We will indicate how such an approach can be understood within a perspective of thinking about a libertarian teaching proposal for this discipline in question. In However, we do not intend to serve as a manual that should be followed to the letter, but we seek to be understood as a sign for a **escape** creative approach that aims to get out of this previously delimited teaching territory, with its perfect squares, where everything is explained from a unity that imposes itself, generating its derivations within a domain in this imposed order, called by Deleuze **Swivel**<sup>1</sup>. Nor are we interested in its reproduction as a method, unless it aims at its transformation and overcoming, in order to favor the emancipation of the student from his responsibilities, in his choices and in the formation of his learning.

In the initial path of our research, we read starting with your friend and also a contemporary thinker, **Michel Foucault**. We observe his valuable contribution in the perspective of the historical construction of schools, as well as his differentiated treatment according to his meticulous considerations regarding the power relations present in the disciplinary process of school education, with its control and maintenance tools. As for the **Power Relations**, discipline and examination, Foucault (1984) is blunt:

Discipline implies a continuous record. Annotation of the individual and transfer of information from the bottom up, so that, at the top of the disciplinary pyramid, no detail, event or disciplinary element escapes this knowledge. In the classical system, the exercise of power was confused, global, and discontinuous. It was the power of the sovereign over groups made up of families, cities, parishes, that is, global units, and not a continuous power acting on the individual. Discipline is the set of techniques by which systems of power will target and result in individuals in their uniqueness. It is the power of individualization that has the exam as a fundamental instrument. The examination is the permanent, classificatory surveillance, which makes it possible to distribute individuals, judge them, measure them, locate them and, consequently, use them to the maximum. Through examination, individuality becomes a pertinent element for the exercise of power. (FOUCAULT, 1984, p. 106).

Subsequently, when we also read some of the professor's publications **Silvio Gallo**, developed from a direction for the elaboration of a proposal for anarchist education; in such a way that it is understood as an education that values so much the **freedom**, as well as the **autonomy** and **responsibility** of the student in relation to the very act of **learn**; Also seen as a criticism of what is offered for learning in the homogenizing, reproductive and hierarchical mode of teaching found in traditional education, despite being considered capitalist, we find in the history of education in Brazil the **Traditional Education** It is also carried out in state public education in its various Federal, State and Municipal spheres, with its gratuity guaranteed since the beginning of the Republic. Such

---

<sup>1</sup>A pivoting order is one derived from a basic hierarchical unit, it develops in a binary way in which its branches or derivations necessarily depend on the central unit, so its variations revolve around this unit like a pivot.



observation and search led us, then, to the Deleuzian conceptual development and its unfolding for the elaboration of an education proposal understood as **Rhizomatics**, applied in this Public School of research, on the occasion of being the workplace at the time and due to the requirement of the professional master's program in philosophy – UFPE – to have an intervention in the classroom. Regarding the education offered in public schools, Gallo (2002) tells us:

Thus, the public school we have is the public school that the State wants to finance us, whether it legitimizes domination, or whether it is the mechanism for distributing a semblance of education that keeps the people in a state of semi-ignorance and political-social apathy, whether this seems to be a neglect of the State with public education or not. (GALLO, 2002a, p.153).

In this way, even if such a proposal may seem contradictory, it is carried out within the concrete possibilities of the **Events**, in a public school in a sugarcane region, in a predominantly Christian society (Catholics and Evangelicals), unconcerned with the political consequences of its public managers. For this reason, this intention aims in some way to overcome such conditions starting from what is given, not taking it as established.

### 1.1 BUT WHAT KIND OF ANARCHY IS THIS?

The word Anarchy is made up of two roots of Greek origin. A derivative of the **arché**, the word **Archon** What it means **housekeeper**; plus the prefix **an**, which means **without**. Thus, as we can see, the word itself simply indicates to us an absence of external government, that is, the absence of a ruler. However, in the development of the conflict of the historical narrative, even for a given democratic conception and for those who have ideals of maintaining a closed, hierarchical, authoritarian society, anarchism comes pejoratively from three sources: disorder or turmoil, violence and terrorism. We stress that this is not our understanding. However, because we perceive the existence of several anarchisms within the libertarian proposal, and in order to avoid such mistakes, we prefer to understand the legitimacy of such a movement as non-violent and that, through education, it is possible to carry out the transformations pertinent to each society in search of individual freedom as long as it is understood collectively.

Within the activity of the study of libertarian philosophical thought, we can commonly find in many thinkers the understanding of the need to eliminate the interference of the State, Religion and Property in the face of individual decisions regarding a society formed with fully educated citizens. Nevertheless Even with the impossibility of addressing the full variety of libertarian thought, we also do not bother to determine its alleged **origin**, although some authors make such estimates, and it is difficult to fully address their **Differences** In a small publication that deals with education, the teaching of philosophy and anarchism, but we reserve some examples pertinent to the point of valuing education as well as the elimination of obstacles to freedom, we will expose to a certain extent what we find in



anarchist theorists who are in line with some of their positions, and also disagreeing with others such as, for example, in relation to actions that lead to any kind of violence. Therefore, we believe that education is the best tool for the liberation and emancipation of the individual, and that, therefore, it is understood as in the thought of the first theoretician to call himself anarchist, in the positive sense of the term, **Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1975)**, who writes to us about the achievement of complete education:

I expound a truth that we try, in vain, to prevent the outbreak; I am writing the preamble to our future Constitution. If concerns allowed us to listen to this definition that seems blasphemous to you, property is theft, we would have the magic sting of the storm; But how many interests, how many prejudices stand in the way of this... Philosophy will not change the course of events in any way: destinies will be fulfilled independently of prophecy: indeed, is it not necessary that justice be done and our education completed? (PROUDHON, 1975, p. 11).

This completeness of education, in the anarchist view, takes place in the realization of a **Comprehensive Education**, in which the capacities of individuals comprise **Intellectual works** and **Handiwork**, without hierarchy or social differentiations that generate exploitation; or when we find in the writings of **Malatesta (2009)** that in his notes without any dating, but with perspectives of its emergence as:

And when some considered that the fundamental cause of evil was the struggle between men which resulted in the domination of the victors and the oppression and exploitation of the vanquished, and saw that this domination of the former and this subjection of the latter gave rise to capitalist property and the state, and when they proposed to overthrow the state and property, Anarchism was born. (MALATESTA, 2009, p. 05).

For, while acknowledging the nature of the philosophical search for **origin**, we start from the understanding that anarchism is already developing, and the determination of its genesis, regardless of date and conceptual character, will not contribute significantly to libertarian thought in the face of its vast theoretical production, with its various expressions of positioning. This leads us to believe that its unfolding and dissemination, its criticisms and its reformulations are proof of the advancement of the concept of freedom. Not being bound to a sacred book or to a personality, libertarian thought will contradict itself if it is not reevaluated and new proposals for overcoming society in search of freedom erupt.

In line with this same view of what is common in libertarian thought, there is also the student of history and anarchist ideas **Woodcock (2002)** that tells us:

It is the general idea proposed by Proudhon in 1840 that establishes a link between him and other anarchists who emerged later, such as Bakunin and Kropotkin, and also with certain philosophers who lived before and after him, such as Godwin, Stirner and Tolstoy, who created anti-government systems without accepting the designation of anarchists; And it is in this sense that I will treat anarchism, despite its many variants: as a system of social philosophy, aimed at promoting basic changes in the structure of society, and, especially since this is the element



common to all forms of anarchism, the replacement of the authoritarian state by some form of non-governmental cooperation between free individuals. (WOODCOCK, 2002, p. 11).

Thus, we work in this perspective the teaching of philosophy, bringing the replacement of the authoritarianism of traditional education by an education of mutual cooperation with dialogue in the learning process, favoring basic changes in the autonomy and responsibility of the student regarding his own construction of knowledge, aiming at his integral emancipation in his formation for citizenship. That said, we can indicate a concern of anarchists with an education without privileges, in order to avoid domination through the possession of knowledge, where in the words of **Bakunin (1979)** We can find:

The first question we are going to consider today is this: Can the emancipation of the masses be complete as long as the education which the masses receive is inferior to that given to the bourgeoisie, or as long as there is any class in general, numerous or not, but which, by its birth, is called to the privileges of a higher education and a more complete instruction? By this question, is it not to solve it? Will it not be evident that between two men endowed with a natural intelligence approximately equal, whose minds are more open to science, and who, having better understood the chain of natural and social facts, or what are called the laws of nature and society, will more easily and comprehensively perceive the character of the environment in which he lives, that this one will feel, shall we say, freer, that he will be practically more skillful and more powerful than the other? He who knows more will naturally dominate the one who knows less; And if there is only this difference of education and instruction between two classes, this difference will in a short time produce all the others, the world of man will return to its present state, that is, it will be divided again into a mass of slaves and a small number of rulers, the former working, as at present, for the latter. (BAKUNIN, M. 1979, p. 32).

What **Bakunin** What warns us, still in the nineteenth century, is that the simple distinction of what and how is taught to students produces and reproduces certain relations of domination, originating in this case, a domination of those who know more over those who know less within society, thus bringing about the emergence of other structures of domination.

Thus, in the interest of understanding the critique of libertarian thought to Western capitalist society, we have **Foucault** who, although he does not declare himself an anarchist, offers a valuable contribution from his ideas, shared through the publication of his books, which will reveal to us the dynamics of a **Power Microphysics (1987)** as well as in the path of the creation of schools we come to his book **Surveillance and Punish: Birth of the Prison (1984)**. From his works, **Foucault** It tells us about the many stages in the development of the historical construction of disciplinary processes of formation, these stages being present in our daily lives in the various institutions, bringing us a submission and carrying out a formation from the subjection of the individual that begins in our social life from the family institution, followed in early childhood education and transmitted **panoptically** by other social spaces:

The "invention" of this new political anatomy should not be understood as a sudden discovery. But as a multiplicity of processes that are often minimal, of different origins, of scattered



locations, which are remembered, repeated, or imitated, they support each other, they are distinguished according to their field of application, they converge and gradually sketch the façade of a general method. We find them in operation in schools very early on; later in primary schools; slowly invested hospital space; and in a few decades they restructured the military organization. They circulated, sometimes very quickly from one point to another (between the army and the technical schools or the colleges and lyceums), sometimes slowly and in a more discreet way (insidious militarization of the large workshops). Each time, or almost, they imposed themselves in response to the exigencies of the conjuncture: here an industrial innovation, there the resurgence of certain epidemic diseases, there the invention of the rifle or the victories of Prussia. This does not prevent them from being inscribed, in total, in the general and essential transformations that will necessarily be determined. (FOUCAULT, 1987, p. 110).

After having a familiarity with the development of Foucauldian thought, observing the approximation with **Deleuze**, in his book: **The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque (1991)**, in this book, the French thinker gives his treatment to the nature of questions of infinite magnitudes from the perspective of thought **Leibnizian**, in an argumentative development and following the logic of such thought, Deleuze (1991) tells us:

Folding-unfolding no longer simply means tending-distending, contracting-dilating, but involving-developing, involuting-evolving. The organism is defined by the capacity to bend its own parts to infinity and to unfold them not to infinity, but to the degree of development consigned to the species. In this way, an organism is involved in the seed (pre-formation of the organs) and the seeds, like Russian dolls, are involved in each other to infinity. (DELEUZE, 1991, p. 21).

Based on this same thought, Deleuze tells us that the **Plane of Immanence**, the comprehensiveness of the Deleuzian concept would then have two faces, one as thought and the other as nature; understood as *Physis* and also how *Noüs*, declaring that there would always be in this way infinite movements intertwined with each other, folding into each other, so that the return of the one brings us the other instantaneously, causing the **Plane of Immanence** Don't stop weaving. With the development of the research we carried out, focused on a vision of education in favor of an emancipatory formation of the student, understood, therefore, as anarchist, we know the book by Professor Silvio Gallo, **Anarchist Education: A Paradigm for Today (1996)**, from which we can highlight a concern and a debate about power relations, among which we highlight the abuse of the teacher's authority, authoritarianism in the classroom by the figure of the teacher, in addition to other power relations in the most diverse educational and/or knowledge sectors, when in a questioning tone he makes us a challenge:

The equation of knowledge and power is therefore inscribed in the well-defined context of a society structured on the model of exploitation; The question we propose is the following: is this equation valid in any and all cases or only in the context of domination? Or, in other words, would it be possible to overcome the condition of the experience of power relations in the school? (GALLO, 1996, p. 55).



And also, later on, when he makes us observe the Foucauldian question of the space of power and its gears by reassembling the images of a traditional and authoritarian teacher in the scenes of the film **The wall**, by the English rock band **Pink Floyd**:

If we take the classical topological conception of power, we must look for the specific place it assumes in the tactical map of education, unfolded over the classroom. In the conception of education that is conventionally called traditional, the topos of power is the teacher's body; Power is incarnate in him, while the students are emptied of it. They are the very image of powerlessness in its strict and literal sense. In the film *The Wall*, directed by Alan Parker, based on an album by the English rock group Pink Floyd, this conception gains all the colors and movements that the magic of cinema allows, presenting the arrogant teacher who acts on his students as a true despot, legitimized in his position by the power he possesses, putting to work the gears of the school machine that acts ideologically on the students. In the film strategically shown as a huge meat grinder that, first removing their individuality and losing their own faces, unifies them all, transforming them into ground meat. (GALLO, 1996, p. 55).

Along with this reading, we also have the guidance of Professor Dr. **Sérgio Ricardo Vieira Ramos** And we saw the possibility of improving such an enterprise, thought of as a contribution to the teaching of Philosophy beyond the questions of content, pedagogical method, school and curriculum; rather, it is seen as a tool to promote student learning, by establishing contact with philosophy through a teaching seen as **Rhizomatic**, with the intention of carrying out a **Deterritorialization** of an old knowledge and of realizing a new one **Reterritorialization** more **Updated**, thus arriving at the continuous development of learning itself.

Although learning is a subject present in the problem of teaching in general, we reserve ourselves for the following context: students, living in the vicinity of the Municipality of **Porto Calvo – AL**, a region on the north coast of Alagoas, with a predominantly sugarcane economy, with a marked influence of the **Dutch Brazil** and **Quilombo dos Palmares** through **Calabar** and **Zombie**, as important and identity characters, in addition to historical representation, since they are also **Psychosocial types** of the city. For this experiment, we used the development of Deleuzian concepts in an exercise of conceptual displacement applied to this particular intervention. We take advantage of the contribution proposed by Professor Silvio Gallo, who makes a Deleuzian approach to the issues of education, taking into account Brazil in particular. **Gallo** (2002) develops his conceptual displacement of Deleuzian thought from a major literature and a minor literature, to what this professor came to call a major education and a minor education. From this, it follows that:

The first characteristic is that of deterritorialization; If in literature it is the language that is deterritorialized, in education the deterritorialization is of the educational processes. The policies, the parameters, the guidelines of higher education are always telling us what to teach, how to teach it, to whom to teach it, why to teach it. Higher education seeks to construct itself as an immense machine of control, a machine of subjectivation, of the production of individuals in series. (GALLO, 2002b, p. 173).



By In the classroom, minor education is deterritorialized from instances so far removed from that local reality and deals directly with educational processes not thought of by the **Larger Education**, the particularities and the **Differences** in the learning of each student inserted in that collective, since:

The second characteristic is the political ramification. If all education is a political act, in the case of a lesser education this is even more evident, because it is an enterprise of revolt and resistance [...] Finally, the third characteristic is collective value. In minor education, every act acquires a collective value [...] In minor education, there is no possibility of solitary, isolated acts; Every action will implicate many individuals. Every singularization will be, at the same time, a collective singularization. (GALLO, 2002b, p. 173-176).

The Vision The rhizomatic nature of the classroom and its ramifications come from a displacement made by Deleuze, deterritorializing this concept of Biology and reterritorializing it in Philosophy. It was intended to achieve it based on the principles of the characterization of a **rhizome** Deleuze's conceptual concept found in his book: **A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia (2000)**. Such principles are theoretically worked on later, but we emphasize our impetus to create a proposal in opposition to any authoritarian, hierarchical, verticalized and homogenizing model. We make this critique with a parallel to the model found in traditional education, recognizing it in the same Deleuzian thought, defined as a model **Tree**, rigid, based on the imposition of the One and its division. In a variety based at most on a dichotomy that in itself already derives from an imposition of a founding unity (**arché**).

The tree is already the image of the world, or the root is the image of the world-tree. It is the classic book, as beautiful organic, signifying and subjective inferiority (the strata of the book). The book imitates the world, like art, nature: by procedures that are their own and that accomplish what nature cannot or can no longer do. The law of the book is that of reflection, the One that becomes two. How could the law of the book be in nature, since it presides over the very division between world and book, nature and art? One becomes two: every time we encounter this formula, even if strategically enunciated by Mao Zedong, even if understood as "dialectically" as possible, we find ourselves in front of the most classical and the most thoughtful, the oldest, the most tired thought. Nature does not act like this: the roots themselves are pivoting with more numerous, lateral and circular branching, not dichotomous. (DELEUZE, 2000, p. 12).

By proposing in his thought that nature does not act in a dichotomous way from the one, Deleuze (2000) goes against tradition and its imposition of the **arché** which aims at a hegemonic thought in order to then propose to us an understanding of various **Multiplicities** beyond this dichotomy of authoritarian construction. He brings us a thought where the understanding is that nature in this sense is multiple, with infinite movements of **Breaks** and **continuity**.

## 2 DETERRITORIALIZATION: A NEW BEGINNING

We believe that psychosocial types have precisely this meaning: in the most insignificant or most important circumstances, to make perceptible the formations of territories, the vectors of deterritorialization, the process of reterritorialization. But are there not also territories and





deterritorializations that are not only physical and mental, but spiritual, not only relative, but absolute, in a sense to be determined later? What is the homeland or the homeland invoked by the thinker, philosopher or artist? Philosophy is inseparable from a Native Ground, to which the a priori, the innate or reminiscence also bear witness. But why this unknown, lost, forgotten homeland, making the thinker an Exile? What is it that will give you back an equivalent of territory, as a home is worth? What will be the philosophical ritornellos? What is the relationship of thought to the Earth? (DELEUZE, 2010, p. 91).

Making a brief passage through the history of Brazilian education and the teaching of philosophy in Brazil, we can observe the many variations of educational policy that accompany the changes in the system of government, the form of government and economic policy in many different moments of this land; consequently, modifying, in turn, their understanding of territoriality, their understanding of existential meaning, and maintaining in teaching what is appropriate according to the interests of certain governments. These variations are dictated by groups that have alternated in power since the times of Colonial Brazil and that directly affect the formation of the various citizens in the entire educational process, from the child as a person in formation to what is expected of an adult citizen. In view of this, we seek that students from the city of Porto Calvo to carry out a deterritorialization in order to be able to come into contact with philosophy for the first time in a school environment and, subsequently, to reterritorialize themselves in a construction of knowledge, advancing beyond the reproduction of the "right", of repeated answers, **decalculating** learning.

A textual analysis of the thinker was carried out **Gilles Deleuze** (2002) in his book: **What is philosophy?**, in a dialogue with his suggested proposal of an experience understood as rhizomatic found in the partnership between **Deleuze and Guattari** (2000) in his book **A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia, Vol. I**, shifted to education in a proposal developed by his commentators, since Deleuze does not specifically address the issue of education in general and philosophical education, but serves as a reference, as he works with great originality the effort of conceptual displacement in the development of his thought, which we consider important in the conception of this proposal of a libertarian education, understood in a rhizomatic view for the teaching of philosophy, investigating the sources to seek, then, the determination of the criteria and conceptual tools that show how the relations of philosophy teaching with the process of philosophy are **Deterritorialization** and **Reterritorialization** to develop our problem. Therefore, from this perspective, Deleuze (2010) tells us that:

To know oneself — to learn to think — to act as if nothing were self-evident — to be astonished, to "wonder that the being is"... these determinations of philosophy and many others form interesting attitudes, although tiring in the long run, but they do not constitute a well-defined occupation, a precise activity, even from a pedagogical point of view. Constructivism requires that all creation be a construction on a plan that gives it an autonomous existence. To create concepts, at least, is to do something. The question of the use or usefulness of philosophy, or even of its harmfulness (whom does it harm?), is thus modified. (DELEUZE, 2010, p. 15-16).



It is also perceived that the simple inclusion of the discipline philosophy in the curriculum alone is not a guarantee that it will collaborate in human formation, in a knowledge of oneself of an emancipatory, existential and ethical aspect to students, in the sense of contributing to an understanding and a critique of philosophical knowledge, historical, economic, political, cultural and environmental aspects that involve the various transformations of society that are present, from birth to the relationships of adult life and its continuity.

This is not the case, that our proposal is not seen only as illustrated and legitimizing repetitions of postulates immortalized in the field of philosophy and the teaching of philosophy, which aim to reproduce what is placed in a horizon only of training manpower for work and its reproduction of certain types psychosocial measures. We intend to have a grounded theoretical basis, but we know that practice requires a work that often goes beyond theory and requires us to take creative individual actions. In the words of Professor Silvio Gallo (2002), we find that such an authoritarian educational procedure must be transgressed, thus, this is our goal, an anarchist education as a way to prevent this heteronomic reproduction:

The tactics of a lesser education as opposed to a higher education are very similar to the tactics of strikers in a factory. Here, too, it is a question of preventing production; It is a question of preventing the greater, well-thought-out and well-planned education from being established, from becoming concrete. It's about putting up resistance, it's about producing differences. Deterritorialize. Always. (GALLO, 2002b, p. 174).

On the other hand, it is important to recognize here the importance of education professionals, activists from various sectors of civil society who fight in the institutions for a well-founded and citizen-oriented educational policy, with their movements of advances and setbacks in the conquests of legal guarantees, of a training education for the exercise of citizenship in the capitalist democratic society in which we live. However, we recognize the need to counter this oppressive order with the support of Professor Silvio's words Gallo in stating to us that:

In the education worked by the capitalist system, whose objective is to perpetuate the society of exploitation: it teaches the bourgeois to exploit, mastering all available knowledge and seeing no other way of life; and it teaches the proletarian masses to remain docile to exploitation, not to rebel against the unjust social system [...] Capitalist education does not form a complete man, but a partial being, committed to principles defined a priori and external to him; In other words, capitalist education is based on heteronomy. (GALLO, 2010, p. 04).

We realize that within the perspective of a **Larger Education**, thus present in the discussions of educational policies, of such broad dimensions, with encompassing legal forms; the Federal, State, Municipal and Private spheres; of the School Managements, of the Teaching Coordinators that follow the order of a universalizing hierarchy, where at the end of the chain there is each student, seen in a generalized way, homogeneously with the same conditions, times and aptitudes in the teaching



relations, understanding them at most within a diversity from the same subjective unit imposed as a standard.

As a consequence of this position, it is necessary to emphasize that our territory is not apprehended from this. Our theoretical support can be found in the position of the anarchist thinker **Mikhail Bakunin**, one of the many times in which he criticizes the consolidated educational models so as not to become accomplices in this mechanism of homogeneous instruction, in this way he tells us that:

All the ideas, which he finds embodied in things and in men, from his birth, and which are impressed on his mind by the education and instruction which the individual receives, even before he knows himself, will find them later consecrated, explained and commented on by theories that the universal conscience or collective judgment and by all religious institutions, of the society of which it is a part. And he himself is so impregnated with them, whether or not he is personally interested in defending, that he reacts involuntarily, because of all the material, intellectual and moral habits that make him an accomplice. (BAKUNIN, 1975, p. 12).

Unlike these generalizing initiatives, we sought to intervene in a specific classroom only. **detrterritorialized** of the instances of the macro policy of this **Larger Education**, but understanding it as a **rhizome**, with its **Connections**, its **ruptures and the other parts of a whole of multiplicities**, present in the society in which it is inserted. In fact, our effort to give rise to multiplicity happens by subtracting this classroom from the others, because we understand that:

It is necessary to make the multiple, not always adding a higher dimension, but, on the contrary, in the simple way, with the force of sobriety, at the level of the dimensions at one's disposal, always  $n-1$  (it is only in this way that the one is part of the multiple, always being subtracted from it). Subtract the single from the multiplicity to be constituted; Write to  $N-1$ . Such a system could be called a rhizome. (DELEUZE, 2000, p. 13 – 14).

By subtracting this class for research from the other classes of the first year of the School, we strive to favor the possibility of constituting the authenticity of the multiplicity of this first year in relation to the other classes. With a schedule of teaching philosophy between these two months (Mar. and Apr.) structured in dialogue with the students, we try to observe the realization of the activities favoring the creation of solutions that link philosophy and its reality. It was established that there would be no test or examination, but rather the elaboration of a **Zine** related to the themes worked on during the intervention period and their dissemination with the intention of finding in this classroom a connection with the whole city, with the surrounding region; its connection with the social roles of the varied social class that participates in this school, from the children of farmers, bricklayers, marketers, even housewives, etc. And, by breaking with the traditionalist view, we favor this **Vanishing line** which makes us different from the multiplicity of classes present in this school and from the others, universalized in a traditional teaching perspective.



### 3 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

From this existential consistency of the intervention, the connection of the philosophical themes with the reality of the students present was elaborated, the problems arose spontaneously despite a previous planning of the research; Themes such as Greek mythology permeated the fascination of the students, but from questions such as: "Professor, are you an atheist?" a debate about religion, etc., began. This helped As a parameter for the observation in the construction of what we call learning maps of the students in this classroom, together with this we made a material with the themes addressed in the classroom, such as knowledge, religion, culture, ethics and politics. The production of the **Zine** served to demarcate the **Deterritorialization** students' prior knowledge from the **Fundamental II**, as well as to materially reterritorialize such learning as a tool for transformation and criticism of the moment of its realization, it also facilitated the issue of the interaction of the individual and the collectivity, assignments and resolutions of tasks. Despite the precarious infrastructural structure of the school and the students' reading difficulties, the class was divided into groups and each group addressed a specific theme. After researching and distributing activities, these groups proposed a debate where they weaved arguments and verified their validity, expanding their knowledge in a movement of deterritorialization, reterritorialization and updating of themselves, ending with a pamphleteer movement of the zine produced and dialogues that went beyond the classrooms, branching connections with other students and other members of the school community.



## REFERENCES

Primary:

DELEUZE, G. GUATTARI, F. O que é a filosofia?. Tradutor: Bento Prado Jr. Alberto Alonso Munoz. 3ª ed. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2010.

Secundária

BAKUNIN, M. Socialismo libertário. Tradutor: Olinto Beckerman. São Paulo: Global Editora e Distribuidora, 1979.

O conceito de liberdade. Tradutor: Jorge Dessa. Porto: Edições Res Limitada, 1975.

DELEUZE, G. Diferença e repetição. Tradutor: Luiz Orlandi, Roberto Machado. Rio de Janeiro: Graal, 1988.

G. A dobra: Leibniz e o barroco. Trad. Luiz B. L. Orlandi. Campinas, São Paulo: Papyrus, 1991.

G.; GUATTARI, F. Mil platôs: capitalismo e esquizofrenia. 2ª ed. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2000.

FOUCAULT, Michel. Microfísica do poder. Org. Tradução: Roberto Machado. 4ª ed. Rio de Janeiro: Graal, 1984.

Michel. Vigiar e punir: nascimento da prisão. Tradução Raquel Ramallete. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1987.

GALLO, Silvio. Educação anarquista: um paradigma para hoje. Piracicaba: Ed. Unimep, 1995.

Silvio. A escola pública numa perspectiva anarquista. VERVE. Nº 01/2002a. ISSN: 1676- 9090.

Silvio. Em torno de uma educação menor. n. 27(2), p. 169-178, jul./dez. 2002b.

MALATESTA, Errico. Anarquismo e anarquia. Tradução: Felipe Corrêa. Faísca: 2009.

PROUDOHN, J. O que é a propriedade?. 2ª ed. Lisboa: Editorial Estampa, 1975.

SILVA, Tomaz Tadeu da. Documento de identidade: uma introdução às teorias do currículo. 2ª ed. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2005.

WOODCOCK, George. História das ideias e movimentos anarquistas – v. 1: a ideia. Tradutor: Júlia Tettamanzy. Porto Alegre: L&PM Editores, 2002.