ABSTRACT – Two Churches (the Neopentecostalism) and the Constitution of the Common in School. In this literature review work, there is a discussion on the constitution of the common in public school, understanding it as a field of singularities/multiplicities, of freedom of speech, which craves for a participatory democracy. With this review, the understanding of the communal is articulated to the accomplishment of evangelical groups, with their moral values (or merits) and practices, based on a discrimination between the religious institutionality and the spiritual church. The conclusion is that the appreciation of collective spaces is a fundamental alternative of/for freedom of expression, as well as of confronting the religious extremisms that present themselves.
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Introduction

The participatory actions of the different segments of Brazilian society marked the period of redemocratization at the end of the dictatorship of the 1980s. In a more or less intense way, they reconfigured the educational field from the desire to guarantee universal access to permanence and democratic management, organizing principles of networks and schools. Collective work, referenced to community contexts, assumed centrality in the possibilities of guaranteeing educational quality, and it is not reasonable or desirable to think about public management, curricula and learning through discrepant guidelines from the notion of the common.

Certainly, there were clashes in the composition of the common, especially since 1990, in relation to the way in which networks and schools should organize themselves: through participatory democratic-collegiate devices, or through bureaucratic/managerial management, with its goals and results, as optimizing mechanisms of entrepreneurial educational management.

One element that makes up this recent historical political scenario is the growth and influence of evangelical sectors in contemporary public life. In this sense, we discuss the possibilities and limits of the task of composing the common in public schools, having as an implication, more specifically, the performance of neo-pentecostal groups. For this, we take as a premise the existence of two churches: the spiritual church referred to life strategies through the encounter with the divine and with the other; and the religious experience guided by an institutionality.

Possibilities of the Common

The testimony of Philippe Lançon (2020), a survivor of the attack on the Charlie Hebdo newspaper, in 2015, in France, presents a disturbing question: the perspective that minority groups, notoriously discriminated against, can curiously contribute in certain situations to the restriction of free expression of others who do not share, in whole or in part, their codes of life. In this specific case, the journalist referred to the condition of Muslims in Europe, largely immigrants, of the first or subsequent generations, who face racist discrimination, due to their social and religious origin, and, at the same time, the existence of extremist segments among these groups, who were not pre-disposed to a community and plurality with whomever they might confront their values and practices.

This issue both affirms the struggle for rights, regarding the discriminatory social and political constitution of territories, as well as the weakening of public spaces and democratic life, given the potential and ostensible censorship of disagreement through extremist methods. The risk, in these cases, is the downfall of common life, due to possible
ruptures that devalue the democratic encounter, creating obstacles, including, for the articulation of struggles between minority groups.

Therefore, keeping the necessary differences in relation to the problem presented by Lançon (2020), we asked about the possibilities and limits of the task of constituting the common in public schools, taking as a reference the performance of evangelical students/parents. Is the common possible? We are clear that the effects of an extremist religious institutionalism cross the school, causing the deconstitution of the common; but when we consider the spiritual church, what relationships can we expect?

Certainly, the educational organizational designation composed by the common gives rise to a different notion from what is currently presented to us, that is, an institutionalism associated with the bureaucratic/managerial model, characterized, each in its own way, by hierarchical formations that stratify the performance of professionals in schools and community participation in deliberative processes. We are interested in the moments of fulgurations where another management is present, from which deliberative community, pedagogical, learning lines, etc.

It would be prudent to point out that this other management does not combine with rigid forms that delimit the way of thinking/doing at school. The delimitations generally come from the political-legal field, from the imposed national curricula, from classification assessments, etc. We defend educational policies developed in and from everyday life, contextualized and freed from the meritocratic productivism of the market and governmental normative control.

It is worth noting that the common involves languages, images, knowledge, affections, codes, habits and practices (Negri; Hardt, 2016, p. 278-279), increasingly spread throughout the city, constituting community life, productive dynamics, social and cultural. It can be understood as a communication/collaboration between singularities/multiplicities. In this sense, every singularity, different from the idea of identity, is related to a multiplicity that defines it, and is not, therefore, conceived in itself. Likewise, multiplicities are constituted by the flow of singularities, which are constantly differentiated (Negri; Hardt, 2016, p. 370).

Singularities/multiplicities, therefore, cannot be confused or directed towards the one or a higher transcendent dimension, be it the market, the public/governmental, or the institutional religious in a sectarian belief system1. These minority lines do not allow themselves to be overcoded by the signifier of the unit (when they are, they cease to be intensities), they are always on the run, in becoming, in ruptures that promote constant creations of realities (Deleuze; Guattari, 2011, p. 17-49). From this perspective, the common is composed in/by becoming, not being subject to stratified organizations that seek to limit and limit these intense flows.
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Thus, the common presents lines that are not subject to hierarchical stratifications, such as, for example, the notion of property. The latter is to identity, what the common is to singularities/multiplicities (Negri; Hardt, 2016, p. 370-371). In this sense, the logic of property is incompatible and tends to block the relationships that take place in the common. Property stratifies the fields in which we live, designates who can and who cannot think/act, compartmentalizes institutions by specialists (authorities), by authorized and legitimized knowledge and practices, as well as prohibiting the participation of parents/guardians/others.

Our understanding is that this hierarchical stratification has intensified lately, as the hegemony of neoliberal policies in recent decades has been undertaking a growing escalation from the privatization perspective, including broad sectors of social production. This occurs through classic privatizations with transfers of companies and public services to the private sector, as well as through more insidious forms, characterized by public management through outsourcing and/or social organizations, or simply by introducing the logic market in the public sphere.

Neoliberal policies were structured to privatize the common, forbidding free access to what was produced and what is constantly being produced in collaborative networks, transforming this social production into property. At the same time, the authors emphasize that, on the other hand, it is not a question of thinking about the common as being gestated in the governmental/state scope. The field where the collaborative dynamics of creation/production of the common takes place is not confused with the private or the governmental/state, being, therefore, autonomous in relation to them (Negri; Hardt, 2016, p. 311).

Having the understanding that the modern sovereign/disciplinary legacy established the public as linked to a patrimonialized State, what we must ensure is another form of organization/management in which social singularities can assume the goods and services produced by themselves and necessary for the its reproduction. It is interesting to comment that this sovereign/disciplinary legacy in the formation of the State, in the advent of the Brazilian Republic, reflected the specific interests of the elite and in no way the will and the minority interests (Valle, 1997, p. 5-18). In this sense, we must question and, at the same time, transform the public interest established in the sphere of the sovereign/disciplinary State by/in the activities of singularities/multiplicities, recreating the public and not associating it with the nation-state (Negri, 2005, p. 267-270). By this understanding, the singularities/multiplicities produce and assume the public, making it common, giving rise to an immanent organization/management that does not depend on a normalizing externality to exist.

It should be noted that the common supposes a democratic meeting, a community, a public space open to debate and decision-making, with unrestricted possibilities for manifestations. Certainly, it is not about a lost community or a unity and identity to be revitalized, but the
perspective of a democratic community constituted by heterogeneity, plurality or by an encounter/a separation that takes place through singularities (Pelbart, 2003, p. 19-41).

Through this understanding, the democratic/community can make use of the work of/in the institution (Le Strat, 2016) as a device of resistance and creation. This activity can be carried out through constant, creative and subversive ordinary interventions, which are not subject to normalization (bureaucratic and/or productivist), being carried out strategically in an adverse institutional context. And also, a second form of intervention characterized by extraordinary moments, when ruptures with the instituted are possible, emerging, in this way, new institutional forms.

Therefore, the work of/in the institution is a minority movement – democratic, in/for the common, it destratifies hierarchical organizations, disorganizes institutions by the intense singularities/multiplicities. This understanding is not contradictory to the comment: “No organization. No hierarchy. No structure” (Tadeu; Corazza; Zordan, 2004, p. 165). The work of/in the institution does not accommodate itself to the instituted, and, in fact, it constantly acts subverting, creating and recreating institutionalities. Democracy, in this sense, reinvents itself through its constant dissolution.

Thresholds between the Religious Institution and the Spiritual Church

What involves us more closely in this work is the constitution of the common in the school, considering the neo-pentecostal evangelical groups. According to data from the 2010 Demographic Census (Censo..., 2012), evangelicals rose from 15.4% (last census in 2000) to 22.2% of the population, with Pentecostals representing 60.0% of this percentage. These data, from the quantitative aspect, indicate, in a certain way, new social and political dynamics in Brazilian society.

The different evangelical segments are basically divided into: historical Protestants, heirs of the confessional reformist legacy; and Pentecostalism, among which are the Neo-Pentecostals. These emerged in the second half of the 1970s, being doctrinally characterized by the theology of prosperity, physical and emotional cures (using exorcism) (Mariano, 2004), in addition to other peculiar characteristics.

This change in the religious demographic composition of society is evidently reflected in social and institutional life, including the public school. There are, at first, no problems in this new composition of force, since the public, secular space is constituted by a mosaic of expressions of the different groups that compose it, so the appearance and the debate by/in the differences are well-known coming and needed. Controversy arises when a specific group, with its principles and values, in seeking its public representation, intentionally or not, nullifies or weakens the provisions that guarantee plurality in the public context,
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aiming at the institutionalization of their beliefs and creeds through of a normalizing universalization.

Citing an example, not from the evangelical field, but from the Catholic field, Cunha (2009) describes a recent fact related to the attempt to intervene in religious education in Brazilian public schools, when the Vatican signed a concordat with the government at the time. This question illustrates how much the church still seeks to maintain influence in the State, by defending confessional positions in regular education, as if it were still the official religion. Considering this issue, the Direct Action of Unconstitutionality (ADI), No.4.439/DF, of 09/27/2017, demanded by the Attorney General’s Office, argues that the principle of secularism is incompatible with the confessional teaching model, as it favors practices and values of dominant religions. It also questions the qualification and admission norms of teachers with ties to the confessions, as well as the expression “Catholic and of other religions”, signed in the Brazil Holy See agreement, which would give an understanding of confessionality by Catholic primacy. The judgment dismissed the ADI (STF, 2017).

State secularism in Brazil not only lacks normative force and cultural ascendancy to promote the secularization of society and to ensure its own reproduction, but it has also been cornered by the advance of politically organized Catholic and Evangelical groups mobilized to intervene in the public sphere (Mariano, 2011, p. 254).

The significant pressure power of these groups gives visibility to the intention of subjecting the State to ecclesiastical corporate interests, evidencing a historical dispute around the weakening or understanding of what state secularism should be and the consequent share that comes from this intervention.

Considering the Brazilian social historical formation, we can say that Catholicism continued to intervene in matters of State, even with secularism in the advent of the Republic, since it maintained a strong influence on issues relevant to the church. But this does not hide the fact, according to Freston (1994), that evangelicals dispute and reproduce a typical logic of an official religion – by claiming the status of dominant, due to the recent quantitative growth; and seek visibility and influence on the decisions of the State, as well as its benefits. Therefore, there is an understanding that the ecclesiastical institutionality, in its different segments, has been making inroads with the objective of determining public policies from a confessional perspective.

We put forward the idea that there is a fine line that separates the religious institutional, with its specific corporate objectives, from the spirituality of the faithful. Therefore, distinguishing the expression “spirituality of believers”, a strategic way of positioning oneself in the world, from institutional action and its purposes of power, would be essential to emphasize the ordinary spiritual way of these groups. In other words, the administrative/theological organization represents pastoral power (Foucault, 2014, p. 55-75) and its strategies of obedience/obedienc
fession, religion, the physical entity, the four walls, the temple, white western Christianity; in short: the organizational processes linked to power, hierarchy and control. As Costa (2018) would say, these institutions and their leaders often conflict with biblical precepts, having as primacy issues linked to tradition and moralism (finance) and the typical prebends of an official religion (Freston, 1994). The counterpart happens through a dynamic that can be defined as a spiritual church, a congregation that extrapolates the institutional sense, a primitive, non-western and colonizing Christianity. The adoption of the term spiritual church, in composition with faith and belief, has a collective meaning, a movement of encounter with the other and the divine that crosses the institution. Of course, these two churches coexist and intertwine, but they keep significant differences.

According to Juliano Spyer (2020, p. 22), the data neglected by many is that evangelical growth is more indebted to the conditions that are mobilized, in networks of mutual support in situations of vulnerability to improve people’s living conditions, than by the action of opportunist and charismatic leaders. He states that a third of Pentecostals live in acute poverty, with a per capita family income of up to one minimum wage, whose members are mostly black and brown (Spyer, 2020, p. 57).

In an interview, theologian Ronilso Pacheco (Santos, 2019) commented on the organic character of some pentecostal churches that are located in peripheral communities, mostly composed of the poor, blacks and women. He does not deny a top-down expansionist plan linked to institutional interests; however, he states that a good part of these peripheral churches are welcoming by the senses constructed in connection with the challenges of survival. Faith, in this context, assumes an aggregating effect on daily survival. In the same sense, the formation of priestly cadres, the so-called institutional agents (Souza, 2012) in pentecostal churches, come from the popular segments themselves, featuring a possibility of linking the aspirations of overcoming a hard daily life and the spiritual perspectives of a better future. The presence of these workers/pastors, in this case, is connected with the way of life of the believers, being examples that it is possible to face difficulties for the promise of a new life.

Not without purpose, our western modernization led to a secularization focused exclusively on instrumental reason, increasing inequality and the perception of subalternity, as it despised the popular religious mentality, the way in which subjectivities are organized and manifested (Vasconcelos, 2009). The author comments on the significant role of popular religion in the culture of Latin American popular classes: the way chosen to face everyday difficulties, as cultural resistance and the search for meaning in life. Therefore, the supernatural should not be perceived as something archaic and traditional. Religiosity would be a survival strategy for the way of life imposed by the elites, an instrument of resistance to the perspective of rationalist secularization (Vasconcelos, 2009, p. 330).
About the Universal Church of the Kingdom of God (IURD), some questions

Juliano Spyer (2020, p. 44) highlights that in the history of the church there have been movements of contestation in the periodic search for a more genuine contact with the divinity. In this sense, the rupture with the normalizing institutionality was characteristic of Protestantism in relation to Catholicism, as well as revivalist movements, including Pentecostals and Neo-Pentecostals, more recently, in relation to historical protestant denominations. Something that denotes a non-homogeneity between the churches, both in terms of organizational aspects, through worship practices, the way in which pastors are paid, and even the more regional/local meaning they assume when they are constituted (Spyer, 2020, p. 48).

The Azusa Street Temple in Los Angeles in the early 20th century, founded by William Joseph Seymour, can be considered the birthplace of Pentecostalism. Unlike the cults of historical Protestant denominations that were organized by the predominance of rational faith, in that one, dances, screams and trances moved by the action of the Holy Spirit abounded. In addition, the congregation was composed of blacks and the poor, with the participation of Hispanics, Asians and whites (Nascimento, 2019, p. 38). At that time, in the USA there was a migration from the countryside to the city, as well as an immigration of poor workers from Europe. This new urban contingent, not properly incorporated into the city, found shelter in this religious expression. The cults broke down some racial, social and gender barriers, as well as expressing an anti-intellectualism based on a spiritual/emotional effervescence (Souza, 2012, cf. chap. 10).

The transformations that Pentecostalism undergoes change a lot throughout the 20th century, but do not significantly alter this social insertion among the underintegrated of capitalism. This fact can be confirmed by the strong dissemination of this aspect in Latin America and Brazil, with the readiness to meet the most immediate demands of the daily life of the most marginalized sectors of society (Souza, 2012, cf. chap. 10).

The Universal Church of the Kingdom of God (IURD), as a neo-pentecostalist segment, is in a way indebted to this historical movement. Thus, some current guidelines derive from this legacy, as well as from other forms that have developed throughout the century and that have been incorporated, in summary we could highlight: the use of mass media, evangelization focused on poor and marginalized sectors of the population, divine healing, exorcism and financial prosperity (Nascimento, 2019, p. 40).

Having been created in the 1970s, by Edir Macedo, in the north of the city of Rio de Janeiro, in an improvised location, the Universal Church in a few years became a religious/corporate phenomenon. Later, it adopted the episcopal government favoring a unitary denomina-
tional structure, centralized and hierarchical by the council of bishops, always having Bishop Edir Macedo as the decision-making apex of this organization (Mariano, 2004, p. 126).

It is worth highlighting the syncretism used by the church in its symbolism and practices, bringing it closer to a popular religiosity. Therefore, unloading sessions, closing the body, white table chain, removing backrests, undoing the evil eye, etc., make up an arsenal of syncretic devices with proselytizing objectives, favoring, on the other hand, an encounter with popular culture (Mariano, 2004, p. 132-133). Despite this deliberate syncretism, intolerance has been a constant orientation of the church, evidenced by the different religious conflicts.

Universal is not the largest evangelical church in Brazil, in quantitative terms, but it is the neo-pentecostal denomination with the greatest expression, since it has under its dominion a religious empire consisting of a church, a television network, a political party and a bank (Birth, 2019, p. 10; 19).

In 1985, after eight years of existence, it already had 195 temples in fourteen states and the Federal District. Two years later, there were 356 temples in eighteen states. In 1989, the year in which he began to negotiate the purchase of Rede Record (television network), there were 571 places of worship (Mariano, 2004, p. 125).

According to the author, no church has grown so much, in such a short time and with such significant media power:

Spearheaded by the Universal Church, neo-Pentecostalism is currently the fastest-growing pentecostal branch and the one that occupies the most space on Brazilian television, either as the owner of TV stations or as a producer and broadcaster of televangelism programs (Mariano, 2004, p. 124).

This quantitative and media growth was also due to the concomitant and strategic occupation of elective positions, either directly or through support, resulting in the concessions obtained from radio and TV. With the political opening in the 1980s, the number of evangelicals arriving at the congress is greater than in all previous history. As Freston (1994) states, Pentecostals, previously with little participation, started to predominate, while the historical ones remained stable. This orderly movement of greater participation in electoral politics on the part of Pentecostals, among other points, meant access to more resources, including the media, which ensured a rapid expansion and strengthening of the corporation.

In some ways, there is among neo-pentecostal groups, particularly in the IURD, a very different understanding of the evangelical apoliticism claimed earlier. According to Macedo (2008), there is a divine project of nation that needs to be developed by the faithful, above all, when they become aware of the importance of constituting representatives.
in parliament and in the executive of the different spheres of government. "We insist that the numerical potential of evangelicals as voters can decide any election, both in the Legislative and in the Executive, at any level, municipal, state or federal [...])" (Macedo, 2008, p. 25). There is, therefore, a shift in the evangelical representational perspective, convinced that they need to act politically so that the divine designs of the nation can happen.

This orientation, in order to fill elective positions, is associated with its own corporate model, according to Oro (2003), for the promotion of official candidacies, including their presentation at meetings, through the numbers and elective positions for which they compete, or even by the presence of these representatives in the services. The choice of candidates is a prerogative of the church hierarchy, having no consultation with the members, linking the mandate to the institution.

This growth and such orientation towards the occupation of elective positions are manifested, for example, in the strengthening of the Evangelical Parliamentary Front in the National Congress. Although it is not a cohesive block, it generally moves along moral lines. Vital da Cunha, Lopes and Lui (2017) classify as extremist the positions of evangelical parliamentarians (not only Pentecostals), who, through political collusion, make intolerance a key to imposing a supposed Christian moral truth on everyone, in this case, within the scope of federal legislature. "Extremist action would therefore be characterized by radical, intolerant and violent positions in relation to differences" (Vital da Cunha; Lopes; Lui, 2017, p. 117). As a result, an agenda centered on moral tradition and customs often clashes with the rights of minorities. As an illustration, the authors cite the case of federal deputy Marcos Feliciano, former president of the Commission on Human Rights and Minorities of the Chamber of Deputies, as the articulator of a project that defends the mandatory teaching of Christian creationism in all public schools and private in the country, in a clear movement of imposing a belief on the others (Vital da Cunha; Lopes; Lui, 2017, p. 117).

It is true that this understanding should not be generalized among Pentecostals and/or Christians, as there are, among them, those who hold non-extremist positions, respecting rights and distancing themselves from this position of imposing values (Vital da Cunha; Lopes; Lui, 2017, p. 118-119).

The institutional bonds that exist between leaders and believers, bonds of trust and often of dependence, can be facilitated by the way in which theological doctrine is taught. There is a constant formation of the members so that they can experience and learn about the established doctrinal teachings, with cults, studies and rituals being this place of learning. In the case of neo-pentecostal churches, the perspective of prosperity is a highlight. Therefore, there is a strong attempt to link social and spiritual life through a direct relationship with the achievement of material goods: the more evident a wealth, the greater the certainty of a full spiritual life.
[...] every follower has a legitimate right to wealth, health and success in this life, therefore, here and now. If such success does not occur, it is because the person is supposed to be at fault with God[...]. To reverse this situation, the adept must make material and financial donations to the church, thus contributing concretely to the work of evangelization carried out by it (Souza, 2011, p. 14).

Therefore, the association between secular and religious life must be carried out along the lines of entrepreneurship. According to the author (Souza, 2011, p. 15), Christian entrepreneurship is in line with the ideology of liberal capitalism, valuing individual and corporate competition, therefore, very adapted to the centrality and the way the market works. We can conclude that ecclesiastical institutions, when professing prosperity as the target of divine blessings, neglect the promotion of social inequality that comes from the current political-economic organization. Guided by a market theology, they justify poverty and income concentration by the individual demerit related to a weak faith. The hypertrophied institutionality in the religious market persists in the message that: "[...] the Iurdian must insistently seek ‘active faith’, that is, he must propose goals to change his life, ask God for change and sacrifice himself” (Mafra; Swatowiski; Sampaio, 2012, p. 85). This sacrifice must put into practice a faith, an active exercise for the change of material life.

More broadly, prosperity is not dissociated from the theology of miracles and cures, since being successful is a sign of a direct action of divinity in the lives of the faithful, both in the material dimension and in the physical, relational and psychological dimensions. There is a hyper-dimensioned spiritualization, everything being cause and effect of the devil’s action. This theology understands that all these plans are connected and can be targeted by evil spirits, in this sense, promoting unloading and liberation sessions are central in weekly meetings, being dedicated to the exorcism of spirits that cause evils of different orders in people's lives. Although the understanding espoused is that not every sick person is possessed, but every possessed person has illnesses, including physical, mental and spiritual ones (Macedo; Oliveira, 2008, p. 69-70 and 76), in fact, there is a spreading of the spiritual dimension, designating evil spirits as responsible for everything (or almost everything). The theological centrality is in a kind of holy war in which there is a spiritual hyperbole in individual and social life and, in a certain way, an insertion, naive or not, in an economic market dynamics not questioned regarding its productions of iniquities in people's lives and in society.

The Devices of Democratic Educational Management and the Management of the Common

The modern school institution shows a structure of ownership, either through the sovereign/disciplinary/bureaucratic legacy, or
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through the contemporary dissemination of managerial/neoliberal policies. The unfolding of this pair in the school/educational daily life can be understood by the deliberate and intense blocking of democratic devices.

We understand by democratic educational device a series of institutional legal procedures derived from the achievements of the movements in defense of the public school in the context of the 1980s/90s, such as, for example, the democratic management unfolded in pedagogical projects developed by the school community; the deliberative school councils referring to administrative, curricular/pedagogical and financial issues; between others. The effervescence of the years of rupture with the dictatorship symbolized struggles for a quality, plural, free and universal public school. The desire for more democratic experiences at school was one of the most evident themes, given the long period of exception experienced in the country.

The proposal of democratic management arises from an understanding, according to which education, as something public, should be organized by principles of collective participation, linked to mechanisms that effectively democratize the educational system and the school itself. These questions, to a reasonable extent, were incorporated into the legal text of the 1988 Constitution, and later in the Education Guidelines and Bases Law (LDB) of 1996, by ratifying the proposal for democratic management as an important principle of education.

The process of elaborating this principle and its devices was involved in an instituting dynamic, which confronted not only the disciplinary/bureaucratic legacy, but also the contemporary dynamics of neoliberal managerialism. We agree with the argument that there was not exactly a rupture between the Taylorist/bureaucratic model and the managerial one. Despite the oppositional narratives and the narrative of novelty of the managerial organization, Lima (2008, p. 119) understands that the modern obsession with rationality, optimization and effectiveness remain as central guidelines.

This non-rupture, however, is organized in a neo-Taylorian guise and begins to be introduced into educational policies by State reforms, which began in the 1990s, configuring the increasingly intense institutionalization of managerial policies and, at the same time, a growing productivist resemantization of the instituting meanings of the so-called democratic management. The neo-business rationalization will strongly affect the public sector, transforming the relationship with the citizen, now considered a client and consumer. Decentralization (Lima, 2008, p. 120), for example, different from the democratic decentralizing conception forged by resistance movements, will be addressed as a way of valuing the spontaneous order of the market and individual freedom. It presents itself, therefore, as an ideal administrative strategy, insofar as it could imprint a governance logic similar to the business sphere. The keynote of the process is to encourage more flexible and participatory ways of managing resources and responsibilities, accompanied by
a deregulation of public services (Oliveira, 2010, p. 127-145). Thus, State reform becomes an indispensable condition within the framework of the restructuring of capitalism from the perspective of financialization.

As part of the reform, a new type of hierarchical formation is introduced in the educational sector that stratifies the performance of professionals in schools and the participation of the community in deliberative processes. The managerial logic values participation and collaboration, as elements of a new organizational culture, through accountability via productivity/goals to be met. In this sense, it mobilizes managers, coordinators and professors as local owners responsible for the pedagogical-curricular management processes, linking them to deliberative-community meetings as new specialists liable to be held accountable by the efficient management to be explained in the results.

The dynamics of elaboration and execution of pedagogical projects and participation in school councils, as devices that derived directly from the instituting movements, are engulfed in this bureaucratic/managerialist institutionality. We understand that there is a paradox in this movement regarding the initial desire for institutionalization, on the part of the movements in defense of the public school, and the consequent loss of instituting intensity, above all, not exclusively, in the context of bureaucratic/managerial policy. In other words, guaranteeing organizational and educational management rights through legal-legal decentralization was the strategy adopted in the struggle for autonomy policies; however, the juridical-legal institutionalization itself closed the field of action of democratic possibilities.

The pedagogical project, for example, became a symbol of a document to be presented to the education departments, failing to express the encounters between the multiple narratives that make up the educational commons. From the instituting experiences of the 1980s/90s, we moved towards the emptying of the device, arising from the bureaucratic/managerial formalization of the pedagogical record, defining it, above all, as a documental piece. Concomitantly, we do not ignore the sense of ownership translated by a modus operandi of restriction of elaboration to specialists and/or groups usually designated by school directors, thus making explicit the power relations through the participatory exclusion of minority groups. This interdiction finds shelter in the principle that articulates the pedagogical project as an identity/guide/north of action, organized, as a rule, in models that fragment and hierarchize theory and practice.

To think of the pedagogical project as a guide/north of action is to ignore the intense encounters in the composition of the common. We affirm that the encounter in/through the common, as elaboration and intervention, is the project itself. The written record or otherwise, can and should be carried out, being much more an effect than a signifier of thinking/acting. However, the bureaucratic/managerial control policy operates by detaching the record from community production, giving the document an aura of truth in the imposition of norms and values.
In this sense, we need to affirm that the registration/elaboration of the pedagogical project must be inserted in debates/disputes in the attribution of meanings (Santiago, 2001, p. 141-173), and must be an open field to the production of meanings arising from a social plurality, cultural (and spiritual).

The work of/in the institution, from this angle, is done by demystifying the pedagogical project as significant, promoting, in turn, community meetings. In this plan of interventions, the pair elaboration/execution should not be dissociated, since intensifying the dynamics of elaboration is as important as execution. The idea of translation (Schvingel; Corazza, 2016, p. 59-73) of the pedagogical project accounts for the perspective of elaboration/execution without dissociation. In translation, it is not a question of putting into practice a supposed original content arising from the significant pedagogical project, but of derivations that are constantly carried out through the subversion of the model and through recreation, provoking a project in motion. Translation is an exercise in thinking without clichés, without copies and collages, it is done by moving and reinventing meanings.

It is worth noting that the pedagogical project must be linked to the school council, not as a mere formalism, but as a broad and plural network of pedagogical curricular production. However, in turn, the school council has become the place for financialization due to the reduction of executing units (Lima; Canedo, 2018, p. 177). These fulfill the function of regulating the procedures related to the pecuniary resources that arrive at the school. The exhaustive overload of activities such as: minutes to be filled out and registered in notaries, opening of bank accounts, etc., characterize a bureaucratic/managerial responsibility, having the effect of reducing the school board to accounting and document tasks. Added to this fact is the representation that is often directed by the centrality of school management (Lima; Canedo, 2018, p. 180-182), by indicating responsible segment names (and students) that supposedly would not constitute divergences from the predominant orientation.

It is important to remember the experience of Paulo Freire in the early 1990s in the management of the São Paulo City Hall (Lima, 2009): how much he defended the elaboration of pedagogical projects and the constitution of school councils as territories of democratic governance. In this sense, he articulated another form of relationship between the education department and schools, by decentralizing processes and valuing the community meeting at school. In other words, the understanding that school routines should have primacy in the elaboration of pedagogical-curricular policies.

The defense and creation of plural educational organizations aimed at collective participation in management and curricular peda-
pogical processes, at the same time, made explicit the proposition that systems and schools should organize other times and spaces guided by political, social, cultural (and spiritual).

Based on this understanding of the multiplicity that constitutes the common, we suggest the need to differentiate the ordinary manifestation of spiritualities from the aspiration of religious institutionalization in public spaces. At the same time, we have witnessed the advancement of the Escola Sem Partido program, with its extremist agenda that disseminates a persecutory climate in schools of minds (Martins, 2019). We believe that the dispute, at least since the 1990s, in relation to the way schools and systems should be organized, by democratic participatory schooling or by bureaucratic/managerial management, takes on new contours when we consider this recent rise of conservatism through moral and extremism, by militarization. More than before, we have the urgency of affirming the possibilities of the common.

The manifestation of spiritualities, different from the extremist conservative impositional perspectives, must be understood by the right to express their singularities. In this sense, within the scope of the props, the assertion that it is a legitimate manifestation of spirituality is quite reasonable, since carrying a bible or a crucifix, as well as strings of beads, a kippah or a veil, must be perceived as signs of expression of a cultural and religious freedom, to be lived also in the public school space. Would it be pertinent to ask them to withdraw? Or even claim uniformity of clothing? Would reducing the manifestation of religious signs be a guarantee of less intolerance? We believe that pedagogical strategies must be based on coexistence and constant debate, repudiating any attempt at institutionalized confessionalism.

[...] in the Brazilian case, the personal use of props that contain religious symbology in public environments such as schools does not contradict the idea of secularism. According to Brazilian legislation, the State and its institutions must be secular and must not display religious objects, but people who frequent public spaces have the right to exercise their freedom and express their religious ideas in their bodies or clothing (Müller; Costa, 2016, p. 33).

Therefore, this manifestation is not only desirable, but also necessary, in the sense of guaranteeing the composition of a public space through difference. In addition to this more symbolic appearance, there is another one that takes place through encounters, through the occupation of territories:

Observing the daily school life (of the pentecostal students), one can see them organizing Bible studies and singing during the break. In these meetings, they have sought to expand their beliefs at school [...] (Oliveira, 2000, p. 101).

It seems something more problematic to have an agreement in relation to such practices, but, considering that they must take place in
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free times and spaces, through spontaneous initiatives of the groups, and when they wish to share experiences among their peers and, eventually, other listeners, they are legitimate. We pay attention to the fact that proselytizing, very common among these groups, should not be disrespectful or harassing. The threshold of this coexistence, of this appearance, must be addressed by the different segments of the school community in spaces with notorious democratic legitimacy. Referring these issues to deliberative places means strengthening them, avoiding censorship for monocratic decisions.

It is evident that these manifestations are not restricted to a certain time and space, they happen, explicitly or not, in/through the different curricular dynamics, including the classroom, in/through the learning processes. From this perspective, Tadeu (2002) highlights that the correlative of thinking would not be teaching, but learning. In the pedagogy of difference, thinking would be the moment of encounter with the other thinking. In this process, learning would not be imitation, assimilation or identification, but a composition of singular points with the signs of the contents, in a way, motivating us to think “[…] the not yet thought, the unthinkable, the untimely, the extemporaneous” (Tadeu, 2002, p. 50). Otherwise, it is not about learning through recognition, as in the Platonic matrix of the search for the improvement of copies in the same way as the originals, but about mutual affect, doing with (the encounter); thus, inserted in the sensitive field, not restricted to the intelligible (Gallo, 2012). Different, therefore, from the imposing curriculum that annuls the differences.

Something quite different, from thinking/learning through the encounter of signs, happens when we take as an illustration the incursions of the Escola Sem Partido program. This made the entry of extremist groups into schools notorious, through arbitrary intervention in curricular and learning processes, above all, by delegitimizing democratic dynamics.

A good school does not ignore differences between teachers, students and families, including what is taught and how it is taught. However, conflicts must be discussed and resolved in a frank, respectful and democratic manner, which, by the way, is educational for everyone. And this is an important part of the educational process. However, Escola Sem Partido, by seeking to impose a moral and dogmatic judgment on teaching, will harm students’ learning. Immersed in a persecutory climate, teachers will not have the minimum conditions for exercising their teaching profession (Cara, 2016, p. 46).

These conflicts are presented, as stated by Cara (2016), by an imposition of a moral and dogmatic judgment on teaching, something peculiar to extremist institutions. Therefore, “[…] no teacher will have security to teach, as he will not know how his class will be judged – and this extends to any area of knowledge” (Cara, 2016, p. 45). Based on this understanding, we do not doubt that ordinary spiritual manifestations
are permeated by an institutionality along the lines described, especially when we consider morality as the matrix of Western theological thought. According to Costa (2018, p. 187): “The fact is that churches can become a school of good manners, with hours and hours spent preaching about morality [...].” Topics such as sex, money, drugs and family gain exhaustively centrality, even leading to illness.

This issue becomes more complex when we take into account the theological doctrine of the market. Entrepreneurship is an important orientation in the composition of the prosperity doctrine of neo-pentecostal churches. The characteristics of entrepreneurship say about merit, individualism, competition, etc. We emphasize that the public field, in order to guarantee the singular and multiple manifestation of spiritualities and/or popular knowledge, cannot be guided by the liberal logic in which the centrality of life is the market. Therefore, these perspectives are completely incompatible with the design of the constitution of the democratic common.

As we stated, we do not neglect that students/parents, as members of these ecclesiastical institutions, manifest this (these) doctrine(s) in schools. There is an intricate crossing of the two churches. The believer, when sharing extremist moral values, becomes sectarian and distances himself from the politics of the common, precisely because he wants to impose his beliefs on others and/or by not putting himself in a position of encounter. The entrepreneur, in turn, greedy for material benefits, also distances himself from the common lines. His share of business, marketing or the accumulation of material goods is more valuable to him than the Christian maxim of love. The constitution of the common by/in spiritualities cannot be carried out either by the extremist moralist or by the individualist liberal.

Anyway, whether we are in a favorable or adverse scenario, the perspective of strengthening democratic devices, the participation of different segments, is fundamental both to encourage and guarantee the appearance of spiritualities and to face the ways that delegitimze it.

**Not to Finish**

Taking the composition of the common as a field of affirmation of a participatory democracy, we address the importance of spiritualities in this organizational school doing/living. Learning takes place through an encounter, through experience; therefore, attempts to neutralize these practices/knowledge in the name of rationalist modernization would mean imposing a secularizing normalizing order. It is true that there is a constant risk of the intertwining of churches, not being possible to separate them all at once. In fact, the religious institutional operates through a double intervention, through proselytizing cooptation and through delegitimization, namely: the spirituality of believers (through the crossing of moral and liberal theologies) and the common (incompatible and depotentiated by the moral and com-
modified imposition of life), respectively. We emphasize that our confrontation takes place through the strengthening of multiple collective spaces, collegiate bodies, pedagogical and curricular projects, the unrestricted expansion of community participation in deliberations, the invention of new dynamics of direct participation, such as expanded forums, assemblies, etc. Finally, the manifestations and appearances of spiritualities must be welcomed and valued for/in the constitution of the common, just as the religious confessional institutionalizing incursion must also be confronted by these same democratic devices.
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Notes

1 It is worth highlighting Wilfred Smith’s (2006) analysis of how the concept of religion was formed in modernity in a belief system restricted to a particular faith community. The author argues favoring a more adequate conception of the concept, by valuing a coexistence “religious” beyond the borders of specific segments, as a way, even, of facing human and planetary issues.

2 The author questions the bond of a community to a social bond of identity, often bordering on totalitarian regimes. Differently, he argues about a community made up of the sharing a separation performed by singularities.

3 The author comments on pastoral power as a technique of power that is carried out, above all, by obedience and confession. He highlights, in this sense, the action of individuals as guides/conductors of others. In our analysis, we link pastoral power to the exercise of the institution in its contemporary corporate developments.

4 It would not be difficult to suppose that the extremist/fundamentalist tradition always aims to constitute faithful obedient to institutionalized doctrine, as well as, on the other hand, bundles of spirituality characterize constant escapes and reinventions.


6 Generally, the structure proposed for the pedagogical project is divided into a framework, diagnosis and programming, characterizing this fragmentation. See Celso Vasconcellos (2019, p. 21-71).

7 The thinking/learning pair composes the pedagogical experiences, in no way resembling practicalism of contemporary technical-instrumental guidelines, aimed both at the basic education curriculum as for teacher training, with its peculiar prescriptive standardization.

References


Two Churches (the Neopentecostalism) and the Constitution of the Common in School


André Antunes Martins holds a PhD in Education from the Federal University Fluminense/RJ. He is currently an adjunct professor at the same university as doctorate. It develops in the field of collective research actions of the common management and policies with a focus on educational democratic. Was also used public education networks in basic education ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4281-5876 E-mail: andreantmartins@gmail.com

Editor in charge: Lodenir Karnopp

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International. Available at: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>.