

The Magisterial Resistance to the Indolence of the Discourse of the Educational Policy in Mexico

Dr. Carlos Rincón Ramírez¹

¹Doctor en Ciencias Pedagógicas, Instituto de Ciencias Pedagógicas "Enrique José Varona", La Habana, Cuba. Profesor Investigador, Universidad Autónoma de Chiapas, México y miembro del Sistema Nacional de Investigadores del Concejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología (CONACyT).

Accepted 11th February 2019

Resumen

En el presente artículo, que forma parte de una investigación más amplia sobre políticas públicas y Movimiento Magisterial (MM), se reflexionan -desde el pensamiento crítico con enfoque de política pública- los elementos más significativos que sustentan la política pública y la racionalidad en que se fundamenta la Reforma Educativa (RE) aplicada en México a partir de 2013. Se aborda el trayecto de las confrontaciones entre el discurso institucional del gobierno en materia educativa y las prácticas políticas de las y los maestros en su pretensión por evitar su puesta en práctica en las aulas. Se parte de una pregunta problematizadora que involucra a los dos principales actores, el gobierno (a través de la Secretaría de Educación Pública) y los maestros de la Coordinadora Nacional de Trabajadores de la Educación (CNTE) que pertenecen al Sindicato Nacional de Trabajadores de la Educación (SNTE): ¿Qué pretende la Reforma Educativa que es mucha la insistencia del gobierno para imponerla sin establecer el diálogo con los educadores y por qué la resistencia del magisterio para aceptarla y llevarla a las aulas?

Abstract

In this present article, which is part of a broader investigation into public policy and teaching movement (MM), the most significant elements which underpin the policy reflect - since critical thinking with a public policy focus- public and the rationale therefor educational reform (RE) applied in Mexico starting in 2013. Deals with the journey of the confrontations between the institutional discourse of the Government educational and political practices of the teachers in their claim to avoid its implementation in the classroom. Part of a question problematizing involving the two main actors, the Government (through the Ministry of Public Education) and the teachers of the national coordinator of education workers (CNTE) belonging to the National Union of Of education workers (SNTE): what educational reform that is plentiful is the insistence of the Government to enforce it without establishing dialogue with educators and why the resistance of teachers to accept it and take it to the classroom?

Palabras Claves: Política pública, reforma educativa, movimiento magisterial.

Keywords: Political Public, Reform Education, Movement Magisterial

Introduction

The present article, which is part of a broader research on educational policies and the opposition and resistance of education workers to its application, addresses one of the nodal and most controversial issues of contemporary Mexico's public policies: the Educational Reform. Designed in the context of structural reforms that the Mexican government implemented in the context of the recommendations of international organizations such as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), which in theory, aims to transform the education system; but in practice, it is an instrument of political control of education workers that violates union and labor rights. The reform proposal is based on standardized and homogeneous criteria for the evaluation of income, permanence, promotion and recognition of teaching work, through the approval of the Law of Professional Teaching Service. Proposal that was rejected by a large number of teachers who were affected by the labor conquests and the danger of pulverizing the teachers' union; In addition, its

application affected the public character of basic education. The teacher resistance did not wait for the imminent risk that the negative impacts it would have on the workers, which influenced so that important sectors of educators from Chiapas, Guerrero, Oaxaca and Michoacán were mobilized to stop the application of public policies.

From Institutional Discourse to Magisterial Resistance

With the cry of protest and the capacity for resistance, thousands of education workers have mobilized in different parts of Mexico against the Education Reform (RE) approved by the federal government in December 2013 and implemented as of 2014. The teachers' mobilizations are a sample of the union political practice of the teachers of Chiapas, Guerrero, Oaxaca, Michoacán and Mexico City. These mobilizations are not new or recent, they are part of the political scenario of the poorest, marginalized and excluded societies of contemporary Mexico, of the Mexico of modernization and developmentalism; but also of the Mexico of the application of the neoliberal policies of the most

Corresponding Author: Dr. Carlos Rincón Ramírez

Doctor en Ciencias Pedagógicas, Instituto de Ciencias Pedagógicas "Enrique José Varona", La Habana, Cuba. Profesor Investigador, Universidad Autónoma de Chiapas, México y miembro del Sistema Nacional de Investigadores del Concejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología (CONACyT) E-mail: crincon_22@hotmail.com

atrocious and dehumanized capitalism, of the Mexico of the surrender of national sovereignty and wealth to the great capitals of the transnational consortiums.

From the Mexican southeast in the year of 1979, education workers gave birth to the Chiapaneco Magisterial Movement (MMCH), organized and decisively confronted the institutional structures of the Ministry of Public Education (SEP) and the authoritarian verticalism of the Union National Education Workers (SNTE); and created in 1981 in Tuxtla Gutiérrez, Chiapas the National Coordinator of Education Workers (CNTE).

During this time the collective expressions of the educational subjects have been expressed in different ways: in the meetings in the work centers, the blockades of roads, public buildings, mass marches and permanent concentration in the capital of Chiapas and Mexico City.

Its present history is still in the process of being built, that is why it's complexity to know it, interpret it and explain it; which requires reflexive attention from the rationality of critical thinking. That is why the analytical urgency to approach its reality with a methodological approach (Zemelman, 2003).

Problematic questions; who are the democratic teachers of Section 7 of the SNTE who are members of the CNTE? Are they social subjects with historical power? What were the reasons that led educators to build a process of struggle that after 36 years remains in force, and that today more than at other times in its history, has strong solidarity support from parents, social organizations and of civil society? What did they do during this time to withstand the onslaught of seven periods of national government? Why the government has not been able to deconstruct them, even though it has implemented various repressive actions ranging from police repression to demonstrations and demonstrations, to the assassination of teacher leaders, including the suspension of salaries, the dismissal of educational workers, the imprisonment of teachers and the cooptation by various means to certain union leaders? What have been the successes and failures of both the government and the teachers' movement?

The uncertainty of the questions leads to epistemic discussions that allow us to build the knowledge of the Magisterial Movement (MM) together with the subjects and from the demands of their social constitution (Zemelman, 2003).

Here is the importance of approaching the analysis of the collective behavior of educators as education workers, from four fundamental methodological categories to objectively understand the qualitative and quantitative data of the magisterial reality. 1) The time / history, allows to understand the different periods of the magisterial struggle, as well as the coincidences, contradictions and differences that may concur; 2) The space / context / territory helps us to identify the geopolitical conditions where the strategies, actions and tactics of the teachers' struggle and their confrontation with the government are developed; 3) The conjuncture / circumstance, presents the most significant elements that are expressed with all their intensity in the different actions of the collective subjects, and 4) The totality

/ structure, integrates each of the elements that underlie the object of study, in this case the magisterial struggle against the Educational Reform. These four categories are not proposed to be used schematically as a methodological linear reproduction of traditional academic thinking; but as dynamic possibilities of critical thinking to recover the social facts of the teachers collective that are presented as alternative options to the institutionalized discourse of governmental power. A first theoretical approach on the subjects that constitute the MM in Mexico is to understand the characteristics that allow to identify it as a social subject that has a militancy and union activism. The first element of reflection is that the MM is a collective organization of education workers who are attached to the administrative structures of the Mexican government that depend on the Ministry of Public Education and the Secretariats of Education of the states. They are organized in one of the ideological apparatuses of the State (Althusser, 1988), the SNTE, Therefore it is not part of the working class or of the productive forces of the economy. Their status as salaried workers of the government bureaucracy does not place them in one of the two historically antagonistic social classes, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. They are social sectors that belong to the lower middle class that do not claim the social emancipation of the marginalized sectors.

These collective subjects recognize themselves, with a political position without identity with any political party. In the collective organization of the GM and the CNTE, they deny any link with the political parties; but in the individual its militants are involved with different political parties, be they left, center or right. Even when collective practices and actions do not involve political parties in the different actions and strategies of teachers' struggle; personally, each education worker has the decision-making capacity to identify with one of the political and military parties actively in the electoral processes, as long as they do not relate one practice to another, nor use their presence in the MM for party benefits. The political party as an organizational structure that can orient and direct social mobilizations has no presence in the process of organization, construction of strategies and tactics of struggle, design of the demands and definition of the stages of the teachers' mobilizations. This absence of the political party has a fundamental rationality. The GM has never considered participating in the electoral processes, nor conquering the administrative spaces of the government, much less the governmental power. This explains the reason why in their strategies of alliances the political party is not seen as another option.

There is a double identity assumed by the collective subjects, first within the MM distanced from partisanship and then, outside the movement as activists of the political parties, it has profound implications. On the one hand, they avoid intervention, electoral manipulation and ideological penetration for purposes other than those of the teachers' struggle. On the other, this partisan plurality is allowed on an individual basis, it is reflected in the electoral processes where each one of the militants defends the political party of their preference and ends up legitimizing the corrupt system of parties in Mexico.

²The presidents who dealt with the teachers' struggle during these years were José López Portillo y Pacheco (1976-1982), Miguel de la Madrid Hurtado (1982-1988), Carlos Salinas de Gortari (1988-1994), Ernesto Zedillo Ponce de León (1994-2000), Vicente Fox Quesada (2000-2006), Felipe Calderón Hinojosa (2006-2012), and currently, the president in turn Enrique Peña Nieto (2012-2018). Of the seven presidents, five are from the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) and two from the National Action Party (PAN), Fox Quesada and Calderón Hinojosa.

This double identity in the political action of the subjects is a contradiction in this social movement, because in fact it is precisely the education workers, who with their presence in the communities have the possibility of orienting and exerting influence on the parents of family to define their participation in the elections. Many of these electoral results with the presence of education workers have guaranteed the victory of political parties (PRI-PAN) that promoted laws that violate their labor, salary and social rights. That is to say, as social subjects of the movement, they confront the political parties, discredit them and discredit them; but as individual subjects, they become allies of those who consider their organic enemies (Gramsci, 1972) to be part of the structures of governmental power. The party has not been conceived as the political vanguard that directs the struggle of the education workers.

This double political identity of the teacher subject has not contributed to the MM being an important factor in generating the social transformations that improve the living conditions of marginalized, excluded and exploited sectors; because when denying the collective participation in the electoral processes it is excluded in the incidence for the designation of the governors.

Another of the fundamental elements that identify the movement is its multi-ideological nature. Neither, as in the case of political parties, the social organization of teachers have defined an ideological path that gives meaning to their existence as a reason for being, their presence in the national political scene and their capacity for organization, mobilization and resistance, beyond of their expectations and demands of the guild. Ideologically they have not defined a critical path that allows to identify if it is a movement of left, center left, center or right. This ideological condition allows the presence of different currents of political, trade union, social and labor thought, many of them antagonistic and contradictory to each other, but which are unified around the imposition of public policies and the affectation of the rights and interests of the education workers. However, within the discussions in the basist assemblies for the definition of teachers' struggle strategies and the conduct of the mobilizations, the activists of the groups that support each of the ideological positions, are confronted in a violent way in order to impose them on the other groups.

Since it is an eminently anti-party and pluri-ideological movement, with actions and strategies of struggle that depend on the solution of its concrete demands, it has no possibilities and conditions to become an emancipatory movement. In addition, as educators, not only have historically been placed public policies that affect rights as workers; also - unfortunately - they reproduce the dominant educational model. Their opposition is part of the struggle of the workers against the application of neoliberal policies in Latin America. In contemporary times, uncomfortable times for the government and the Mexican political class due to the difficulties of applying educational policies in society and RE in the classrooms; and the resistance that teachers from various states have opposed, as well as the debates and confrontations between the different actors that converge in the scenario of the teachers' struggle, the disputes between both actors have focused on the educational field.

Contrary to what the education workers had for many years posed as essential demands, which were limited to economic, union and labor demands; now, the central issue of the opposition and the teachers' mobilizations is political with strong implications in the present and future work of teachers. The actions have focused on the rejection of educational policies; same as in the governmental institutional discourse, they were designed with the objective of "improving the quality of education" (SEP, 2016). The consensus and social legitimacy that the government expected for the implementation of the policies, has not been expressed as planned. On the contrary, even against an impressive media campaign of social conviction and discredit of teachers, every day the consensus of various sectors of society (parents, non-governmental organizations, academics, intellectuals and civil society in general) has been overturned in support of the magisterium.

It is in this context that the application of the educational policies that the government tries to impose raises other questions: What hides behind the RE that is a lot of stubbornness and stubbornness to impose it and little willingness to dialogue it, in such a way that allows find a teacher consensus route? Two analytical assumptions are fundamental to consider in order to try to scrutinize a possible answer to this question; one of them is the issue of free public education and the other is the issue of pensions and pensions. The application of the RE has as background to solve two essential problems for the government. On the one hand, expand the participation of private capital in the investment in basic education, which would justify the reduction of the budget allocated to pre-school, primary and secondary education; and on the other hand, mitigate the serious problem generated by pensions and retirements, given the inability of the government to maintain a fair and decent system; because they have used irresponsibly for other purposes, saving workers.

Therefore, it is important to delve into what is the argumentative arsenal of the different political actors around it, both the defenders and the detractors of the SR? The government has assumed as a fundamental criterion in its argumentative thesis that with the SR, the State will recover the conduction of education and fight corruption in the sale of places, which had been "kidnapped" by the teachers' dissidence. Two quite ridiculous arguments. Is there a weak state in Mexico that has not been able to lead the administration of education derived from the Mexican Revolution of 1910? Is it not the educational authority that delivers the official documents for the allocation of places and their acquisition in property by the teacher? If there has been corruption in the allocation of places by the SNTE and if it currently exists by the CNTE; if true in both cases, as the SEP maintains; who gives the legal document to the teachers to appear to work at a work center, is not the union or the Coordinator; but the educational authority of the federative entities; that is, the head of the corresponding level of the education secretariats of local governments. Therefore, the corruption of places is an act of co-responsibility that directly involves the SEP. This argument from the government's institutional discourse is diluted by itself and delegitimizes its expressions of administrative morality that it argues.

The Dispute of the Educational Reform

The education workers organized in the CNTE and grouped around the teachers' resistance, have maintained that the reform is not educational, but administrative and labor; therefore, his opposition lies in rejecting it and denying it totally.

In the debate on the RE there are four political actors: the SEP, the SNTE, the CNTE and the MM. Each one of them moves in different routes of action, strategies and tactics, with different perspectives and life horizons. But all converge around the proposal of RE, which from our analytical perspective is not an educational reform because it has no pedagogical, psychological, sociological, philosophical, anthropological and economic arguments to guide the formation of present and future generations on a horizon long-winded. That is, he has not defined what kind of woman and man he wants to form.

The SEP is directly responsible for the design of strategies and actions in the educational field by the Mexican government to offer a quality public education, including the material conditions of the schools, the design of theoretical, methodological and technical pedagogical proposals innovative and meaningful for society; as well as the training and professionalization of teachers. It also has the responsibility of planning the allocation of the financial resource to the different areas that imply the delivery of a quality public education. Therefore, in its field of action are three of the fundamental elements of the education system to ensure that the education offered to the public is of quality: the pedagogical model, professionalization of teachers and sufficient financial resources to fulfill the task granted by the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States. The logical and rational conjunction of these three factors, contribute to improve the objective conditions of education that is taught in public sector classrooms. Whether or not it meets these conditions is a matter of debate and reflection on the reality of the educational system in Mexico. The current reality is far from responding to the fulfillment of those conditions.

The SNTE is the trade union political structure created expressly for the defense of the interests of education workers at the service of the government. It is one of the ideological apparatuses of the State (Althusser, 1983) whose function is to serve as a transmission belt between collective political practices, the demands made by education workers and the response that the political class in power usually assumes. In theory, the responsibility of the union leadership is to meet the demands of the defense of the labor, salary and union rights of its members and guarantee the security of the work spaces; but in practical reality, this is not usually the case. Government policies have been disciplined and at various times in the history of teacher unionism, it has colluded with the government to become one of the detractors of the teachers who are its members. In the historicity of the SNTE there is no tradition of union struggle that has been identified with the defense of the interests and rights of education workers, nor union leaderships that accompany them; What has existed is a conspiracy of the union with the institutional powers of the government and a historical relationship of political amassat with the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) and in recent years,

with the New Alliance Party (PANAL) created expressly by the SNTE to maintain preserves of power and to constitute itself as a partisan political structure that allows it to participate in the electoral dispute for spaces of political representation.

The GM emerged in 1979 in Chiapas as a response to the needs of improving the living conditions of teachers and democratizing the Executive Committee of Section 7 of the SNTE. The teachers of this union section have a direct administrative relationship with the federal government, since the hiring and payment of salaries is a decision that is assumed from the center of the country. Later, in the most recent years of contemporary times, the teachers of the Trade Union Section 40 have joined the teachers' struggle, who belong administratively to the government of the state of Chiapas. The incorporation of the educational workers of this union section to the teachers' struggle was not the result of a level of political consciousness of the subjects, nor of the orientation and induction of the union leaders; but of the preoccupations to guarantee the labor stability and the uncertainty that the RE has presented. The fear of unemployment and job insecurity embodied in the General Law of Professional Teaching Service (Federal Executive Branch, 2013) are the factors that have influenced teachers, not only to join the fight, but to join the CNTE.

It is the movement with greater antiquity and one of those that has more experiences in the struggles of workers in the last forty years of the history of Mexican unionism. From its foundation the movement was assumed as a political union position distant from the political parties and without any connection with the partisan ideologies, maintaining an opposition to partisan union affiliation and defending its ideological and political heterogeneity and plurality. Situation that in some moments, has earned him strong critics to his strategies of fight on the part of the political parties, including the calls of "left".

The CNTE was created in 1981 in Tuxtla Gutiérrez, Chiapas (Rincón Ramírez, 1996) as a need to bring together the various teacher union political forces that were dispersed in various entities (Chiapas, Oaxaca, Guerrero, Michoacán, State of Mexico, Morelos, Tabasco, among others) and to design actions and strategies of struggle with the same scheme of simultaneous mobilization. Its main objective is to strengthen the teaching organization in joint actions to present a broader front in the defense and vindication of their demands. Its ideological conformation is heterogeneous, since the same confluence positions of left like radicals and of center left; they have even militated in their active ranks members of the right parties (National Action Party), center right (Institutional Revolutionary Party) and "left" (Party of the Democratic Revolution). The interest that unifies them around this union structure is not the commitment to a partisan political project, but the defense of rights as workers in education and the opposition to the imposition of educational policies, which were approved without their participation.

The struggle of the teachers who work in the MM is a field of possibilities for the construction of scenarios of human significance and resignification of the sense of the pedagogical practice of public education. It has also been constituted in possibilities of political rationality to face the

onslaughts of the dominant structures of the Mexican State and to avoid the imposition of educational public policies that threaten the integrality of labor law and the expectations of a dignified and decent retirement; that, in addition, are putting at risk the public sense of education. Therefore, it is not only an issue that is exclusively discussed in the workplace. It is a field that involves other fields such as the epistemic, the social, the economic, the cultural, the ideological. It is not only confined to teacher training and teaching practices in the classrooms of basic and upper secondary education. It is also a strong opposition to the educational model imposed by the dominant social classes, which has proved inefficient and ineffective in responding to the problems and structural needs of education in Mexico. It is an epistemic debate in the broadest sense of construction of educational knowledge (De Sousa Santos, 2006). It is the most striking evidence of the failure of the post-revolutionary education model that formed the generations that built Mexican nationalism; of the model that emerged from the Mexican Revolution and that the PRI rudely appropriated.

What is at issue in this new stage of the magisterial struggle is the conformation of the educational rationality on which the educational model should be based and its theoretical, methodological and technical practice, constructed from different approaches and views, distant and opposed. On the one hand, the instrumental and pragmatic rationality of the neoliberal economies, defended by the politicians of the government in turn and the big transnational capitals (Gentile, 2015), that base the educational aims in the formation of pragmatic and individualistic competences for the insertion to the labor market in the shortest possible time. And on the other hand, the humanist rationality that defends the meaning and social value of public, secular and free education. The design of the current public policies of the RE in Mexico has been carried out with the participation of international experts who have based their decisions on the recommendations of the international financial organizations (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, International Monetary Fund, World Bank, Inter-American Development Bank), but with the absence of the main actors involved in the educational task, the teachers; which denies the historical recovery of the knowledge and pedagogical and educational practices of the subjects responsible for educational work (De Sousa Santos, 2012). Not only has there not been debate with educators on how to improve the quality of education, they have been denied the right to express their opinions and contribute their pedagogical knowledge for the transformation of educational results; the educator-community pedagogical relationship has been made invisible and the historical knowledge of the communities has been omitted as possibilities of concretion and application of authentic educational policies, socially agreed upon.

The teachers' struggle is one of the expressions of the workers who try to build a worthy and decent future; because the present already have conflicted and problematized by the imposition of educational public policies. They are the most significant social actors in the social construction of the State, because in them are the responsibilities of forming the generations of the present and future of each nation. Therefore, any proposal for transformation, modification or restructuring of the

educational system or any of its parts, will not achieve the planned purposes if teachers are not involved in the definition of public educational policies; simply, because they are the direct assets of practice in the classroom and who will have the responsibilities of articulating the theoretical foundations of education with the methodological practice of teaching. The denial of their involvement is normative legal fiction imposed by the government, because it is fair in the everyday reality of the schools where educational policies are confronted and the ruptures between the pedagogical ideal and the educational reality are expressed.

In this first network of reflexive ideas, it is necessary to pose two problematizing questions: what is the meaning and *raison d'être* of the teachers' struggle? What are the contents, political, ideological, social, economic, labor, cultural and union foundations of the teachers' struggle? These, in turn, lead to other questions: What is the epistemic foundation of RE? What is the logic that gave rise to the educational policy? What is intended to achieve in teachers of basic and higher education with these public policies? What problems will be solved with the application of the legal foundations of the Reform? What is its educational and pedagogical sense? How is its implementation explained and understood?

To answer these and many other problematic questions, we propose to incorporate the four categories of analysis listed above into the reflection. 1) Time / history, 2) space (territory) / context, 3) conjuncture / circumstance and 4) totality / structure; they are mediated by two analytical power categories: conflict and contradiction. This epistemic approach implies understanding that the magisterial struggle is analyzed as a social subject (MM) of knowledge of the problematic field of education; and not just as a simple research object of the educational, social and humanities sciences. Therefore, the recovery of their daily experiences, their passions and aspirations in the constant resistance against educational policies and the defense of labor rights, constitute the nodal elements to know, understand and explain the rationality that has gave meaning to this collective expression of education workers.

The Beligerance of Institutional Discourse

The capricious discourse of public educational policy, impregnated by the belligerence of the strategies to apply the SR and its faithful squire the teacher evaluation, do not have deliberative arguments that sustain a convincing rationality before the Mexican educators. With the absence of analytical support to guarantee the acceptability of the educational policy proposal of the political group in power and the lack of a solid base that convinces the teaching profession, the political discourse becomes inconsistent, aggressive, violent, intolerant, provoking the action be repressive and bloody. This generates destabilization and rupture between the political sector (deputies and senators) responsible for legislating public policies, officials of the dependencies of the education sector (SEP and Education Secretariats of the state and federal governments) that put them into practice and; the recipients and users (teachers of basic and upper secondary education) of those decisions. This inability of the government's political discourse to convince citizens of the "goodness" of the SR, as well as its

own educational and pedagogical weakness in its content, has provoked negative responses and rejection not only of the teaching profession. Civil society has also publicly expressed its opposition to the forms and mechanisms that have been used to put it into practice. The inefficiency of political conviction and the belligerence of the intolerant discourse have been translated into repressive actions and acts against any act of oppositional rebellion. The turbulence of uncomfortable times for politicians in the administrative structures of education weakens the options of agreements and pacts between the government and civil society; and the gap between consensus and dissent is widening day by day. The possibilities of agreements and arrangements between both actors are increasingly remote.

This discourse that was not constructed in the abstract nor lacking in ideological sense, responds to another more complex discourse that represents the interests and aims of the Mexican State. This is the discourse whose fundamental purpose is to impose a model of economic growth and neoliberal social development in society. The risk of radicalization and rupture in the democratic systems of dialogue and communication between both positions that are confronted, can be very high. On the one hand, a position that wants to impose at any cost a proposed SR proposal, even against the teachers, who are directly responsible for its application. And on the other hand, the one that resists abrupt and blatant imposition, which has raised dialogue as mechanisms of detente and understanding between subjects in conflicts.

No educational project like this has solid foundations in the fields of politics, economics, ideology and the social, it has the potential to translate into reality and guarantee its purposes, if not with the conviction, consensus and acceptance of the teachers, because all educational proposal, translated into the pedagogical reality, only has two direct actors: those who teach and those who learn (Bauman, 2013). In the case of Mexico, neither of them has been considered for their design and definition of the actions that must be undertaken in the daily life of the classrooms. The SR is a proposal of administrative modification of the working conditions of the teachers, therefore, it cannot even be considered a teaching policy.

What prevails in today's Mexico is impunity, corruption, manipulation of electoral processes, lack of accountability of the political class, total impunity in the different spheres of government and political parties, violation of human rights and the privileges of powerful women and men. Essentially, it is the tiredness due to the abusive use of power, fatigue and the uncertainty of society. In this globalized Mexico and subordinated to the economic, financial, labor, energy, social and educational policies there are two definitions of two absolutely opposite projects of society. On the one hand, a political project that is violating the public sense of education and delivering it to national and transnational capitals; and on the other, the irrevocable defense of the public content of education and the construction of scenarios that avoid the social increase of those affected by these decisions.

The polarization of relations between the government and teachers as active actors of civil society, but fundamentally as those responsible for shaping future generations of

citizens, has reached high points of confrontations and belligerents. The closure of the educational authorities and the degradation of the political discourse of the Secretary of Education and the president of the republic to dialogue with the teachers of the four states (Chiapas, Guerrero, Oaxaca and Michoacán) who have mobilized against the RE, bare the authoritarianism and resurgence of classical political practices of anti-democratic governments. Faced with the inability of educational authorities to address, through responsible and constructive dialogue, the rejection of educational policies; in the wrong way, the government has misguided its strategy to achieve the imposition of this reform. The governability of the Mexican political system is in crisis of legitimacy and recognition of civil society. Repression as one of the expressions of the authoritarian state, has generated in response to this type of political behavior, increased violence, breaking the relationship between government and citizenship, as well as the loss of prestige of the political class. However, faced with this increasingly problematic situation between the State and one of the most belligerent and combative social sectors in the last forty years in Mexico, the institutional response has been the hardening towards the GM and the CNTE.

The opposition and resistance of education workers is not a trivial or superficial collective attitude; nor is it a superficial or spontaneous contradiction to educational policies. It is part of a historical tradition of struggle that has 36 years of presence in the entities of the Mexican southeast. It is an expression of mature and sensitive rationality of the collective subject that has opposed the arbitrariness of the Mexican political class and its entire administrative legal structure.

This collective subject that is made up of workers and workers of education, is one of those who are better organized in society and has an organic structure capable of mobilizing more than 80 thousand teachers and more than 50 thousand parents of family in a single political action. Its convening capacity adduces two fundamental factors. First, they are working in most of the communities that have the highest rates of poverty and social marginalization in Mexico; and second, as a consequence, they work in basic education schools (pre-school, primary and secondary) and upper secondary (baccalaureate) schools with the greatest educational backwardness in all of Mexico.

Construction of a near Future

As a preliminary conclusion to this analysis - because the topic of the MM in Mexico is current and with mobilizing power - it is important to consider that the conjuncture of the electoral process that will take place in July 2018 is a watershed for the possibilities to strengthen resistance actions and teacher mobilization strategies, which can consolidate strong actions against the indolence of educational policy discourse and curb its application in schools. For this, two budgets are required for the action of the magisterial struggle. One social and one political. The social budget demands that education workers be able to critically influence the construction of organizational scenarios that involve the majority of the communities where they are working; and that the educational process of teaching and learning constitutes the bulwark of the radical transformation of social thought, in the perspective

of the conformation of a new epistemic conception that of historical meaning to the *raison d'être* of resistance and contradiction. The political budget poses the challenge to the teachers' MM to negotiate alliances with the social sectors that are willing to generate a process of transformation in Mexican society, without surrendering dignity or retreating in the struggle to dignify the political life of Mexicans. This implies orienting the vote to the electoral proposal that guarantees them the defense of their project of magisterial struggle, but essentially, the construction of a more just, honest, dignified, tolerant, inclusive and more humane society.

References

1. Althusser, Louis. (1983). *Philosophy as a weapon of the revolution*. Mexico: Notebooks of Past and Present. (1988). *Ideology and ideological apparatuses of the State*. Buenos Aires: New Vision, Buenos Aires.
2. Bauman, Sigman. (2013). *about education in a liquid world*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
3. From Sousa Santo, Boaventura. (2006). *Renew critical theory and reinvent social emancipation*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: CLACSO. (2012). *University, social movements and new horizons of critical thinking. Second cycle of encounters: Colonial Spaces*. Córdoba, Argentina: University Channel, National University of Rio Cuarto. Interview 28/05/2012.
4. Gramsci, Antonio. (1972). *Notes on Machiavelli, on politics and the Modern State*. Buenos Aires, Editorial Nueva Visión.
5. Gentile, Pablo. *Latin America, between inequality and hope*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Siglo XXI Editores.
6. Federal Executive Power. (2013). *General Law of the Professional Teaching Service*. Mexico: Official Gazette of the Federation, September 11, 2013.
7. Rincón, Ramírez, Carlos, (1996), *Relations of power and dominion in the Chiapaneco Teacher Movement*. Tuxtla Gutiérrez: Faculty of Humanities, Autonomous University of Chiapas. (2013). *Resistance and subordination. The intersperses of the teachers and Zapatista struggles*. Tuxtla Gutiérrez: Autonomous University of Chiapas.
8. Zemelman, Hugo. (2003). "Towards a strategy of conjunctural analysis". In publication: José Seoane. *Social movements and conflicts in Latin America*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: CLACSO, OSAL Program.