

The De-ideologizing Function of Historical-Critical Pedagogy

A função desideologizante da Pedagogia Histórico-Crítica

La función desideologizadora de la Pedagogía Histórico-Crítica

Maycon Henrique da Silva ^[a] 

Marechal Cândido Rondon, PR, Brasil

Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná (UNIOESTE)

Paulino José Orso ^[b] 

Cascavel, PR, Brasil

Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná (UNIOESTE)

How to cite: SILVA, M. H. da; ORSO, P. J. A função desideologizante da Pedagogia Histórico-Crítica. *Revista Diálogo Educacional*, Curitiba, PUCPRESS, v. 26, n. 88, p. 27-38, jan./mar. 2026. <https://doi.org/10.7213/1981-416X.26.088.DS01EN>

Abstract

This paper is a synthesis of the research systematized in the master's dissertation (2025). The goal is to revisit discussions on the concept of ideology in the field of Marxism and, based on the assumptions of dialectical historical materialism (DIAMAT) and historical-critical pedagogy (HCP), to explain the anti-ideological character of this pedagogical theory or, as suggested, its de-ideologizing function. Firstly, it is defined the concept of ideology based on the writings of Marx and Engels. Then, it is addressed the importance of the explicit positioning of HCP as a Marxist theory of education and highlight the elements that distinguish it from bourgeois pedagogical conceptions. Ultimately, it is reaffirmed HCP's social commitment to social transformation and conclude that one of HCP's fundamental contributions is to oppose all expressions of ideological thought and to form critical consciousness in the proletariat.

Keywords: Education. Marxism. Ideology. De-ideologization. Historical-Critical Pedagogy.

^[a] Doutorando em Educação, e-mail: maycon.mhs@gmail.com

^[b] Doutor em Educação, e-mail: paulino.orso@unioeste.br

Resumo

O presente artigo é uma síntese da pesquisa sistematizada em forma de dissertação publicada em fevereiro de 2025. O objetivo é retomar as discussões sobre o conceito de ideologia no campo do marxismo e, a partir dos pressupostos do materialismo histórico-dialético (MHD) e da pedagogia histórico-crítica (PHC), explicitar o caráter anti-ideológico desta teoria pedagógica ou, conforme sugere o título do artigo, a sua função desideologizante. Primeiramente, o texto aborda o conceito de ideologia a partir dos escritos de Marx e Engels, em seguida trata da importância do posicionamento da PHC enquanto uma teoria marxista da educação e evidencia os elementos que a distinguem das concepções pedagógicas burguesas. Ao final, reafirma o compromisso social da PHC com a transformação social, e conclui que uma das contribuições fundamentais da PHC consiste na oposição à todas as expressões do pensamento ideológico e a formação da consciência crítica da classe trabalhadora.

Palavras-chave: Educação. Marxismo. Ideologia. Desideologização. Pedagogia Histórico-Crítica.

1. Introduction

Humanity has long debated the question of the formation of thought and rationality. Perhaps one of the best-known sentences on this subject is: "I think, therefore I am," by the philosopher and mathematician René Descartes (1596-1650). The sentence presented by the French thinker points to the supremacy of thought over existence. From this perspective, by being able to think and rationalize about himself and the world around him, man would have proof of his own existence.

However, can we still consider this premise adequate currently? Is it thought that defines existence or existence that defines thought? Where do our beliefs and values, our morals and ethics, our way of seeing the world and behaving in it come from? These and other questions have been present in human history since the beginning, sometimes more accentuated by the social context, sometimes more retracted and limited to specific groups.

The historical time in which we live calls us to resume this discussion with even greater theoretical rigor and an unwavering social commitment. The waves of obscurantism and scientific denialism, coupled with a project of permanent domination by the ruling class, are causing a civilizational catastrophe that points to a irreversibility stage, unless the course undergoes a radical shift.

Thought, ideas, worldviews, and knowledge are elements directly linked to the educational act. According to Saviani, education is tied to immaterial work and, more specifically, to that whose product is inseparable from the producer; "in this sense, a book is material, but what it contains are ideas, theories, therefore something immaterial" (Saviani, 2011, p. 90). However, both the production and the socialization of this immaterial "product" occur based on material conditions and constitutive elements of objective reality. This observation inevitably leads us to the concept of ideology.

According to the aforementioned research, the debate surrounding ideology is very broad in the fields of social sciences and education (Silva, 2025, p. 13). Even among Marxist thinkers, there is no consensus regarding the definition of ideology. To a large extent, two major conceptual approaches are observed: one that understands ideology as the set of ideas and values of individuals and different social groups, and another, from the perspective of Marx and Engels, which expresses itself in the form of partial, mistaken, and false ideas about reality.

Therefore, revisiting these authors is an essential task. Historically, they dealt with the question of ideology and extracted from historical reality itself the elements that constitute it. The critique of the existing thought at the time, produced by the thinkers in *The German Ideology* (1932), is also found in their other works, forming a watershed in Western philosophical thought.

Between the two conceptual approaches we mentioned regarding ideology, Marx and Engels are linked to the second conception. For the authors, ideological thought is an instrument of domination of one class over another, it is the "image turned upside down as in a *camera obscura*" (Marx; Engels, 2007, p. 94), an expression of the imposition of the ruling class in the field of thought.

Since historical-critical pedagogy is a Marxist pedagogical theory, by appropriating its foundations and implementing its assumptions in our pedagogical practice, we can see the social function it plays in education and society. Beyond a merely theoretical discussion restricted to the world of ideas, we need to identify the real and objective implications of adopting a Marxist pedagogical perspective.

In this sense, insofar as the foundations of Historical-Critical Pedagogy (HCP) are the assumptions of dialectical materialism, this pedagogical theory plays an essential role in the fight against ideological thinking and can equip individuals to develop a critical consciousness that unveils reality and understands the world as it truly is, with the goal of transforming it.

2. Marx and Engels and the question of ideology

Although the topic of ideology became more widely disseminated after the studies of Marx and Engels, they were not the first to use this terminology. History reveals that Antoine-Louis-Claude Destutt de Tracy (1754-1836) was the first intellectual to develop a conception of ideology in the context of the French Revolution. He aimed to understand how ideas, concepts, and worldviews were produced in human thought.

Tracy attributed his studies on the formation and development of human ideas to a subdivision of zoology. For the French scholar, ideas were formed in the minds of men from their relationship with nature; therefore, this process was organic, metabolic, and should become a branch of the natural sciences (Lowy, 1985, p. 15).

As Tracy's school grew and produced followers, Napoleon Bonaparte criticized its studies, claiming that these analyses were useless because they produced nothing materially and added nothing to social development. The emperor called these thinkers "ideologues," who lived in the world of ideas, distant from reality, or, in other words, in a parallel world (Lowy, 1985, p. 15).

The Napoleonic conception of ideologues and the question of ideology became hegemonic in that context. However, it is in the work *The German Ideology* that Marx and Engels attribute to ideology an unprecedented, precise, and scientific meaning.

It can be said that *The German Ideology* historically marks the birth of an innovative scientific method, historical-dialectical materialism. It is at least curious to note that the work that introduces the foundations of Marx and Engels' method has ideology as one of its main categories of analysis.

When confronted with the so-called Young Hegelians and highlighting the idealist character of their thought, Marx and Engels assert that

Completely contrary to German philosophy, which descends from heaven to earth, here we ascend from earth to heaven. That is to say, we do not start from what men say, imagine or represent, nor from men as they are thought, imagined and represented, in order to then arrive at men of flesh and blood; we start from men who are actually active and, from their real life process, we also expose the development of ideological reflections and echoes of this life process. (...) It is not consciousness that determines life, but life that determines consciousness (Marx; Engels, 2007, p. 94).

The formation of thought, in Marx and Engels, is not the result of mere speculation or belief of the thinkers of a given society, it does not consist of a divine intellectual illumination that predetermines the order of things on the material plane; on the contrary, it is the material conditions and the relations between men that constitute the way of thinking of a society.

In a society whose production of men's lives is divided into antagonistic classes and one of these classes exercises dominion over the other, the ideas, concepts, and worldview of the dominated are those imposed by the class that dominates them. According to the authors,

The ideas of the ruling class are, in every epoch, the ruling ideas, the class which is the dominant material force in society is at the same time its dominant intellectual force. The class which has at its disposal the means of material production also has at its disposal the means of intellectual production, so that at approximately the same time the thoughts of those who lack the means of intellectual production are subjected to it. The ruling ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relations, they are the dominant material relations grasped as ideas; therefore, they are the expression of the relations that make a class the ruling class, they are the ideas of its domination (Marx; Engels, 2007, p. 47).

It is this hegemonic thought, which arises from the correlation of forces between classes and imposes the worldview of the dominant class, that Marx and Engels call ideology. Therefore, from a Marxist point of view, ideology is not just any way of thinking, nor is it about the different viewpoints of social groups. Ideological thought has specific

characteristics that do not "descend from heaven to earth," but manifest themselves from the concrete relations of domination of one class over another.

However, we cannot directly relate ideology to lies or the mere falsification of ideas. If that were the case, ideological thought would be easily diluted and refuted by the exposure of truth and would not establish itself as dominant for very long. Ideology possesses complex characteristics that cloud the understanding of the world as it is. In the words of Marx and Engels, "if, in every ideology, men and their relations appear upside down as in a dark chamber, this phenomenon results from their historical life process, in the same way that the inversion of objects on the retina results from their immediately physical life process." (Marx; Engels, 2007, p. 94).

The materialist assumption of Marx's thought points to the objectivity of truth; for the author, truth is not in the thoughts of individuals, but in their relationship with objective reality. In this sense, the role of science is to capture the multiple determinations of real objects so that the passage from the concrete reality to the concrete thought is possible.

However, the appearance of objects or the mere description of how they appear in social relations is not sufficient for a faithful assimilation of their essence. It is necessary to investigate the most intimate connections that compose them, identifying the categories and mediations that constitute them as real objects. "The method which consists in rising from the abstract to the concrete is nothing other than the way thought proceeds in order to appropriate the concrete, to reproduce it as thought concrete." (Marx, 2011, p. 55).

Therefore, truth in Marx is objective and can be understood through a method that allows one to go beyond appearances. For him, "scientific truths are always paradoxical when judged by everyday experience, which only captures the deceptive appearance of things" (Marx, 2013, p. 101). Thus, the role of science is to break with everyday life and the "deceptive appearance of things" towards their essence, because otherwise, "all science would be superfluous if the form of manifestation and the essence of things coincided immediately" (Marx, 2013, p. 838).

Thus, we can affirm that ideology possesses a dimension of falsification and concealment of reality, but not only that. According to Iasi, Marx establishes five elements that characterize ideological thought: concealment/veiling, inversion, naturalization, justification, and presentation of the particular as if it were universal. Without these dimensions, according to the author, the Marxian concept of ideology is emptied (Iasi, 2014, p. 113).

These characteristics express the complexity of ideological thought. It is not a set of lies propagated by the ruling class, but rather an inverted vision of an inverted world. In this sense, when discussing religious ideology, Marx affirms: "This State and this society produce religion, an inverted consciousness of the world, because they are an inverted world." (Marx, 2005, p. 145).

Ideology is the thought process that endorses, justifies, and naturalizes an entire social organization based on exploitation, inequality, prejudice, xenophobia, sexism, and moralism. It attempts to convince us that this is the only possible way of life and attributes a sense of permanence and eternity to the present social order.

It is no coincidence that Marx and Engels titled their work *The German Ideology*. With this, they intended to draw attention to the fact that German philosophers of the time started from an inverted conception of consciousness. Instead of understanding consciousness from the existing relations of production, that is, from existing materiality, they started from ideas, from self-consciousness.

It transpired that, when we compare Marx's conception of ideology with that of other Marxist authors, we find important divergences that completely alter the meaning of this essential concept for understanding Marx's method.

Some aspects of the thought contained in Marx's work were not well assimilated by several of his followers. After his death (1883), Engels became the greatest authority in defending his friend's ideas and a profound combatant against the misunderstandings that occasionally arose among Marxist thinkers. When Engels died (1895), the proliferation of misunderstandings and distortions of Marxist thought worsened considerably. Socialist theorists clearly showed their limitations in understanding Marx's work.

One of the causes of these distortions was the late publication of several works by Marx and Engels. *The German Ideology*, for example, took 86 years to be published for the first time. Produced between 1845 and 1846, its first complete publication was only available in 1932, already in the Soviet Union. This means that several classic Marxist thinkers produced their writings without having access to this work, and most of them used the term ideology as a synonym for a set of ideas of a particular social group.

Lenin himself did not have sufficient resources to formulate a more faithful synthesis of Marx's thought. He did not have access to some of the most notable philosophical texts, such as the *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, the complete text of *The German Ideology*, and the *Grundrisse* (Konder, 2002, p. 52).

Due to the impossibility of accessing essential texts by Marx and Engels, several Marxist intellectuals such as Lenin, Gramsci, Luxemburg, among others, maintained in their writings the most recurrent conception of ideology, which remains the most widespread to this day. For these authors, ideology is a worldview, it is the personal and subjective values that guide human action in the world.

In Lenin, we find the idea of ideological struggle, of a clash between "ideologies": the working class and the ruling class. The author states that socialism itself, "as the ideology of the class struggle of the proletariat, is subordinated to the general condition of the birth, development, and consolidation of any ideology." (Lenin, 1976, pp. 204-205).

Gramsci also relates the concept of ideology to worldview. When discussing the struggle for hegemony in the fields of thought, culture, and education, the author considers that every great movement begins with an embryonic phase before consecrating great names and achieving great feats. In this initial phase, movements have not so clear and diffuse ideologies, which are also important for the construction of an ideology capable of becoming hegemonic (Gramsci, 2017, p. 311).

These authors, as well as other Marxist intellectuals of the 20th century, adopted, according to Konder (2002), a reductively sociological conception of ideology. According to the author,

Marxists of the late 19th century and especially those of the early 20th century, for the most part, adopted a reductively sociological conception of ideology, limiting themselves to the effort of identifying — and denouncing politically — the simplest direct forms of expression of the material interests of social classes in the discourse of theorists, in action programs or in artistic production (Konder, 2002, p. 55).

We know that the concept of ideology was not a central object of discussion for these intellectuals; each of them lived in specific social contexts that demanded political and intellectual work aligned with the needs of their historical time. However, since history is not linear and its driving force is social contradictions and class struggles, the attacks launched against education and public schools require us to return to themes that have sometimes been neglected. This is the case with ideology.

The wave of denialism led by conservative sectors of society has produced unfounded accusations against public schools, for example. We often hear about "cultural Marxism," "ideological indoctrination," "gender ideology," among other fallacies that "go viral" through social media and convince a large part of society.

Is HPC just another ideology among many?

3. Historical Aspects and Marxist Foundations of Historical-Critical Pedagogy

The history of historical-critical pedagogy reveals important elements for understanding its de-ideologizing function. As we have already stated, this is not a "conceptual dispute" to ascertain what ideology is for this pedagogical theory. Our effort is to find, in materiality, the foundations of HCP and the social function it performs, the way in which the category of ideology actually appears.

In 2026, Historical-Critical Pedagogy will complete forty-seven years of history. Its first formulations took place in the context of the so-called "years of lead" (*Anos de chumbo*), in which, following a military-business-imperialist coup, Brazil experienced twenty-one years of repression, torture, death, and dictatorship (1964-1985).

Saviani considers the work *School and Democracy*, published in 1983, as a preliminary introduction to Historical-Critical Pedagogy. It contains a set of four texts produced from a historical analysis of the main theories of education and points to paths for the elaboration of a truly critical theory that had not yet been officially called by that name. The texts are: "Theories of Education and the Problem of Marginality", "School and Democracy I- The Theory of the Curvature of the Rod", "School and Democracy II- Beyond the Theory of the Curvature of the Rod", and "Eleven Theses on Education and Politics".

On that occasion, the author analyzed the main existing theories of education and classified them into two distinct groups: non-critical theories of education and critical-reproductive theories. Saviani discusses the hegemonic and bourgeois character of the theories that are part of the first group (Traditional School, New School and Technician School) and exposes the limits of the critique made by the theories of the second group (Theory of the education system as symbolic violence, Theory of the school as an Ideological State Apparatus, and the Theory of the dualist school) (Saviani, 2021, p. 4).

The author's objective was to indicate the constituent elements and necessary contents of a revolutionary pedagogy that had not yet existed. For Saviani, this revolutionary pedagogy

(...) identifies bourgeois proposals as elements of recomposition of hegemonic mechanisms and is willing to fight concretely against the recomposition of these mechanisms of hegemony, in order to open space for the emerging forces of society, for the popular forces, so that the school can be inserted into the broader process of building a new society (Saviani, 2021, p. 46).

In a context of profound social, economic, and educational crisis, where traditional, progressive, and technocratic tendencies dominated Brazilian pedagogical thought, Saviani adopted historical-dialectical materialism as a philosophical presupposition capable of supporting and underpinning the construction of a revolutionary pedagogical theory. For him, a Marxist pedagogical theory should not only identify the limitations of the capitalist school. The school itself can contribute to the emergence of its opposite through clear objectives and fundamental content for human emancipation.

I believe that the task of constructing a pedagogy inspired by Marxism implies grasping the underlying conception (of an ontological, epistemological, and methodological order) that characterizes historical materialism. Imbued with this conception, it is a matter of penetrating the inner workings of pedagogical processes, reconstructing their objective characteristics and formulating the pedagogical guidelines that will enable the reorganization of educational work in terms of the aims and objectives of education, the training institutions, the educational agents, the curricular content, and the pedagogical-didactic procedures that will drive a new educational ethos aimed at building a new society, a new culture, a new human being, in summary (Saviani, 2011, p. 24).

The task proposed by Saviani is essential, yet far from simple. The starting point for constructing a revolutionary pedagogical theory is understanding the constitutive elements of the method on which it is based. In other words, it must appropriate the foundations of historical-dialectical materialism and then translate them into pedagogical processes in all their aspects, in order to overcome the capitalist mode of production.

Initially, in the drafting of the first texts that constitute the theoretical framework of Historical-Critical Pedagogy, the author indicates four central elements of Marxist theory that guide him. The first two are based on the works of Marx, and in the last two Saviani draws on the writings of Gramsci. These are: 1) the distinction between material and immaterial production in order to understand the nature and specificity of education; 2) the understanding of the method of political economy to delimit the method of Historical-Critical Pedagogy, in which the dialectical conception of science is assumed in contrast to Bacon's inductive method that inspired the new pedagogies; 3) the

concept of catharsis as the culminating moment of the educational process; 4) the guidelines for the elaboration of the school curriculum in which history should be the guiding principle of all teaching content (Saviani, 2011, pp. 24-25).

This path of "immersion" in the categories of Marx's method to produce a revolutionary pedagogical theory led Saviani to understand the specific role that the school should play in the context of class struggles: the transmission of objective, scientific, and systematized knowledge transformed into school knowledge.

According to Saviani, the word knowledge has three distinct dimensions stemming from its Greek origin: *doxa*, *sophia*, and *episteme*. The term *doxa* refers to what we now call common sense; it is the popular knowledge reproduced culturally among people based on beliefs, superstitions, or individual experiences. The word *sophia* refers to the knowledge of elders, that is acquired through life experience; it is the advice of elders to new generations. The concept of *episteme* points to objective, systematized, more elaborate knowledge, produced and accumulated by humanity and scientifically proven. Therefore, this last one is the type of knowledge that should be organized and transmitted within the scope of school education (Saviani, 2011, p. 14).

In defending the objectivity of scientific knowledge, which, transformed into school knowledge, should occupy the central role of the school's social function, Saviani affirms that the objectivity of knowledge is not synonymous with neutrality. "Neutrality is impossible because disinterested knowledge does not exist. Although all knowledge is interested, objectivity is possible because not all interests impede objective knowledge. There are interests that not only do not impede but demand objectivity" (Saviani, 2011, p. 8).

Saviani argues that what hinders or enables an objective understanding of reality are the different interests that permeate the society in which we live. In the case of the working class, it is important that, based on historical determinations, reality is understood as it truly is, in order to transform it. The ruling class, in turn, has an interest in hiding, concealing, and distorting these determinations, as it intends to remain the hegemonic class.

Historical-Critical Pedagogy, therefore, has the clear objective of socializing the objective, systematized, and historically produced knowledge of humanity. This defense, according to Saviani, is what makes HCP a theory that surpasses modern bourgeois thought and characterizes it as a Marxist theory of education based on two important premises:

The commitment to understanding and explaining educational problems from this perspective, which transcends modern bourgeois thought, constitutes a Marxist theory of education. This theory, clearly realistic in ontological terms and objectivist in epistemological terms, operates within the framework of two fundamental principles: 1. Things exist independently of thought, with the corollary: reality determines ideas, the reverse is not true; 2. Reality is knowable, with the corollary: the act of knowing is creative not as the production of the object of knowledge itself, but as the production of the categories that allow the reproduction, in thought, of the object one seeks to know (Saviani, 2011, p. 21).

Based on a superior method, distinct from that used by bourgeois thought, which Marx called the scientifically exact method (Marx; Engels, 1973, p. 258), Saviani defends the primacy of reality over thought and affirms that it is possible to know the real world objectively, extracting from it its own categories of analysis. In Marx's words:

The concrete is concrete because it is the synthesis of many determinations, that is, the unity of the diverse. Therefore, the concrete appears in thought as the process of synthesis, as a result, not as a starting point, although it is the true starting point and, therefore, also the starting point of intuition and representation (Marx; Engels, 1973, pp. 258-259).

Thus, for historical-dialectical materialism and for the HCP, ideas, representations, abstractions, theories, and worldviews do not arise in human thought as if by magic. Knowledge, as well as other elements of culture, is historically produced from real and concrete human relationships, from the way in which humans produce their own existence.

Considering the points discussed above, it seems to us that, based on its historical, political, and philosophical foundations, the HCP itself produces for itself a conception of ideology, and this could be none other than that produced by Marx and Engels.

If we agree with the German thinkers, then ideology has the function of obscuring reality so that we do not see it as it truly is. In other words, ideology is the veil that obscures objectivity, preventing the masses from seeing contradictions, exploitation, misery, manipulation, destruction, and all the chaos brought about by the present mode of production.

Therefore, neither Marxism nor the HCP can be considered "ideologies of the working class." On the contrary, they are instruments for unveiling reality that express the movement of the real world with greater fidelity; hence, they are de-ideologizing theories.

4. Historical-Critical Pedagogy and its de-ideologizing function

The word "deideologization" or "deideologizing" may, perhaps, seem strange to the reader. In fact, these expressions are found very rarely in the best-known theoretical work, although we do encounter them in the work of a few scholars.

Generally, authors use the terms "anti-ideology," as Manheim (1929) does, "counter-ideology," as Chauí (2008) and Lowy (2000) state, or "non-ideological thought," as used by Bell (1960). These expressions refer to that which is contrary to ideology or which opposes it, and sometimes all these terms are used as if they were synonyms. Certainly, it is not appropriate here to debate the use of this or that terminology, but rather to clarify the use of the term "de-ideologizing."

In affirming the de-ideologizing function of Historical-Critical Pedagogy, we take as our premise the Marxist and Engelsian conception of ideology, in contrast to the concept that has become hegemonic in the social sciences and, consequently, in education. This Marxist conception, which explains how ideological thought is produced, was summarized by Chauí as follows:

[...] in terms of historical and dialectical materialism, it is impossible to understand the origin and function of ideology without understanding class struggle, since ideology is one of the instruments of class domination and one of the forms of class struggle. Ideology is one of the means used by the dominant to exercise domination, making it so that it is not perceived as such by the dominated (Chauí, 2008, p. 79).

The author continues:

Ideology is the process by which the ideas of the ruling class become the ideas of all social classes, they become dominant ideas [...]. Ideology consists precisely in the transformation of the ideas of the ruling class into dominant ideas for the whole society, so that the class that dominates on the material plane (economic, social and political) also dominates on the spiritual plane (of ideas) (Chauí, 2008, p. 85).

It is from this conception of ideology that we use the word de-ideologization, in order to refer to the collective, gradual and organized process of deconstruction of ideological thought.

The term "de-ideologize" is found in the works of several thinkers. For this moment, we will present the contributions of two of them: Ignacio Martín-Baró (2017) and Antônio Joaquim Severino (1986).

The first is one of the great references in Social Psychology. In his text entitled "De-ideologization as a Contribution of Social Psychology to the Development of Democracy in Latin America," written in 1985, the author discusses the role of psychology in the face of the dictatorial movements that plagued Latin American countries. Martín-Baró states that ideology serves the function of concealing and justifying reality with the aim of perpetuating power

relations, and that social psychology should contribute to de-ideologization so that people can understand reality and transform it. The author states:

Considering these ideological forms that justify the situation of oppression by referring to God or national security, it is up to Social Psychology to de-ideologize. De-ideologizing means unmasking the alienating common sense that covers up the objective obstacles to the development of democracy or that makes them acceptable to people (Martín-Baró, 2017, p. 62).

Martín-Baró was a militant psychologist from El Salvador who fought against the dictatorial government of his country and in Latin America during the 1970s and 1980s. The scholar argues that ideology is one of the main causes of popular apathy in the face of a dictatorship, as it convinces people that relationships of violence and profound exploitation are natural, thus obscuring the prospect of a different future.

In the field of education, one of the great names of this philosophy in Brazil also addresses the de-ideologizing character that education can exercise. In his work *Education, Ideology and Counter-Ideology*, published in 1986, Severino revisits the debates on this topic and affirms that education has a de-ideologizing function, based on the premise of the socialization of objective knowledge. For him, philosophy plays an essential role in this process. He states:

This means that human consciousness can also develop an activity that, in its specific content and without severing its roots from the socio-cultural fabric, would be de-ideologizing, that is, counter-ideological, insofar as it is capable of denouncing the masking forms of various discourses about reality, advancing other forms of discourse without this masking, even assuming the objectivity of social determinations and conditioning, and accepting the limitations that result from this, both for its own thinking activity and for the very condition of human existence. Undoubtedly, to the extent that this reflection denounces the ideological meaning of a discourse—defending the interests of a dominant social group — the new discourse may be identifying itself with the interests of groups that were previously dominated, thus recovering the universality lost in the particularity of the dominant group (Severino, 1986, p. 32-33).

For Severino, ideology compromises the objectivity of knowledge, transforming the ideas of the ruling class into universal ideas without due clarification of their historical, political, and social determinants. The author considers that his position is not radical enough to oppose science to ideology, but argues that science united with philosophy, from a critical perspective, is a powerful weapon in the fight against ideological thought.

When discussing the possibility of the practical and collective construction of a pedagogical theory that opposes the dominant logic and, therefore, is de-ideologizing and revolutionary, we observe two distinct thoughts among educators and intellectuals in education. The first conceives of education as redeeming society, as if, exclusively through it, the radical transformation of society and the overcoming of the current mode of production were possible. The second conception understands education as merely reproducing social inequalities and capitalist logic, and, however it proposes a critical analysis of society, its action does not go beyond the world of ideas, the superstructural extent, without resulting in any practical action to transform society.

Historical-Critical Pedagogy emerged as a response to the feeling of powerlessness and discouragement that took hold in the Brazilian educational landscape between the 1960s and 1970s. In the current context, it is proving increasingly necessary. It is not just another theoretical option or another teaching method to be practiced, but a social, political, and pedagogical commitment to the transformation of society.

5. Conclusion

The topic of ideology is permeated by contradictions, disagreements, and differing conceptions. Furthermore, there is a certain lack of clarity about what actually characterizes ideological thought. The challenge becomes even

greater when we attempt to link one of the most complex themes in the social sciences to education, and seek to identify the ideological elements that, directly or indirectly, compose the hegemonic conception of education today.

For this reason, we seek to demonstrate, even briefly, the historical trajectory of the concept of ideology and the qualitative leap made by Marx and Engels in the development of this theme in their works. It is no coincidence that, starting with Marx's work, debates about ideology expanded exponentially.

In Marx and Engels' view, ideology is not just any kind of knowledge or worldview. It has a class and domination bias. It is a set of ideas originating from the ruling class, characterized by: 1) An inverted understanding of an inverted reality; 2) The naturalization of social relations, eliminating their historical character; 3) The justification of elements of contradiction such as inequality, hunger, misery, violence, among others; 4) The obscuring and, therefore, the concealment of the truth and the multiple determinations that result in the current form of social organization; 5) The presentation of particular interests (in this case, those of the bourgeoisie) as if they were universal.

Since HCP is a pedagogical theory grounded in historical-dialectical materialism, and considering its historical, political, and philosophical assumptions, its anti-ideological perspective, or, as we prefer to use the term, its de-ideologizing function, becomes evident.

However, in Historical-Critical Pedagogy, it is social practice that marks the beginning and end of its methodology. Knowledge restricted to the world of ideas does not imply social transformation and therefore has no force against ideology. Saviani states that the objective alteration of practice can only occur from our condition as active and real social agents, and that education does not transform directly and immediately, but indirectly and mediately, that is, by acting on the subjects of practice (Saviani, 2021, p. 58).

Therefore, education committed to transforming social practice is the one capable of contributing to the process of de-ideologization, not replacing one phraseology with another nor being content with storing knowledge in the name of pseudo-intellectualism, but rather with a practical, political, pedagogical, and social commitment to overcoming class society.

References

- CHAUI, Marilena de S. *O que é ideologia*. 2. ed. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 2008.
- GRAMSCI, Antonio. *Cadernos do cárcere: volume 3 – Maquiavel. Notas sobre o Estado e a política*. 8. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2017.
- IASI, Mauro. Alienação e ideologia: a carne real das abstrações ideais. In: IASI, Mauro. *Marx e a dialética da sociedade civil*. Marília: Oficina Universitária, 2014. p. 95-124.
- IASI, Mauro. *Consciência e ideologia: para além dos muros de pedra*. 1. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2022.
- KONDER, Leandro. *A questão da ideologia*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2002.
- LÊNIN, Vladimir. *Carta a la “Unión del Norte del POSDR”*. Obras completas, v. 6. Madrid: Akal, 1976.
- LOWY, Michael. *As aventuras de Karl Marx contra o Barão de Munchhausen: marxismo e positivismo na sociologia do conhecimento*. 7. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2000.
- LOWY, Michael. *Ideologias e ciência social: elementos para uma análise marxista*. 1. ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 1992.
- MARTÍN-BARÓ, Ignacio. *Crítica e libertação na psicologia: estudos psicossociais*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2017.
- MARX, Karl. *Contribuição à crítica da economia política*. 2. ed. São Paulo: Estampa, 1973.

MARX, Karl; ENGELS, Friedrich. *A ideologia alemã*. Tradução de Rubens Enderle; Nélio Schneider; Luciano Cavini Martorano. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2007.

MARX, Karl. *Grundrisse: manuscritos econômicos de 1857–1858*. Tradução de Mario Duayer; Nélio Schneider. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2011.

MARX, Karl. *O capital: crítica da economia política*. Livro I. Tradução de Rubens Enderle. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2013.

MARX, Karl. *Salário, preço e lucro*. Tradução de Rubens Enderle. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2013.

ORSO, Paulino José. Pedagogia histórico-crítica: uma introdução. *Revista Gesto-Debate*, v. 7, n. 1, p. 1-30, 2023.

SAVIANI, Dermeval. *Escola e democracia*. 44. ed. São Paulo: Autores Associados, 2021.

SAVIANI, Dermeval. Marxismo e pedagogia. *Revista Histedbr On-line*, Campinas, n. especial, p. 16-27, abr. 2011.

SAVIANI, Dermeval. *Pedagogia histórico-crítica: primeiras aproximações*. 12. ed. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2021.

SEVERINO, Antônio Joaquim. *Educação, ideologia e contra-ideologia*. São Paulo: EPU, 1986.

SILVA, Maycon Henrique da. *Pedagogia histórico-crítica: uma teoria pedagógica desideologizante*. 96 f. 2025. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) — Programa de Pós-Graduação Stricto Sensu em Educação, Nível de Mestrado e Doutorado (PPGE), Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná (UNIOESTE). Disponível em: <https://tede.unioeste.br/handle/tede/897>. Acesso em: set. 2025.

Editor Responsável: Alboni Marisa Dudeque Pianovski Vieira

Recebido/Received: 05.01.2026 / 05.01.2026

Aprovado/Approved: 26.01.2026 / 01.26.2026