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Abstract
This article aims to provide a discussion on the triad Education, Psychology and Work, showing that there is a pedagogy inherent in the capitalist production, which brings as the retrenchment of the processes involved in development of the human personality and become restricted and limited. To do so, start with brief comments about the socio-historical reality of the thematic work, and how this has influenced the development of the human psyche in capitalist society. In sequence, seek the contributions of psychology based on Historical Materialism-Dialectic, and in particular the Socio-Historical Psychology of Vygotsky, to examine the processes that develop human consciousness (sense and meaning), linking them with the divestiture process (sociological and psychological) inherent to the company. Finally, and more discussion, correlate to education, making the contrast between the educational process and a contemporary pedagogical proposal to develop the full potential of the individual, aiming to form a full citizen, without this dichotomy intellectual work and manual work in this company which are organized under the capitalist mode of production.
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1. INTRODUCTION
The present article aims to provide a discussion on the triad of Education, Psychology and Work, demonstrating that there is a pedagogy inherent in capitalist production, which implies the restriction of the processes of development of the human personality, becoming restricted and limited.

We consider that the mechanism of human evolution has occurred in a particular way, and only appears in the external phenomena of culture and society, through the creative and productive activity of work, which is the fundamental human activity for the formation of man. Consequently, we can see that the mode of production of a society is reflected in the human psyche, in such a way that its peculiarities depend on the particularities of the relations of production between men. Therefore, to consider the conceptions of development, from the modes of production, or relations of capitalist society, is to think of an inequality of possibilities of development.

Adherence to the status quo is due, in particular, to a system of classifying and mass communication teaching, which are privileged instances for the reproduction of the relations of forces in force. In order to guarantee the reproduction of productive means, capitalism effectively guarantees the reproduction of the labor force: to this end, the school system, together with certain communication processes, qualifies men as workers, performing ideological inculcation diluted in the knowledge and values transmitted between the generations. Reified relationships bring implicit violence by imposing meanings and values considered legitimate and imposed by doctrinal manipulation doctrinally sanctioned and historically determined.

Thus, in this perspective, education does not allow the development of its dual role: it does not allow the appropriation of knowledge about the physical and social world and, at the same time, it hinders the development of the higher psychological functions, which allow the individual to become subject capable of thinking reality and transforming it.

According to Marx (1985), it is men who make history, but do so within certain real contexts. Thus, element components of the logical-historical reality produce and are produced along the historical path of capitalism and, in a sense, can be considered strategies that maintain this mode of production.

In order to deal directly with the subject, we consider that it is of fundamental importance to present some elements that allow us to understand the changes that have been taking place in the world production system, causing great transformations in the world of work due to the restructuring of the forms of production and, consequently, of this educational system.
2. WORK AS A HUMAN ACTIVITY.

According to Albornoz (2002), the word work comes from the Latin tripalium, that is, an object of three sharp sticks used in agriculture and also as an instrument of torture.

We associate the work with the transformation of nature into products or services, thus being elements of culture. In this way, we can see that what distinguishes human work from that of other animals is that in this there is awareness and intentionality, while animals work by instinct, without consciousness. In this way, work is considered as the effort made, and also the capacity for reflection, creation and coordination.

During the various periods of history, the work took on multiple forms, being researched by several authors in the multiple sciences. Albornoz (2002, p. 14), contributes to this position when he writes:

(...) scholars assume that the history of the word work refers to the prehistoric passage from the culture of hunting and fishing to the agrarian culture based on animal breeding and planting. (...) The meaning that today is given to work refers to the modern passage from agrarian to industrial culture.

For Marx (1983), the work, fruit of the relationship of man with nature and man with man, is what distinguishes us from animals and moves history. This author developed his works having great influence of the German idealism, as well as of the English economy, being his writings a compilation of the works of Hegel, the classic economists and the French socialist doctrines.

The author analyzes in detail the concrete meaning of work for the development of man and his distortions in capitalist society. For him, the essence of the human being is at work, that is, man is what he produces, and the nature of individuals therefore depends on the material conditions that determine their productive activity.

Thus, work would be the mediating factor between man and nature. It is the expression of human life, and through it the relationship between man and nature alters. Marx (1983, p. 149-150), tries to show the above explanations when he writes that:

Work is a process involving man and nature, a process in which the human being with his own action drives, regulates and controls his material interchange with nature as one of his forces (...) Acting on the external nature and modifying it, at the same time modifies its own nature.

According to these ideas, work is understood as the main element for the humanization of the social being, for it is through the production and reproduction of its existence that the subject develops socially, distinguishing himself from all other non-human forms.

Leontiev (2004, p. 35) points to this question when he says that "every individual learns to be a man". Through this statement, it is possible to understand that man grows, develops, transforms and learns in his interaction with nature. In the same way, work acquires a mediating character between man and nature.

We understand that work is an efficient means in the process of overcoming social life and development of the human personality. It is a fundamental element in the formation of the individual's consciousness.
In this relation man-work-nature, the individual subjectivity of the worker produced throughout his life history needs to be restructured, trying to put himself in front of the conditions and demands of the labor market.

Having emphasized some aspects of work as a constituent of this subjectivity, it is necessary to seek brief comments about the work in capitalist society, in order to understand how this has developed throughout history, and consequently, influenced the subjectivity.

3. WORK IN CAPITALIST SOCIETY.

In the Middle Ages, European societies began gradually to implement the idea of regular work, this being the mark of Capitalism, a new conception that advanced beyond the agricultural activity marked by the cycles of nature.

As the typical relations of capitalist society deepened, capital became more valued, with the transformation of inputs into commodities and profits. On these profits, the owners of capital begin to appropriate the means of production, buying with salaries the labor force of those who come to live from that work.

Motta (1986) considers that these long and exhausting days of work were thus defined by capital, losing the natural relationship with the movement of the Earth, with the seasons or climate. We can consider, in a way, that time came to belong to capital, which requires work.

The small workshops where the artifacts were produced are losing space for the emergence of factories. Factories became the place where workers were assembled to perform different tasks, producing a commodity. With the advance of industrialization one arrives at the manufacture, and with this to the systems of automation implemented by the machines, making the great factories capable of producing something complex from its beginning until the final operation under the command of the capitalist, represented by the foreman or factor. As a result, unions are beginning to establish themselves in defense of the interests of the working class and in search of justice in capitalist production.

Lindquist (2002, p. 12) points out that in order for workers to market their labor in return for a wage, it was necessary to wage the various autonomous forms of survival, creating laws that would oblige free people to work, deepening the division between the ruling elite and "vagabonds and unworthy". In this way, work in the capitalist world increasingly gained the form of wage employment and its absence was called unemployment.

It is important to emphasize that in the supremacy of the capitalist form of production, labor and work were confused. The concept of employment is understood as a relation of buying and selling of workforce between hired and hirer, formalized contractually, standardized, with a certain degree of rigidity in relation to hiring and dismissal, and a certain degree of stability with respect to permanence. Already the concept of work is understood as a relationship, customized or personalized, of buying and selling workforce between two parties, formalized contractually in a diffuse or informalized way by agreement of the parties.

Albornoz (2002) clarifies that the words employment and unemployment were used in Europe in the late nineteenth century, because until then those who managed to minister their own existence were identified as workers or as professionals belonging to some coalition of office. Those who were not in these groups lived wandering the streets in search of food, certainly needing some assistance. These were harshly identified and treated by the laws of the time as poor, homeless, incapable, invalid and even stray.

However, the workers who were forced into the wage labor relationship did not remain in this serenely. The various companies and the state lacked to construct strategies to control the workers and to
assure the production and the consumption of the goods, where, in the first decades of century XX, was instituted a model of organization of the work known like Taylorism-Fordism.

Salgado (1996) clarifies that Taylorism emerges first, pointing out that every movement of the worker should be strictly controlled by a management in constant vigilance. Fordism exacerbates these changes by implementing the assembly line, where each worker would perform only one task performed at a given time in his or her job. The model of Fordism was associated with a new dynamics of the capitalist mode, initiating times of production and mass consumption, as it introduces quantity-based production at low costs.

The author also states that from the second half of the 1960’s onwards, considerable portions of the changes in the world of work take shape, mainly related to factors such as:

a) workers' struggles against the repetitive work of factories;

b) The North American financial crisis of the period;

c) The rise in oil prices in the 1970’s;

d) The relative saturation of the consumer market in the central countries;

e) The increasing success of Japanese industry in international competition.

In this way, more flexible and multi-purpose models of work organization are gaining ground, such as "Volvoism" (semi-autonomous groups mainly adopted by Swedish factories such as Volvo) and Toyotism (the Japanese industry model, specifically in the Toyota factories) (Salgado, 1996).

Faced with these new models, the changes become noticeable in the less rigid factory routines, with a less rigid leadership where the work of those dealing with industrial production becomes less mechanical. However, the dispute becomes more intense, because the worker now deals with the monitoring of symbols and messages of computer systems, thus requiring permanent professional qualifications, which are considered as selection criteria.

However, in Brazil these changes are not uniform, since we are still living with a work that is close to slavery (Salgado, 1996). Stable employment is either inexistent or extremely difficult for the majority of the population. Unemployment reaches high levels all over the world, where we live with different situations, that is, a minority with stable employment and guaranteed rights, many more unemployed looking for alternatives.

The profile and the historical trajectory of the income distribution in Brazil certainly limit the capacity of consumption, and, therefore, the acquisition of goods and services by the common citizen.

The work then becomes considered a self-created (cooperative), or reacquires activities in clandestine workshops, with pirates products, in an immense network that offers the possibility of access to some income through illegal activities, the informal economy.

In contrast to the much-vaunted record-keeping work in the portfolio, the informal market offers uncertain and insecure, truly temporary work. The feeling experienced by all job seekers is insecurity.

4. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WORK, PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION.

According to the Socio-Historical Psychological Theory, which is based on Vygotsky's Historical-Cultural Psychology, work is a fundamental mediator in the constitution of the subjectivity of the individual, since it allows us to orient our objectives socially, as well as our continuous modification. Through work man performs an activity on nature. Activity, in this perspective, is an essential characteristic in the life of the subject and refers to everything that triggers actions generated by a need.

Oliveira (1992) clarifies that for Vygotsky, activity is one of the processes that compose and promote human psychological functioning, that is, psychological functions are the result of human activity on the
social and natural environment. As man works to satisfy his needs, he transforms nature, produces knowledge, and creates himself. Thus, the constitution of man occurs in the process of activity, since it provides the transition from that which is outside into man. The activity of the individual occurs in a system of relationships and social life, where work occupies a central place, and is also in the process of historical changes.

In Socio-historical theory, work is the element of constitution of the subject and his consciousness. It is an institutionalized human activity, that is, determined by the way in which the social context is organized to carry out this activity, which uses tools and has specific organizations and that appears as a way of meeting individual needs.

Human activity, as a result of social and historical development, will be internalized by the individual and constitute his consciousness, his ways of acting and his way of perceiving the real world. We understand, then, that consciousness is formed from the relation of man to the socio-cultural world, in its relation to reality, in a permanent process, determined by the socio-historical conditions that are transformed into symbolic and singular productions, that is, It houses the social transforming into individual. It is a process that is always under construction, which results in the way we think, act, feel. In short, it is a process that elaborates the representations of reality based on the activities of higher psychological functions and their contents.

According to Leontiev (2004), the consciousness, or psyche, is the reflection of the concrete reality of the relations that exist between it and the subject, which leads to distinguish the world from the interior impressions and makes possible the development of self-observation same. Therefore, consciousness is composed of subject-sensitive content, such as sensations, images of perception and representations, making possible the relation between sense and meaning, and therefore differentiating the real world from individual interior impressions, thus enabling observation of herself. For Vygotsky, "consciousness would thus represent a qualitative leap in phylogenesis, being the highest component in the hierarchy of human psychological functions" (OLIVEIRA, 1992, p. 41).

According to Leão (1999, p. 19), the consciousness also has its psychological characteristics, and:

(...) in the attainment of individual psychological representations the concrete reality shows itself to the man maintaining the objective stability of his properties and conserving his independence of the relations and subjective necessities that the man maintains with her. Thus, it allows for awareness. This process of awareness of the objective properties of reality and individual subjective needs is due to the relations that human activity establishes between what really exists and man himself. Therefore, the representation that allows the consciousness only occurs when the subject acts for a reason of its own and, consequently, causes the object to be represented already with a sense that links it to the subject. For this reason, the representation that constitutes the consciousness is characterized psychologically by the presence of the relation internally constituted between the sense and the meaning.

Thus, meaning is taken as the reflection of reality independently of man's individual or personal relationship with man, for man appropriates a historically constituted system of meanings. However, the properly psychological fact lies in the way in which meaning will be internalized, and in what it will be transformed for the individual. This form as it will be given in the individual scope depends on the subjective and personal sense that this signification will have for the individual.
Sense can be considered as the individualization of the social meaning represented for each consciousness. In other words, the psychological sense is the social significance mediated by the experience of each man in and related to his social practice, a relationship that is created in life, in the activity of the individual.

Thus, in distinguishing between sense and meaning and in discussing these concepts, Vygotsky evidences the dialectic in the constitution of consciousness, that is, the integration between the affective and the cognitive, the historical-social character of the subject.

Sociologically we observe that the conditions of existence based on this new form of the organization of production, in which the product of work action no longer belongs to it, but is massified in the constitution of commodities and that is opposed to the very work of the proletarian class, the capital, will not compose their conscience, thus preventing the ordering of their activities.

Leontiev (1978) explains this situation well when he makes an analogy between working in a weaving and other works, showing that this social division of work and private property gave rise to a form of structuring of human consciousness characterized by the dissociation between the sense and meaning of action. He says that:

Weaving has (...) for the worker the objective meaning of weaving, spinning, spinning. However, this is not the way in which her conscience is characterized, but by the relation that exists between these significations and the personal sense that they have for their work actions. We know that meaning depends on reason. Consequently, the sense of weaving or spinning for the worker is determined by what prompts him to weave or spin. But such are his conditions of existence that he does not believe or does not weave to correspond to the necessities of the society in thread or cloth, but only by the salary; Is the wage that gives the thread and the fabric its meaning for the worker who produced them. For the capitalist, the sense of spinning or weaving lies in the profit which he draws from it, that is, a thing foreign to the properties of the fruit of production and its objective significations (Leontiev, 1978, p. 123).

We can understand, then, that on the psychological level, this rupture between the sense and meaning of human actions implies the restriction of the processes of development of the human personality, becoming restricted and limited. Leão (2007, p.12) complements this statement by stating that it "establishes false relations between sense and meaning in consciousness, alienating the subject by preventing the adequate representation of the world where those subjects are to produce their life". The individual does not have, therefore, something that impels him to appropriate knowledge, skills and values that lead him to development as a human being.

However, alienation is also held by capitalist society as creating obstacles that hinder the appropriation of human culture by individuals, a culture understood as material and intellectual, produced collectively, and which, however, is privatized, ceasing to be patrimony of all. It is worth emphasizing that in capitalist society we deal with the regime of accumulation of goods and that knowledge is a valuable product, since it serves as an instrument of domination. In this way, it becomes understandable, in the focus of capital, the reason for such restriction of this culture for many individuals, classes, groups and nations, generating social and psychological inequalities.

This notion that some know and others have to be commanded is ideological. Alienation holds this view, which generates insecure people, easy to manipulate. Mészáros (2006) complements this idea when he
says that one can not lose sight of the necessity of confrontation. The excluded have to question the reason for their exclusion. Then you will come to the conclusion that there is nothing to justify it.

Faced with such questions, we understand that the process of identification of this worker has its development mediated by socializing agents such as social communication, family, school - which in our society is the form of an organized, institutionalized education. Thus, we must consider that these devices, social mediators, contribute to the reproduction and maintenance of the process of alienation.

This analysis of the relation between the sense and meaning of human actions has decisive implications for education. We know that one of the great challenges of contemporary school education is to get students to assign meanings to the learning of school contents. However, we also know that one of the pitfalls contained in these propositions would be precisely to require an immediate and pragmatic relationship between the sense and meaning of learning of school contents, linking this learning to the everyday alienator of our capitalist society.

To reflect on these issues, we must consider Leontiev's (1978) analyzes of the alienating process in capitalist society, given either by the dissociation between the sense and meaning of actions, or the impossibility that exists for the vast majority of people to appropriate them, making use of existing material and non-material wealth.

From these notes, we refer to the following question: is man alienated by this mode of production of material life, under what aspects of reality is the subjectivity of a worker who produces his existence without the work configured as employment? We can at first think that in the subjectivity of this worker, an alienated worker in the system, in his consciousness the alienation is even stronger, for, as we know, alienation is a necessary aspect of working in capitalism.

In this way, this lack of knowledge about reality is mediated by education, which participates in the formation of such individuals and thus contributes to the maintenance of their alienation.

The main motto of those who struggle against capitalist society, alienation and intolerance, is human emancipation. Education, at first, thought as a possibility for this change, has become an instrument of capitalism. In this way, formal school education is seen as a mechanism of transmission of the dominant ideology aiming at maintaining the status quo, imposing forms of behavior and understanding of the world and the relationships established in it. In other words, education has become a part of the process of capital accumulation and of establishing a consensus that makes it possible to reproduce this class system by providing the knowledge and personnel necessary for the expanding production of the capitalist system by transmitting such values that corroborate the dominant interests.

According to Duarte (2004), it is necessary to consider the creation by capitalist society of these obstacles to the appropriation of human culture by individuals, that is, the private appropriation of this intellectual and material culture that is produced collectively and that should be considered patrimony of all beings, Which does not happen in this society, since the capitalist regime has as its essence the accumulation, making the appropriation of culture impossible, and thus generating inequality among human beings.

This same question has already been worked out by Leontiev when he questioned the non existence of individuals predisposed biologically to artistic / scientific activity and others, but that such appropriation of these elements consequently creates and develops such potentials. When you appropriate a cultural product, the individual is relating to the social history that this product brings with it. The individual is formed, then, from the appropriation of these results of social history and objectively within it, that is, human nature is social.

Of course, this is a defense of the role of education in general in the formation of human beings, and it is this education that we need to develop human beings aware of their class, its history, and its potentials.
It becomes evident that the core of the practices of social transformation is education. Mészáros (2006) points out that it is necessary to recover the meaning of education, which is to know oneself and to learn by different means. Critical thinking must be developed by the people, for only it has the strength to be free.

For Dupas (1999), education becomes a key point in the issue of qualification. It is necessary to educate the worker not only with specific technical skills, but mainly to make possible the formal knowledge of schooling, thus promoting the capacity to understand society in its amplitude.

Charlot (1979) considers that education forms the personality of the individual based on norms that reflect political and social realities. Teaching then acts in a political way, by which it establishes psychological structures of dependence, idealization and renunciation in its psyche, forming an individual who follows the interests of the ruling class.

According to this same author, the education passed through the school plays an ideological political function, which transmits to the subject false, obscure ideas, detached from the social, political and economic reality from which they originate legitimately.

Capitalism emanates an ideological system that inculcates daily in the minds of people the idea that all are equal. We know that in capitalism, education itself is a commodity, resulting in the crisis of the public system of education, pressured by the demands of this capital, and by cuts in government budget resources. This fact is truly explicit by neoliberalism, through the commodification of education, transforming educational spaces into spaces of consumption and profit.

The abatement of public education, as opposed to the growth of the private system, occurred at the same time that socialization shifted from school to advertising, media and consumption. It is up to us to question: what is the function of the educational system, especially the public system, if not to fight against this alienation that is imposed on us?

Nowadays we live practically a new version of illiteracy, in which people are able to explain the facts, not to understand them. This difference between explaining and understanding the world is what can lead to the accumulation of knowledge and consequent understanding of the world.

According to Gramsci (1991), the school's tendency is to abolish any kind of disinterested (not immediately interested) and formative training in education in general.

We realize that it is impossible to separate ourselves from an ideological education to construct new educational purposes if we do not consider the social situation of men. Since educational purposes are based on class interests, education must be an instrument of awareness in the construction of a new society.

Manacorda (1987) supplements these notes by saying that the state must establish by law the duty to provide education-instruction for all, providing just the material conditions (funds, structures, personnel, etc.) for the accomplishment of this task and, finally, to control the execution and the respect of its laws.

Research based on this theme must offer subsidies for the education processes, with the intention that they act to allow the expansion of individual consciousness seeking the accomplishment of the humanizing function of work and the reduction of its alienating function.

This possibility proves feasible because alienation can only be overcome with education. Education must be geared towards a sustainable humanity. We must visibly establish the ends to which this education is oriented, and recognize that these must be social, necessarily having a class meaning. To establish these ends is, at the same time, to define the culture, the society and the man that one intends to form and to develop. In this aspect is the future of a nation. We urgently oppose this ideological pedagogy, seeking a pedagogy that truly considers the social aspect of education, forming individuals capable of understanding and criticizing the social reality in which they are inserted.
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