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ABSTRACT: By problematizing the Cartesian paradigm, the body has been the object of attention in the educational field. In the current scenario that moves towards the expansion of the school day, this is a relevant matter. This paper, of bibliographic nature, aims at contributing to this debate by seeking elements to analyze the concept of body present in integral education movements in the country and in the Programa Mais Educação (More Education Program), using the corporeality proposition suggested by Merleau-Ponty. Conclusions of this analysis enable reflecting that the division between body / mind remains in these movements; and in the More Education Program it is possible to catch glimpses of advances towards corporeality. However, full time school may not be structured in the juxtaposition of curricular activities in proposals for expanding school hours. Rather, it must provide a comprehensive view of the student body, which is why we list arguments in favor of a learning corporeality as a possible foundation for integral education experiences.
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REFLEXÕES SOBRE CORPOREIDADE NO CONTEXTO DA EDUCAÇÃO INTEGRAL

RESUMO: Ao se problematizar o paradigma cartesiano, o corpo tem sido objeto de atenção no campo educacional; e, no cenário atual que acena para a ampliação da jornada escolar, esta é uma questão pertinente. Este artigo, de cunho bibliográfico, tem como propósito contribuir com esse debate ao buscar, na proposição de corporeidade proposta por Merleau-Ponty, elementos para analisar a concepção de corpo presente nos movimentos de educação integral no país e no Programa Mais Educação. As conclusões da análise propiciam refletir que a cisão corpo/mente permanece nesses movimentos; e, nas proposições do Mais Educação, vislumbram-se avanços em direção à corporeidade. Entretanto, a educação integral não pode se estruturar na junção de atividades curriculares nas propostas de ampliação do tempo escolar, mas deve propiciar uma visão integral dos discentes, razão de elencarmos argumentos em favor da corporeidade apreendente como possível fundamento para experiências educacionais de tempo integral.


INTRODUCTION

Throughout the years, the body has been the object of attention and studies in the field of education (BEZERRA; MOREIRA, 2013). Therefore, discussing the body and education, in this article, does not constitute “news”. In turn, considering the changes in the national scenario, with the current emphasis on studies, and with the debates and experiences on integral education growing in the country (BRASIL, 2010b; 2010c; MOLL, 2012), the issue of the body comes back to the stage as the object of analysis, especially with the proposition of the More Education Program, a national policy that advocates the increase in school hours (MOLL, 2012) and whose activities focus greatly on the body.

In this sense, this article, having a bibliographical nature, intends to provide understanding the body in the scenario of the movements that were constituted around integral education in Brazil and, more recently, in the More Education Program.

Historically, the body has been subdued to an inferior condition since the moment when the human being was divided into two parts: “mind and body”. This understanding of the body starts when Plato conceives human beings ontologically as belonging to two realms: the realm of sensation/material - imperfect, to which they belong by nature and, therefore, the physical part of the body, and the realm of ideas - perfect, located on the mind (GALLO, 2006).
The dichotomy between body and mind gained strength when Descartes (1983), in his studies on human rationality, characterized the psychophysical dualism as matter (body or corporeal substance – *res extensa*) and spirit (soul or mental substance – *res cogitans*), reinforcing the separation between the material and the spiritual worlds (CARBINATTO; MOREIRA, 2006). Thus, the body would always be subjected to the commands of the mind, in a process that connects the existence of the subject to its rational, non-existential condition.

Historically, school processes expose a form of working with the body that evidence such division, and the separation between disciplines that work with the mind (Mathematics, History, Languages, etc.) and Physical Education that “works” the body (NÓBREGA, 2005, 2010). This way of perceiving the body reveals it is understood as “physical”, rather than in the sense of corporeality.

The understanding of body assumed in this article, and which guides our analysis, is the one proposed by Merleau-Ponty (1994) and his studies on phenomenology. For this scholar, the body may not be seen as the sum of parts, whereas the soul is something that controls this assembly. The human body may only be perceived and known by means of its life and its experience, therefore, is understood in its plenitude.

This understanding of the body is what leads us to question the initiatives of integral education, permeated by the discourse on the whole subject and on educating full time, and which justify, considering the extension of school hours, the need for diversifying school contents and the inclusion of sport, artistic and cultural activities.

Would we be experiencing a new movement in the field of education, in which the split between body and mind is tensioned by a different understanding of the subject as the one who learns by means of everyday experiences, savoring knowledge in itself and not only by means of ideas in books, charts or faculty speeches?

Integral education school experiences in the country are heirs to several movements (SILVA, 2013) that are impregnated with an understanding of “men” and, therefore, of body. In this article, we have undertaken, thus, a search for the understanding of body present in the Anarchist, Integralist and New School movements, as well as in the More Education Program, which make up the scenario of discussions and experiences of and on integral education in Brazil. The expression “integral education” seems to indicate a new idea of body, in which the division between body and mind must have been overcome.

The first section in this text provides an analysis of the concept of body in the integral education movements previously tried in Brazil, which reflect on the current propositions and experiences, and the second section intends to discuss corporeality in the More Education Program.
THE EXPERIENCE OF CORPOREALITY IN INTEGRAL EDUCATION MOVEMENTS IN BRAZIL

ANARCHIST MOVEMENT

Having a counter-hegemonic nature, the anarchist movement (archon = leader, an = without) started, in the 19th century, to struggle in favor of the workers cause. This movement had numerous lines of action, and education was one of them. It is, thus “[...] in the context of human emancipation, dreamed of in the 19th century, from the yoke of all impositions, whether from nature, or those resulting from men dominating men, the concept of integral education arose” (GALLO, 2002, p. 13).

Anarchist education’s, also called libertarian pedagogy or libertarian education, proposal was geared towards the construction of schools by the workers themselves, and that they had a socio-political nature, completely different from state or religious schools (GALLO, 2002). This concept of libertarian education was connected to the negation of alienation suffered by part of the workers, actualizing a relation between work and education that sought more justice and freedom for them (CAVALIERE, 2009a).

Anarchist education gradually developed the concept of integral education amidst the worker’s movement, and had Mikhail Bakunin and Paul Robin as their main militants. The latter was responsible for structuring, initially, the anarchist pedagogical practice in this perspective (GALLO, 2002).

Besides them, Francisco Ferrer y Guardia (1859-1901) was one of the most active scholars in anarchist education, as he developed the so-called Modern Schools (based on anarchist logic), opening the first one in 1901 in Spain (COSTA; BAUER, 2011).

For Costa and Bauer (2011), from the first steps of the anarchist movement to the materialization of schools guided by this concept, some principles that characterize their precepts.

1 – the defense of individual freedom and autonomy, or the principle of libertarian individualism; 2 – the defense of free and autonomous action, without representation, not based on institutionalism, or the principle of direct action; 3 – the defense of a free society, without domination or power hierarchy, or the self-management principle; 4 – the defense of associativity and organization based on localism, or the federative principle (COSTA; BAUER 2011, p. 5).

In Brazil, this educational movement arrived with European immigrants, as well as with Brazilian researchers/activists who...
maintained contact with the group. In 1906, the first Brazilian Workers’ Conference was held, inaugurating an incipient organization of this movement in the country. During this event, which had an anarchist-unionist nature, the action points, the organization strategies and the development of Modern Schools, in accordance with the model proposed by Ferrer y Guardia (MARTINS, 2010) were outlined.

Modern Schools were opened starting in 1912 in São Paulo, in Rio de Janeiro, in Belém do Pará and in Porto Alegre (LEITE; CARVALHO; VALADARES, 2010). These schools were seen “[...] as a space for struggle, militancy and propaganda, as important as Unions” (COSTA; BAUER, 2011, p. 23).

Whether in their first European experiences or in Moder Schools created in Brazil, this educational proposition was based on the articulation of three human dimensions – intellectual, physical (consisting of manual, sportive and professional/polytechnic dimensions), and moral –, all part of the same plan, therefore, free of any hierarchy (GALLO, 2002).

Paul Robin developed his work in the Prévost orphanage, in France, from 1880 to 1894, where he sought “[...] to provide maximum development of physical, intellectual and moral development of children, and, in an integral education approach, aimed at forming complete beings [...]”, in addition, “[...] they developed manual activities as means to complement education” (MORAES, 2009, p. 31).

A complete education, advancing, gradually, towards a broader view of subjects was sought. That is to say, there was a claim to the understanding that human beings would be this owned-body, in the words of Merleau-Ponty (1994), rather than an agglomerate of parts, to which different activities should be offered to meet these dimensions’ needs.

For instance, in Physical Education, which included sports and recreation, in manual education and in professional education, greater emphasis was placed in the formative aspect of pedagogical practices. About this, Gallo (2002) clarifies that, contrary to the thought at the time, which advocated Physical Education for workers’ physical well-being and health, anarchists believed that, by means of games, students could learn the sense of group and collectivity.

We may infer that Paul Robin advances in the concept of integral education, explaining that it is not only about accumulating several notions, but rather the harmonic development of all human faculties (MORAES, 2009).

Based on his interpretations on the meaning of libertarian education for Bakunin, Gallo (2002, p. 30) states that:
for people to accept their own freedom, it is important that they know themselves, know themselves as a whole: discover themselves as a body, as a conscience, as a social being, all integrated and articulated. This is why education for freedom must also be integral education, in which people perceive themselves and know themselves in all of their aspects (emphasis added).

More than that, for libertarian pedagogy authors, integral education could not be restricted to intellectual education, but should advance towards a meaningful learning. This learning may be part of the doing, of the practice that values corporeality in the learning process (GALLO, 2002).

Although anarchists still fragmented knowledge, assigning physical, manual and professional practices to the body, as if the intellectual and moral dimensions were not part of it, integral education advocates advance in the sense that no knowledge should be more important than the other and, in addition, argue that all dimensions contribute to human formation in an integral manner.

About this, it is important to point out that the concept/attitude of corporeality requires conceiving education as a deeply human experience and that it is the learning of culture. A human being’s body is not a mere body, but a human body, which may only be understood from its integration with the global structure (REZENDE, 1990; MERLEAU-PONTY, 1994; MOREIRA, 2006).

Corporeality means advancing in search of an education that highlights the statement that the human being “does not learn only with intelligence, but with the body and its guts, its sensitivity and imagination”. Still regarding the phenomenon of learning, we recall that “because men are not simply animals, nor simply reason, they are not, either, not merely individuals, not merely social” (REZENDE, 1990, p. 48-49). Corporeality, as concern in the educational process, is designed to understand the human phenomenon, as its attention is directed to the human beings, to the meaning of their existences, to their history and to their culture. For this learning, it is not possible to reduce the structure of the human phenomenon to any one of its elements. A polysemic, polymorphous and symbolic dialectic has to be used.

INTEGRALIST MOVEMENT

Another movement dealing with integral education was integralism, which emerged in Brazil when Plínio Salgado, its main author, publicizes the October Manifesto in 1932, instituting, from then on, the Brazilian Integralist Action (AIB - Ação Integralista Brasileira). Such initiative was supported by the Brazilian upper middle class, and
guided its actions in welfare and educational works (COELHO, 2006).

By preparing a proposal for and education with political-conservative bases, as they emphasized spirituality, nationalism and discipline, integralists stated their intent to promote integral education for integral men, that is to say, they intended to form integral men by proposing activities for physical, intellectual, civic and spiritual aspects (COELHO, 2004; 2005).

Differently from the anarchists, who advocated human emancipation by means of principles, such as equality, truth, solidarity and freedom, integralists, based on the tripod—God, family and the country—seek conformation of the people to the most conservative aspects of society.

Integralists argued that teaching all things connected to God was required for developing the spiritual aspect; teaching all things connected to obligations towards the nation was required for developing the civic aspect; teaching all things connected to school and culture was required for developing the intellectual aspect, and working with muscle strength, health and hygiene was required for developing the physical aspect (PINHEIRO, 2009).

In investigative researches on the documentary sources produced by this movement, Coelho (2004, 2005, 2006) found records that indicated the existence of over three thousand integralist centers in Brazil, starting in the 1930’s.

Based on hierarchical relations of conformance and obedience, the integralist movement operated with “fundamental truths” defined mainly with regards to spirituality/religiousness, respect and defense of the country and family (COELHO, 2005).

For Cavaliere (2010), the 1920’s were marked by a hygienist-educational vision that resulted in an authoritative project of school education, which believed school literacy was the way to solve all problems in Brazil. Integralist education was guided by this idea, in which elevating the people’s “culture” was a requirement. Thus, the Brazilian elite would same acculturated peoples (PINHEIRO, 2009).

For members of this movement, Brazil needed an educational systems that emphasized discipline, hygiene, and literacy, as in the hygienist view of the 1920’s, in order for the people to be led “in conformance” to the industrial and urban society being formed.

According to Coelho (2005), there are records of moral and civic education classes, as well as sport activities in the integralist centers, in which Physical Education was developed as capable of distracting youth from what Integralism thinkers considered “futile pleasures”, and of keeping young people healthy.
Two observations are relevant regarding this movement, as they help us to understand the concept of integral education and the idea of body underlying it, namely: the use of Physical Education as an end in itself, strongly characterized by the hygienist movement, and discipline as a goal and a principle to be adopted in the educational process.

We can characterize the hygienist movement as the one intended to form strong, healthy men to work in the industry, and women sufficiently apt to procreate and care for the home. We may point out that the hygienist movement relied, basically, on medical actions for disease control, and on physical exercises that made the body healthy, apt for modern urban needs (CARVALHO et al., 2012).

If the body is viewed as physical shape only, and it is assumed it should be cared for and treated as an object of possession, the possibility of understanding the subject in an integral manner is reduced. Therefore, as to the interpretation of Physical Education as the education of the physical, we may infer that it is not an education that views the subject in its entirety, but as fragmented. In this subject, parts need to be worked separately, as an end in themselves.

In addition to being worked separately, the body was to be disciplined. On this topic, Foucault (2010, p. 29) comes to our help, as he makes it clear that the investment on the body takes place for political reasons of control and power.

But the body is also directly involved in a political field; power relations have an immediate hold upon it; they invest it, mark it, train it, torture it, force it to carry out tasks, to perform ceremonies, to emit signs. This political investment of the body is bound up, in accordance with complex reciprocal relations, with its economic use; [...] the body becomes a useful force only if it is both a productive body and a subjected body.

A proposition, based on the assumption that some had more knowledge than others and, therefore, had the duty to teach them the minimum, understanding that the country’s social-economic situation required a population that was minimally literate, educated, instructed and disciplined, understands the educational process as very close to issues of domination and control, not only of the physical, but of the bodies.

A subjected body and destitute of knowledge is an easily manipulated, controlled and organized body. It is discipline, in the end, that fabricates subjected, docile bodies, as it “[...] partitions as closely as possible time, space, movement” in order to make them – the bodies – more compliant and more useful at the same time (FOUCAULT, 2010, p. 133).
Finally, we understand that, starting from a hygienist view of education, from a disciplining notion, based on the preservation of social values, and especially, on a reduced view of the body that understands it solely as physical, the concept of integral education, after the integralist movement, is based on the idea of individual as a sum of parts, and does not advance towards a concept of human being based on corporeality.

Writing, or yet thinking and speaking, on corporeality require us to refer, once more, to Merleau-Ponty’s writings in dealing with this topic, as well as to explain two warning signs indicated by the author as guiding principles for understanding corporeality.

The first one is recorded as follows: “The world is not what I think, but what I live; I am open to the world, I unquestionably communicate with it, but I do not possess it, it is inexhaustible” (MERLEAU-PONTY, 1994, p. 14).

The second principle is:

We must seek an understanding from all these angles simultaneously, everything has a meaning, and we shall find this same structure of being underlying all relationships. All these views are true, provided they are not isolated, that we delve deeply into history and reach the unique core of existential meaning which emerges in each perspective. It is true, as Marx says, that history does not walk on its head, but it is also true that it does not think with his feet. Or one should say rather that it is neither its ‘head’ nor its ‘feet’ that we have to worry about, but its body (MERLEAU-PONTY, 1994, p. 17).

Corporeality, as an interpretation originating in phenomenology, means a being explaining its existentiality, a being that thinks the world, the other, and itself, in the attempt to re-learn how to see life and the world. Corporeality, which is life, centers its concern in the search for identification of beings that reveal themselves.

NEW SCHOOL MOVEMENT

In the same effervescent 1930’s, a movement arose, based on the ideas of Rousseau and Pestalozzi, which defended integral education as a right for everyone, rooting its bases on pragmatic – prágma from where practice originates – concept of education, directed to psychology by William James and actualized in education by John Dewey, among other researchers (SCHMITZ, 1980).

The New School Pioneer Manifesto from 1932 characterized this movement in Brazil, which, after the publication of document “The educational reconstruction in Brazil: to the people and to the government”
written by 26 authors, led by Lourenço Filho and with major contributions by Anísio Teixeira, pointed out the need for a quality, mandatory and secular public education (LEITE; CARVALHO; VALADARES, 2010).

The construction of pragmatist thinking, geared towards education, was mostly focused on individualism, on the importance of acquiring knowledge, and on actualizing a school based on the concepts of democracy and reflexive experiences in which the teacher is seen as an assistant to educational functions (GOMES, 2008).

About the pragmatic concept of education, Cavaliere (2010, p. 255) explains that it “considers the reflexive thought as the result of confronting problem situations, and as the origin, at each moment, of momentary forms, among the most appropriate and non-standard ones, to face situations”.

In the new school or liberal movement, as it was also known, school becomes a micro-society designed to developed planned and selected activities, to enable learning how to live in society, in a democratic manner. In addition, the student is viewed as an active being throughout the learning process, and initiative and spontaneity, always based on action, are always valued (LEITE; CARVALHO; VALADARES, 2010).

Carneiro Leão, Fernando de Azevedo and, especially, Anísio Teixeira based their educational proposals in this concept of teaching, and this was highly important to the actualization of experiences in Full Time Schools in the country. We also have to highlight that, at the time, the development of a public school project in which memorization should be abandoned in favor of an incorporate learning, meant progress (TEIXEIRA, 1930).

Initially, in the 1930’s in Rio de Janeiro, schools based on the Platoon System of teaching. This system, imported from the United States by Anísio Teixeira himself, was structured upon work, education and recreation, and did not see the classroom as the only educational space (CHAVES, 2002).

Later on, in the 1950’s, in the state of Bahia, Anísio structured Class-Schools and Park-Schools at the Centro Educacional Carneiro Ribeiro (CECR). This proposal alternated recreational activities and the so-called intellectual, and also enabled students who were orphans lived in the school, and were educated in an integral manner, full time (GADOTTI, 2009).

Anísio Teixeira worshiped “action” and stated he did not understand why all manual trades were underpaid. He advocated the construction of class-schools and park-schools in generously large places, as, for him, this was an essencial condition.
In order to justify the existence of a New School that emerged to the modern world, he strongly criticized traditional education. For him, traditional school had precepts:

*Study* – the way to learn a lesson. *Learning* means accepting and rooting to the memory a habit or fact or an ability. *Teaching* is simply an indoctrination of those facts or concepts. The cycle was simple: the teacher *lectured, assigned* the task after that, and *quizzed* the student on the following day. Books were intentionally divided into lessons. The programs determined the period when such and such lessons were to be mastered. Tests, which checked if the books had been learned, conditioned promotions. Good students were the most *docile* ones to the discipline, those who best adapted to this bookish process to prepare students for the future (TEIXEIRA, 1930, p. 14).

In order to prepare a new way of thinking education, Anísio noticed it was essential to be alert to changes in the world, and three guidelines shall regulate this analysis – men were no longer taken by spiritual fear, and were instead filled with a feeling of optimism in relation to freedom of thought; industrialization that changed the rhythm of family life and of society itself; and democracy that required forming subjects to be free and have their opinions respected (TEIXEIRA, 1930).

This is why, in view of the failure of old school institutions and the urgency modern society would impose for the formation of subjects apt to face its transformations, a New School should be envisioned. This should prepare men to solve their own problems, as well as foment them for an uncertain and unknown future. In addition, New School should provide life and experience opportunities, so that children could gain the moral and social habits they needed to integrate the new dynamic and complex society that was being outlined (TEIXEIRA, 1930).

Again, based on his own writings, we understand that, for Teixeira, other goals were being designed for a new school.

How great are, thus, new responsibilities assigned to school: educating rather than instructing, forming free men rather than docile men; preparing for an uncertain and unknown future rather than transmitting a fixed and clear past; teaching how to live with more intelligence, more tolerance, more finely and more nobly and more happily, rather than simply teaching two or three instruments of culture and some little school manuals. (TEIXEIRA, 1930, p. 15)

Anísio pointed out that this new proposition should be based on the actual experience situation, in which we could practice what we have really learned. That is to say, for him, learning depended directly on incorporating attitudes related to the subject’s life (TEIXEIRA, 1930).
Although Anísio Teixeira and other scholars in the New School Movement have advanced towards other pedagogical practices than the traditional ones, and a new way of viewing learning has been developed, their interpretation of school has not reached a complete notion of corporeality, as it expressed a belief in rationality and in the urgent adaptation required from the modern society, and was still anchored on a dichotomous view of the subject, albeit understanding the value of learning using the entire body, as we may observe in their writings.

Let us imagine children learning how to write. Their entire physical activity is committed to it. Arm and hand muscles, head, neck, upper body, everything is in movement. They are experiencing several feelings of pressure, effort, breathing. Their entire mental activity is also working. They observe, recall, imagine, plan special processes, experience in a way or another. Moreover, however, they fill. (TEIXEIRA, 1930, p. 22, emphasis added)

The paradigm of modern rationality was still fully in force in the 19th and 20th centuries; therefore, both the new school movement, and other movements dealing with integral education, were based on the belief that freedom was provided by reason, by science, by method, and by experimentation.

Classic science built a mechanical model of the universe, characterized by repetition and predictability, by the search for control and prediction, by means of mathematical and mechanical models, by the prevalence of a utilitarian view of knowledge as opposed to reflection. (NOBREGA, 2010, p. 104)

For Nóbrega (2010, p. 31), modern perspective, emerging after the French Revolution, “[...] was responsible for demonstrating the power of reason in knowing the world, especially regarding technical-scientific development” and, proceeds by stating that “modern rationality produced a fragmented knowledge of the body, several overlapping layers in the form of various discourses that tried to silence the wisdom of the body and its sensitive language”.

In order to explain the focus placed by moder philosophy on issues regarding the sensitive Nóbrega (2005) points out that modern rationalism was divided into two, one of which is named idealist (Descartes) and the other, empiricist (Bacon e Locke). For both segments, knowledge should be certain and safe. The first one focuses on the subject (Descartes’ famous “I think, therefore I am”, i.e. a subject is the one who, by means of thought, methodic doubt, may achieve absolute truth), whereas the second one focuses on the object of knowledge (by means of experimentation, exterior to the subject, may achieve the truth).
Although they approached knowledge from different perspectives, both visions agreed that the sensitive would not be reliable, would not lead to true knowledge. Only reason, experimentation, doubt and method would be able to lead us to predicting all things, to overpowering nature, and to progress (NÓBREGA, 2005).

Contemporary philosophy, starting on the 19th century, opens new possibilities for believing in the sensitive element as structural to the lives of subjects. Hegel, by means of the understanding that body and spirit cooperate to the humanization of men through labor, and Marx, who viewed man as a historical category, also thought of from labor perspective, have denounced the alienated body, deformed by the conditions to which they have always been subjected. On the other hand, by means of interpretation of existence, Nietzsche criticized the dualistic Cartesian tradition and values the body in the understanding of men, and, especially, Merleau-Ponty (1994) defends that, based on the body, the human subject is situated in the world and knows it (NÓBREGA, 2005).

However, this contemporary view of the sensitive was not effective on the bases of the conceptions studied herein, as they are conducted by the paradigm of human rationality, as we may see in an excerpt of Anísio’s own text:

Why do we progress? [...] What happened was the application of science to human civilization. Materially, our progress is a child of inventions and the machine. Mankind obtained instruments to fight against distance, time, and nature. [...] But that is not all. The fact of science brought along a new mentality. [...] Scientific experimentation is a literally unlimited method of progress. So much so, that men started to see everything in terms of this mobility. All men do is a mere rehearsal. Tomorrow it will be different. Men acquired the habit of changing, transforming themselves, “progressing”, as they say. This change and this “progress” are felt by modern men: they do it. Men build and rebuild their environment. And more and more they become powerful, by assembling and disassembling an entire civilization. (TEIXEIRA, 1930, p. 2)

Therefore, although based on an educational view that offered the opportunity of experiencing knowledges other than those usually directed to school, both the new school and the anarchist movements, with their libertarian rationality, still believed in issues associated to the cognitive, the mind and the cogito in the words of Descartes. Thus, modern rationality “[...] generated suspicion on sensitivity of all aspects of social life” and sensitivity was always associated to the body, therefore we start, based on Cartesian psycho-physical dualism, to suspect the body, clinging to reason (NÓBREGA, 2010, p. 98).
Coelho (2004) states, about integral education movements, that they had different political-ideological concepts, but their educational activities were always similar. Except for a few specific characteristics in each one, they were about providing different activities for the different dimensions of the subject, such as, for instance, “[...] it has been said many times that we would have an integral education of the learner when Physical Education would take care of the physical, of practical nature, and an education for the intellects of theoretical nature” (NÓBREGA, 2005, p. 47).

From the corporeality standpoint, the mind is also body, moral and ethics are also bodies. Given that “the body is not a disembodied entity; the mind is not in a given part of the body, it is body itself” (NÓBREGA, 2010, p. 80).

Viewed as corporeality, the body is not imprisoned in an exclusive area of knowledge, therefore, it shall not refer to Physical, manual or professional education, and it is necessary to contact, establish dialog with all areas. “As the body is an existential, affective, historical, epistemological condition, [...] we must admit the body is already within education” (NÓBREGA, 2010, p. 114).

Finally, based on this analysis, we evoke Paro (2009) by stating that the concept of Education would already be integral, stressing, however, that the subject be understood as corporeality, not as an assembly of parts. Activities directed to specific knowledges, in extended school hours or not, may constitute a concept of integral education, as long as we add to it the idea that the world is not finished and “is always to be constituted be human interference, which is not an attachment to the body, but requires a body as specific form, because knowing is a corporeal attitude” (FERNANDES, 2013, p. 37).

CURRENT SCENARIO OF INTEGRAL EXPERIENCES IN BRAZIL: THE MORE EDUCATION PROGRAM

Based on the characterization of said integral education movements in Brazil, namely: anarchist, integralist and new school, as well as on the analysis of corporeality in them, we intend to understand what is currently being signaled as an integral educational experience in the country, as well as how the body is understood in this program. The Brazilian Federal Constitution of 1988 the Brazilian Statute of the Child and Adolescent (ECA) of 1990 argued in favor of special attention to education as means of protection to school-age children (BRASIL, 2009a). As a continuation to this stimulus, the Brazilian National Educational Bases and Guidelines Law 9394, of 1996, Article
34, paragraph 2, proposes an effective and progressive extension of school hours at the discretion of schools themselves (BRASIL, 1996).

Although this extension was mentioned in 1996, only after the proposition by the Plan for the Development of Education (PDE), in 2007, does it materialize, as structural and financial support to full time integral education were effectively provided for.

The PDE seeks to “[...] ensure quality, inclusive education, which enables the development of autonomy in children and teenagers, as well as the respect to diversity” (BRASIL, 2009b, p. 12). This plan, better known as an an umbrella of goals and actions, includes over 40 programs focusing on Basic and Higher Education, literacy and Professional Education, the financing of the Fund for Maintenance and Development of Basic Education and Appreciation of the Education Professional (FUNDEB), which was created to expand the Fund for Maintenance and Development of Basic Education and Appreciation of Teaching (FUNDEF).

In 2014, the new National Plan for Education (Law 13.005/14) which replaces the old plan – National Policy for Education (PNE), effective after 2001, and legalized several of the actions included in the PDE. Among them, the one we are currently interested in is that which deals with full time integral education described in goal 6, and its respective strategies (BRASIL, 2014). It is assumed that the new PNE intends to ensure the financing of education in a general manner, when it allocates the destination of 10% do Gross Domestic Product (GDP) at the end of effective plan period. Thus, we believe new forms of financing, broader and more effective, will reach integral education in Brazil in the next ten years.

However, before this assurance existed, the PDE had to count on numerous initiatives to materialize after the year 2007. One of them was the commitment plan All for Educations, by Decree 6.094/07 that combines “[...] efforts by the Union, States, Federal District, Municipalities, families and communities in favor of improving the quality of Basic Education” formulating 28 guidelines to be equated to the effectiveness of the improvement of the quality of national education (BRASIL, 2009b, p. 13).

Among the 28 guidelines listed in this plan, is the More Education Program, designed to foment integral education by means of socio-educational actions, especially during the second school shift (BRASIL, 2007).

This program, instituted by the Interdepartmental Ordinance 7.083/10 (BRASIL, 2010a), is the articulation of actions and programs issued by several Brazilian departments, among them, the Department
of Sports, Education, Culture and Environment, which organized themselves in macro-fields of pedagogical follow-up, environmental education, sports and leisure, human rights and citizenship, culture and arts, digital culture, health prevention and promotion, communication and use of media, investigation in the field of natural sciences, economic education (BRASIL, 2009a; MOLL, 2012).

Structuring of this concept of integral education is done by means of the analysis of experiences that took place in Brazil, as well as of the return to Anísio Teixeira’s educational project. However, it proposes progresses as it intends to expand not only the time and space for education, but also, by means of other educational opportunities, the concept of integral education (MOLL, 2012).

The More Education Program evidences its intentions regarding integral education, understanding it as means for elevating the quality of education “[...] in addition to fomenting the reflection on new work methodologies, new gazes on the curricula and pedagogical practices” (BRASIL, 2013, p. 3).

The program seeks to “increase school hours, ensuring learning, reinventing the organization of time, spaces and logics which preside over school processes, overcoming the discursive and abstract nature predominant in school practices”, as it cannot be simply “more of the same”, but rather effective integral education (MOLL, 2012, p. 133).

In order to change school routines, new forms of thinking it are required. Organization cycles and the educating city are, thus, the basis for the organization of this new school routine (MOLL, 2012).

Working with the idea of an educating city means recognizing the “[...] territory as an educational space, rich in cultural, social, economic, political, sports, and leisure manifestations, among others, taking advantage of all of their potential” (PINHEIRO, 2009, p. 57).

Based on these assumptions, school is no longer the only educational space and now incorporates a network of learnings, on which the community and all of its knowledges are included. Therefore, the More Education Program invites the community to enter the school, at the same time as it invites the school to make use of the community of which it is part.

The program structural organization calls for a coordinator at the school, which counts on the contributions by community agents, social educators, university students, among others, who may contribute to integral education (PINHEIRO, 2009; MOLL, 2012).

These people are assigned to work with workshops for the macro-fields, by means of which, with no hierarchical organization of practices, the curriculum may become an integrated “whole”. That
is to say that, disciplines, workshops, projects, recess, lunch hour, that is, everything contributes equally to integral formation of individuals.

In his master’s degree research, Pinheiro (2009, p. 62) devoted herself to becoming familiar with the concept of integral education in the More Education Program, and indicates that

[...] the concept of integral education in the current debate is anchored on the different socially, politically and historically built understandings of the categories of school time, educational space, integrated actions, intersectoriality, integral formation, among others, and is a concept under construction.

Along this same line of analysis, other studies (CAVALIERE, 2009b; SILVA, 2013; SILVA, J.; SILVA, K., 2013, 2014) have agreed that the More Education Program has characteristics from Anísio Teixeira’s New School proposal, in which public school is a reference to the community, and from the idea of Educating City, based on Paulo Freire and Moacir Gadotti who tried to implement guidelines from Unesco’s “Faure Report”, using spaces in the city as educational territory.

In addition, characteristics such as Umberto Eco’s Mandala of Knowledges, cultural studies and the curriculum interconnected to community knowledges complete the scenario of specificities that the program tries to compile in search of a new concept of school (CAVALIERE, 2009b; SILVA, 2013; SILVA, J.; SILVA, K., 2013, 2014).

In face of this array of new possibilities brought by the More Education Program to broaden the discussion about full time integral education, we will limit ourselves to pinpoint those that help us interpret the perspective of body present in this proposal. Because of this, we will discuss time and space categories, knowledge fragmentation and hierarchical organization, and, finally, corporeality.

The program operates with an idea of time that is not reduced to chronological time (Chrónos), but also to time lived (Káiros) and, in addition, does not consider the limited school space, but the space as territory to be occupied, used, transcended by innovative methodological practices.

On this topic, Machado (2012) states that the history of integral education in Brazil (as previously demonstrated) seems to be limited to the increase of school hours, and that the More Education Program, however, debates such principles when it brings time/space categories as educational opportunities to the reflection.

The author also explains that Chrónos time, in the realm of school, is that which needs to be filled at all times, rapidly and urgently, for the completion of plans and tasks. Káiros time, on the other hand, is that measured by experience, by living. Based on his studies, the
The author concludes that experiences lived intensely by the students are those they keep and that have greater impact on their histories. For the author, “even with so much pedagogical investment by the school on ‘timed’ texture times, it seems corporeal Káiros grounds meaningful learning to the lives of learners” (MACHADO, 2012, p. 272).

Arroyo (2012) states that Brazilian children and teenagers live in social vulnerability conditions and that, because of this, they live in precarious spaces with times more and more dehumanized. “In this space-temporal precariousness, the most vulnerable is the body, the life [...] The being of the body, the corporeal being is irremediably linked to the spatial being, the temporal being, as we are humans” (ARROYO, 2012, p. 40).

We are in space; we draw it with our bodies by means of movements that express corporeality in different ways. Time is event, what is lived, not as a succession of “nows”, but as presence. Thus, full time integral education must be an increase of space/time in the Káiros sense, an increase in living and experiencing for the acquisition of an incorporated knowledge (NÔBREGA, 2010).

What these programs⁸ bring of more radical to public policies, to pedagogy, to teaching, to the school system, is the recognition that we deals with people who are life, body, space-time [...]. We are minds in corporeal, temporal-spatial, and live subjects, not abstract, non-corporeal, non-spatial, atemporal minds, wills who have rarely related the possibility of learning to the possibility of living. (ARROYO, 2012, p. 41-42)

The concept of integral education proposed in the More Education Program is consistent with recent researches that effervesced with the incitement caused by the Federal Government and the advertisement of the program starting in 2007. Even before this program was launched, the need for integral development of men, in the form of their “[...] cognitive, affective, corporeal and spiritual faculties, recovering, as priority educational task, the formation of men understood in their totality” (GUARÁ, 2006, p. 16) was already advised. The key concern of education shall not take place only with the learning of academic knowledges, but also of those resulting from social life (GUARÁ, 2006).

As we complete the analysis of corporeality in the More Education Program, we realize that it tries, even if it only materializes as a proposition, not only the increase of time, or the diversifying of activities, but rather, the (re)signification of this time as time lived; the reformulation of teaching methodologies that do not understand the learner as a fragmented being, mere process spectator; the need to bring school closer to the community and integrate them.
It is well known that many problems are involved in the implementation of the More Education Program, such as low income paid to community educators, or their specific qualification to be present in the educational realm. In addition, several cities still understand integral education as the mere proposal of extracurricular activities during the second school shift (CAVALIERE, 2009a; SILVA, J.; SILVA, K., 2014).

But, if we analyze this program under the perspective of phenomenology and corporeality, we notice that it moves towards integral education which strives to be an awareness, or better yet, by means of Merleau-Ponty (1994), be experience; and this means being apt to communicate interiorly with the word, with the body and with other bodies, being, with them, in existence, what is much more than only being besides them. The sense of belonging by the human being category may only be understood and lived in the existence of human bodies experiencing life.

As we move towards integral education, the time has arrived for us to avoid our schools continue being the bearers of pedagogical intended for “confinement and fattening methods” (FREIRE, 2011). This author, referring to the ‘buttock’ methodology, frequent in our schools, in which the student is confined to classrooms and desks, proposes it is similar to the conditions reserved to pigs, chickens and cows, when it is necessary to fatten them before slaughtering them.

As such methodology, quite valued by the established power, is proposed, we have docile studies bodies, mimicking values in force: still, conservative, rigid, tense, aseptic and cold bodies,

Integral education requires pedagogical processes that emphasize the students’ motor skills, understood as an adaptive, evolutionary and creative process of the praxis being, in need of others, the world and transcendence. In motor skills, physical, biological and anthropological components are present. As human beings, we are needy, and for such reason, we intentionally move towards transcendence (MOREIRA, 2011).

**FINAL CONSIDERATIONS**

The analyses of educational movements involving full time school in Brazil show us that integral education shall not be merely a merger of different activities and, thus, the juxtaposition of the different subject dimensions. Educating integrally means understanding the human being is a body, which lives daily school experiences and incorporates them as they gain meaning and significance in these subjects’ lives.
In its roots, integral education should be the one that recognizes a person not as a “[..] fragmented, body and intellect” being, but, rather that who, in its integrality “[..] builds oneself by means of different languages, in several activities and circumstances” (MAURÍCIO, 2009, p. 54-55).

Cavaliere (2009a, p. 50) clarifies such vision of integral education by stating that

Daily democratic experience, in the sense of experimentation of human relations based on fair rules and on the respect for the other and the group, associated to diversified cultural experiences, would be bases for the construction of a school education that could be called integral education.

Rabelo (2012, p. 122-123) complements these statements by proposing that “[..] traditional education, due to its impersonal nature, makes it easier to reproduce a non-authentic existence of the student-being which does not understand its potential” whereas, in integral education, there is “respect for the existence of the other and not for an imposed knowledge grounded on non-critical memorization, and student-beings are provided with the freedom for becoming transparent to themselves”.

Thus, we observe a new challenge in relation to full time integral education, as Rabelo (2012, p. 120) points out: “[..] that of transforming a classically cognitive experience (of knowledges) into a possibility of integral and holistic human development”.

From this perspective, the body is (re)inserted in education, and is not limited to Physical Education or the education of the physical, as in part time school. Corporeality is lived and experienced in Káiros time of a Math or ‘capoeira’ class. Children and teenagers now have the opportunity to incorporate knowledges as actors in and live and pulsating educational process.

Understanding the formation process based on corporeality means going beyond, means perceiving that “[..] it is not about a body that appropriates new knowledge, but an enraptured body that displaces its corporeality towards what it does not yet know, but intuits as a possibility” in search of an intentionally incorporated knowledge (ZIMMERMANN, 2007, p. 4).

Para Assmann (2012, p. 150), “corporeality is not a complementary source of educational criteria, but its primary and major radiant focus”. For him, “[..] without a philosophy of the body, which permeates everything in education, any theory of the mind, intelligence, the global human being, ultimately, if fallacious to begin with”.

We share with the same author the defense of an education based on corporeality, before any other limitation is proposed. That
is to say, “[...] the body, from the scientific point of view, is the fundamental and basic instance for articulating key concepts for a pedagogical theory. In other words: only a theory of Corporeality may provide the bases for a pedagogical theory” (ASSMANN, 1994, p. 113, emphasis by the author).

Learning based on the experience of corporeality is connected to the incorporation (becoming a body), to the living of experiences that help understanding the world. Receiving information translated as scientific symbols only contributes to the reproduction of the social model in effect and, therefore, to the perpetuation the continued manipulation and exploitation of financially and socially underprivileged groups, thus reducing the sense of belonging to the community where they live, erasing meanings that move men towards overcoming barriers to which they are daily subjected.

Rezende (1990, p. 69) also reminds us that “[...] more that a mere process, education intends to be a project for customization of subjects, of both individual and collective disalienation”. This may only take place if we understand the subject as corporeality, as integral human beings. Working for integral education, which requires full time schooling, means considering the culture of children, teenagers and youth, which is made out of bodies. These bodies are not only physical, moral or intellectual, but rather corporeality, which does not separate the subject from the world, the mind from the physical, Language from Physical Education. Corporeality which does not define a hierarchy of knowledges on behalf of achieving indexes, but which understands that education is made of, and by, subject-bodies that structure the culture in which they live, as, in the end: “A body that is educated is a human body that learns how to make history by producing culture” (MOREIRA, 2012, p. 135).
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NOTES

1 Discussions in this text are the result of the research that analyzed the concept of body in the integral education experience developed in a city in the state of Minas Gerais (GONÇALVES-SILVA, 2014) funded by the Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa de Minas Gerais – FAPEMIG (Minas Gerais Research Foundation); and of the study, under development, on the relation with student’s knowledges in the context of integral education, performed with the support of the Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico – CNPq (National Council for Scientific and Technological Development). These studies comply with ethical standards for research with human beings, by means of protocols CEP/2648 and CEP/606.850.
The October Manifesto was the culmination, in the form of a document, of a series of actions by the group known as Brazilian Integralist Action. Written in 1932, the manifesto revealed the concepts of men, the world, and the wishes for the Brazilian nation, through their leaders, among which, especially, Plínio Salgado. Available at: <http://www.integralismo.org.br/?cont=75>. Access on: March 19, 2015.

In some of this works, Plínio Salgado establishes a differentiation between instruction and education. Instruction is the process of enriching intelligence, which is achieved by acquiring information in technical, scientific, and artistic aspects, whereas education is the formation of character (COELHO, 2005).

Information retrieved from the video “Anísio Teixeira: education is not a privilege”, available at: <www.dominiopublico.gov.br>.

In order to further studies about rationality as a structuring base for the anarchist educational movement, see Martins (2010).

Cavaliere (2002) states that curricular organization for the second school shift favors hierarchic organization of disciplines, and that the ideal organizational model would be that which alternated disciplines and workshops in a continuous process of valuing and resignifying sport, arts and cultural activities.

Today, we have a total of ten macro-fields, added two to those existing in 2008. Among these, which include over sixty activities, the school may choose five or six to be implemented there. (MOLL, 2012).

Arroyo (2012) refers to all school hour increase programs, whether they are full time or integrated (a system that includes a shift and the return to school to complement hours in the second shift).
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Reads:
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