

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF LISBON
VOL. 03 • ISSUE 3 • 2015

EDUCATION

JOURNAL OF EDUCATION VOL.3





SISYPHUS 3

BIOPOLITICS, EDUCATION AND LATIN AMERICA

Edited by

JULIO GROPPA AQUINO & MAURA CORCINI LOPES



INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF LISBON
VOL. 03 • ISSUE 3 • 2015

Editor

Jorge Ramos do Ó

Associate editors

João Filipe de Matos, Luís Miguel Carvalho
and Pedro Reis

Invited editors for this issue

Julio Groppa Aquino and Maura Corcini Lopes

Editorial board

Heidi L. Andrade (University at Albany, USA); Julio Groppa Aquino (Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil); João Barroso (Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal); Antonio Bolívar (Universidad de Granada, Spain); Lyn Carter (Australian Catholic University, Australia); Marcelo Caruso (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany); Denice Barbara Catani (Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil); José Alberto Correia (Universidade do Porto, Portugal); Nilza Costa (Universidade de Aveiro, Portugal); Inés Dussel (Instituto Politécnico Nacional, Mexico); Yrjö Engeström (Helsingin Yliopisto, Finland); Andreas Fejes (Linköpings Universitet, Sweden); Cecília Galvão (Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal); Candido Gomes (Universidade Católica de Brasília, Brazil); Donald Gray (University of Aberdeen, UK); Françoise F. Laot (Université de Reims Champagne-Ardenne, France); Martin Lawn (University of Edinburgh, UK); Stephen Lerman (London South Bank University, UK); Ralph Levinson (University of London, UK); Licínio C. Lima (Universidade do Minho, Portugal); Salvador Llinares (Universidad de Alicante, Spain); Justino Pereira de Magalhães (Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal); Christian Maroy (Université de Montréal, Canada); João Filipe de Matos (Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal); António Nóvoa (Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal); Dalila Andrade Oliveira (Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Brazil); Jenny Ozga (University of Oxford, UK); João Pedro da Ponte (Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal); Thomas S. Popkewitz (University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA); Marcos Reigota (Universidade de Sorocaba, Brazil); Laurence Simonneaux (Université de Toulouse, France); Feliciano H. Veiga (Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal); Alfredo Veiga-Neto (Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil).

About this journal

Sisyphus — Journal of Education
ISSN: 2182-8474 (PRINTED VERSION)
ISSN: 2182-9640 (ONLINE VERSION)
Electronic version available, free of charge, at
<http://revistas.rcaap.pt/sisyphus>

Property

Institute of Education, University of Lisbon
Alameda da Universidade, 1649-013 Lisboa, Portugal
E-mail: sisyphus@ie.ulisboa.pt

Support

This journal is financed by national funds through FCT — Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia within the scope of the Strategic Project — Unidade de Investigação e Desenvolvimento em Educação e Formação (contract PEst-OE/CED/UI4107/2014)

Secretariat

Gabriela Lourenço

Design and Publishing

Edições tinta-da-china

Legal deposit

356 800/13

SISYPHUS 3

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF LISBON
VOL. 03 • ISSUE 3 • 2015

- 7 Biopolitics, Education and Latin America
Introduction by *Julio Groppa Aquino* and *Maura Corcini Lopes*
- 10 Wearing Foucault's Clogs: Biopolitics
in Brazilian Educational Research
Julio Groppa Aquino and *Fabiana Augusta Alves Jardim*
- 38 Policies of Social Action and Inclusion
and Current Brazilian Tensions
Maura Corcini Lopes and *Alfredo Veiga-Neto*
- 60 Intercultural Education in Chile:
Colonial Subjectivity and Ethno-Governmental Rationality
Patricio Lepe-Carrión
- 88 Governmentality and Pedagogical Apparatuses in Management Times
Silvia M. Grinberg
- 110 Training the Human Animal:
Biopolitics and Anthropotechnics
Carlos Ernesto Noguera-Ramírez and *Dora Lília Marín-Díaz*
- 132 Biopower and Education:
Self-Care, Subject and Truth
Marco A. Jiménez and *Ana María Valle Vázquez*
- 157 Notes on contributors
- 160 Submission guidelines

Sisyphus — Journal of Education aims to be a place for debate on political, social, economic, cultural, historical, curricular and organizational aspects of education. It pursues an extensive research agenda, embracing the opening of new conceptual positions and criteria according to present tendencies or challenges within the global educational arena.

The journal publishes papers displaying original researches — theoretical studies and empiric analysis — and expressing a wide variety of methods, in order to encourage the submission of both innovative and provocative work based on different orientations, including political ones. Consequently, it does not stand by any particular paradigm; on the contrary, it seeks to promote the possibility of multiple approaches. The editors will look for articles in a wide range of academic disciplines, searching for both clear and significant contributions to the understanding of educational processes. They will accept papers submitted by researchers, scholars, administrative employees, teachers, students, and well-informed observers of the educational field and correlative domains. Additionally, the journal will encourage and accept proposals embodying unconventional elements, such as photographic essays and artistic creations.

Biopolitics, Education and Latin America

Introduction by Julio Groppa Aquino & Maura Corcini Lopes (Editors)

After the last quarter of twentieth century, it has become almost impossible not to take into consideration the importance of the contributions of Michel Foucault's legacy, and hence, its impact on various fields of human knowledge, concerning the achievement of a more refined comprehension of current social issues. In educational field, in particular, whether in regard to the analysis of the discursive and non discursive practices that currently take place in schooling and beyond it, or in studies on the subjectivation processes and, still, in investigations on the resonances between education and the political, economic and cultural changes in present times, the fact is that Foucault seems to be more alive than ever.

As is well known, even without having dealt directly and preferably with education, the French thinker created several conceptual instruments that, when put to work, happen to be very fertile to reframe the theorizations and certainties on which relied—and still rely—many of the educational practices and policies invented by Modernity. Undermining supposed truths and casting new lights on “realities” that remain in shadow when using traditional pedagogical theories, those *tool-concepts*—expression coined by the philosopher himself—have been particularly powerful in the research conducted in education. Among them, biopolitics merits special attention.

Even though the concept has not been invented by Foucault, he gave it a new meaning, understanding biopolitics as the manners implied, “since the



eighteenth century, to rationalize the problems arose to government practice by the proper phenomena related to a set of living people constituted as a population: health, hygiene, birth, longevity, races...".¹ Like that, biopolitics is bound both to the birth and to the governmentalization of modern states regarding liberal and neoliberal rationalities, which operate as specific styles of being and doing. These styles are self-reflexive and, at the same time, guided by conservation feedback.

Thus, implications between education and biopolitics become evident. It is precisely on such implications this special issue is dedicated.

The articles that compose it were written by Latin American experts from the following countries: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia and Mexico. They all assume the Foucauldian notion of biopolitics and use it as an analytical tool to discuss various issues related to the present education, its transformations and its connections with multiple and rapidly changing social contexts, today, in Latin America.

Issues such as the crisis of the disciplines, inclusive education policies and practices, continuing education programs, adult figure deletion, cultural racism and intercultural education, relations of the social subjects with themselves, with others and with the truth, entrepreneurship pedagogy and school routine are placed side by side with theoretical discussions.

Given the variety of themes and the complexity of the connections, it is impossible to approach them either in terms of amplitude or of depth. Nevertheless, what the editors and authors hope is to contribute in order to offer a more nuanced understanding on education role in an increasingly globalised and uncertain world, submitted to the liberal and neoliberal rationalities and, therefore, guided by the logic of market, competitiveness and social inequities.

REFERENCE

FOUCAULT, M. (2006). Naissance de la biopolitique. *Annuaire du Collège de France*, 79^e année, Histoire des systèmes de pensée, année 1978-1979, p. 367-372. *Dits et écrits III (1976-1979)*. Paris: Gallimard.

¹ Originally: "on a essayé, depuis le XVIII^e siècle, de rationaliser les problèmes posés à la pratique gouvernementale par les phénomènes propres à un ensemble de vivants constitués en population: santé, hygiène, natalité, longévité, races..." (Foucault, 2006, p. 818)



**WEARING FOUCAULT'S CLOGS: BIOPOLITICS
IN BRAZILIAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH**

JULIO GROPPA AQUINO

groppaq@usp.br | University of São Paulo, Brazil

FABIANA AUGUSTA ALVES JARDIM

fajardim@usp.br | University of São Paulo, Brazil

ABSTRACT

The article initiates by presenting the context and effects of the uses of biopolitics, a notion that Foucault frames during a period of theoretical transition, when he operates important displacements in his analytics of power. In the second section, we take 45 articles that appeared in Brazilian main journals in the field of education, during the past fifteen years, and that referred either to the notion of biopolitics or biopower. We noticed that the problems confronted by Foucault during this *biopolitical interlude* have undoubtedly found an echo in the angst, hopes and obstacles faced by Brazilian researchers during the post-dictatorial times. We believe this happened, among other reasons, because of the paradox they were witnessing: the first steps Brazil was walking towards democratization of relations and institutions, at the very same time neoliberal practices and reforms were introduced into the horizon.

KEY WORDS

Michel Foucault; Biopolitics; Brazilian education; Educational research.



SISYPHUS

JOURNAL OF EDUCATION

VOLUME 3, ISSUE 3,

2015, PP. 10-37

Wearing Foucault's Clogs: Biopolitics in Brazilian Educational Research¹

Julio Groppa Aquino | Fabiana Augusta Alves Jardim

*I produce clogs and find in it an almost erotic pleasure,
for I am happy when someone sticks the feet in them.*

MICHEL FOUCAULT

The epigraph that served as inspiration to the strange title we chose to name this article has been taken from an interview Michel Foucault has given in 1973, during one of his stays in Brazil (Augusto, 1973). It is one more exemplar of those remarkable sentences the French philosopher employed to highlight the fact that his thinking was an ongoing work, always provisional and somewhat temporary: toolbox, scalpel, Molotov cocktails, fireworks, clogs (in French, *sabots*). All images that express the *use-value* he gave to the philosophy he meant to produce aiming present times, and whose pretensions was no other than change its strategic configuration by reactivating the possibility of a critical distance from ourselves (Foucault, 1983).

The election of what we are calling a clog-hypothesis seemed to us as an appropriate manner of approaching the reception of Foucauldian propositions on biopolitics in Brazilian educational field of researches. Therefore, it is not

¹ The authors are grateful to the Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (Fapesp) for providing the funding to the researches whose results are here partially presented (Processes 12/20174-0 and 15/07857-0).

only because Foucault referred to this clog idea in Brazilian territory (the same way he first spoke of biopolitics during a conference at Rio de Janeiro, in 1974), but mainly for its contribution to clarify the approach we are assuming.

The article will develop in three different sections. In the first one, we intend to examine the uses Michel Foucault gave to the notion of biopolitics, by perusing three different sources: from the *Dits et Écrits*, two conferences and the summaries Foucault has written for the 1978 and 1979 lectures at Collège de France; from his books, the final chapter of the first volume of *History of Sexuality—An Introduction* (in French, *La volonté de savoir*); and, last, from his lectures at Collège de France, the final lecture of 1976, *Society must be defended*, and the courses of 1978 and 1979, *Security, Territory, Population* and *The Birth of Biopolitics*. Regarding these pieces, we intend to emphasize the instrumental nature of the notion of biopolitics on Foucauldian thought, as well as its connection to a period of theoretical transition, during which the author operates some very important displacement towards bypassing his interlocutors' ideas but also, ultimately, transcending himself.

In the second section, we undertake a cartography of how the theme of biopolitics appears in Brazilian researches of Foucauldian orientation. In order to pursue that we take into account 45 articles that have been published in the main journals of Brazilian field of Education during the last fifteen years. The selection considered the uses of the notions of biopolitics and biopower and it didn't matter whether it was a more explicit use or, instead, if it was a marginal one.

At the final section, we present some ideas about Foucauldian biopolitics as a clog-operation of thinking when in face of our educational present.

BIOPOLITICS IN MICHEL FOUCAULT'S THOUGHT

Because it has been very deeply analyzed by other authors (Lazzarato, 1999; Castro, 2011; Rabinow & Rose, 2006), we do not intend to sharply circumscribe here a notion that carries along a floating meaning and is, strictly, an operational one. In this first section, our objective is to revisit the theme of biopolitics in Foucault's work, pursuing at once the concerns that led him to use it and the context in which it appears.

As we previously mentioned, the first (recorded) reference Foucault makes to biopolitics was at a conference in Rio de Janeiro, 1974, that was

called *The birth of social medicine*. During his talk, he examines the thesis that capitalism was to be blamed for the privatization of medicine. Although in a slightly different analytical key, the author presents an idea he would express more clearly in *Discipline and Punish* (that appeared the next year):

... capitalism, which developed from the end of eighteenth century to the beginning of the nineteenth century, started by socializing a first object, the body, as a factor of productive force, as labor power... It was biopolitics, the biological, the somatic, that mattered more than anything else. The body is a biopolitical reality. Medicine is a biopolitical strategy (Foucault, 2000, p. 137).

The notion's first appearance is, therefore connected to a pool of themes close to those referred to during the 1978 and 1979 lectures at Collège de France. Also, Foucault tries to emphasize the emergence of practices that are capable of investment on biological body, which allows the productive forces to develop and to unlock the possibilities opened by the new forms of production.

This methodological insistence on the productive nature of power reappears during another conference, that has also taken place in Brazil (but this time at Salvador–Bahia), in 1976. Again, Foucault retrieves the notion of biopolitics. He starts criticizing the limits of the reflection that western societies developed about power, mostly thinking of it as repression (he refers directly to psychoanalysis, to sociological politics and to ethnology of traditional societies). He resumes from his aim of escaping the institutional and the juridical models of analyzing power. In this sense, the image of a mesh is referred to, in order to suggest that disciplines and biopolitics have both taken part on this process of tightening the web that recovers individuals. From now on, individuals are no longer thought of only in juridical terms (a loose mesh, which allows a series of activities, exchanges and displacements to leak from it); they are now confronted with other axes of subjectivation. In this conference, biopolitics assembles a meaning closer to the one that appears in the final chapter of *La volonté de savoir*:

Life now becomes, beginning in the 18th century, an object of power. Life and the body. Previously, there had only been subjects, juridical subjects from whom we could collect goods, and life too, moreover. Now, there are bodies and populations. Power becomes materialist. It ceases to be essentially



juridical. It has to deal with real things [*des choses réelles*], which are bodies and life. Life enters the field of power: a major transformation [*mutation capitale*], doubtless one of the most important, in the history of human societies (Foucault, 2007).

Political investment of the body, emergence of life as an object to power. It is worth highlighting two other aspects about this 1976 conference. The first one is that Foucault gives special attention to the problem of illegalities and to the role of imprisonment to the production of violence. That is to say that the law produces effects even when it is introduced in contexts where there are no realistic perspectives of recovering the entire social body. Of course this is the last part of *Discipline and Punish* but perhaps it was also a subtle but firm manner to speak to Brazilian intellectuals and to their efforts of imagining how to escape the civil-military dictatorship. Foucault seems to suggest that the return to the State of Law would be insufficient to assure other freedom than civil or political ones. Therefore, Foucault calls the attention to the fact that the technologies of power he analyzes compose a *corpus* of counter-rights:

From the 19th century onward, in societies which appear as societies of rights, with parliaments, legislatures, codes, courts, an entirely different mechanism of power was beginning to seep in, which did not follow juridical forms and which did not have the law as its fundamental principle, but instead had the principle of the norm, and which no longer had courts, law, and juridical apparatus as its instruments but instead, medicine, social controls, psychiatry, psychology. We are therefore in a disciplinary world; we are in a world of regulation. We believe that we are still in a world of law, but, in fact, this other type of power is taking shape through channels [*relais*] that are no longer juridical channels (Foucault, 2007).

The second aspect that is worth emphasizing is that Foucault refers straightforwardly to the role played by sexuality as a surface to these two technologies of power, which allows their strategic coupling:

... and we can clearly see how sex [*le sexe*] could become, from this moment forward, which is to say precisely from the 18th century, an absolutely capital component; for, basically, sex is situated very precisely at the point of articu-

lation between the individual disciplines of the body and the regulations of population. Sex is that through which one can assure the surveillance of individuals... (Foucault, 2007).

Within the *Dits et Écrits*, it is only in these two conferences and in the courses' summaries that the notion of biopolitics appears. In all of them, the notion assumes a precise quality, by which Foucault identifies the emergence of specific technologies of power, capable of unlocking the operative effects produced by the notion of population. These practices are mostly participant of the general frame of disciplines: social medicine, psychiatry and juridical institutions. That is why *sex* is a central hinge that makes the articulation between disciplines and biopolitics possible.

We can see, therefore, the construction site where the notion of biopolitics is being shaped as a tool. Once again, it is about proposing a political genealogy of West, uncovering power and subjection relations that are immersed in democratic and welfare institutions. By doing so, he contributes to dismantle the Western self-representation as a civilization in constant progress, oriented by values such as equality, freedom and fraternity. We will come back to this in our final considerations.

Let us see now how the notion appears in the only book in which Foucault makes use of it: the first volume of *History of Sexuality*. The sentence is now very well known:

One might say that the ancient right to take life or let live was replaced by a power to foster life or disallow it to the point of death... The setting up, in the course of the classical age, of this great bipolar technology-anatomic and biological, individualizing and specifying, directed toward the performances of the body, with attention to the processes of life characterized a power whose highest function was perhaps no longer to kill, but to invest life through and through (Foucault, 1978, p. 138-139).

It is therefore in these pages that biopolitics appears as a notion that allows him to identify a new configuration of technologies of power over life, introducing biological into the center of political power. At least from the perspective of practices and effects, this represents a rupture to sovereignty and provokes changes to the disciplinary dispositive. The notion allows him to think differently about the changes that classical *episteme* has suffered, as



long as the entrance of life as a political problem unfolds into a new relation between history and life (Foucault, 1978, p. 143). Finally, here the notions also functions to make visible the effects of the overlap of the regulation by norms and juridical system of law:

I do not mean to say that the law fades into the background or that the institutions of justice tend to disappear, but rather that the law operates more and more as a norm, and that the judicial institution is increasingly incorporated into a continuum of apparatuses (medical, administrative, and so on) whose functions are for the most part regulatory. A normalizing society is the historical outcome of a technology of power centered on life... We should not be deceived by all the Constitutions framed throughout the world since the French Revolution, the Codes written and revised, a whole continual and clamorous legislative activity: these were the forms that made an essentially normalizing power acceptable. (Foucault, 1978, p. 144).

It is important to notice that, at the end of these pages where he refers to biopower, Foucault identifies a new form of political resistance:

The “right” to life, to one’s body, to health, to happiness, to the satisfaction of needs, and beyond all the oppressions or “alienations”, the “right” to rediscover what one is and all that one can be, this “right”—which the classical juridical system was utterly incapable of comprehending—was the political response to all these new procedures of power which did not derive, either, from the traditional right of sovereignty (Foucault, 1978, p. 145).

We will resume the theme of resistances within the frame of technologies of power in the following paragraphs. Before, we will pass to the final commentaries about the uses of biopolitics during Foucault’s lectures at Collège de France.

Foucault either makes use of the notion or intents to produce its genealogy in three different occasions: during the 1976 course, *Society must be defended*; in 1978, *Security, Territory, Population* and, in 1979, *The Birth of Biopolitics*.

Society must be defended is contemporaneous to the appearance of *La volonté de savoir*. Over the lectures, Foucault examines war as a frame to analyze politics in Western societies. As the title of the course suggests, the objective was to understand how the problem of defending society could appear, assigning

State the possibility, the responsibility and the ability to ensure its citizens' security. What is interesting is that Foucault operates a displacement from the juridical cases (as in the lectures of 1975, *Abnormal*) and from the medical practices, connected to sexuality (as in *La volonté de savoir*) towards philosophical and historical practices that legitimate power, during sixteenth century.

Foucault begins his lectures by discussing the emergence of the “war of races” as a discourse that can be thought of as an event both to politics and history. In this sense, the “war of races” appears as a counter-history, reclaimed by the subjugated people as a memory of the truth, which functions to reactivate political arena, as long as they allow the struggles and conflicts silenced by the conquest to be heard in present times.

“War of races” appears, therefore, as a practice of resistance to historical and philosophical discourses that tried to legitimate sovereign power. It is a practice that introduces a binary logic into political conflicts and that changes entirely the very experience of history in West by showing its opened nature (Foucault, 2003). “The war of races” is also “the first exclusively historico-political discourse to emerge in the West... in which truth functions exclusively as a weapon that is used to win an exclusively partisan victory (Foucault, 2003, p.57). Foucault also contends that it will be from this frame of analysis that many revolutionary works extract their “will to rekindle the real war that once went on and which is still going on, even though the function of the silent order of power is to mask and smother it, and even though it is in its interest to do so” (Foucault, 2003, p.79).

We start referring to these initial lectures because they allow us to clarify a dimension of biopolitics that Foucault had begun to approach both at the end of his 1975 lectures and *History of Sexuality I*: the problem of racism.

In his 1975 lectures, Foucault (2003) spoke in terms of a racism against *abnormal*, in order to make visible the effects of a new psychiatric power, which functioned by normalizing. At the end of *La volonté de savoir*, Foucault addresses racism straightforwardly as the effect of biopolitical technologies, which allows to reintroduce the power of death into political field, besides the aim of *making live*: the death of some will now be the condition of a general increase of the health of population, always thought of in long term. During the *Society must be defended* lectures, Foucault refers to a racism of State, making it clear that it operates cuts within a population, what makes it possible for power to divide it and to hierarchize it, producing a differential distribution of the chances to live and die:

I think that, broadly speaking, racism justifies the death-function in the economy of biopower by appealing to the principle that the death of others makes one biologically stronger insofar as one is a member of a race or a population, insofar as one is an element in a unitary living plurality... The specificity of modern racism, or what gives it its specificity, is not bound to mentalities, ideologies or the lies of power. It is bound up with the technique of power, with the technology of power (Foucault, 2003, p. 258).

It is worth noticing that, although Foucault refers to Nazism, he also repeatedly mentions the soviet totalitarianism. By doing so, he reiterates his critique to Left thinking, which shows the incapacity to reflect on power and—as he will say during the 1979 lectures—to propose a different governmentality (Foucault, 2008). By focusing their analysis on power in its institutional aspects, Left thinking finds itself hostage of practices and technologies that reproduce some of the problems they would like to bypass. And so the 1976 lectures concludes with this acid critique to Left’s impotence to surpass biological politics, which includes modern racism—this conservative appropriation, at the end of the nineteenth century, of the critical firepower contained within the “war of races” discourse.

During the next year lectures, *Security, Territory, Population*, biopower appears as an object to be analyzed through the exam of security mechanisms (diseases, epidemics and food shortage). But soon after the first lectures, Foucault displaces the problem from a genealogy of biopower towards a genealogy of western governmentality—a project that he embraces entirely at the fifth lecture. Besides identifying the idea of *population* as a surface that rearticulates tactical and political technologies during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Foucault recedes towards the analysis of pastoral power and the emergence of *raison d’État*, both of them taken as the condition of possibility to the entrance of life and government as political problems. It is at this moment that Foucault recovers those archives he had examined in the 1974 conference: social medicine, public hygiene, urbanization and the two frames of control (harm and plague), *police*—in the specific German meaning. But it is also where the author presents liberalism as a sort of permanent critique of State.

Likewise, in the course of the 1979 lectures, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, the notion will describe, broadly, “the attempt... to rationalize the problems posed to governmental practice by phenomena characteristic of a set of living beings forming a population: health, hygiene, birth-rate, life expectancy,

race...” (Foucault, 2008, p. 317). During these lectures, Foucault addresses neoliberalism, examining both the German and the North American models. During the 1978 lectures, he had shown how liberalism could be thought as a technology of government that introduces a limit to State practices other than Law; at this time neoliberalism appears as an art of government capable of restructuring practices and discourses of State. But it does not mean overcoming biopower; instead, taking biopower and reshaping it in new terms, what implies a deep transformation of political institutions created within the juridical model.

Foucault concludes the lectures with a reference to political history as a stage of conflict and battle between different arts of government. But he also acknowledges the strategic centrality played by liberalism:

What should now be studied, therefore, is the way in which the specific problems of life and population have been posed within a technology of government which, although far from always having been liberal, since the end of the eighteenth century has been constantly haunted by the question of liberalism (Foucault, 2008, p. 323-24).

In the range of six years, we have this trajectory that only now, at distance of time and when we are in possession of its various pieces, we can acknowledge as an incessant work of returning to archives in order to face, continuously, the challenge of thinking differently about the relations of power. If the idea of a micro-physics had taken him to identify the disciplinary anatomo-politics that invested in the body-machine, the dispositive of sexuality seems to lead him to the consciousness of another strength playing to give form to present times, what he translates in terms of a biopolitics of species. Over these years, biopolitics passes from an instrument of precision to a sort of master key that makes visible a range of political technologies and practices: war of races, political economy, pastoral power, *raison d'État*, neoliberalism. All these themes can now interlock into a genealogy of western governmentality. Along with the notion of government, Foucault also demonstrates a clear concern with the problem of resistance: counter-conducts, critique, dissidence, uprising, a wish not to be governed, the “right of the governed” (Gros, 2013). The problem of liberation and of ethics is here announced, once again, as a reiterated refusal of universal concepts and as a claim for inventing new forms of government.



THE FOUCAULDIAN BIOPOLITICS AND ITS USES IN BRAZILIAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

From the general framework outlined above, and pursuing a general overview of the appropriations of the notion of biopolitics in the Brazilian educational field, 45 articles, from 25 different education journals in the period of 2001 to 2014, have been selected in order to compose the current research. The timeframe of the early 2000's is not arbitrary. It has to do with the publication in Brazil, in 1999, of *Society must be defended* (Foucault, 2000), in which the notion is initially mentioned. However, it is important to keep in mind that the final chapter of the *History of sexuality I*, which consists of one of the benchmarks for the discussions, had been in circulation since the late 1970's. Nevertheless, such discussions will gain strength and systematization only three decades later with the publication in Portuguese, in 2008, of the other two courses delivered by Foucault—*Security, territory, population* (2009) and *The Birth of Biopolitics* (2008)—in which the theme of biopolitics becomes central.

Thus, in view of the selected material, four separate, but often crossed, argumentative axes were isolated. The first axis is related to studies devoted to the triad body/sexuality/health. Another branch of the studies is referred to the discussion about inclusive education. The third one involves the research field dedicated to certain aspects of governmentality/neoliberalism. The fourth axis approaches the historiographical studies that used the notion of biopolitics in their analysis.

Our discussion will begin with the last ones, which happen to be the least frequent in the set of texts.

Among the chosen articles in the last axis, perhaps the most emblematic is the one written by Silva (2013), which establishes the historical nexus between biopolitics, eugenics and education in Brazil, in the period from 1911 to 1945. It is, according to the author, the historical zenith of racist thesis, in use in Brazil since the 19th century, until its decline with the end of the Second World War and the collapse of the so called Era Vargas². The period is characterized by the bonding between educational practises and hygienist/eugenic precepts, through the efforts of their dissemination/popularization

² Period in the Brazilian history between 1930 and 1945. It is named after the first presidency of Getúlio Dornelles Vargas, who assumes an interim government after a civilian *coup d'état* in 1930. He leads a constitutional government from 1934 to 1937 and finally imposes a dictatorship from 1937 to 1945.

either in the context of schooling itself, or in the social domain by newspapers, books, conferences, etc. In short, the purpose was to instruct people about scientific ideas concerning an alleged racial and moral improvement of the Brazilian man, by encouraging a sanitary and, at the same time, nationalistic awareness.

Referring to the school realm, the author highlights the enthusiastic expectations assigned, in that context, to Physical Education. Carvalho & Guido (2011) have achieved a similar effort, but focusing on a subsequent historical period—1964 to 1985—, through the analysis of the journal *Revista Brasileira de Educação Física* [Brazilian Journal of Physical Education].

Other analytical trend explored by historiographical texts focuses on the practices based in “Nova Escola” movement³. Lima (2007) analyzes the ABC Tests, formulated by Lourenço Filho, which were implemented in primary schools of São Paulo in the decade of 1930, aiming at solving the high level of failure in the initial years of schooling. The author considers these tests

as a resource of biopolitics because they produced knowledge about an aspect of students’ life—their maturity for learning reading and writing. And this knowledge allowed to intervene in the population, organize it into more homogeneous, legible and manageable groups (p. 145-146).

In fact, it is worth enhancing the key role, in biopolitical terms, conferred to the psychological discourse within the educational field. It can be attested in the articles by Guimarães (2013), Elias & Resende (2014) and, specially, in the one by Santos (2011), which deals with a particular phenomenon: the teachings directed to mothers in children’s care manuals. To do so, the author analyses two editions (1963 and 2002) of *The life of the baby*, a best seller, originally published in 1941, written by Brazilian paediatrician Rinaldo De Lamare. The study presents incisive reflections:

Through the permanent vigilance of her baby and the monitoring of what the child is already able to do, the mother becomes a child development inspector, and should turn to the experts, if she notices something abnormal. In addition, the mother extracts truths about that subject who is on her

3 As it was entitled in Brazil, New School movement is analogue to Progressive education movement. It was led in Brazil by Lourenço Filho and Anísio Teixeira, among other pedagogues, in the 1930’s.

surveillance, truths that will be readdressed to the child in the pedagogy and psychology discourses, depending on the position that it occupies in the normal curve (p. 439).

The overall scenario outlined by historiographical studies creates a fertile ground for the studies that focused on contemporary educational issues. Moreover, one of the most significant attributes of educational studies appropriations of the notion of biopolitics is the radius increase of the analyses beyond school frontiers, embracing a series of socially scattered (in)formative actions.

In this direction, a good example is Coutinho's study (2003) on the appearance of pedagogical spaces for children in Brazilian shopping centres. According to the author, it's necessary to understand this kind of event as an effect of a growing *hiperprivatization*, according to author's terms, of educational services nowadays, consisting of a set of initiatives apart of the State regulation and at the mercy of massive forces of the market.

Studies on the media educational character are also an example of researchers' attention to outward movements of educational initiatives. An example of this effort is the article by Henning et al. (2014) about the biopolitical strategies implied on environmental education discourses through advertisements broadcast on television and on the Internet, since

ordering and composing the reality, media manufactures lifestyles. It selects what should be said and indicates the way it must be said. Thus, it sets up a power operation that reaches countless people, considering the circulation power of its discourses (p.226).

Similar attention to non-school educational dynamics can be found in the studies related to triad body/sexuality/health, which happen to show a significant impact in the set of selected articles. It is undoubtedly one of the main branches of the educational studies about biopolitics.

Weber's article (2011) dedicated to analyse the *Programa de Saúde da Família*, public health policy of Brazilian Federal Government in operation since 1994, which established itself, according to the author, as a powerful biopolitical *dispositif* for governing population groups under its domain.

The treatment granted to aging by the media was, in turn, focused in two studies. In the first case, Oliveira & Siqueira (2013) analysed the Brazil-

ian video *Solitário Anônimo* (Anonymous Solitaire), released in 2007, which presents the true case of “one man, found in grave state of malnutrition, without any personal or family reference, admitted in a public hospital against his will: he intended to die by starvation” (p. 149). In the second text, Giusti (2014) prioritized front pages of health inserts in two newspapers, from 2004 to 2010. The study conclusions describe the biopolitical spectrum of management operations on such population groups, in view of the production of

an old age based on health promotion, i.e., a healthy aging. The promotion enunciations currently adopted, which frame every subjects as liable to intervention, reveals the project dictated by geriatrics, which orientates the control of human life in all its extension... The establishment of the elders new figure is based on the need for this population adaptation to follow the accelerated flow of events that define our times (Giusti, 2014, p. 184).

Based on the proposition by Pereira & Ferraro (2011), the pedagogical nexus of actions carried out either by Government, by market or by culture, could be defined as holder of a curricular nature; curriculum being understood as “all forms of organization of space, time, skills, truths and practices within the universe of the school and its surroundings” (p. 139). That is what the authors advocate when they present the school measures for prevention and control of Influenza H1N1 when it appeared in Brazil in 2009, demonstrating the conversion of curriculum practices in a ruthless security *dispositif*. From this emblematic case of alliances between biopolitics and education, the authors conclude: “each and every one must be conformed under the general model of normality and risk management” (p. 145).

Using statements about obese people that circulated in Orkut communities, Camozzato (2011) examines what she names *current updates of racism*, operated by body discourses, currently not only under a disciplinary frame, but also a biopolitical one. Such process develops, according to the author,

when we speak about sexuality, fashion, youth identities, among other themes, the body is there, watching the set of processes that make us subjects of certain experiences. Therefore, the body is constantly (re)evaluated, compared, selected... Qualify, improve, clean, extract, sort, purify, accelerate, modify, in brief, verbs that meet a eugenics will (p. 178).



It is also under the motto of combating obesity that César & Duarte (2009) highlights a phenomenon entitled *fitness pedagogy*, in order to analyse the biopolitical effects of neo-liberal economic corollary in contemporary education. It is, according to them, the emergence of new government forms of children's bodies, based on diverse files, such as

body measurements, conducting exercises, the elaboration of new school meals and, above all, the diffusion of a slim and healthy lifestyle, which is the central theme of the new body pedagogy that now invades contemporary school and takes it as a privileged instrument of diffusion (p. 128).

Regarding to the meanders of the relationship between education biopolitics by bias of embodiment, both Altmann (2007) as Silva, Siqueira & Lacerda (2010) pointed out the discourses around teen sexuality and, specially, the unexpected pregnancy. Likewise, Cruz (2007) examined the discourses about childhood, adolescence and AIDS, while Ribeiro (2008) did the same with those about drug use prevention, when they emerged in the 1970's in Brazil.

Some statements in this last text reaffirm the amalgam role of the psychological discourse regarding the binomial health-education, marked in the logic of risk prevention, i.e. in

complex interconnection between the psi discourse and the governmentalization relations within state and society, marked by the constant search of new tactics of population management and by the rise of the expert psi figure as an increasingly qualified and privileged interlocutor... The psi knowledge and the rationality of governing conducts, economic and secure government, constitute, therefore, the parameters for the emergence of prevention logic (Ribeiro, 2008, p. 363).

A similar set of issues (sexuality, eating disorders, drug use and mental health) became the motto of an intervention in a public primary and secondary school in Fortaleza (capital of Ceara state, in the country northeast), in the form of focal groups. Their outcome was analysed by Barros (2013), and, once again, the notions of risk and prevention emerged as “mechanisms by which the discursive practices in health accomplished intersections between individuals disciplining and biopolitical processes linked to social normalization of the body-species life of juvenile population” (p. 377).

The critique of medicalization processes, associated to the biopolitization of educational practices often attested in school background, appears in two studies, both having reached similar conclusions. In the first case: “the large-scale medicalization of children nowadays can be read also as appeal to quiet the conflicts, denying them as inherent to subjectivity and to human encounter” (Guarido, 2007, p. 160). The second: “the increasing intensity of competition orders at work and of very high demands for performance goals, added to the fraying of solidarity and the fragmentation of social ties, creates space for the expansion of the body medicalization” (Lemos, 2014, p. 492).

Finally, among the texts relating education and biopolitics in the thematic intersection body/sexuality/health, there is one that seems to distinguish from the others, which are often tied to a kind of hermeneutical juxtaposition of the Foucauldian notion of biopolitics over some empirical frame. Sierra & César (2014) face the challenge of a post-identity LGBT (lesbians, gays, bisexuals, transvestites, transsexuals and transgender people) existential aesthetics in education. The notion of biopolitics, adversary to the aesthetics of existence, describes the capture of sexual differences through the identity fixation of their protagonists, imposing them a role as legitimate as, paradoxically, secreted in the socio-political and school order. Thus, the subject of rights would automatically convert in subject of norm. It is, according to the authors, the

production of bodies and lives adjusted to classification, correction and normalization processes that impose LGBT subjects a way of life operated from heteronormativity which establishes the identity logic as a resource to inclusion in the legal, social and educational sphere (p. 37).

The intrinsic relationship between inclusion and normalization joins the argumentative structure of most part of the educational researches that operated with the Foucauldian notion of biopolitics. It is, more specifically, a vigorous front explored by the texts analysed, which dedicated to characterize the requirements and, at the same time, the setbacks around educational inclusion in Brazil.

Hailed as a major legal achievement from the re-democratization process in the country, which culminated in the latest Law of Directives and Bases of National Education (LDB 9394/96), the guarantee of educational services to either marginalized social groups, or persons in situation of vulnerability, has consolidated itself as a socio-political imperative in Brazilian present time.



Despite the correctness of the educational inclusion precept, Foucauldian researchers seem to be unanimous in pointing out the paradoxical effects witnessed in its factual appropriation.

In an opening text of this thematic field, Veiga-Neto (2001) offers what could be considered the Gordian knot of education inclusion: its normalizing function.

The norm, while allows to draw the dangerous, strangers, unknown and the bizarre ones from wild exteriority, by capturing them and making them understandable, familiar, accessible, controllable, it allows, at the same time, to frame them at a safe distance, to the point that they don't incorporate. This means that, by converting an unknown into a known abnormal, the norm makes this last one another case of its own... It's also what makes it such a central operator to the government of the others; there is no escape (p. 29).

As one can easily assume, discussions on the norm/normalization open a range of varied possibilities regarding the analysis about the relationship between biopolitics and education—something that underlined the textual production focused here in this text, concerning the practices of children education, special needs education, prison education and, above all, public policies related to the field.

Other text that could be considered germinal is the one by Souza & Gallo (2002). From an association between Foucault and psychoanalysis, the authors propose to discuss the topic of exclusion and, particularly, racism.

The theme of exclusion also echoes in the study conducted by Martins (2009), which presents nursery practices, that took place in Aracaju (capital of Sergipe, another state in the northeast region), addressed to children of low-income workers, whose responsibilities were systematically disqualified by the educational agents, resulting in stigmatization of children, believed to be raw.

It was possible to testify that the big issue that prevented day care to let mothers participate in other tasks, including the pedagogic level, was the mistrust in the capacity and in the “pedagogical condition” of those mothers, submitted that they were to the role of poverty and ignorance. Who can't know how to read, to write, to take care of hygiene, of good food. They don't know, don't know... (p. 40).

A specific social niche focused in one of the articles refers to young victims of abandonment by their families, who were under social protection. The research of Sales & Rocha (2013) was held with 15 at-risk host assistance institutions in Fortaleza. Some conclusions of the study are acute:

We verified that the exclusion of those young people reveals itself by the invisibility that they carry nowadays. They do not disturb, do not mobilize, do not change the order of the world. They are normalized by the inclusion policies. Their lives do not preoccupy (p. 327).

In an argumentative perspective opposite to the invisibility of the subjects, another researcher understands the logic in the discourses/policies related to inclusion: they “always define the boundaries of a certain selectivity degree that emphasizes the difference by prejudice, as a strategy of social segregation, constantly aiming at a collective or individual exposure” (Osório, 2007, p. 302).

Studies on exclusion/inclusion processes have found, however, more positive explanatory approaches, as in the case of childhood.

That’s what the texts by Carvalho (2006) and by Bujes (2010) allow to witness, both devoted to the practice of early childhood education. With the spread of biopolitical modality of population management, childhood finds himself entangled, according to the second author, in practices which overcome the purely disciplinary scope. Set around the notion of risk and its characteristic susceptibility, childhood care has accomplished, currently, an extended radius of action, derived from the activation of a wide range of security techniques related to children custody.

If what is at question is the management of the children lives, the risks to which they are exposed could be found in such diverse points such as the parents’ level of education, their employment status, their income, the family structure, the access to community medical care, the relative child position in family constellation, family hygiene habits, hours in front of the TV, school attendance, and many others (p. 171-172).

Also Lemos (2009), reviewing documents from the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) released between 1990 and 2003, detects distinctive features of the biopolitics corollary, through the bonding between security, protection of



life and discipline of children and adolescents bodies: “What seemed a rescuing mission of poor and helpless childhood reveals itself clearly as a social control policy of disadvantaged populations, held by cautionary bias on an economic basis” (p. 17).

In an article on the cultural attitude related to the so called human and social differences, Benevides (2012) offers a summary of Foucauldian studies point of view about what is at stake in inclusive education:

The will that sustains these practices, policies and discourses operates in order to take care of, include and secure the rights to health, to good quality of life, to the education of others—in one word, is to show the will of power that sustains the protection *dispositifs*. Thus, who understands that the production of the difference to be included is simultaneous to the production of normality that includes, will understand better the will of power that sustains the protection *dispositifs* (p. 900).

Through the prism of biopolitics, it becomes evident the fact that effectiveness of populations government processes operate through conversion of virtuality into universality, particularity into globalism. In other words, it achieves totality by singularity. Here lies the centrepiece of biopolitical modality—markedly flexible and floating—of lifestyle shaping in contemporary times. Lunardi (2006) explains it in a discussion about practices carried out by special needs education:

It is not a question of being associated to an individual’s body at the level of detail, as the discipline does it, but, on the contrary, it is acting upon global mechanisms in order to achieve also global states based on balance, regularity... The “real” individual, characterized as presenting “concrete” risks and needing to be imprisoned, ceased to be the central concern for Government programs. Attention now turns to the association of certain factors that constitute not only individuals, but spaces, communities, social risk populations (p. 178-179).

To the author, it is exactly as a community at risk and, therefore, as a target of imminent social control that individuals with educational special needs are being designed, treated and *subjectivated* by the public policies addressed to them at the present time.

A similar perspective is advocated by Saraiva & Lopes (2011) regarding educational practices in prisons. This segment of the population, despite being in confinement, would not be apart from the inclusion meshes and the neoliberal accent that designates them. Unlikely, it is only different “gradients of participation” (p. 28) of each of the sub-groups that compose the contemporary social diversity.

It should be pointed out, yet, a significant amount of texts dedicated to offer properly conceptual elements about inclusion as a political practice in governmentality. In this direction, the production by Veiga-Neto & Lopes (2007), Lopes (2009) and Lopes & Rech (2013) is exemplary. An excerpt from one of the Lopes’ texts is a sample of the kind of approach at stake:

Inclusion in contemporary times has become one of the ways that States found, in a globalised world, to keep control on information and economy. The promise of a status change within consumer relations—a promise that also comes to those who live in absolute poverty—, articulated the desire for condition of life change, is a source that maintain partnership between State and market, keeping inclusion as an neo-liberalism imperative (Lopes, 2009, p. 167).

The essential theoretical bond between biopolitics and governmentality, as attested in the Lopes’ writings, configures the last axis of educational studies dedicated to biopolitics in education.

One of the argumentative milestones that structures this last axis refers to the processes of *subjectivation*, devoted to the edification and the constant update of the *homo oeconomicus*, as pointed out by Foucault in *The Birth of Biopolitics*.

One of the representative texts in such a way to estimate the current biopolitical rationality is the one by Saraiva & Veiga-Neto (2009). Through a dialogue between Foucault’s ideas and other thinkers, such as Gilles Deleuze, Maurizio Lazzarato and Richard Sennett, the authors synthesize the main changes experienced in and by contemporary educational practices: a distinct mutation of children and young people’s values and behaviours brought up by the advent of new technologies; a reorganization of school temporality based on immediacy, due to the hegemony of psychological pedagogies and their emphasis on students’ interests; finally, a subordination of pedagogical action to the dictates of the labour world and its actual impermanence,



resulting, among teachers, in “increasing flexibility, *deprofessionalization, replacement, disqualification, social marginalisation, salary deflation, political devaluation, associative and union weakening*” (p. 199, Gryphons of the authors), and, among students, in entrepreneurial subjectivities based on the unfailing logic of learning to learn.

In the wake of an endless civilizing mission, a strategic turning point arises in Brazilian pedagogical rationality, according to Saraiva (2013). The author reviewed journal articles from educational field between 2005 and 2012, in which the researchers evocated the insertion of new themes in the curricula, according to three major axes: nutritional education, as well health and sex education; entrepreneurial and financial education; environmental education and traffic education. The endeavour to disseminate technical-scientific based information, by way of clarification of the school population in favour of living without risks, contemplate not only students, but also their families and the communities to which they belong.

It is necessary to recognize that if there was a time when the population control relied mainly on strategies of restriction to information (like censorship), today it seems that the truth, especially scientific truth, is what serves as the main support element (p. 177).

The author’s argument is valuable since it draws a framework of biopolitics updates in education, within the centrepiece of contemporary processes of governmentalization, resulting in what Camozzato & Costa (2013) perfectly synthesize: a growing willingness for pedagogy. According to the authors, this is the effect of a historical movement towards an uninterrupted flexion of pedagogy idea and, consequently, its domains expansion.

In this process of expansion, we create and feed, continuously, a willingness for pedagogy, which, somehow, becomes “visible” and “speakable”, showing us how society and the population as a whole are targets of that expansion. This willingness should be understood as the search for fulfilling a lack, an insatiable desire that is, overall, kindled by changing needs that are never supplied (p. 41-42).

In order to establish the theoretical basis for the analysis of educational issues related to contemporary socio-political problems, many of the texts

included in this latter category make use of an essay structure, by way of dissemination of Foucault's main ideas about the notion of governmentality.

Thus, three articles, respectively by Costa (2009), César (2010) and Maia (2011), are highlighted. The first one, in particular, has become a reference employed by several subsequent studies. Reviewing Foucault's ideas contained in *The Birth of Biopolitics*, the author focuses on the educational outcomes from human capital theory, as formulated by the Chicago school, highlighting the emergence of an entrepreneurship culture in school practices. This is the outbreak of *individuals-micro-enterprises*, according to his terms, holders of the following attributes:

They are proactive, innovative, flexible, with a sense of opportunity, with remarkable ability to provoke changes, etc. Migrating from market—the new economic theories, administration and large business corporations (corporate ethos)—for society as a whole, this new discourse arrives at the education received and celebrated both by progressive and conservative sectors, by private and public segments, by governmental and non-governmental organizations (Costa, 2009, p. 181).

Overwhelmed by the learning to learn mantra, “contemporary self-entrepreneurialism and school education must regroup with the goal of producing the ‘human capital’ equipped with a beautiful body and informational and cognitive extraordinary skills” (César, 2010, p. 232). In other words, it is about developing changing capacities instead of cultivating long-lasting knowledge, promoting modes of *subjectivation* as occasion of uninterrupted educational investments, which would result in hyperactive bodies and minds always in readiness for lifelong learning.

That is, according to Saraiva (2014), one of the indelible marks of cognitive capitalism: the biopolitical alliance between the regulatory universes of education and labour. Associating the educational scope to the domain of immaterial labour, according to the assertion by Maurizio Lazzarato and Antonio Negri, the author detects a new pedagogical rationality in course, embodied in initiatives such as the pedagogy of projects and, above all, distance education.

A similar perspective is advocated by Silva & Fabris (2012), as well by Silva (2014). In both cases, printed materials addressed, respectively, to the university public and, in the second case, to high school teachers, are analysed.

The conclusions point out the main role that the media plays in the thought and conduct management of educational subjects, underscoring a *pedagogy of protections* which, according to Silva (2014, p. 955), “as it is located within the political game of security technologies, takes the communities as spaces of pedagogical intervention, proposing to regulate teachers’ subjectivity”.

The last selected text is a thought-provoking article in which the biopolitical Foucauldian is coupled to the concept of *faciality* formulated by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari. Carvalho (2013) proposes, then, three ethical-political principles in opposition to the many constraints operated by *biopolitized* school, according to his terms: to overcome the walls of dominant signifiers-significations; to replace the manufacturing will for a handmade attitude; finally, to promote the event rather than strict planning.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The cartography we intended to present here has shown itself at once intensive and modest. It is intensive when we take into account the intricate work of collecting and organizing data. But it is modest in the sense we tried to resist the temptation of judging the uses of Foucault. We took very seriously Foucault’s proposition about the clogs by assigning the notion of biopolitics the usage of something to be enjoyed, put into circulation and, especially, something capable of producing multiple resonances. A clog-notion, so to speak.

Therefore, we have to acknowledge that the critical project endeavored by Foucault during the years we tried to map in the first section—a period usually referred to as his *biopolitical interlude*—has undoubtedly echoed the angst, hopes and obstacles that were circulating in Brazilian society when it was time to face post-dictatorial challenges. Part of Foucault’s writings appeared just when this society was trying to take the first steps toward a democratic reform of its institutions. But it was also the 1980s, a period when practices and values clearly from neoliberal matrix were emerging. This is why we believe that when the educational researchers conjure the notion of biopolitics, they are not just wearing a comfortable clog-notion: they are also assuming a clog-operation, in the sense they bear a critical attitude, ultimately deeply questioning our educational present and its evils.



From this perspective, we resume from a last dimension, already mentioned, but to what we want to call attention for it is profoundly connected to the reasons the notion of biopolitics is so contemporary to Brazilian educational research, since the late appearance of translations of *Dits et Écrits* and the Collège de France lectures.

Examining Foucault's *biopolitical interlude*, as well as the manners his ideas were received by educational research in Brazil, we can reason that this period extends, and somehow also closes, a trajectory of sharp critique to the stakes and hopes western societies have put into the idea of rights as a juridical reality and into the principles of equality, freedom and fraternity as basis of free-democratic societies. A genealogy of relations of power in West aimed to reinsert, within the strategic field of struggles, some of the *low beginnings* of practices and technologies of government that overpass our experience of present times—also (and specially) our educational present.

After Foucault, it is possible to recognize that the era of equality is also the era of disciplines that hierarchize, select and rebuild differences accordingly to a new rationality. It is also the era of biopolitical practices, and its norm of differential distribution, which implies giving up the utopia of individual insertion. If the relation between education and discipline seemed evident since the first Foucauldian works appeared, the paradoxical articulation between democratization of school and neoliberalism will produce a new horizon of problems where, as we have seen in the second section, the imperative of inclusion will repeatedly arise.

Accompanying Foucault, we are also confronted to the idea that the era of freedom carries along technologies of government that produce and, at the same time, consume freedom. That is to say that Foucauldian critique makes visible—crisply—the *meshes* of power that make freedom relative, as long as it is crossed by practices that produce subjects. Therefore the paradox of freedom as condition to regulation processes.

Finally, Foucault confronts us with the limits of the era of fraternity when he unveils that it is based upon a racism of State that continuously produces cuts in order to scavenge population by identities that, largely, have consequences over their higher or lower chances of living—and living here has a biological, labor or educational sense. As we can now acknowledge, beneath, above and within laws and rights, run practices that incessantly produce new forms of living and, therefore, new educational subjects.



Beyond clog-notions, Foucault's legacy seems to be the continuous challenge for us to escape the traps we were historically imprisoned in (Foucault, 1983). And this could mean, ultimately, that we take off our received clogs and risk hurting our bare feet by walking the unpaved paths of contemporaneous—experiencing its shards, its dirtiness, its compulsory incompleteness.

REFERENCES

- ALTMANN, H. (2007). A sexualidade adolescente como foco de investimento político-social. *Educação em Revista*, 46, 287-310.
- AUGUSTO, S. (1973). O arqueólogo do saber, *Veja*, 249, 78-79.
- BARROS, J. P. P. (2013). Biopolítica e educação: relações a partir das discursividades sobre saúde na escola. *Educação & Realidade*, 38(1), 361-381.
- BENEVIDES, P. S. (2012). De onde falamos nós? Uma análise da produção da diferença a ser incluída. *Educação & Realidade*, 37(3), 887-903.
- BUJES, M. I. E. (2010). Infância e risco. *Educação & Realidade*, 35(3), 157-174.
- CAMOZZATO, V. C. (2011). O corpo nas atualizações do racismo contemporâneo. *Educar em Revista*, 41, 165-180.
- CAMOZZATO, V. C. & COSTA, M. V. (2013). Vontade de pedagogia: pluralização das pedagogias e condução de sujeitos. *Cadernos de Educação*, 44, 22-44.
- CARVALHO, A. F. (2013). A escola: uma maquinaria biopolítica de rostidades? *Revista Sul-Americana de Filosofia e Educação*, 20, 4-29.
- CARVALHO, R. S. (2006). A emergência das instituições de Educação Infantil. *História da Educação*, 20, 115-134.
- CARVALHO, W. L. & GUIDO, H. A. O. (2011). Fundamentos orientadores para as políticas públicas da educação física no regime militar (1964-1985). *Educação e Filosofia*, 50, 583-606.
- CASTRO, E. (2011). *Lecturas foucaulteanas: historia conceptual de biopolítica*. Buenos Aires: UNIPE.
- CÉSAR, M. R. A. (2010). (Des)governos...: biopolítica, governamentalidade e educação contemporânea. *Educação Temática Digital*, 12(1), 224-241.
- CÉSAR, M. R. A. & DUARTE, A. (2009). Governo dos corpos e escola contemporânea: pedagogia do fitness. *Educação & Realidade*, 34(2), 119-134.
- COSTA, S. S. G. (2009). Governamentalidade neoliberal, teoria do capital humano e empreendedorismo. *Educação & Realidade*, 34(2), 171-186.



- COUTINHO, K. D. (2003). Educação como mercadoria: o público e o privado no caso dos shopping centers. *Educação & Sociedade*, 84, 955-982.
- CRUZ, E. F. (2007). Infâncias, adolescências e AIDS. *Educação em Revista*, 46, 363-384.
- ELIAS, A. F. & RESENDE, H. (2014). A criança ajustada: aspectos do pensamento de Dante Moreira Leite sobre a infância urbana brasileira. *Cadernos de História da Educação*, 13(1), 137-156.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality*. Volume 1: An Introduction. New York: Pantheon Books.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1983). The subject and power. In H. L. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow, *Michel Foucault: beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (2nd ed., pp. 208-226). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2000). The birth of social medicine. In Faubion, J. (Ed.) *Essential works of Michel Foucault 1954-1964*, volume 3, Power (pp. 134-156). New York: The New Press.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2002). *Os anormais: Curso no Collège de France (1974-1975)* (2nd ed.). São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2003). *Society must be defended. Lectures at the Collège de France (1975-1976)*. New York: Picador.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2007). The mesh of power (complete). *Viewpoint Magazine*, September 12th, 2012. Retrieved 2015-06-01 from <https://viewpointmag.com/2012/09/12/the-mesh-of-power/>
- FOUCAULT, M. (2008). *The Birth of Biopolitics. Lectures at the Collège de France (1978-1979)*. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2009). *Security, Territory, Population. Lectures at the Collège de France (1977-1978)*. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.
- GIUSTI, P. H. (2014). A normalização do idoso na mídia impressa: provocações foucaultianas. *Revista da FAEEBA*, 42, 173-185.
- GROS, F. (2013). Y a-t-il un sujet biopolitique? *Nóema: Rivista Online di Filosofia*, 4-1, 31-42.
- GUARIDO, R. (2007). A medicalização do sofrimento psíquico: considerações sobre o discurso psiquiátrico e seus efeitos na Educação. *Educação e Pesquisa*, 33(1), 151-161.
- GUIMARÃES, P. C. D. (2013). “Tudo presta a quem tudo precisa”: os discursos sobre a escolarização da infância pobre, presentes na *Revista do Ensino*, de Minas Gerais (1925-1930). *Revista Brasileira de História da Educação*, 13(3), 87-116.



- HENNING, P. C., RATTO, C. G., HENNING, C. C., & GARRÉ, B. H. (2014). Educação ambiental e discurso: estratégias biopolíticas e produção de verdades. *Educação em foco (Juiz de Fora)*, 19(1), 221-242.
- LAZZARATO, M. (1999). Para uma definição do conceito de “bio-política”. *Lugar Comum: Estudos de mídia, cultura e democracia*, 5-6, 81-96.
- LEMONS, F. C. S. (2009). O UNICEF e as práticas de governamentalidade de crianças e adolescentes no espaço/tempo. *Teias*, 20, 1-19.
- LEMONS, F. C. S. (2014). A medicalização da educação e da resistência no presente: disciplina, biopolítica e segurança. *Psicologia Escolar e Educacional*, 18(3), 485-492.
- LIMA, A. L. G. (2007). Testes ABC: proposta de governo de uma população problemática. *Psicologia Escolar e Educacional*, 1(1), 139-163.
- LOPES, M. C. (2009). Políticas de inclusão e governamentalidade. *Educação & Realidade*, 34(2), 153-169.
- LOPES, M. C. & Rech, T. L. (2013). Inclusão, biopolítica e educação. *Educação (Porto Alegre)*, 36(2), 210-219.
- LUNARDI, M. L. (2006). Gerenciar o risco, garantir a segurança e a normalidade: tríade da Educação Especial. *Perspectiva*, 24(spe.), 177-193.
- MAIA, A. (2011). Do biopoder à governamentalidade: sobre a trajetória da genealogia do poder. *Currículo sem Fronteiras*, 11(1), 54-71.
- MARTINS, M. C. (2009). As “crianças cruas”: refletindo sobre infância, poder e exclusão no cotidiano da creche. *Revista da FAEEBA*, 31, 33-42.
- OLIVEIRA, A. C. C. & SIQUEIRA, V. H. F. (2013). O infame solitário: o que o documentário *Solitário Anônimo* pode acrescentar aos debates sobre educação em saúde?. *Pro-Posições*, 24(2), 147-164.
- OSÓRIO, A. C. N. (2007). Estranho medo da inclusão. *Educação*, 32(2), 301-318.
- PEREIRA, M. V. & FERRARO, J. L. S. (2011). Currículo e práticas de controle: o caso da gripe H1N1. *Currículo sem Fronteiras*, 11(2), 134-146.
- RABINOW, P. & ROSE, N. (2006). O conceito de biopoder hoje. *Política & Trabalho*, 24, 27-57.
- REVEL, J. (2005). *Michel Foucault: conceitos essenciais*. São Carlos: Claraluz.
- RIBEIRO, T. M. (2008). A emergência da prevenção do uso de drogas na educação. *Contrapontos*, 8(3), 353-366.
- SALES, C. & ROCHA, F. H. (2013). Jovens em acolhimento institucional prolongado: entre a vida governada e a liberdade. *Linhas Críticas*, 39, 307-329.
- SANTOS, C. A. (2011). A vida do bebê: a constituição de infâncias saudáveis e normais nos manuais de puericultura brasileiros. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, 47, 427-442.

- SARAIVA, K. (2014). A aliança biopolítica educação-trabalho. *Pro-Posições*, 25 (2), 139-156.
- SARAIVA, K. (2013). Educando para viver sem riscos. *Educação (Porto Alegre)*, 36(2), 168-179.
- SARAIVA, K. & LOPES, M. C. (2011). Educação, inclusão e reclusão. *Currículo sem Fronteiras*, 11(1), 14-33.
- SARAIVA, K. & VEIGA-NETO, A. (2009). Modernidade líquida, capitalismo cognitivo e educação contemporânea. *Educação & Realidade*, 34(2), 187-201.
- SIERRA, J. C. & CÉSAR, M. R. A. (2014). Governamentalidade neoliberal e o desafio de uma ética/estética pós-identitária LGBT na educação. *Educar em Revista*, (spe.1), 35-51.
- SILVA, A. C., SIQUEIRA, V. H. F., & LACERDA, N. G. (2010). Literatura e sexualidade: visibilidades e silenciamentos nas apropriações docentes. *Educação & Realidade*, 35(1), 233-251.
- SILVA, M. L. (2013). Biopolítica, educação e eugenia no Brasil (1911-1945). *Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação*, 8(4), 900-922.
- SILVA, R. R. D. (2014). Comunidades como espaços de intervenção pedagógica um estudo da docência no ensino médio. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, 59, 945-966.
- SILVA, R. R. D. & FABRIS, E. T. H. (2012). Os universitários como um público: educação e governamentalidade neoliberal. *Educação & Realidade*, 37(3), 905-921.
- SOUZA, R. M. & GALLO, S. (2002). Por que matamos o barbeiro? Reflexões preliminares sobre a paradoxal exclusão do outro. *Educação & Sociedade*, 79, 39-63.
- VEIGA-NETO, A. (2001). Incluir para saber. Saber para excluir. *Pro-Posições*, 12(2-3), 22-31.
- VEIGA-NETO, A. & LOPES, M. C. (2007). Inclusão e governamentalidade. *Educação & Sociedade*, 100, 947-963.
- WEBER, C. A. T. (2011). Programa de saúde da família e o governo das populações. *Educação & Realidade*, 36(3), 867-882.

*

Received: September 4, 2015

Final version received: December 15, 2015

Published online: December 30, 2015



**POLICIES OF SOCIAL ACTION AND INCLUSION
AND CURRENT BRAZILIAN TENSIONS**

MAURA CORCINI LOPES

maurac@terra.com.br | University Vale do Rio dos Sinos, Brazil

ALFREDO VEIGA-NETO

alfredoveiganeto@gmail.com | Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil

ABSTRACT

By briefly describing the events that highlight the emergence of policies of social action and inclusion in Brazil, from the 1930's through the mid-2010's, this paper presents reflections about the production of a new type of individual who possesses, in the learning processes, the potency to invert the relationship between absolute poverty exclusion for the lack of competence-in/exclusion. Such policies, as they operate as State strategies for the biopolitical government of the population, produce in articulation with other practices what may be considered a subspecies of the *Homo œconomicus*, namely, the *Homo œconomicus discentis accessibilis*. The digital inclusion is discussed as an important and effective operator for inclusion in Brazil.

KEY WORDS

Inclusion; Learning; *Homo œconomicus discentis accessibilis*; Biopolitics.



SISYPHUS

JOURNAL OF EDUCATION

VOLUME 3, ISSUE 3,

2015, PP. 38-59

Policies of Social Action and Inclusion and Current Brazilian Tensions

Maura Corcini Lopes | Alfredo Veiga-Neto

INTRODUCTION

Dealing with the policies of social action and inclusion in Brazil requires the assessment of events that have been meaningful to Brazilian history since the 1930's until today, the second decade of the 20th century. Here, we do not propose to outline a history of the discussions about such policies, neither to historicize in detail the events that made possible the development of social actions in the country. Our purpose is merely to outline the debates that make us understand the relations between the current economic crisis in our nation and the increasing glorification of learning in educational programs that foster inclusion, digital accessibility and the individual development of competences.

As we have argued elsewhere (Veiga-Neto & Lopes, 2007, 2011), issues such as the strong stimulus to send children to school and the support to actions of school inclusion and accessibility and the educational programs that prioritize learning by means of acquiring competences—in a way where each individual may become an entrepreneur of him/herself—demand strong and continued financial investments. As a result of the current Brazilian economic crisis, all of it seems to be under growing threat.

EMERGENCES

In Brazil, the policies of social assistance, inclusion and digital accessibility have been established quite late in relation to other Western countries. In the 1930's, social assistance was strongly marked by paternalism, aimed at promoting individual actions or directed at just a few social sectors. From 1964, the social legislation became more and more subordinated to the national security precepts, as the military dictatorship was settled in the country, which ran until 1985. During this authoritarian period, strong investments were made by the military government to de-mobilize the opponent political forces and the democratic resistance. In the final years of the dictatorship, crises could be observed in the system, together with a modest start in mobilization of new social entities, with strong democratic character. The scarce resources so far invested in the population, and more specifically on the quality of life in the instances of labor, health and education, led to the rise of reclaiming social movements, which culminated, in 1988, in the promulgation of a new Constitution. In it, also known as the "Citizen Constitution", the advancement in social rights—such as "education, health, labor, housing, leisure, safety, social security, protection of motherhood and childhood, assistance to the poor and helpless [...]” (Brazil, 2001, p.12)—are remarkable.

By imprinting a remarkable difference in relation to the period of military rule, in force in the nation for 20 years, this Citizen Constitution promoted the social rights as a matter of citizenship. The welfare character of the practices on the population was moving to the emphasis on the protection of individual rights. This means moving *from* government actions with emphasis on charity and philanthropy to government actions with an emphasis on law and citizenship. Even though the universalization of rights is still something to struggle for in Brazil until the present day, after the Citizen Constitution there has been a long way in which State actions onto the population have expanded. At first, a highlight must be given to the construction of the Unified System of Social Assistance (SUAS), in 1990.

According to Lasta (2015), the Organic Act of Social Assistance (LOAS), promulgated in 1993, ensured social assistance as a universal policy. In other words, LOAS ensured and recognized Social Assistance as a universal policy and defined guidelines to create and implement the Unified System of Health Service. Since then, the State conducts such policy by means of distinct levels of government: local, state, and federal. The actions taken at



these levels, supported by popular representatives, mapped and started the works on sectors of the population which were under conditions of social vulnerability. Even though LOAS has started the works on specific segments of the population under social vulnerability, it was in 1995, after the 1st *National Conference on Social Assistance*—with the theme of “Social assistance as a citizen’s right and a duty of the State”—that the guidelines to improve the de-centralized and participative system of Social Assistance have been evaluated and proposed. The 4th *National Conference on Social Assistance*, whose theme was “Social Assistance as a policy of inclusion: a new agenda for Citizenship”, held in 2003 in celebration of 10 years of LOAS, and coordinated by both the Department of Social Assistance and the National Council of Social Assistance, meant an important advancement towards the sedimentation of the new terms of the Policy of Social Assistance in Brazil. After great debates, new courses of action were proposed and approved for the Policy of Social Assistance in Brazil. The *Consolidated Report of the State Conferences of Social Assistance*¹ records the discussions of the groups in those debates.

In the second half of the 1990’s, the Fernando Henrique Cardoso Federal Administration opened the doors for international investments, which reached the population and its many ways of social participation. From then on, intense actions to tackle poverty and hunger were implemented, including the creation of the Extraordinary Department of Food and Nutritional Safety, the Department of Social Assistance and the Executive Secretariat of the Inter-Department Managing Board of the Program *Bolsa Família* (“Family Grant”).

In 2004, the Lula da Silva Administration closed the above-mentioned Departments and Secretariat, and created the Ministry of Social Development and Fight against Hunger. Its major purpose was to promote social inclusion in addition to whole assistance and minimum income for the families under conditions of absolute poverty. Proceeding with the actions started in the previous administration, funds were considerably expanded for the social programs. The actions taken by the Ministry of Social Development and Fight against Hunger, in a strategic manner, now began to promote inclusion as one of the main national goals. For such, the actions were conducted in partnership with various public and private sectors, and with the civil society. The National Social Assistance Policy was adopted in 2004; in

1 Retrieved May 20, 2015, from: <http://www.mds.gov.br/saladeimprensa/eventos/assistencia-social/iv-conferencia-nacional-de-assistencia-social>

the following year, is implemented the Unified System of Social Assistance, being responsible for the social assistance services throughout Brazil. Under the umbrella of this policy are all those who find themselves in a situation of social vulnerability.

The scenario briefly described above is the stage where, in Brazil, the State strategies to fight the immense and historical social inequalities take place. Although a lot of advancement has already occurred, such inequalities are still remarkable. It is also in this social and political scenario that inclusion earns great magnitude in the assistance movements, and turns out to be seen, in Brazil, as one of the greatest targets of the State. Among the different sectors and areas committed to promote inclusion, education takes a prominent place since the beginning.

TENSIONS AND IMBALANCES

Unlike the policies of social security, the policies of social assistance and protection seek to include those who need the direct interference of the State for their survival. After all, in Brazil there is still a lot of people unable to contribute to social security in order to ensure the provision of their own protection (Lopes, 2009).

In Brazil, it is taken for granted—at least among those who fight for equal conditions of life and social participation—the need to invest in the population segments which have been historically and negatively discriminated (Castel, 2008). Despite this general agreement, the governmental strategies employed to eradicate absolute poverty in the country and to change the precarious conditions of life among the poor are an issue full of controversies and intense debates. Since the early 2000's, one sees an increasing investment in social assistance and a growing mismatch between the number of those who, through their work, contribute to the maintenance of social security. Out of balance, the scale is tilted to the side of assistance; expenses go higher and higher and tax collection is lower and lower, which gives a picture of part of the crisis which is already being materialized in the nation (Lopes, 2009).

When we mention the crisis, we are not referring to that kind of feeling that is typical of Modernity as Bauman tells us (Bauman, 1998). Nor are we defining Modernity as a time of permanent crisis (Hardt & Negri, 2003). More-



over, we are not talking about *krisis*, in the sense that one of us discussed when defining condition of life (Veiga-Neto, 2008). We have in mind the crisis that has an impact over the 21st century and reaches not only the representatives of the great economic blocks, but also countries as Brazil, which has an emerging economy and, in the social aspect, a situation that is still very alarming. The crisis to which we refer to is that of a typical entrepreneurial and financial capitalism; it is a capitalism that, by creating programs to care the individuals and to strengthen festive identity processes, fade and weaken the notion of society. In Touraine's words (2011, p. 123-124),

[...] in this context, the social reconstruction, which should facilitate the primacy of the action of new actors, is indeed blocked by the crisis and the massive reduction of funds. The crisis in itself does not facilitate the modernization of the political and social field; it is the reverse that is true.

The crisis enunciated in Brazil demand us to understand, in a global level, the moment we are living; and it also requires, even if briefly, the resume of historical events that made up the Brazilian present situation. In the previous section, in a very much summarized way, we pointed out the major national events that were in part determining factors of the conditions of the social struggles for the right to social assistance. As we have seen, amidst such struggles, in the past 50 years Brazil has experienced two decades of military dictatorship, followed by three decades of democracy. In this last period, the country walked briskly in the execution of a kind of neoliberal rationality, which, somewhat oddly, combines itself with the principles of the Welfare State. Maybe it is the case that we should call this new neoliberalism (that we are having in Brazil today) *caboclo*².

It is a rationality in which the State and the business company make significant and productive partnerships to promote better conditions of life for the population that now has access to social assistance as a right guaranteed by protection policies. This “means to ensure protection to those who need, with no prior contribution to the provision of such protection” (Brazil, 2004, p. 10). The way of access to the social protection policies is easy to be obtained, as it is enough to fulfill some conditions that prove the situation

² In Brazil, *caboclo* is the word used to designate the persons resulting from a cross between Indigenous Brazilian and European people.

of poverty or misery, of vulnerability and exclusion. It should be noted that the category “social exclusion” is the most difficult to be sized, insofar as it is, unlike the other ones, in a relationship of immanence with inclusion. Stated another way, the exclusion always appears in relation to inclusion, that is, someone is excluded from a situation of inclusion or vice-versa (Lopes & Dal’Igna, 2007).

Although the contributions to social security are paid by vast portions of the Brazilian population, by themselves such contributions do not manage to meet the demands from the (also large) groups of extremely poor people. They need investments in their lives, so that they can, after all, change themselves. It is precisely at this point that appear the partnerships between the State and business corporations, the State and private institutions; or, if you wish, the State and the market.

Partnerships between the State and the Market grow stronger and stronger, with the purpose of eradicating poverty and promoting, through education, new forms of life and of understanding the world. In these new forms, what really matters is the individual autonomy and independence, and no longer the traditional principles of solidarity with a feeling of stable allegiance to a given collectivity and the common good.

For Sposati (2002), the autonomy of individuals comes with the capacity of the citizens to supply their vital, economic, political, social and other needs, ensuring the conditions for individual and collective dignity. Such provision, in the political, economic and market configurations of the present, takes place, partly, through the (personal and educational) conditions faced by each individual to provide their own livelihood and, in part, through the conditions supplied by the State, in partnership with the market (in providing funds that are missing for the maintenance of minimum conditions of life). In this case, some kind of paradox is settled in the relationship between individual and society. By means of the collective work force, we produce part of the conditions that ensure assistance to the individuals; but, by capitalizing the individuals aimed at survival, at the change of life, at self-overcoming, at the acquisition of individual competences without an ethical commitment towards other people, we end up producing individuals who turn their back on the social reality.

Rocked by the policies of social assistance and action, inclusion became both an imperative and a strategy to lead the conducts of the population (Lopes, 2009, 2015), which naturalized the presence of all in the fringes

of society and, consequently, of the market. It is seen as natural that everyone has rights, all are invested of conditions of self-governing, of learning, of participation, of being connected. The main question is: “everyone must be within”, even if many continue to be “imprisoned” within one of the fractions of the wide gradient of social and economic participation.

We are facing a type of inclusion that is immanently connected to exclusion. As we have already argued, it is an excluding-inclusion in an in/exclusion (Lopes & Dal’Igna, 2007). The autonomy—or lack of it—of individuals becomes a function of the offering, even if local, of the conditions so that everyone has access “to all”, as well as the capacity of learning certain strategies of self-entrepreneurism and annulment or reduction of the disabling factors.

Thus, autonomy is related to the conditions offered within a gradient of inclusion. This means that inclusion takes place considering a variation of magnitudes along a “spatial dimension”. In other words, inclusion takes place within a gradual variation of certain characteristics of a given milieu. Conditions of work, of social participation, of health, of cultural capital and of education are fundamental to define the capacities of the individuals who are in circulation in the gradient. This means that inclusion does not imply in changes in the very gradient, but results in positioning the individuals in the gradient and make operate, within each degree of variation, a gear that allows modifying the positions taken by them.

In Brazil, a way to measure the effectiveness of the inclusion policies is the expansion of the number of individuals accessing education and capable of incrementing both their respective scores of consumption and their participation as opinionative subjects, politically more participative. It is not, however, a change in the sense of those advancements speculated by the socialist ideologies. Even though there are some improvements in the income share, changes in the economic model did not happen and there are no signs that they will happen, and furthermore no one knows if those improvements will last. Strictly speaking, a greater economic homogeneity is not underway and not even a remarkable and decisive improvement in the share of wealth is taking place; but instead, a multiplication of differences can be seen. Therefore, it is not a turn in the economy, neither the victory of the ideal of social equality and better distributiveness. It is, in fact, the multiplication of diversity, settled and incremented by the expansion of competition and consumption.



Somehow, it seems more and more difficult to talk about social classes in Brazil. The elements of the traditional sociological and economic theories that define the classes prove to be increasingly fragile, inconsistent and inconstant. At all times the economic, financial, educational, cultural diversities are multiplied.

It is interesting to note, then, that the expansion of the conditions for participation of a greater number of people does not necessarily result in the expansion of movements towards the ideal of social equality. On the contrary, as Lazzarato (2014) has argued, diversity strengthens competition and stimulates the production, the multiplication and many crisis of subjectivities.

There are varied and extensive gradients along which individuals are distributed, according to the criteria that are used to classify them. In each gradient there is diversification of identities and types of life conditions that range from industry workers, self-employed, waged workers to—since the first decade of 2000 in Brazil—the assisted people. The latter are not taxpayers, although they are essential to the market and to the functioning of the gradient in which they are included.

In this century, many were the investments³ in Brazil to reduce the fringe of absolute poverty that threatened the development and the participation of the nation in the international rankings. Pointed out by the magazine *Exame*⁴ as the 13th country that most invested in the fight against poverty in the past two decades, Brazil invested in the reduction of inequality in terms of income and wealth, with the purpose of getting more balance in its development. It has also invested in other dimensions, in addition to the economic one, such as health, education, culture, race/ethnicity, etc. The combination of the outcome of such investments is what may result in more substantial changes in the people's lives. Therefore, the investments made in the two past decades need time and continuity to bring more solid and permanent social gains. The current Brazilian crisis, made well visible in the second half of 2014, threatens precisely the continuation of the programs whose purpose was to reverse the life conditions of the Brazilian population.

3 For more details about the development indices, see document *Indicadores de Desenvolvimento Brasileiro 2001-2012*, available in Portuguese at www.uff.br/observatoriojovem/materia/relatório-indicadores-de-desenvolvimento-brasileiro-2001-2012-revela-que-brasil-eleva-escola. Retrieved on May 20, 2015.

4 Available at <http://exame.abril.com.br/brasil/noticias/brasil-e-120-pais-que-mais-gasta-com-combate-a-pobreza>. Retrieved on May 26, 2015.

Many *desfiliados* (unaffiliated)—to use a category by Castel (2008)—or many excluded—to use a relational category which is, as a result, rather fragile in terms of its characterization—were captured by the social action programs and “promoted”, even without a permanent guarantee that they would remain in the new level they occupy as included. Assisted people were converted into an economic/financial category and, even if under constant threat of losing the status they have, they retain some participation guarantee in the financial game. Such game relies on the State as a sponsor, not only for the individual getting a benefit, but also for the social gradient in which the individual is located.

Official documents insist: from the first decade of the 21st century on, Brazil goes through changes in the life conditions of the poorest. According to data published in the *Report on Brazilian Development Indicators* (Brazil, 2013, p. 14),

The economic growth in the last decade benefitted more significantly the population of lower income, which contributed to reverse the historical inequality in the country. Between 2001 and 2011, the income of the 20% poorer increased in a pace seven times higher than the richer (5.1% per year in the average above inflation at 0.7%). The monthly average household income *per capita* of the 20% poorer went from R\$ 102.00 in 2001 to R\$ 167.00 in 2011.

A sponsoring State, which operates as a business company, affording for the cost of investments that aim to ensure favorable publicity to promote its image, sees itself currently threatened by the present financial and moral crisis that it has been facing.

One cannot deny that the social and the assistance policies contributed to change the life conditions of the Brazilian population. Then, it is not the case to say that the Brazilian biopolitical investments mostly did not pay back in improvement for the population and, consequently, for Brazil as a whole. However, we say that there is a mismatch between such investments and a medium and long-run social policy for social, economic and financial security. The risk taken by Brazil, due to a wild expansion of social and assistance investments, was to generate part of the crisis we are going through currently.

The end of the military dictatorship in Brazil and the openness both in democracy and in the market, which began to happen in the early 1990s, made



several conditions possible so that, in the following decade, most of the investments in the population emerged as a structural need, both national and global. If historically the Brazilian social and economic inequalities undermined the nation's image, in the late 1990s—and mainly in the mid-2000s—, the State investments in the population drew the attention of international investors, as Brazil was now seen as a country *with a and of the future*. The country's image was turned upside-down as now it was under threat both by the internal shakes of moral and legal nature, and by the internal and external economic imbalances (of the *entrepreneurial* and *financial capital*).

Gros (2011), discussing the last courses delivered by Michel Foucault in the *Collège de France*, but with special attention to the course *Birth of bi-politics*, held in 1979, mentions three forms of capitalism uttered by the philosopher. They are: the *mercantile capitalism*, the *industrial capitalism* and the *entrepreneurial/managerial capitalism*. Gros adds another form to these three types of capitalism, which he calls *financial* or *stock-holding capitalism*. For him, the latter form of capitalism emerged in the last decades, produced by the variation in the stock markets. We will not explain each one of them, as we believe this would be unnecessary for the context of this paper; but we focus, even though quickly, the two latter forms mentioned above: the *entrepreneurial/managerial capitalism* and the *financial* or *stock-holding capitalism*.

For the *entrepreneurial/managerial capitalism*, production is associated with planning and strategic actions. The human dynamics are central to mobilize the sophisticated gears of production. Among the strategies that we are able to see emerging in this form of capitalism is *inclusion*. Although inclusion may be interpreted in many other ways, we understand it as we have already discussed earlier, both as an *imperative* and as a *strategy* of the State. An *imperative* since it is imposed with the power of the Law. A *strategy* because, after exceeding the school institution and earning social and assistance expression, it is configured as a set of actions aimed at eradicating extreme poverty, at the social development and the growth of the labor market (Lopes & Fabris, 2013).

There are a lot of assistance programs that could be quoted here, as they dealt with inclusion as a strategy to reverse a present situation. However, as an example, we highlight two of them: the *Program Solidarity Community* (created in 1995) and the *Program to Eradicate Child Labor* (created in 1996).

The Solidarity Community strategy aimed at fighting poverty in Brazil. Its purpose—based on the articulation of resources coming from the State, the private enterprise, and the third sector—was to mobilize economy with

the opening of new jobs. Supported by the “principle of solidarity, the program operated, in 1995, in 302 small towns which faced high percentages of poverty, especially in the Capital cities and metropolitan areas. In 1996, actions were expanded to 1,111 towns and cities”. (Lopes & Rech, 2013, p. 215)

The *Program for the Eradication of Child Labor* had the purpose of withdrawing children from child labor by supplying income to the family whose minimum income *per capita* was up to half minimum wage and with children aged 7 to 14 years. One of the conditions to get the grant from the Program was to keep the child going to school. Such fact, including others, shows how productive school seems to be in the process of social reeducation and implementation of a new social culture. According to Lopes and Rech (2013, p. 216), “according to 2001 data, by the *Institute of Applied Economic Research (IPEA)*, the Program took actions such as: grant “citizen child”, plan to support states of lower human development (PADH), expanded work day, and generation of productive occupations for the families served by PADH”.

For the *financial or stock-holding capitalism*, speculation and indebtedness are major conditions for its best functioning. There were many campaigns of “responsible consumption” which misleading individuals to new needs. For example, people in the context of the *Program My House My Life* were encouraged to consume electric appliances, and they even got a funds card with which they could buy things, with the purpose of keeping the economy functioning and contribute to maintain Brazil’s economic growth even in the moments of crisis. The same happened with technology, when computers could be purchased cheaply, so that a new digital culture of social participation would be disseminated, as well as a culture of digital accessibility. Schools are therefore committed to institute and spread this new culture, as they were encouraged by public educational policies intended to democratize the digital access and inclusion.

Touraine (2011, p. 37)—analyzing the atmosphere of unbridled consumption which was widespread in many countries and benefitted great leaders in detriment of others going poor, as well as when analyzing the dismantling of the banking system and the crisis of capitalism, mainly in the United States—, preserving the differences, gives us clues that we can utilize to interpret the current Brazilian crisis. After all, also in Brazil we have a feeling of the capitalist crisis experienced in several parts of the world. That author (Touraine, 2011) points to two reasons for the decline of a type of capitalism. One of them is the sophisticated and uncontrolled credit operations;



the other reason is the increasing inequalities. Both reasons haunt Brazil, as the investments in the country, along the 2000s, were precisely towards the openness to international markets, the expansion of credit to a greater number of people and the investments in social, educational, and assistance policies. Such policies improved the life conditions of many Brazilians, who now relied on the State in a very close way to get personal and family aids. The education, however, had no time—or faced resistances—to invest in new practices of subjectivation capable of forming, on the long run, subjects for a new culture intended *by and for* the capital.

Although Brazilian education has been summoned to participate in the game of the financial capitalism and to conduct training for competences, education was not able to produce, in such a short time, new subjectivities which, being able at the same time to self-entrepreneur themselves, they would also be capable of taking responsibility for the others. Such responsibility does not mean solidarity and collective strengthening; on the contrary, it means to afford minimal maintenance of competition, able to ensure the economic life of one of the most fragile portions in the gradient of inclusion.

LEARNING SOCIETY, DIGITAL ACCESSIBILITY, AND THE *HOMO ŒCONOMICUS DISCENTIS ACCESSIBILIS*

By seeking to know the objectives of a number of Brazilian governmental programs aimed at the educational field, it is almost inevitable to ask two questions. We do not intend to answer them in this paper, but only bring some elements to think about them: *What is the use of education?* and *How do we understand learning and what is the place learning takes in Brazil today?*

Noguera-Ramirez (2011, p. 230), summarizes:

[...] if the concepts of *doctrina* and *disciplina* have governed the pedagogical reflection along the Middle Age; if *institutio* and *eruditio* have dominated the pedagogical thinking in the 16th and 17th centuries; if *education*, *instruction* and *Bildung* have prevailed between the late 18th century and the early 19th century, the concept of *learning* will be the predominant pedagogical concept in the 20th century and, it seems, the early 21st century.

Still according to the same author, the concept of learning, in its contemporary meaning, is directly linked to the Anglo-Saxon tradition⁵, associated with Biology and the evolutionary theories of the 19th century. The expansion of the concept along the 20th century may be perceived in many documents where the language of education was replaced by the language of learning. Biesta (2013a), arguing the notorious ascent of the concept of learning, exemplifies the fading of education through the more and more faded concept (which many think is now outdated) of teaching and adult education. In Biesta's words, "teaching was redefined as the act of supporting or facilitating learning, as well as education is now often described as conducive of learning opportunities or experiences. Students are now called learners, and adult education became adult learning". (Biesta, 2013a, p. 32). Such an event is in line with elements that characterize a type of neoliberal rationality, insofar as such rationality has in freedom a principle of mobility and constitution of individuals increasingly autonomous, independent, and entrepreneurs of themselves.

Aimed at developing entrepreneurs of the self and individuals who are more autonomous and competitive, Brazil has invested in the formation of subjects who, as they are entrepreneurs and learners for their entire lives, are capable of mobilizing a local business creatively. They are also capable of understanding the lack of jobs as a temporary situation resulting of an alleged individual incapacity of managing one's conditions of employability. In this state of affairs, the lack of learning opportunities ends up being a bigger problem than the lack of work, as the former adversely affects the individual right to learning and the effects of the latter may be minimized by the entrepreneurial spirit of the entrepreneur of the self.

Let's see an example of investments made on learning opportunities. In 2009, the Department of Labor and Employment released the *Manual of Learning*. Such document aimed at clarifying issues associated with the Act of Learning, as well as providing guidance to entrepreneurs about what to do when hiring apprentices. The introduction, signed by Carlos Lupi, then the Secretary of Labor and Employment, reads: "More than a legal obligation, therefore, learning is an action of social accountability and a major factor to promote citizenship, resulting, ultimately, better productivity." (Lupi, 2009, p. 9).

5 For Noguera-Ramirez (2011), the notion of learning would be found rather in the francophone tradition than in the Germanic and Anglo-Saxon traditions.

Biesta (2013b) exposes four tendencies that justify the expansion of learning. They are: 1) the emergence of new learning theories; 2) post-modernity; 3) the silent explosion of adult learning; 4) the erosion of the Welfare State.

The first trend—the “emergence of new learning theories”—, advocates the active nature of those who learn and the active methodologies used for learning, and thus contributes greatly to displace *from* the attention about the activities conducted by the teachers to the attention about the comprehension of learners. In this tendency, teaching loses ground to activities that may be characterized as being the *support* to and *facilitation* of learning.

The second tendency—“post-modernity”—argues that teaching is no longer effective to explain the differences experienced in the present day, and takes identities as referents to meet the individual demands; by acknowledging that school is no longer formative for this new age, it says that the education project is entirely modern and linked to the Enlightenment thinking, therefore it is incapable of meeting the contemporary needs.

The third trend—the “silent explosion of adult learning”—shows how much adults seek new ways/objects of learning in an increasing variety of places. Such places focus on the individual, strengthening certain competitive and individualistic practices.

Tendency number four—the “erosion of the Welfare State”—may be easily associated with the market and neoliberalism. According to it, the learner is a consumer. Families, deemed as responsible for the education of their children, choose the school where they will enroll the children depending on what that specific school offers in terms of the variation of learning and how much the families can interfere with the pedagogical practices; thus the family determines *what, when* and *how* their children’s learning must be unleashed.

In many ways, Noguera-Ramirez (2011)—by problematizing the notion of passivity of the one who learns and by advocating the idea that the learner is an *agent*, that is, he or she acts over him/herself—approaches the arguments sustained by Biesta (2013a, 2013b). In that author’s words, “[...] learning is today the form of pedagogical government, no longer the government of the citizen, but of the “constant learner”, of the *Homo discentis*. Learning throughout life, learning to learn is motto of contemporary government”. (Noguera-Ramirez, 2011, p. 230)

Homo discentis becomes productive in the contemporary time and is useful for a neoliberal rationality because, due to his/her cognitive plasticity

and ability to learn from experience, he/she becomes more skillful in finding individual solutions for everyday problems, as well as he/she is more open to the formation of new interests. Therefore, *Homo discentis* is mobilized by curiosity, by dissatisfaction and interest. The notion of *interest* is linked strategically to the notion of learning, and the interest is found in the very heart of learning as conceived in Modernity and, more specifically, by the pedagogues of the Progressive Pedagogies. Thus, Noguera-Ramirez claims that interest is the core of the modern concept of learning, and justifies that “interest places the individual’s capacity of action in the center of analyses, agency as what distinguishes and particularizes the individual from the liberal society, to the cosmopolitan citizen of the Enlightenment”. (2011, p. 233)

Then, it is through interest that we can bind the *Homo discentis* or the learner to (neo)liberalism throughout life and to the *Homo œconomicus*. Moved by interest, the individual becomes the target of *noopower* and the object of oneself.

When considering the articulation between *Homo œconomicus* and *Homo discentis*, it is possible to realize the construction of an educational process aimed at a capitalism that is occupied with the investors and with the permanent negotiation of values. Inspired in Biesta (2013a, p.37-38), this means:

[...] the learner is the (potential) consumer, the one who has certain needs, in which (2) the teacher, the educating action or the educational institution are seen as the provider, that is, the one that exists to meet the needs of the learner, and in which (3) education itself becomes a commodity—a thing—to be supplied or delivered by the teacher or the educational institution, and to be consumed by the learner. (p. 37-38)

In the course *Birth of biopolitics*, Foucault (2008) sees the *Homo œconomicus*, as an individual who takes him/herself as a target and as capital. In other words, he or she places him/herself an entrepreneur of the self. The individual, instituting him/herself as a business company, fights constantly with the others and with him/herself to aggregate value to what he/she already possesses. As it is all about his/her own capital, he or she fights to satisfy their own interest. In a narcissistic, individual and individualistic action, they compete with themselves. In this Sisyphean game, being available and accessible to others is a fundamental condition so that interests are



remedied by the active practice of permanent learning and, simultaneously, other interests are produced.

Taking further our own investigations and, especially, the insights developed by Noguera-Ramírez (2011), Loureiro (2013) problematizes the Brazilian policies and programs for digital inclusion. By seeking reasons for the strong investments to develop a digital culture among the population, she argues that the abilities required from the *Homo œconomicus* are more and more connected with the access and the use of digital technologies. Loureiro (2013) says more: the programs intended to disseminate digital technologies and promote digital inclusion in education seem to build strategies whose target is the government of those who, due to their precarious life conditions, are not captured or are not accessible to a society of digital educative type.

As we have already argued, according to the logic of inclusion as a strategy to capture everybody, all must be accessible, as well as all must possess minimum conditions to provide their own life conditions. In Saraiva's words (2013, p. 170): "the notion of *Homo œconomicus* is expanded, the economic objectivation must be expanded to all realms of life, including by touching those considered so far as being out of the economic scope". Thus, governmentality is affected as the *Homo œconomicus* unfolds him/herself, that is, by being accessible and having access to a digital world, he/she is capitalized, making investments in his/herself and keeping as a lifelong learner.

Be accessible to access and be accessed seems to be an important condition in the constitution of *Homo œconomicus discentis*. Loureiro (2013, p. 174) points the connection in network and the availability to access and to be accessed as strategies that enhance inclusion, the constitution of entrepreneurs of the self and the electronic governmentality, and asserts that being accessible is a non-negotiable condition in our time. As a result of investments in accessibility and the unbridled struggle for information, the condition of being permanently accessible must translate into a feeling that composes the subjectivity of the individuals. For the author, accessibility, together with the condition of being a lifelong learner, are conditions that make up the *Homo œconomicus*. She calls *Homo œconomicus discentis accessibilis* all those who today are mobilized by learning and called upon by the need to be accessible in order to be the entrepreneur of the self, or to keep themselves included in a higher number of communities which feed differentiated interests. Her argument is quite interesting when she says that digital inclusion works as an extremely important and effective operator for inclusion at large.

Homo œconomicus discentis accessibilis is a polymorphic variant within the species *Homo œconomicus*. Although we are utilizing the concept of species and, linked to it, the concept of polymorphism—both strongly associated with Biology—we are certainly not naturalizing those concepts. We propose a biological analogy just with the purpose of pointing out that cultural-identity, economic, and social variations are not sufficient to define other “species”, but they are only polymorphic variations that allow us to read some variants of the “species” *Homo œconomicus*. *Homo œconomicus discentis accessibilis* may be understood as a sub-species that is identified by the presence, the manifestation and maintenance of some economic behavior.

In the *Homo œconomicus discentis accessibilis*, it is possible to see the operation, in addition to what has already been mentioned in this paper, of a number of policies and programs intended for digital dissemination and inclusion. The target of such policies and programs are those who are more exposed to social risks and, at the same time, they are exposing Brazil to the risk of failing to conquer new positions in the international development and security rankings. Among the many programs spreading digital technologies in the population, put into operation since the 1980's in Brazil, we quote: *Project EDUCOM*, implemented in 1983; *National Program of Educational Information Technology (PRONINFE)*, implemented in 1989; *National Program of Information Technology in Education (PROINFO)*, implemented in 1997; and *Program A Computer per Student*, implemented in 2010.⁶ In all these programs, education is mentioned as a condition for change and school appears as a crucial element to create a new culture of rights, of autonomy and of permanent learning for all.

CONCLUSION

Closing this paper, produced in the seam that we have developed in our research groups, we aim to have shown how social action and inclusion policies operate in Brazil as strategies of biopolitical government over the population. Operating with educational, economical and financial discursive practices, among others, about the life of every individual in particular, such strategies create a subspecies of *Homo œconomicus*, that is, *Homo œconomicus discentis accessibilis* (Loureiro, 2013).

6 For a detailed discussion about such Programs, see Loureiro (2013).



In the constitution of the lifelong learner or the constitution of a kind of learning subjectivity lies the current condition for the maintenance of the government of the individuals' behavior. In other words, in capturing the interest of the one who learns is the possibility of transforming the individual into an entrepreneur of himself; it is, also, the possibility of changing certain individual difficulties into new challenges to be overcome with more investments in learning and in the development of competences.

In Brazil, there is a bet in the education of individuals so that they will replace the relationship poverty–exclusion by the lack of competence–in/exclusion. In this logic of investment, there is not an exclusion that is not thought in relation to some situation of inclusion. Therefore, the situations of exclusion, resulting from extreme abandonment of the individual by the State, are reduced; but the situations of temporary exclusion due to the competences of individuals to revert the game of exclusion into in/exclusion increase.

Finally, in the production of the *Homo oeconomicus discentis* is the possibility for Brazil to write a different history, although under the constant threats of making life and work more precarious, side by side with an increasing political, moral and economic fragility. Moreover: in the production of the *Homo oeconomicus discentis accessibilis* is the possibility of the State to control more effectively its population, especially those social fractions hitherto marginalized and, so even, less accessible to such controls.

REFERENCES

- BAUMAN, Z. (1998). *O mal-estar da pós-modernidade*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar editor.
- BIESTA, G.J.J. (2013a). *Para além da aprendizagem: Educação democrática para um futuro humano*. Belo Horizonte/São Paulo: Autêntica Editora.
- BIESTA, G.J.J. (2013b). *The beautiful risk of education*. Boulder, Co: Paradigm Publishers.
- BRAZIL (2001). *Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil*. São Paulo: Saraiva.
- BRAZIL (2004). Plano Nacional de Educação 2001. In *Direito à educação: subsídios para a gestão dos sistemas educacionais—orientações gerais e marcos legais*. Brasília: MEC/SEESP.
- BRAZIL (2013). *Indicadores de desenvolvimento brasileiro 2001-2012*. Brasília: Governo Federal.



- CASTEL, R. (2008). *A discriminação negativa. Cidadãos ou autóctones?* Petrópolis, Rio de Janeiro: Vozes.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2008). *Nascimento da biopolítica. Curso no Collège de France (1978-1979)*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
- GROS, F. (2011). Direito dos governados, biopolítica e capitalismo. In I. Neutzling & C. M. Ruiz (Org.). *O (des)governo biopolítico da vida humana* (pp. 105-122). São Leopoldo: Casa Leiria.
- HARDT, M. & NEGRI, A. (2003). *Império*. Rio de Janeiro: Record.
- LASTA, L. L. (2015) *Políticas de Assistência Social no Brasil: o governo da vida pela proteção e inclusão social*. PhD Thesis, UFRGS, Porto Alegre, Brazil.
- LAZZARATO, M. (2014) *Signos, máquinas, subjetividades*. São Paulo: SESC, n-1 edições.
- LOPES, M. C. (2009). Políticas de Inclusão e Governamentalidade. *Educação & Realidade* 34(2), pp. 153-169. Retrieved on May 16, 2015, from <http://seer.ufrgs.br/educacaoerealidade/article/view/8297/5536>
- LOPES, M. C. (2015). Inclusão como estratégia e imperativo de Estado: a educação e a escola na produção de sujeitos capazes de incluir. In H. de Resende (org.), *Michel Foucault: o governo da infância* (pp. 291-304). Belo Horizonte: Autêntica.
- LOPES, M. C. & DAL'IGNA, M.C. (Org.). (2007). *In/Exclusão nas tramas da escola*. Canoas: ULBRA.
- LOPES, M. C. & HATTGE, M. (Org.). (2009). *Inclusão escolar: conjunto de práticas que governam*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica.
- LOPES, M. C. & FABRIS, E. H. (2013). *Inclusão & educação*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica.
- LOPES, M. C. & RECH, T. L. (2013). Inclusão, biopolítica e educação. *Revista Educação*, 36(2), pp. 210-219. Retrieved on May 25, 2015, from <http://revistaseletronicas.pucrs.br/ojs/index.php/faced/article/view/12942>
- LOUREIRO, C. B. (2013). *Disseminação das tecnologias digitais e promoção da inclusão digital na educação pública: estratégias da governamentalidade eletrônica*. PhD Thesis, São Leopoldo: UNISINOS. Retrieved on May 25, 2015, from <http://www.michelfoucault.com.br/?teses,42>
- LUPI, C. (2009). Introdução. In BRASIL. *Manual da aprendizagem: o que é preciso saber para contratar o aprendiz*. Brasília: MTE, SIT, SPPE, ASCOM.
- NOGUERA-RAMÍREZ, C. E. (2011). *Pedagogia e governamentalidade ou da Modernidade como uma sociedade educativa*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica.
- SARAIVA, K. (2013). Educando para viver sem riscos. *Revista Educação*, 36(2), pp. 168-169. Retrieved on May 25 2015, from <http://revistaseletronicas.pucrs.br/ojs/index.php/faced/issue/view/697>



- SPOSATI, A. (2002). Movimentos utópicos da contemporaneidade. In M. Sorrentino (Org). *Ambientalismo e participação na sociedade*. São Paulo: EDUC/FAPESP.
- TOURAINE, A. (2011). *Após a crise. A decomposição da vida social e o surgimento de atores não sociais*. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- VEIGA-NETO, A. (2008). Crise da Modernidade e inovações curriculares: da disciplina para o controle. In E. Peres et al. (Orgs.). *Trajetórias e processos de ensinar e aprender: sujeitos, currículos e culturas*, pp. 35-58. Porto Alegre: EDIPUCRS.
- VEIGA-NETO, A. & LOPES, M. C. (2007). Inclusão e governamentalidade. *Educação e Sociedade [Especial]*, 28(100), 947-963.
- VEIGA-NETO, A. & LOPES, M. C. (2011). Inclusão, exclusão, in/exclusão. *Verve*, 20. São Paulo: Nu-Sol, 212-135.

*

Received: September 4, 2015

Final version received: December 15, 2015

Published online: December 30, 2015



**INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION IN CHILE:
COLONIAL SUBJECTIVITY AND ETHNO-GOVERNMENTAL RATIONALITY**

PATRICIO LEPE-CARRIÓN
patriciolepe@gmail.com | University of Chile

ABSTRACT

This article is the product of research conducted in the frame of FONDECYT Research Initiation project n° 11140804, entitled “Education and Cultural Racism: Evidence and Discursivities in Agents Who Implement the Bilingual Intercultural Education Program (PEIB)”, jointly conducted by the University of Chile’s Department of Pedagogical Studies and the University of Sao Paulo’s Faculty of Education Postdoctoral Program. The text explores the problem of “cultural racism” in intercultural education programs developed for Mapuche indigenous children in Chile. In order to do so, we first examine the production of subjectivity during the colonial era and later the emergence of ethnic issues in the current government agenda. Our evidence and analysis display how the degradation of indigenous peoples is objectified in the Chilean State’s discursive practices, perpetuating social and economic inequality through the production and administration of identities, as well as efficiently controlling ethnic conflicts.

KEY WORDS

Racism; Governmentality; Intercultural education; Mapuche people; Chile.



SISYPHUS

JOURNAL OF EDUCATION

VOLUME 3, ISSUE 3,

2015, PP. 60-87

Intercultural Education in Chile: Colonial Subjectivity and Ethno-Governmental Rationality

Patricio Lepe-Carrión

INTRODUCTION

Opposed to European countries, where educational efforts concentrate on integrating immigrants into Western culture, in Chile and the rest of Latin America, intercultural education poses more complex issues, given its focus on the experience of domination and exploitation of indigenous peoples during the conquest and later during the eras of colonization and the development of Nation-States. This inferiority complex, or the “colonial wound” (Mignolo, 2003, 2007), upheld by racism (Quijano, 2000) and its consequential processes of subjugation, such as sixteenth- and seventeenth-century evangelization campaigns (Lepe-Carrión, 2012d), followed by the eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Bourbon “utilitarian” education (Lepe-Carrión, 2012a), provided the foundation for constructing all future social representations surrounding “indigenous” peoples (specifically the Mapuche), as well as the modes of relating to the system of symbols, rituals, and institutions imagined and created by the creole class: that is, the “Chilean nation” (Anderson, 1993; Lepe-Carrión, 2012c; Valenzuela M., 2008).

This article is organized into two parts: in the first part, we attempt to illustrate a history of the processes of subjectification, enabled by the manipulation of “indigenous” people (the Mapuche), both as an object of civilization and fertile breeding ground for the manual labor force.

In the second part, we contextualize the Bilingual Intercultural Education Program (PEIB), which, over the last two decades, has developed into an essential part of the Chilean multicultural paradigm or ethno-governmental rationality (Boccaro, 2007; Boccaro & Bolados, 2010; Foucault, 1999a, 1999b). This program has become part of a unique historical process in which the State acts as an agent of particular external forces, appearing to act in the best interest of the indigenous population's quality of life.

Far from elaborating a history of ideas, we attempt to address the rise of the colonial matrix of power and identify a model of evangelization and education which influence the institutional racism¹ currently operating in education policies and lead to alarming social inequality in regards to indigenous affairs (CASEN, 2015; Nahuelpan, 2012).

The State's agency organizes the praxis that articulates this set of practices and discourses on indigenous "inferiorization" (in this case, of Mapuche culture and life). However, inferiorization practices are also prevalent in other governmentality schooling initiatives that render public education a tool for reproducing social and economic inequality by capitalizing on the manual and unskilled labor force.

Therefore, new tactics disguised by the idea of "cultural and linguistic fundamentalism" are used in the attempt to administer Mapuche and non-Mapuche identities, while also efficiently controlling the complex panorama of ethnic conflict in southern Chile. Evidently, this proves a violent and radical method to depoliticize the "field of education" in regards to social and economic demands of a historically discriminated group of people.

¹ Regarding the concepts of "race" and "racism", we must clarify three issues. First of all, the idea of "race" exists long before its biological connotation appeared in the nineteenth century (scientific racism). Its use became popular in the practices of differentiation and hierarchal structuring of the work force, along with unequal accumulation and distribution of recompenses; in other words, it served as an ideological justification for colonial domination that arose in the fifteenth century during the "invention" of America (Quijano, 2000; Wallerstein, 1989). Second of all, more than a biological reality, the concept of "race" is an intellectual and social construct impregnated with diverse cultural meanings and consolidated on the basis of different historical processes (Hering Torres, 2003a, 2003b, 2007). Finally, this very concept of race came to create new definitions of inclusion-exclusion during the construction of the Nation-State; social relations were "racialized", establishing a very subtle continuance between "race struggle" and "class struggle".

CONSTRUCTING THE COLONIAL SUBJECT: THE JESUIT MISSION

Fifty years after the debate of Valladolid over the nature of the “Indian” and his place in Western civilization (Lepe-Carrión, 2012b), in Chile another debate arose that would transform the authoritarian and bloody strategies implemented by the Spanish against the indigenous population. This debate led to a new mode of articulating imperial interests of domination based on a particular kind of “disciplining”, implemented or mediated by religious congregations, primarily the Jesuits. This strategy is not only considered a key precedent in the formation of Emancipation thought during the nineteenth century (“national subject” or “economic subject”), but also—and primarily—as a fundamental element in defining the differences between “barbarism and civilization” or in the construction of the colonial subject in seventeenth-century Chile.

Following Homi Bhabha, we believe the idea of a “colonial subject” suggests both the colonizer and the colonized, and that it is impossible to conceive the colonized process of subjectification without the presence—minimal as it may be—of the dominating subject (Bhabha, 2002). Therefore, in said construction of the “colonial subject”, there must always be a “relation of power” sewn between both subjects who recognize and identify each other as such. Rolena Adorno (1988) reminds us that in “recognizing” the Other, the colonial subject recognizes himself. In this case, the limits that defined specific identities were constructed when the Spanish colonizer established a hierarchy of his position over the colonized and, simultaneously, the latter imagined and resisted colonization in constant tension with relations of power (between European superiority against the indigenous and later against the *mestizo*).

During the prolonged Arauco War (1550-1656), and after the so-called “Battle of Curalaba”, which demoralized the Spanish with enormous death tolls—including Governor García Oñez de Loyola—and the destruction of several cities in southern Chile, debates arose around “indigenous slavery”, already in illegal practice for many years prior. Although inspired by terror and the desire for revenge, the Spanish in Chile requested that the Crown legalize said practice as an excuse for military auxiliary against the natives. The Crown responded in favor: “[...] declaro y mando: Que todos los indios [...] sean avidos y tenidos por esclavos suyos, y como tales se



puedan servir de ellos y venderlos, darlos y disponer de ellos a su voluntad"² (España, 1608).

Before mandating this dire resolution, around the year 1599, the first justifications regarding the problem of slavery began to be voiced, albeit of a practical nature. After fighting ceased in Curalaba, *encomenderos*, clergy, and soldiers all found themselves in a similar state of devastation, and slavery posed a definitive solution to the Conquest's downfalls: "the war would end and prosperity would come, the land would be settled and the mines would be worked, and the barbarians would receive the punishment they so deserved" (Jara, 1971). A notable record that represents the general opinion on slavery during this period is a text by the Licenciado Melchor Calderón, entitled *Tratado de la importancia y utilidad que hay en dar por esclavos a los indios rebelados de Chile* [Treatise on the Importance and Utility of Enslaving the Rebelled Indians of Chile] (Calderón, 1607).

Melchor Calderon's treatise had an enormous impact, not only due to the title's lack of subtlety but also because the content represented the feelings of a large portion of the Spanish and emerging creole community.

The public launching of the work took place in a solemn cathedral in Santiago, attended by distinguished members of the era's different elitist classes. On this occasion, Melchor Calderón delivered a heartfelt and eloquent speech in which, shedding several tears, he recalled the death of Governor García Oñez de Loyola. Then, with his "Treatise" in hand, he asked none other than the Rector of the Society of Jesus College to read it for all present—after all, the same rector had previously spoken out in favor of capturing "Indians", enslaving them, and even burning them at the stake for heretics (Hanisch, 1974).

Melchor Calderon's Treatise never intended to reflect on the problem of slavery, as one may suspect from its title. Rather, it meant to express the sentiments of an era in order to illustrate a form of sovereign thought: the "*ego conquiro*" ("I conquer"), which had been evolving since the first days of the conquest. This mode of thinking was founded on articulating the colonial economy with that of the metropolis, as well as subjugating Indians, considered barbarians (not even subjects capable of improvement through illicit slavery) and an impediment in the sovereign process of domination near the

2 "[...] I declare and mandate: That all Indians [...] be taken as slaves, and as such they shall serve, be sold, given away, or used as seen fit."

end of the sixteenth century. Hence, Melchor Calderon's Treatise appeared as a consensual voice under the sovereign power formula of "make die and let live", meaning the indomitable and irremediable Indian could be eliminated without a guilty conscious—the King decided whether subordinates had the right to life or death (Foucault, 2000).

The conquering enterprise seriously questioned the real "utility" of indigenous peoples, given the fact that they had no labor disciplining, were unable to produce surplus, and completely unfamiliar with the modes of capitalist production, depriving them of the necessary conditions to enter the modern colonial economic system (Pinto Rodríguez, 1996).

The exploitation of indigenous peoples implied posing a serious ontological question or, more accurately, said exploitation constituted the raw material (epistemic, moral, and politically considered) for future reflections on the issue of the "subject" ("ego cogito"), or if those half-naked bodies constituted or not a real existence. Here underlies the first methodical doubt: since the "Indian" lacks reason and thought, he does not exist as "humanity" (European imaginary) and therefore, the *encomienda* system, personal service, sexual exploitation, and even the death of Indians are all justified. On one side is the conqueror (subject-culture) and on the other very distant side the indigenous peoples (object-nature) (Castro-Gómez, 2005; Dussel, 2000, 2008; Maldonado-Torres, 2007).

The seventeenth century is characterized by an emerging subjugation, where the "indigenous" is constructed as a (colonial) "subject", his identity invented or represented by the European through exclusion, omission, and silencing. His place in the world arises from the position taken at the moment of encounter with that "other", with his "constitutive outside" which he questions and which questions him; since it is in the distancing, in the "suture", where the construction of identity happens (Hall, 1996). Such a construction determines the role one can occupy within the capitalist economy. This role is clearly conditioned as a fixed value based on "human qualities", evidenced through lineage, through blood.

The colonial project implied a process of construction that would transform "indomitable Indians" into "productive Indians". Logically, slavery and death were too costly compared to "evangelical (and hence, civil) fabrication" of the natives, who, in the long run, turned into "humans" with an enormous potential for production within local markets in favor of the Spanish Crown.



From this point of reference, we can acknowledge the Rate of Santillán in 1558 as the first labor legislation that transformed illegal manual labor into a key element within the world capitalist order, which began to enforce imperial interests. Enacted by García Hurtado de Mendoza, the legislation introduced a set of regulations meant to regulate labor relations between the Spanish and indigenous people. Though it apparently consisted of consenting a more humane sense to the *encomienda* system, the decree was in reality a mechanism of production that the colonial economy offered in order to accelerate the transition from the “savage Indian” to the “domestic worker”.

Thus, during the beginning of the seventeenth century, a new project was introduced, determined not only to conquer indigenous territories but also to subsume the culture of the “Indians of Chile” (*Reche*) into the archetypical Spanish culture. More precisely, the project aimed to “civilize”—by evangelism—the barbarous native, converting him into an inhabitant of the nation, into a worker domesticated by culture. The following quote illustrates the basis of this project:

[...] it was imperative to continue colonization: sowing the land, raising churches and houses, exploiting the mines. All this required the manual labor of submissive Indians. Indoctrinate them, conquer them with the faith and teach them Spanish (because ‘language is an instrument of indoctrination,’ and the Indians needed to speak Spanish to understand the instructions of their new masters) was the second purpose that the missions in particular set out to accomplish (Labarca, 1939, p. 8)

The administration of this evangelical strategy reveals many parallels with the events discussed at Valladolid. Called the “defensive war”, this project was led by the Spanish Jesuit priest Luis de Valdivia (1560-1642), paradoxically the same rector of the Jesuit College who publically read Melchor Calderon’s text in the cathedral of Santiago to encourage the legalization of enslaving indigenous peoples. This priest was—undoubtedly—inspired by the ideas of Bartolomé de Las Casas and a known promoter of the first reforms that began to take place in Chile upon the arrival of the Society of Jesus (1593), and which also reproduce to some extent the discussion of “natural” people; that is, whether or not evangelization should use force, whether or not Indians were apostates, and, of course, whether or not Indians should be captured for use as “personal service”. Though Father Valdivia first sup-

ported the enslavement of Indians, he later defended their rights, according to historiographical accounts (Jara, 1971). However, it is not for us to judge his double standards.

In order to fully comprehend the project employed by the “defensive war”, it is necessary to take into account the earlier work of the Jesuit priest José de Acosta in Peru, considered a precursor to Valdivia (Pinto Rodríguez, 1988). In 1588, Acosta had published his *De Procuranda Indorum Salute*, not only the first work written by a Jesuit priest in America but also the basis for systematic reflection on the role of the “missions”. In *De Procuranda*, we can identify five issues that constitute what may be the pillars of ensuing misology: 1) Indians can be true Christians; 2) evangelization cannot neglect the conquest; 3) evangelization must begin with the indigenous culture; 4) knowledge of indigenous religions; and 5) a different model of indoctrination (Marzal, 1998).

How long the judicial procedure of the “defensive war” lasted and the details of its accomplishments are of little consequence now. If failure can be found in this entire procedure, clearly it was not the Hispanic-Mapuche peace “treaty”. On the contrary, failure can be attributed entirely to the outdated sovereign apparatus that violently devised against native culture and was confronted by the persistent resistance of people who permanently wanted to destroy that “colonial difference”.

However, it is important to emphasize that in the Kingdom of Chile the “defensive war” was introduced as an emerging historic process that symbolizes, firstly, an imaginary border differentiating between the barbarians and the civilized; and, secondly, the rise of a new modality in power relations: discipline.

The colonial power, or the diagram of power we are describing, constitutes a matrix that operates along a double meaning: it is simultaneously macro-political and micro-political. In other words, it constitutes both a macro structure of domination on a global scale while a series of technologies operate on a subjective level. These two levels cannot be separated as if they belonged to two independent powers: it is impossible to understand indigenous slavery or evangelization without comprehending the political grid within the Spanish empire, or the latter’s intimate relationship with other emerging empires (such as the English, Dutch, or French).

The techniques of individuation, for example, only acquire meaning when they are observed in the light of change (primarily economic change)



occurring within the colonial world order. However, the referenced macro structure, or the idea of totality in a specified sense, cannot be seen as a mere abstraction or entelechy; much to the contrary, we believe the power expressed in the practices and techniques of the seventeenth century are very concrete and visible (Castro-Gómez, 2007; Deleuze & Guattari, 2002).

Jesuit priests used a variety of political strategies to silently influence the processes of subjectification during the colonial era, including “evangelization” (or rather “disciplinary power”), the Missions, Parliaments, commerce, Indian schools, the establishment of chiefs and ambassadors, and elitist pedagogical techniques. Inferiorization of the Indian, and later the *mestizo*, was not an immediate outcome that derived from a macro structure, rather the result of inconspicuous work of micro agencies operating on the level of individual conduct, which “straightened”, “civilized”, and “integrated” them into the implicit and explicit norms of the empire (Bocara, 1996).

Jesuit missionary expansion was primarily connected to disciplinary mechanisms, the foundation of educational institutions (or those of confinement) aiming to transmit routine conduct to natives, or to the “government of their souls”, through surveillance, inquisition, and constant and systematic examination.

Over the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, a series of educational institutions emerged in Chile that would, on the one hand, extend or reverberate evangelization techniques introduced during the “defensive war” and, on the other, perpetuate a model of education already in course in Europe.

Although schools and universities during that period were administered by different religious congregations (Mercedarians, Franciscans, Dominicans, Augustinians, and Jesuits), we must recognize that Jesuits gained respect and admiration from their peers for their efficient (and ambitious) pedagogical methods and contents (Aedo-Richmond, 2000; Labarca, 1939).

Members of the Society of Jesus implemented the *Ratio Studiorum* (s/a, 1599) as a way of organizing and practicing their teachings into a homogeneous body. As an official study plan, this document does not necessarily reflect on pedagogy but rather outlines a group of methodologies, curricular advice, and extremely strict regulations ultimately meant to discipline both students and teachers. Discipline—let us recall—does not only refer to theoretical knowledge, but also to certain molding techniques carried out through regulation and surveillance of routine activities (Foucault, 2006).

Emile Durkheim (1983) indicates that “discipline” constituted the most original, superior, and efficient factor of Jesuit pedagogy, which could be distinguished by two fundamental principles. The first principle is characterized by the permanent and close contact the educator maintained with the student, not only meant to hinder any sort of “deviant conduct”, but also to closely study and transform the student’s “character and habits”. To achieve this goal, the educator developed strategies to reach the students’ minds and persuade them love him; that is, to generate a bond of friendship and dependency so strong as to extend beyond merely scholastic contexts, in many cases to the extreme of death.

The second fundamental principle is characterized by emulation or competition, in which students were forced to endure strict regimens of competitive quarrels and segmentation within the classroom. Students were divided into two groups or armies, the “Romans” and the “Carthaginians”, who lived in constant imperial rivalry. Once a month, each army of students was required to form a strict hierarchy of dignitary positions: an *emperor* (dictator or consul), a praetor, a tribune, and several senators. Furthermore, each army was divided into “decuries”, or subgroups of ten students led by a decurion elected by the aforementioned high dignitaries. Each decury, ranked from best to worst, depending on student performance, competed with its equivalent counterpart in the opposing camp (Durkheim, 1983; Foucault, 2002). In Chile, these divisions of positions and dignitaries were neither specific nor strict, and the number of students was considerably lower.

What we seek to underscore in this perverse competitive system is the relevance of such hierarchy. Not only did the dignitary positions become a clear reference and object of desire in that they endowed students with power and considerable superiority over their classmates; the model used to construct a citizen-subject—other times called “subordinate”—also became the perfect representation of the Chilean society Chile the colony was attempting to form at that moment in history. This model can be understood as the classroom itself, both in its spatial and temporal structures, as well as in the practices the educators exercised over students or select students over other students.

As Durkheim most cogently points out, Jesuit schools turned into small cities where each student acted as an official. There, awards and punishment—or honorific distinctions—gave cause to reinforce and maintain a world in which differences were naturalized on the basis of a life struggle

according to aptitude. This system also inculcated the unrestricted recognition or respect for noble dignitaries. The incidental aspects of what we have illustrated here reside in that the aforementioned abilities and conditions of nobility were intimately related to a blood line or lineage, which very rapidly began justifying, through the instruction of National History as a scientific argument, that in Europe the (ontological) distance between Europeans and non-Europeans was fully on the rise, and that lineage would “rationally” legitimize such differences. Eighteenth- and nineteenth-century creoles, with less contaminated or less stained blood than *mestizos*, appropriated this discourse as a perverse mechanism to dominate and exploit during the first years of the construction of the Nation-State.

Jesuit education was always directed at different, very segregated social groups: Spaniards and creoles, *mestizos*, and Indians. There were schools for the future leaders of colonial society and exclusive schools for the children of leaders. Such is the case of the San Francisco Javier boarding school, founded in 1611, where conditions for admittance were closely related to bloodline: applicants were required to be the legitimate children of a marriage between decent people. Likewise, children of indigenous parents were denied admission under all circumstances, even if they came from a legitimate marriage (Silva Santa Cruz, 2010).

The first and most significant Jesuit school was the Colegio Máximo de San Miguel, founded in 1594, which began by teaching Grammar, and later Theology and Philosophy, establishing since then a “racially” differentiated educational program:

the five priest-teachers who worked at the school divided their educational work in the following manner: in teaching Spanish, one dedicated his time to the Indians of Arauco; another to Black slaves and two to the Spanish population; and the last one taught introductory writing (Aedo-Richmond, 2000, p. 16).

The indigenous population was only taught basic elements of agriculture, artisan work, and manual trades, such as carpentry, ceramics, shoemaking, weaving, tanning, boat building, ironwork, tailoring, furniture, jewelry, painting, and construction (primarily of churches and cathedrals); and very rarely rudimentary reading and writing skills. Although the first Jesuits advocated for abolishing slavery, they nonetheless reaped the benefits of the

encomienda system. However, following the First Provincial Congress, they abandoned the *encomiendas*, replacing them with a system of labor service tenancy (*inquilinaje*).

The Society of Jesus was the first promoter of “*inquilinaje*” in Chile, an institution that would eventually transform its many and large estates into renowned agricultural and artisan schools (Aedo-Richmond, 2000). In fact, in 1740, with the arrival of German Jesuits who taught manual and industrial trades, the Society already had huge estates in Calera de Tango, Santiago, Andalién, Mendoza, Concepción, La Serena, and Valparaíso.

Far into the eighteenth century, “service and manual trades” continued to be attributed to *mestizos*, Indians, Blacks and mulattos. Nobility rejected such activities as “scantly noble” and under no circumstance could public offices or high reputation positions be filled by people “stained” with native blood. Even the Jesuits required their school teachers and professors to provide a statute of blood cleanliness with proof of European ancestry and, as a separate requirement, demonstrate they had never undertaken a “servile” activity or trade (Frontaura Arana, 1892; Labarca, 1939). Regardless, this method of selection was self-regulated through education, which, racialized or segmented according to indigenous origin, fostered manual or “servile” labor at Jesuit estates and schools as a means to maintain self-sufficiency. This system introduced a *sui generis* mode of compassionate domination, where indigenous people went from being slaves to tenant laborers.

This does not only mean—as this historian emphasizes—“that Jesuits substantially contributed to the economic development of Chile” (Aedo-Richmond, 2000, p. 18). It also, more importantly means that they contributed to installing a system of organizing the work force, “racialized” through “education”, which guaranteed its permanent reproduction. Mario Góngora describes this system as continuing to “provide in the future laborers, tenants, and other servants” (Góngora, 1960, p. 95). If this implies contributing to a country’s economic development, we cannot ignore that this system holds one of the central social practices of work differentiation in the formation process of Nation-States during the nineteenth century.

The paradox of the entire colonial education system in Chile is that “educating” (or “civilizing”) the Indian turns into a violent process of “inferiorization”. As a last resort, religion, understood as we have outlined it above, acquired a fundamental role as a power apparatus within the



modern/colonial world system of fixing and constructing colonial mentalities and manners that positioned natives below the ethnic superiority of Europeans.

During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with the arrival of the Bourbons and later with the Independence process, education would no longer be the church's exclusive responsibility, transformed into a State apparatus to eradicate poverty and idleness (Lepe-Carrión, 2012a). As such, education would slowly become an institution that, although endorsed by a progressive and urban discourse, maintained intact the system of differentiation and hierarchy of the labor force based on the idea of "race".

EMERGENCE OF ETHNO-GOVERNMENTAL RATIONALITY AND DEPOLITICIZATION OF INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION

The racism grounded in our colonial past has not disappeared. On the contrary, it has been reinvented under different systems, primarily as "cultural fundamentalism" (Stolcke, 1999; Taguieff, 1991; Wallerstein & Balibar, 1991). Currently, in this neoliberal, modern, and commercialized vortex, racism is restored through the means of a complex cultural dissimulation (Lepe-Carrión, 2012b), which embraces diversity as a strategy to legitimize a single space of discussion and control over ethnic issues. "Neoliberal multiculturalism" (Hale, 2007), also referred to as "new multicultural logic of world capitalism" (Zizek, 1998), is the principal characteristic of the world's most sophisticated democracies, even when it adopts names as complex as "interculturality" (Cruz Rodríguez, 2013).

As a government strategy, interculturality has lost its "critical" vision regarding the racial structures that sustain social inequality, ever since it became associated with world multiculturalism. This explains why there is such a profound discordance between government discourse and that of indigenous communities, who interpret interculturality as a paradigm and project undergoing constant development. Such development is seen to cover ethical, political, and epistemic dimensions that reach beyond mere encounters, or dialogues and coexistence, since interculturality requires profound revisions and restructuring of all the social and political institutions and activities involved in the processes of subordination (Tubino, 2005a, 2005b; Viaña, 2010; Walsh, 2002a, 2010).



The interculturality that appears in official discourse has turned into a useful tool for methods of domination, given it conceals a new form of ethnic discrimination and segregation through the recognition and respect of the other, as long as he/she continues being the other (Žižek, 1998). That is to say, a new way to culturally differentiate citizens between normal and “internal others” (Briones, 1998a; González Casanova, 2006) who must integrally preserve their customs and traditions. As such, their exoticization or folklorization will lead to cultural “recognition” and paradoxically “distance” them from the homogenization of the national spirit.

In the years following the dictatorship (1973-1990), the successive governments of the Concertación³ began introducing a series of debates concerning the country’s historic debt with “indigenous ethnicities”. These debates resulted in several agreements outlining a set of demands regarding territory, recognition, self-government, and cultural and linguistic rights.

The first debates over indigenous issues, during the government of Patricio Aylwin (1990-1994), instituted the Indigenous Law N°19.253 (Chile, 1993), which recognizes and promotes cultural diversity, introduces mechanisms of interaction between the State and indigenous peoples (Boccarda & Bolados, 2010). For example, the National Corporation for Indigenous Development (CONADI) is a product of this law, currently constituting one of the most relevant establishments for the promotion, coordination, and execution of policies referring to indigenous peoples.

Since then, a vast government initiative was launched to seek the “inclusion” of indigenous peoples through their participation in community, health, and intercultural education. The first manifestation of this new wave of interest in indigenous affairs appeared in 2001 through the “Integral Development of Indigenous Communities Program” (Orígenes), financed with loans from the Inter-American Development Bank and the Ministry of Education (MINEDUC). As time passed, it became clear that the government sought to turn Chile into a pluricultural and multiethnic country. Institutionalization of an intercultural discourse became evermore apparent in the rhetoric of State and parastatal agents. Even President Michelle Bachelet, during her first term beginning in 2008, spoke of a “Social pact for multiculturalism”,

3 Center-left political coalition that has governed since the end of the dictatorship to date (currently under the name of the New Majority) with only one interruption from 2010-2014, when a center-right government took office.



which consisted of recognizing obsolete aspects of the pacts signed by previous governments with indigenous peoples, and announced a new plan of action for revising the “political system, rights, and institutionalism”. Even more recently, during her second term, Bachelet, in her State of the Union speech on May 21, 2014, declared her aim to establish quality public education in which “all students are educated to be intercultural citizens” (Chile, 2014). This State interest in multicultural issues, where the indigenous appear as a population subject to needs and aspirations, and where their lives are the object of intervention through imperceptible techniques to shape conduct, is what we call here “ethno-governmental rationality” (Boccaro, 2007; Boccaro & Bolados, 2010; Foucault, 1999a, 1999b).

Intercultural education came about through the Bilingual Intercultural Education Program (PEIB), introduced within the framework of Education Reform (García-Huidobro & Cox, 1999) as a way to fill deep gaps in the current education plans, since school curriculum had not been adapted to indigenous contexts.

Though the old education model had undergone multiple transformations, it remained untouched as a homogenizing State strategy to address cultural diversity. It must be noted, however, that the idea of “contextualizing” education in schools for indigenous girls and boys is not the latest product of multicultural ecstasy, rather it comes from a long list of disputes, complaints, and demands by a significant number of leaders of indigenous communities, professors, and intellectuals that date back to 1920 (Cañulef M., 1998).

Regardless of the flaws regarding methodologies and cultural appropriateness (Rother, 2005; Williamson, 2006), the PEIB has had an unpredictable territorial impact, which undoubtedly, for multiculturalism’s proponents, reinforces and institutionally strengthens its continued presence in government strategies. The PEIB has turned into the fundamental operating hand of social policies (Educación, 2011; Williamson, 2012). However, this has not only occurred in connection with Chile’s problems of segregation, but also—primarily—in harmony with “transnational cultural flows” of recognition of diversity and ethno-development (Appadurai, 2001; Hannerz, 1998).

On the basis of the above, if the concept of “interculturality” used in Chile is “functional” to the State’s absolute control of ethnic conflict, we should pose the following questions: under what apparatuses of knowledge/power, or expert knowledge, does the government intervene, organize, establish hierarchies, and legitimize intercultural discourse? Furthermore,

how does interculturality in Chile also become functional for neoliberal multicultural interests? Or even, what idea of “culture” is shuffled into the rhetoric of governmentality, specifically through the PEIB, and to what extent can this idea become an instrument of ethnic differentiation? What are the social representations of the “indigenous”, “traditional”, “patrimonial”, and “authentic” that ethno-governmental apparatuses are producing and reproducing through the discursive practices of PEIB agents?

All these questions, which deserve extensive analysis, can be gathered under the prism of a single problem: the presence of racism in schools has not completely disappeared, and although enormous efforts have attempted to diminish discriminatory processes and practices, racism persists through “cultural” resignation and linguistic fundamentalism, spawning segregation effects. As long as the agents that implement the PEIB, as a normalizing apparatus to shape the population’s conducts, do not adopt a “critical” perspective of interculturality, void of this type of fundamentalism, schools will continue to be sources of social inequality and exclusion.

However, what exactly does “critical interculturality” mean in an inter-ethnic context, and how does it relate to the idea of multiculturalism?

Critical interculturality is an ethical, political and epistemic project that aims to construct a society where dialogue sustains the relationships between cultures (Fornet-Betancourt, 2001; Tubino, 2005a, 2005b; Walsh, 2002a, 2010). However, in order for dialogue to exist, a mutual recognition must already exist, difficult to achieve in a world where inequality or social, economic, political, and power asymmetries are so abysmal, and have for centuries maintained a system of domination and subjugation of one people over another. Thus, only in a critical sense, interculturality “clears horizons and opens paths that confront the still-persistent colonialism” and offers “social and political transformation, transformation of the structures of thought, action, dreams, being, loving, and living” (Walsh, 2009).

Both the micro and macro dimensions of interculturality—meaning the levels of interpersonal and structural relations, such as those with the State (Albó C., 2008)—must combine or complement each other in a permanent exercise towards accepting the “other” so that “he will be accepted as a subject with identity, difference, and agency” (Walsh, 2002b). Understood in this “critical” light, interculturality lies far from the politics of recognition, which often seek to “include”, to “be together” or even “let be”. Rather, it adopts a subversive, counter-hegemonic position, capable of transforming



structures that have historically enabled the asymmetries of power. Therefore, the “multicultural” alternatives posed by the “university”, as a global project of homogenization, are not sufficient or satisfactory for the decolonization thought offered by interculturality. The objective of such thinking rests in “pluriversality” in its widest sense, both of knowledge and of modes of existing.

Multiculturalism, on the other hand, refers to a set of politics of recognition, positioning itself as a (legal) doctrine of identification and “tolerance” in the face of cultural diversity. And if interculturality began “from” below (structural inequality), multiculturalism becomes problematic considering that it begins “from” a supposed universal citizenship. In other words, multiculturalism originates in an abstract space of relations that, on a secondary plane, erases or installs fundamental inequalities, destroying them to benefit cultural demarcation and the inclusion or aperture towards “difference”. This way, multiculturalism is completely “functional” to neoliberal politics that are sustained on this principle of control and domination of national and transnational hegemony (Muyolema, 2001; Walsh, 2009), facilitating the task of pejorative classification or segregation around a “cultural differentialism”.

Multiculturalism’s affirmative actions, although necessary, are in most cases merely a tool of judgement used by those who generate public policies in education, allowing them to distinguish and define those cultural rights concurrent with the ideal of a plural and liberal democracy, as well as other reclamation rights outside that ideal of democracy or simply oppositional to it. Hence, those who protest against inequalities, injustice, or for historical demands to improve the quality of life, can be considered subversives, radicals, intolerants, or even extremists in the name of universal ethics (Hale, 2007).

Such is the case of the current PEIB in Chile, whose objective is “to contribute to the development of the language and culture of the indigenous peoples and to the education of intercultural citizens in the education system”. In other words—and partially following the guidelines established by Convention No. 169 concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries (ILO)—the program adheres exclusively to cultural and linguistic aspects.

The cultural differentiation operating here, as a kind of “internal coloniality” (González Casanova, 2006) imposed on indigenous peoples, results in powerful effects of “ethnicization”. Ethnicization implies the formation of

subjectivities or political subjects based on pairing certain “ethnic groups” with their respective representations or images drawn from criteria, expert discourses, or regimes of truth (Restrepo, 2011; Wade, 2000). In this case, ethnicization is built from those discourses introduced by multicultural policies in Chile since the 1990’s, as we briefly described earlier—those policies that also operate along the dynamics of neoliberal multiculturalism.

Cultural and linguistic fundamentalism has led to the widespread idea that interculturality is a last resort for the failures of education programs that excessively concentrate curriculum on folkloric aspects (festivities, dress, stories, dances, food, etc.), or from thinking that reclaiming language, or permanently using that language in textbooks, constructs an intercultural vision of education. This only achieves a sort of inverted racism, or distant racism, where instead of resisting diametrically opposed values, the specific and clearly identifiable differences of the “other” surface and are interpreted from a privileged position of homogeneous national discourse. That is, difference is not only confirmed but also becomes a kind of exoticism, distant from the intrinsic superiority of sameness (Žižek, 1998).

The depletion of indigenous culture and language in education contexts, achieved by excluding worldviews and philosophies, results in newly depriving complete meaning of the most engrained conceptions of indigenous historical demands. These worldviews and philosophies are precisely the nucleus of resistance and creativity that indigenous people have maintained for centuries, in spite of colonialism. This constitutes a dispossession of cultural rights that do not necessarily coincide with the ideals of neoliberal democracy where they are forced to participate, since, as we must clarify, governmental interculturality has never been reciprocal. For instance, if a Chilean chooses to be an intercultural citizen by learning of or ignoring the Mapuche world (the language and culture), the Mapuche, regardless, is compelled to integrate into Western culture and, in doing so, compelled once again to reassess his ancestors’ culture. Therefore, reciprocity or symmetry of dialogue and exchange do not exist; rather, this example would fall under a kind of unilateral interculturality that attacks the principle of non-contradiction in its definition.

Such reassessment of culture can trigger a devaluation of world visions—most likely opposing—in regards to the earth, family, State, God, moral obligations, etc. and necessarily derives in essentialisms, folklorization of culture, exoticism, and museumization of icons that reduce and isolate the



most significant indigenous cultural expressions (Kymlicka, 2003; Trapnell & Neira, 2004; Tubino, 2005b).

These are visions that, ironically, strengthen the dismantlement of an institutional structure, hegemonically monocultural and ethnocidal in regards to the vital conditions outlined above, and that are essential for the survival and development of a specific ethnicity: a) vindication of the territorial area usurped through colonialist actions; b) full legitimacy as valid judicial representatives; c) political autonomy in the administrations of justice, health, education, tax systems, etc.; all goals that would come into effect gradually, but with a clear and pragmatic agenda, and with a real commitment to interculturality that transcends the Ministry of Education and must interact with other State organizations. Of course, we must add to this list d) the acquisition of cultural and linguistic rights that articulate and grant identity coherence to these demands (Varese, 1982).

The most interesting aspects of this process of ethnicization is that, firstly, it tends to depoliticize the education process so that interculturality is thought of as exclusively “for” indigenous peoples and not for the society as a whole—that is, an intercultural citizen is seen as a (homogenized) “national subject”. Second of all, the categories of “race” and “racism” operating as indicators of differentiation at the beginning of the twentieth century—or even many centuries beforehand through proto-racism installed in our country during the conquest, the colonial era, and later, during the formation of the Nation-State (Lepe-Carrión, 2012a, 2012c, 2012d)—underwent a transformation from a rhetoric of exclusion based on “natural” attributes to a rhetoric of inclusion and exclusion based on “the difference of cultural identity, traditions, and inheritance” (Stolcke, 1999). Currently, what has emerged is a series of indicators or criteria of judgement (always new and changeable) between “difference” and “sameness” (them and us) that places the accent on “cultural” characteristics. Thus, some authors choose to speak of “neo-racism” (Barker, 1981; Wallerstein & Balibar, 1991), “differential racism” (Taguieff, 1991), or simply “cultural fundamentalism” (Stolcke, 1999). Culture, in this case, is manipulated as an apparatus of naturalization (Wallerstein & Balibar, 1991), in the sense that it can be used to segregate and exclude in the same way that the concept of “race” did for centuries in our country and throughout the Americas in general.

CONCLUSIONS

The ideas discussed in this article are organized around the fact that in Chile, issues of ethnicity denote a closer relation to “multiculturalism” than to critical “interculturalism”. With that said, official discourse does not value the words used to discuss these issues, meaning that on a conceptual level, we have witnessed over the last several decades the installment of a new ethno-governmental diagram of knowledge/power used to administer identities and control ethnic conflict.

To display this, we outlined a brief description of the modes of subjectification during the colonial era, where the idea of “inferiorization” emerged and was used to elaborate different religious and State apparatuses of domination. This also resulted in differentiating work and establishing a hierarchal work force based on ideas of race, which inserted the indigenous population into the national community as deprived citizens.

Accordingly, it is clear that interculturality studies require not only descriptive, but rather analytical investigations of the concept of culture (Restrepo, 2014). We must discover how culture operates in ethno-governmental discourses on intercultural education because that is where parastatal agents (teachers and traditional educators) “reproduce” (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1996) structures of ethnicity. In other words, pedagogical practices can be thought of as governmental practices and, as such, the reproduction of ethnicization in an education context cannot be explained by the idea of a “hidden curriculum”, since that only conceals disputing relations of power.

Discursive practices of teachers and traditional educators are similarly anchored in the matrix of relations of knowledge/power (ethno-governmentality). This matrix’s historic threshold is the emergence of an intercultural education apparatus (PEIB) as a response to the country’s debt with indigenous peoples, whom this apparatus attempts to identify, differentiate, and maintain far from vindication conflict. It is from this threshold that discursive practices must become legible and visible.

This last point is of utmost importance, since “culture” is understood here from a “metacultural” perspective (Briones, 1998b), meaning from beyond what is commonly interpreted as the set of actions of a particular group of humans, or how they carry out such actions. A “metacultural” perspective also considers culture as the properties that intensely influence the construction of ethnicity [hegemony], meaning in its own historical condition of



mediation and production. Social representations, or even “cultural difference”, are made possible by this double sided “culture”, both as a social process of meaning and concurrently as a producer of “regimes of truth” that grant the faculty to determine what is and is not “cultural” (Briones, 1998b); or to determine how culture itself permanently formulates a series of indicators or categories of differentiation that engrain fundamentalism. These indicators determine borders or “imaginary boundaries” (Said, 1990) of cultural discontinuity, of “contact zones” (Pratt, 2009), where such flows of production of difference interact; and, finally, of schooling scenarios where social inequality is produced and reproduced.

REFERENCES

- ADORNO, R. (1988). El sujeto colonial y la construcción cultural de la alteridad. *Revista de Crítica Literaria Latinoamericana*, 14(28), 55-68.
- AEDO-RICHMOND, R. (2000). *La educación privada en Chile: un estudio histórico-analítico desde el período colonial hasta 1990*. Santiago: RIL Editores.
- ALBÓ C., X. (2008). Interculturalidad y formación política para América Latina. *Colección Aalten – IECTA(970)*, 1-15.
- ANDERSON, B. (1993). *Comunidades Imaginadas. Reflexiones sobre el origen y la difusión del nacionalismo* (E. L. Suárez, Trans.). México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- APPADURAI, A. (2001). *La modernidad desbordada: dimensiones culturales de la globalización*. México: Trilce; Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- BARKER, M. (1981). *The New Racism*. Londres: Junction Books.
- BHABHA, H. K. (2002). *El Lugar de la Cultura*. Buenos Aires: Manantial.
- BOCCARA, G. (1996). Notas acerca de los dispositivos de poder en la sociedad colonial-fronteriza, la resistencia y la transculturación de los rechemapuche del centro-sur de Chile (XVI-XVIII). *Revista de Indias*, LVI(208), 659-695.
- BOCCARA, G. (2007). Etnogubernamentalidad. La formación del campo de la salud intercultural en Chile. *Chungara, Revista de Antropología Chilena*, 39(2), 185-207.
- BOCCARA, G. & BOLADOS, P. (2010). ¿Qué es el multiculturalismo? La nueva cuestión étnica en el Chile neoliberal. *Revista de Indias*, LXX(250), 651-690.
- BOURDIEU, P. & PASSERON, J.-C. (1996). *La Reproducción. Elementos para una teoría del sistema de enseñanza*. México: Fontamara.



- BRIONES, C. (1998a). *La alteridad del "Cuarto Mundo". Una deconstrucción antropológica de la diferencia*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones del Sol.
- BRIONES, C. (1998b). *(Meta)cultura del Estado-nación y estado de la (meta)cultura*. Brasilia: Universidad de Brasilia.
- CALDERÓN, M. (1607). *Tratado de la importancia y utilidad que ay en dar por esclavos a los indios rebelados de Chile*. Madrid.
- CAÑULEF M., E. (1998). *Introducción a la educación intercultural bilingüe en Chile*. Temuco: Instituto de Estudios Indígenas. Universidad de La Frontera.
- CASEN (2015). *Encuesta de Caracterización Socioeconómica Nacional – CASEN 2013*. Ministerio de Desarrollo Social de Chile.
- CASTRO-GÓMEZ, S. (2005). *La poscolonialidad explicada a los niños*. Popayán: Editorial Universidad del Cauca – Instituto Pensar, Universidad Javeriana.
- CASTRO-GÓMEZ, S. (2007). Michael Foucault y la colonialidad del poder. *Tabula Rasa*, 6, 153-172.
- CRUZ RODRÍGUEZ, E. (2013). Multiculturalismo e interculturalismo: una lectura comparada. *Cuadernos Interculturales*, 11(20), 45-76.
- DELEUZE, G. & GUATTARI, F. (2002). *Mil Mesetas. Capitalismo y Esquizofrenia*. Valencia: Pre-textos.
- DURKHEIM, E. (1983). *Historia de la Educación y la Pedagogía*. Madrid: La Piqueta.
- DUSSEL, E. (2000). Europa, modernidad y eurocentrismo. In E. Lander (Ed.), *La colonialidad del saber: eurocentrismo y ciencias sociales. Perspectivas latinoamericanas* (pp. 41-54). Buenos Aires: CLACSO.
- DUSSEL, E. (2008). Meditaciones anti-cartesianas: sobre el origen del anti-discurso filosófico de la modernidad. *Tabula Rasa*(9), 153-197.
- ESPAÑA, REY DE [1598-1621: Felipe III]. (1608). Real Cédula para que los indios de guerra de las provincias de Chile sean dados por esclavos, no reduciéndose al gremio de la Iglesia antes de venir a manos de personas que los tomaren (26 de Mayo). In Á. Jara & S. Pinto Vallejos (Eds.), *Fuentes para la historia del trabajo en el reino de Chile. Legislación, 1546-1810* (Vol. I, pp. 254-256). Santiago (1982): Editorial Andrés Bello.
- FORNET-BETANCOURT, R. (2001). *Transformación intercultural de la filosofía: ejercicios teóricos y prácticos de filosofía intercultural desde Latinoamérica en el contexto de la globalización*. Bilbao: Desclée de Brouwer.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1999a). La 'gubernamentalidad'. *Estética, ética y hermenéutica. Obras esenciales* (Vol. III, pp. 175-197). Barcelona.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1999b). Las mallas del poder. *Estética, ética y hermenéutica. Obras esenciales* (Vol. III, pp. 235-254). Barcelona.



- FOUCAULT, M. (2000). *Defender la Sociedad. Curso en el Collège de France (1975-1976)*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2002). *Vigilar y Castigar. Nacimiento de la Prisión*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI Editores.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2006). *Seguridad, territorio, población. Curso en el Collège de France (1977-1978)*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- FRONTAURA ARANA, J. M. (1892). *Noticias históricas sobre las escuelas públicas de Chile a fines de la era colonial. Su origen, número, maestros, alumnos, castigos, textos, métodos de enseñanza, e importancia que ellas tuvieron en el éxito de la revolución de la independencia*. Santiago: Imprenta Nacional.
- GARCÍA-HUIDOBRO, J. E. & COX, C. (1999). La Reforma Educacional chilena 1990-1998. Visión de conjunto. In J. E. García-Huidobro (Ed.), *La Reforma educacional chilena*. Madrid: Editorial Popular.
- GOBIERNO DE CHILE. (2014). *Mensaje Presidencial. 21 de Mayo de 2014*. Santiago.
- GÓNGORA, M. (1960). *Orígen de los Inquilinos de Chile central*. Santiago: Universidad de Chile.
- GONZÁLEZ CASANOVA, P. (2006). Colonialismo interno (una redefinición). In A. Boron, J. Amadeo & S. Gonzalez (Eds.), *La teoría marxista hoy*. Buenos Aires: CLACSO.
- HALE, C. R. (2007). ¿Puede el multiculturalismo ser una amenaza? Gobernanza, derechos culturales y política de la identidad en Guatemala. In M. L. Lagos & P. Calla (Eds.), *Cuaderno de Futuro N° 23 – Antropología del Estado: Dominación y prácticas contestatarias en América Latina* (pp. 285-346). La Paz, Bolivia.
- HALL, S. (1996). Introducción: ¿quién necesita 'identidad'? In S. Hall & P. d. Gay (Eds.), *Cuestiones de identidad cultural* (pp. 13-39). Buenos Aires: Amorrortu editores.
- HANISCH, W. (1974). *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en Chile*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Francisco de Aguirre.
- HANNERZ, U. (1998). *Conexiones transnacionales. Cultura, gente, lugares*. Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra.
- HERING TORRES, M. S. (2003a). La limpieza de sangre y su pugna con el pasado. *Torre de los Lujanes. Boletín de la Real Sociedad Económica Matritense de Amigos del País*(50), 105-121.
- HERING TORRES, M. S. (2003b). “Limpieza de Sangre” ¿Racismo en la edad moderna? *Tiempos Modernos*, 4(9).
- HERING TORRES, M. S. (2007). “Raza”: Variables históricas. *Revista De Estudios Sociales*(26), 16-27.



- JARA, A. (1971). *Guerra y sociedad en Chile: la transformación de la Guerra de Arauco y la esclavitud de los indios*. Santiago: Universitaria.
- KYMLICKA, W. (2003). Estados multiculturales y ciudadanos interculturales. In R. Zariquiey (Ed.), *Realidad multilingüe y desafío intercultural* (pp. 47-82). Lima: Fondo Editorial PUCP.
- LABARCA, A. (1939). *Historia de la enseñanza en Chile*. Santiago de Chile: Imprenta Universitaria.
- LEPE-CARRIÓN, P. (2012a). Biopolítica borbónica en Chile: el discurso antropológico sobre la ociosidad y el vagabundaje. In M. E. Díaz & C. Pescader (Eds.), *Descolonizar el presente: ensayos críticos desde el sur*. General Rocca – Argentina: Publifadecs.
- LEPE-CARRIÓN, P. (2012b). Civilización y barbarie. La instauración de una 'diferencia colonial' durante los debates del siglo XVI, y su encubrimiento como 'diferencia cultural'. *Andamios, Revista de investigación social*, 9(20), 63-88.
- LEPE-CARRIÓN, P. (2012c). *El Contrato Colonial de Chile. Crítica a la racionalidad impura, en la configuración racial del discurso científico, político y prácticas culturales en los siglos XVII, XVIII y XIX*. PhD Thesis, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Valparaíso.
- LEPE-CARRIÓN, P. (2012d). Reflexiones en torno a la instalación de la colonialidad en Chile. Evangelización, educación y reproducción de la 'diferencia colonial' en el siglo XVII. In J. C. Skewes et al. (Eds.), *Colonialidad/Decolonialidad del Poder/Saber. Miradas desde el Sur* (pp. 223-242). Valdivia: Ediciones Universidad Austral de Chile.
- Ley 19253 C.F.R. (1993). *Establece normas sobre protección, fomento y desarrollo de los indígenas, y crea la Corporación Nacional de Desarrollo Indígena*.
- MALDONADO-TORRES, N. (2007). Sobre la colonialidad del ser: contribuciones al desarrollo de un concepto. In S. Castro-Gómez & R. Grosfoguel (Eds.), *El giro decolonial. Reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global* (pp. 127-167). Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre Editores.
- MARZAL, M. M. (1998). *Historia de la Antropología. Vol. I, Antropología Indigenista*. Quito: Ediciones Abya-Yala.
- MIGNOLO, W. (2003). *Historias locales/diseños globales: colonialidad, conocimientos subalternos y pensamiento fronterizo* (J. M. Madariaga & C. V. Solís, Trans.). Madrid: Akal Ediciones S.A.
- MIGNOLO, W. (2007). *La Idea de América Latina. La herida colonial y la opción decolonial* (S. Jawerbaum & J. Barba, Trans.). Barcelona: Editorial Gedisa.



- MINISTERIO DE EDUCACIÓN. (2011). *PEIB-ORÍGENES. Estudio sobre la implementación de la Educación Intercultural Bilingüe*. Santiago: MINEDUC.
- MUYOLEMA, A. (2001). De la 'cuestión indígena' a lo 'indígena' como cuestionamiento. In I. Rodríguez (Ed.), *Convergencia de tiempos: estudios subalternos/contextos latinoamericanos. Estado, cultura y subalternidad*. Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi.
- NAHUEL PAN, H. (2012). Formación colonial del Estado y desposesión en Ngu-lu Mapu. In C. d. H. Mapuche (Ed.), *Ta ñ fijke xipa rakizuameluwün. Historia, colonialismo y resistencia desde el país Mapuche* (pp. 123-156). Temuco: Ediciones Comunidad de Historia Mapuche.
- PINTO RODRÍGUEZ, J. (1988). Frontera, Misiones y Misioneros en Chile. La Araucanía 1600-1900. In J. Pinto, H. Casanova, S. Uribe & M. Mathei (Eds.), *Misioneros en la Araucanía, 1600-1900*. Temuco: Ediciones Universidad de La Frontera.
- PINTO RODRÍGUEZ, J. (1996). Integración y desintegración de un espacio fronterizo. La Araucanía y las Pampas, 1550-1900. In J. Pinto Rodríguez (Ed.), *Araucanía y Pampas. Un Mundo fronterizo en América del Sur* (pp. 11-46). Temuco: Ediciones Universidad de la Frontera.
- PRATT, M. L. (2009). *Ojos Imperiales. Literatura de viajes y transculturación* (O. Castillo, Trans.). México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- QUIJANO, A. (2000). Colonialidad del Poder y Clasificación social. *Journal of World-System Research*, VI(2).
- Ratio atque institutio studiorum Societatis Iesu (1599). In E. Gil (Ed.) (1992), *El sistema educativo de la Compañía de Jesús*. Madrid: Universidad Pontificia de Comillas.
- RESTREPO, E. (2011). Etnización y multiculturalismo. *Revista colombiana de antropología*, 47(2), 37-68.
- RESTREPO, E. (2014). Interculturalidad en cuestión: cerramientos y potencialidades. *Ámbitos de encuentro*, 7(1), 9-30.
- ROTHER, T. (2005). Conflicto Intercultural y Educación en Chile: Desafíos y Problemas de la Educación Intercultural Bilingüe (EIB) para el Pueblo Mapuche. *Revista Austral de Ciencias Sociales*(9), 71-84.
- SAID, E. W. (1990). *Orientalismo* (M. L. Fuentes, Trans.). Madrid: Alquibla Ensayo.
- SILVA SANTA CRUZ, M. J. (2010). Para que aprendan virtud y letras. La pedagogía de la Compañía de Jesús y el convictorio de San Francisco Javier en Chile. 1611-1767. *Revista Pensamiento Educativo*, 46-47, 247-264.

- STOLCKE, V. (1999). Nuevas retóricas de la exclusión en Europa. *Revista Internacional de Ciencias Sociales*, 159.
- TAGUIEFF, P.-A. (1991). Las metamorfosis ideológicas del racismo y la crisis del antirracismo. In J. P. Alvite (Ed.), *Racismo, antirracismo e inmigración* (pp. 143-204). Donostia: Tercera Prensa-Gakoa.
- TRAPNELL, L. & NEIRA, E. (2004). *Situación de la educación intercultural bilingüe en el Perú. Consultoría solicitada por el Banco Mundial y PROEIB-Andes*. Lima.
- TUBINO, F. (2005a). La interculturalidad crítica como proyecto ético-político. *Encuentro continental de educadores agustinos (enero 24-28, 2005)*. Retrieved from <https://oala.villanova.edu/congresos/educacion/lima-ponen-02.html>
- TUBINO, F. (2005b). La praxis de la interculturalidad en los Estados Nacionales Latinoamericanos. *Cuadernos Interculturales*, 3(5), 83-96.
- VALENZUELA M., J. (2008). Distorsiones de nuestra identidad: sobre espej[ism]os culturales, acumulación protésica y olvidos etnocéntricos. In L. C. Parentini (Ed.), *Historiadores chilenos frente al bicentenario* (pp. 515-519). Santiago: Comisión Bicentenario, Presidencia de la República.
- VARESE, S. (1982). Límites y posibilidades del desarrollo de las étnias indias en el marco del Estado Nacional. In F. R. Aravena (Ed.), *América Latina: etnodesarrollo y etnocidio*. San José de Costa Rica: FLACSO.
- VIAÑA, J. (2010). Fundamentos para una interculturalidad crítica. In J. Viaña L. Tapia & C. Walsh (Eds.), *Construyendo interculturalidad crítica* (pp. 97-133). La Paz: Instituto Internacional de Integración del Convenio Andrés Bello.
- WADE, P. (2000). *Raza y etnicidad en latinoamérica*. Quito: Ediciones Abya-Yala.
- WALLERSTEIN, I. (1989). *El capitalismo histórico*. Madrid: Siglo XXI, Editores.
- WALLERSTEIN, I. & BALIBAR, E. (1991). *Raza, Nación y Clase*. Madrid: IEPALA Textos.
- WALSH, C. (2002a). *Interculturalidad, Reformas Constitucionales y Pluralismo Jurídico*. Paper presented at the Coloquio sobre Administración de Justicia Indígena, Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar, Quito. Retrieved from http://www.uasb.edu.ec/padh/centro/pdf2/WALSH_CATHERINE.pdf.
- WALSH, C. (2002b). La (re) articulación de subjetividades políticas y diferencia colonial en Ecuador: Reflexiones sobre el capitalismo y las geopolíticas del conocimiento. In C. Walsh, F. Schiwy & S. Castro-Gómez (Eds.), *Indisciplinar las ciencias sociales. Geopolíticas del conocimiento y colonialidad del poder. Perspectivas desde lo andino* (pp. 175-213). Quito: Editorial Abya Yala.
- WALSH, C. (2009). *Interculturalidad, Estado, Sociedad. Luchas (de)coloniales de nuestra época*. Quito: Ediciones Abya-Yala.



- WALSH, C. (2010). Interculturalidad crítica y educación intercultural. In J. VIAÑA, L. Tapia & C. Walsh (Eds.), *Construyendo interculturalidad crítica* (pp. 75-96). La Paz: Instituto Internacional de Integración del Convenio Andrés Bello.
- WILLIAMSON, G. (2006). Chile: un panorama de la educación intercultural bilingüe. *Revista Investigaciones en Educación*, VI(2).
- WILLIAMSON, G. (2012). Institucionalización de la educación intercultural bilingüe en Chile. Notas y observaciones críticas. *Perfiles Educativos*, XXX-IV(138).
- ZIZEK, S. (1998). Multiculturalismo, o la lógica cultural del capitalismo multinacional. In F. Jameson & S. Zizek (Eds.), *Estudios Culturales. Reflexiones sobre el multiculturalismo* (pp. 137-188). Buenos Aires: Paidós.

*

Received: September 4, 2015

Final version received: December 15, 2015

Published online: December 30, 2015



**GOVERNMENTALITY AND PEDAGOGICAL
APPARATUSES IN MANAGEMENT TIMES**

SILVIA M. GRINBERG

grinberg.silvia@gmail.com | CONICET/UNSAM, Argentina

ABSTRACT

Change and the novel have become privileged instances, images of obligation and of how things should be: schools must change and teachers must become instruments of transformation; rather than teach, they must guide learning processes. We understand that those faces of novelty ceaselessly express modes of confrontation and of struggle. In response to the hypotheses, increasingly fashionable in recent years, surrounding processes of deinstitutionalization and in direct relation to de-subjectivation, this work delves into how daily life at schools is enacted, shaped, affected from the perspective of governmentality studies. Through the notion of the pedagogical apparatuses, we evidence the heterogeneous, diffuse, contradictory, and overlapping ways that daily life operates in the government of population, that is, the experience of the State that involves both government processes as such (the direction of conduct) and ways to avoid being governed, that is, ways that we, as subjects, invent ourselves in the world. Thus, with Foucault, we can assert that *things might have changed a little... the battles may not have the same face*. Rather than deny institutions and declare their senselessness, we frame the question of pedagogy as a political question in relation to the new faces of current battles.

KEY WORDS

Pedagogical apparatuses; management societies; daily life; slums.



SISYPHUS

JOURNAL OF EDUCATION

VOLUME 3, ISSUE 3,

2015, PP. 88-109

Governmentality and Pedagogical Apparatuses in Management Times

Silvia M. Grinberg

INTRODUCTION

The problematization of school life has, since the end of the 20th century, been enmeshed in processes of change and reform that became central to, among other things,¹ the dynamics of education systems. In the processes of school life, this is not a minor concern. Since the nineties, schools have been called on to effect transformations, to handle crises, and to administer change and teachers to become their students' coaches under the paradoxical notion that, in knowledge societies, it is no longer necessary to teach knowledge but rather to convey search procedures (Simons & Masschelein, 2008; Peters, 1996; Noguera, 2013; Grinberg, 2008; Armella, 2015).

The pedagogical apparatuses designed, conceived, and imagined by many important enlightenment thinkers were essential to creating a world in which the idea of normal, normalizable, and normalized subjects is commonsensical² (Veiga-Neto, 2013). In recent times, we have experienced a wide range of sensations, from the critical to the nostalgic, in relation to those "ideals"; it is clear that we no longer live in that world. Becoming normal,

¹ The rhetoric of reform and change resonates a wide range of fields and institutions, from schools to hospitals, mental institutions to private companies, etc.

² See Castro-Gómez (2010).

thinking of ourselves in the world as normal subjects, can even be cause for offense. Diversity, innovation, and creativity have become the terms that define what is good and worthy, what must be at the crux of any possible future and, of course, at the crux of education. Rather than suggesting that we are outside the measurement and definition of horizons of desirability, what matters here is to define the specificities of this non-narrative narrative that calls on us to be who we want to be and becomes a scale of modulations and endlessly open possibilities.

It is in this framework that we speak of management societies as key *elements* to current modes of governing a population no longer conceived as a whole. Society is no longer envisioned as a body that functions with organic integrity. It is no longer a question of homogenizing populations. In fact, the narrative of government entails just the opposite: the tolerance of diversity, the glorification of the Self and its individual potentials. Thus, according to management logic, the rationality of fragments defines the terms of population government where subjects are charged with making themselves and the school is re-interpreted as community institution that must manage itself.

In the framework of governmentality studies (Foucault, 1991; Rose, Valverde, & O'Malley, 2006; Castro-Gómez, 2010; Simons and Masschelein, 2008; Grinberg, 2008; Veiga-Neto, 2013), we inquire into those processes as they are experienced in the dynamics of school life. On the basis of the notion of the pedagogical apparatus,³ it is important to interrogate lines of daily life understanding that they involve political modes that enable possibilities and manage action (Ball, et al., 2012) as well as resistance to those modes. Second, we understand that the relations of force involved in the daily life of schooling are increasingly enmeshed in urban fragmentation and selective metropolitanization and the forms that they adopt (Prévôt Schapira, 2002). In the metropolises of the global south, many areas have taken root as a consequence of crisis and of the fragmentation of economic and social life, processes that, since the end of the 20th century, have pushed large sectors of the popula-

3 “It is significant, from the point of view of considering the conceptual specificity of *dispositif*, that Foucault makes a clear distinction between it and *appareil*. Several times in his description of the *dispositif* he uses the term *appareil* with a different sense as part of the description. Apparatus in Foucault seems to be a smaller subset of dispositive, and one that is more specifically state-centered and instrumental. It seems unlikely that he would use the word with such specific associations if he meant it as purely and simply interchangeable with dispositive, which he has been at pains to describe as more heterogeneous and more distributed.” (Bussolini, 2010, p. 93)

tion into informal settlements largely lacking in urban infrastructure (Davis, 2007; Chatterjee, 2008; Bayat, 2000; Rao, 2006, 2008; Roy, 2011; Slater, 2009). As we will discuss here, schools and neighborhoods have undergone similar experiences to such an extent that their study requires research strategies that heed school as a territorialized experience (Grinberg, 2011).

This is the framework, then, in which we inquire into the daily life of schools understanding that, on the one hand, many of the lines of current debates on education are common and/or globalized (see, among others, Simons & Masschelein, 2008; Peters, 1996, 2006, 2010, 2013; Popkewitz, Olson, & Petterson, 2006; Veiga-Neto and Corcini Lopes, 2011, Noguera, 2013; Grinberg, 2008) and, on the other, that many of those lines take on specific tones and nuisances as they intersect with urban life. If this holds true in general, it has a distinct set of characteristics in the global south (Rao, 2008; Arabindoo, 2014; Grinberg, 2011), where it is associated with, among other things, slums and the consolidation of specific ways poverty has taken rooted in the urban territory.

We turn here to the research that we are currently carrying out in schools in the Buenos Aires Metropolitan Area located in areas that, since the end of the 20th century, have experienced, among other things, traumatic processes of impoverishment and, with them, the constant growth of slums, now inhabited by three generations. After long periods on the ground, we can conclude that these areas are marked by such extreme fragility that even policies of inclusion⁴ often fail not only to revert exclusion but actually end up furthering it, becoming part of the very problem they attempt to solve. We can, in light of the notion of the pedagogical apparatus, describe the lines that characterize the tumultuous beginning of the century in and from the emerging processes of school life. Central to our concern are the historical ways a set of forces unfold and produce modes of schooling. Two concepts are key to the notion of the apparatus: politics and historicity. It is a question of exploring the multiplicities and crevices of daily life at school and its tasks, the heterogeneous, diffuse, contradictory, and overlapping ways that those multiplicities and crevices interact every day which, when studied, come before as like a puzzle impossible to solve.

Our fieldwork in schools is performed from an ethnographic post-structuralist perspective (Choi, 2006; Youdell, 2006; Ringrose and Coleman, 2013;

4 It is not our intention here to discuss the notion of inclusion. Regarding that, see, among others, Corcini Lopes & Hattge (orgs.) (2009).

Grinberg, 2013; Youdell & McGimpsey, 2015). Returning to Deleuze and Parinet (2007), it is a question of making history in the present, which is not the same as lived experience whose singularities are drowned out by observations of a universal to become mere moments. It is, rather, a question of studying the events of daily life, its divisions and detours, to yield a fractured historicity (Cole, 2013). From this perspective, we reflect on the particularities of pedagogical apparatus in those urban spaces of the global south where poverty and environmental decay—keys to understanding the daily life of the neighborhood and/or school—converge (Rao, 2008; Jones, 2011; Bussi, 2013; Langer, 2014). We attempt to grasp the complex interconnected structure of a daily existence where the changes that take shape overwhelm the virulence of social, political, economic and, of course, educational, transformations and their assemblages.

ON THE NOTION OF APPARATUS: METHODOLOGICAL NOTES

Foucault uses the notion of the apparatus—mostly in relation to the topic of “governmentality”—to speak of the conjunction of discursive and non-discursive practices that gives shape to the surfaces on which subjects are inscribed and produced, and themselves produce. This is a territory of multiple inscriptions, a field whose study requires heeding aspects of changing and unstable power relations that constantly suffuse society. That is precisely the role of the *dispositif*, which Foucault uses as a way to approach and analyze certain dimensions of power’s application and exercise. The *dispositif* is, then, a historical formation per se, a network of relations that do not constitute any element in particular but rather “the resonance of heterogeneity” (Castro-Gómez, 2010).

At stake in the lines that cross and compose an apparatus are government policies on the levels of design and legislation, on the one hand, and of enactments (Ball, 2013) and opposition, on the other. This vision does not understand those two components as polar. Instead, it sees the daily operations of subjects in school in relation to the network of lines of force implicit to any apparatus. What matters, then, is not the opposition between micro and macro, between policy design and enactment, but rather lines that intersect with such intensity that one cannot be understood without the



other; these lines of schooling move, struggle, and mingle with the lines of, for instance, educational policies, urban life, the neighborhood, etc.

These are heterogeneous and dynamic configurations in constant motion that entail practices and forms of thought that give shape to contemporary experience. They can be studied like a polyhedron:

[...] within a heterogeneous and dynamic field of relations, the dispositive would seem to be a kind of moving marker to allow some approximation of a particular preponderance or balance of forces at a given time. It helps to identify which knowledges have been called out and developed in terms of certain imperatives of power, and it aids in the discernment of the many resistances that also necessarily run through the multiple relations of force according to Foucault. This is all the more important given his castings of power as a fractured field in which the different lines of force are sometimes reinforcing, sometimes undermining and contradicting one another—reading the points of confrontation and intensity is historically and politically valuable. (Bussolini, 2010, p. 91)

The apparatus—the network established between elements—is always an act of bricolage (Rabinow & Rose, 2003) that can be performed using anything at all. What distinguishes apparatuses is not only the elements that they use but also the position that each of those elements occupies. Due to this very composition of the apparatus, the criticism of apparatuses and struggles are always strategic. The multiplicity of relations of force is immanent to the domain where they operate and those relations of force are constitutive of the organization of the apparatus, how it operates and is transformed, reinforced, or inverted by constant battles and confrontations. It is a question of grasping a particular preponderance or balance of powers at a given time, which helps to identify what knowledges, as well as practices of resistance, are deployed.

The dispositive has janus-faced strategic functions as network of power relations allowing a certain confluence and direction of forces, or as conceptual tool allowing at least a provisional analysis of a certain configuration of entities, knowledges, and discourses that discloses points of existing and possible resistance. (Bussolini, 2010, p. 92)



Concepts, as well as how they are stated, are useful to grasping differences between historical periods but also to addressing overlaps, configurations, and re-configurations. Concepts operate differently according to those configurations and that is particularly important in these tumultuous times when many statements characteristic of criticism from the seventies and eighties have been relocated as truths of these times. Thus, for instance, the decentralization of education systems that was once associated with a criticism of authoritarianism now means the transfer of responsibility for the design of curricula and for performance onto subjects and/or institutions.

What matters here, then, is that resonance, that heterogeneous set of factors: lines of force in their historicity exactly as they are experienced and enacted in a territory.⁵ Our fundamental concern here is to take root in the territory in order to unravel the networks at stake in processes of government and subjectivation.⁶ Once again, “the lines of subjectivation seem particularly capable of tracing paths of creation, which are continually aborting, but then restarting in a modified way, until the former apparatus is broken” (Deleuze, 1992, p. 164). It is a question of addressing both sedimented processes, the archive, and lines of actualization. The question is how processes of government are lived and experienced, how the subject intersects with the sedimented, which lines are divided, traced and/or broken?

These practices are enacted in history, where the exercise of power and processes of subjectivation are by no means what they used to be: “the disciplines which Foucault describes are the history of what we gradually cease to be, and our present-day reality takes on the form of dispositions of overt and continuous control in a way which is very different from recent closed disciplines” (Deleuze, 1992, p. 164). Foucault (2007) is speaking of the configuration of the corporate society. Here, we use the term “management societies” to refer to the new dynamics of population government insofar as they entail a set of knowledges and technologies, as well as an ethos specific to these times.

It is important as well to differentiate and to recover the notion of *dispositif* in relation to the Deleuzian concept of “assemblage” (*agencement*) (Legg,

5 In Deleuze’s words, “There are lines of sedimentation, Foucault says, but also lines of ‘fissure’, and fracture. Untangling the lines of an apparatus means, in each case, preparing a map, a cartography, a survey of unexplored lands—that is what he calls ‘field work’” (1992, p. 155).

6 Regarding this point, see the interesting distinction that Castro-Gómez formulates (2011) between the notion of subjection and subjectivation. The first is bound to determining conduct and the second to subjects that direct their own conduct.

2011). As McFarlane (2011) point out, thinking with assemblage appears as a specific form of relational thinking that attends to the agency of wholes and of parts, not one or the other, the interplay between stability and change, order and disruption. In this framework, we engage the notion of assemblage ethnography as methodology (Youdell and McGimpsey, 2015). That is the “trans” nature of many productive relations; of the “map” as charting movements across orders and scales, with a different spatial or temporal sense than ethnography might otherwise provide. Assemblage requires the methodology to move, us to move, to make hopefully creative use of a range of qualitative and quantitative methods to account for the detail of assemblage components, the nuances of their productive relations and the far-reaching assemblages produced (p. 121). As Renold and Ringrose point out (2010), in recovering the notion of lines of “flight” and the Braidotti’s concept of “alternative figuration”, the ruptures and alternative figurations do not always involve a total “molar” resistance, but rather significant spaces of doing differently that are crucial to mapping practices that exceed the sedimented.

This is what we pursue through the fieldwork discussed below. We look to material produced during long periods spent in two high schools located in the middle of a slum and a third that, while not located within the confines of that neighborhood, draws students from the same population. In addition, in 2010 and 2011 we applied a semi-structured research instrument to teachers, parents, and students in a sample of high schools selected on the basis of a scale constructed from census information where the 0.10-0.20 range corresponds to the sectors with the most favorable situation in the city and 0.40 to those living in slums. This approach enables us to describe some of the tensions characteristic of the aforementioned urban fragmentation.

PEDAGOGICAL APPARATUSES IN CONTEXTS OF URBAN POVERTY

MANAGEMENT AND RESPONSIBLE CITIZENRY: SCHOOLS AND NEIGHBORHOOD LEFT TO THEIR OWN DEVICES

Since the end of the 20th century, a range of programs and policies has been put in place that bestows on institutions and subjects the responsibility to manage themselves. The argument goes that those institutions and subjects are the ones that best understand their specific realities and hence should



undertake actions that reflect that understanding and consequent diagnosis. Under the mandate of efficacious management and responsible citizenship, subjects are left to run their own cooperatives and/or civil society organizations and to procure funding to improve streets and safety, and to paint schools (Grinberg, Gutiérrez & Mantiñán, 2012). The word “empowerment” has become commonplace to refer to attempts to elevate self-esteems assumed to be low and to make communities, schools, etc. responsible for their own fate. In the specific case of education, a new theory of human capital came on the political horizon, signaling a correlation between employability and educability. Thus, individuals and families are seen as responsible not only for their unemployment but also for a diagnosis that renders them not only unfit for employment but also for education. A sort of pastor who provides no guidance (Rose, 2007) is the figure that affirms that man is the one who must take center stage in his own development and, hence, participatory action must be undertaken on the part of the community (Dean, 1999; Rose, 1999) and of persons in order to improve egos and/or living conditions.

The exercise of responsible citizenship requires that subjects create NGOs, foundations, and cooperatives (Bayat, 2000) and procure funding by a variety of means in order to start and maintain soup kitchens and tutoring services, as well as establish micro-enterprises to clean schools, plazas, empty lots, streets, etc. In the poorest neighborhoods, then, we find management specialists who not only know how to devise projects but also the ins-and-outs of fundraising.

In the schools where we do our research, this new logic means that, in a variety of ways, responsibility for management has been transferred onto the school and teachers. This in a context where to procure working bathrooms, chairs for students, usable schoolyards, classrooms with safe electrical installations, ceilings and floors that don't collapse, the school administration must deploy strategies where the only way to make oneself heard is by shouting. As one principal told us after months of requesting heaters from the relevant authorities, “I sat on top of the heaters and told them that I would not come down until they had sent them to the school”. While this might appear to be an amusing anecdote, it is the way that institutions operate or are made to operate.

The life of neighborhoods and schools left to manage themselves depends, then, on being able to shout loud enough to show that there is a real risk of things getting out of hand, of an explosion ensuing. It may then be possible

to get some attention that, for a few months at least, will calm things down and/or get the heaters⁷ (Grinberg, 2011). In terms of population government, this means control of disorder or controlled disorder (Fearnley, 2005).

THE EDUCATION OF THOSE WHO ARE NO LONGER NECESSARY

In the age of flexible capitalism, education in the slums does not seem to revolve around the making of productive bodies. One of our field notes from observations at schools addresses the use and management of time, as well as how time is experienced at school. In terms of the time allocated to teaching a subject, for instance, it was often not clear when a new subject had begun after a test was taken (Langer, 2014; Armella, 2015; Grinberg, 2011). It is no longer a question of learning how to work and, hence, of learning the efficacious and adequate use of time. There is no hurry. This means that students graduate at least one year later than they were initially expected to. That is not only because they are not promoted, but also because in the middle of the year many students stop attending school and don't come back until the following year. Students do plan to graduate, but at a slower pace. And this is an important topic because it is no longer a question of dropping out, but of taking more time to finish school.

Location of the school	Have you stopped attending school for at least one year?		Total
	Yes	No	Yes
0.10-0.20	8.0%	11.8%	11.1%
0.21-0.30	16.8%	36.1%	34.2%
0.31-0.40	25.7%	32.9%	32.2%
+ 0.40	49.6%	19.2%	22.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

SOURCE: OWN ELABORATION ON THE BASIS OF THE "ENCUESTA A ESTUDIANTES DE ESCUELA SECUNDARIA" CEDESI. EHU. UNSAM (2010-2011).

The administration and/or enrollment in these schools manifest this slow pace. This fluctuating enrollment has given rise to a new category—"absent in attendance"—which refers to a way of inhabiting school space. It describes

7 See http://www.ghil.ac.uk/trg_poverty_and_education/publications.html (02/29/2016)



a situation where a student arrives at school late and is marked absent but is, nonetheless, at school. If there is no schedule, being on time doesn't matter. Then again, there are rarely enough chairs for all the students enrolled, so if they were all to show up at once that would be a problem. If, as Massey states (1993, p. 155), "spatiality and temporality are different from each other but neither can be conceptualized as the absence of the other", school life shows how, in fact, time and space are made up along the way.

The notion that time is gold that characterized modes of schooling geared to educating workers seems to have vanished: it is nowhere to be found in these fragments of the city, often despite what the subjects in the schools themselves would wish. Time is stretched out and a fatigued wandering has become the norm. And thus the circle of employability opens in on itself, blaming schools, teachers, students and/or families for what they do not do in a daily reality that questions the possibility of employability itself.

THE FLEXIBLE SCHOOL.

THE SCHOOL IN THE PROCESS OF BECOMING

"A student is punished for jumping over a school wall to get in, that is, he jumps in from the street because he wants to get inside the school's premises." No matter how strange it may seem, that situation described in the field notes is just one of the scenes that takes place at school every day. It makes it patently clear that apparatus are historical: a situation like this one would have been inconceivable under Foucault's logic of discipline. These practices differ from those operative in the traditional school. While, at first glance, the anecdote may seem nonsensical (Deleuze, 1994), that is just what, paradoxically, charges it with meaning. If the student had gone into the school as he does every day, there would be nothing to report. What we have here, though, is a student climbing the walls not to escape from school, but to get inside, and that skews to say the least our expectations about misconduct while demonstrating the force of someone fighting to have a place.

Management logic takes on a specific set of traits when it entails the administration of the life of that population that Foucault so aptly defined as liminal (2007): subjects are charged with making themselves and the school reinterpreted as a community institution; both are left to their own devices in an unanchored back-and-forth. In the 21st century, those who attend school in slums are the children of welfare plans, day labor, trash



rummaging, and looking for something to eat in the *quema*;⁸ these are the chronically unemployed and it is no longer necessary that their bodies be docile, at least not in the sense that they were under industrial capitalism. Foucault's luminal population has become the abject population (Kristeva, 1988; Butler, 2002; Grinberg, 2013) and that applies to both the subjects and the neighborhoods they inhabit in those zones that, though uninhabitable, are densely populated.

Situations like the one described above are common in schools where students knock on doors, ring bells, and jump over walls to try to get in (Grinberg & Langer, 2014). If the wall used to mark the limits such that the circulation through spaces was controlled in order to regulate exit, the current dynamics in these schools are just the opposite. What is pursued now is not escaping the gaze but rather getting in and gaining a place in the institution.

It is very difficult to administer school life in the age of management where institutions are asked to become more flexible, to function in exception (Grinberg, 2012). As opposed to the rigidity of schooling in times of management, disorientation seems to reign and a complex tangle takes hold of the institution. As will be discussed below, something very similar happens with teaching.

BECOMING A TEACHER IN A LEARNING ASSEMBLAGE

"You can't teach these kids anything because they don't participate", says one teacher, full of despair, after a number of attempts to give classes that appear to be taken from a manual for teaching according to learning apparatuses (Simons & Masschelein, 2008) where education is called on to prepare people to face changes autonomously; it should "prepare mankind to adapt to change, the predominant characteristic of our time. In this case, knowledge is viewed as an output of mental processes and, as such, the result of a "construction. Learning is an active, constructive, and social process that could and should be managed, and this first and foremost by learners themselves" (p. 401). In this dynamic, the act of teaching becomes coaching to orient processes and education—as the teachers themselves point out—a question of making students act. After a number of attempts and training

8 *Quema* is the name of the neighborhood located in one of the city's largest trash dumps.



courses, this teacher asks us for help because nothing seems to work, nothing seems capable of setting off that process of making student act. Thus, though teaching is relegated for the sake of construction, it hardly seems to augment “employability”.

Before these images, we are consistently confronted with excess, with students who report being more and more bored in school (Grinberg & Langer, 2014), with teachers who are troubled because everything they do seems to hinder, rather than foster, the not always simple task of students composing texts. Situations like these only confirm that knowledge is more than just self-management. That’s probably why students value most those teachers that explain, that is, the ones that teach. The aforementioned scene of the student jumping over a wall to get into school is not strange if understood as forming part of current apparatuses where the will to learn demands teachers that teach. And it is there, where lines of resistance—that which searches and also takes flight—seems to ally with those moments of life in the classroom where knowledge takes center stage not to be “constructed” but, rather, to be considered along with a teacher who understands that, despite everything, that is what they are there for.

LOOKING FOR SCHOOL. THE WILL TO LEARN

Finally, we would like to consider this scene that took place at the very beginning of the research:

I am standing in the schoolyard during recess. It’s my first day at the school. A female fourth grader comes over to ask me who I am and what I am doing there. I answer and ask her what she is doing here. She stands right in front of me, looks me straight in the eye and, with an expression on her face that says she does not understand the question, shrugs and says. “I’m here to learn.”

We were startled by this scene: we came to the school having been warned of the state of crisis and the impossibility of education and what we find is a nine-year-old girl who, without batting an eye, expresses what should naturally take place in school. She was not there to get the certification that would entitle her family to a cash-transfer program, as many claim. She went to school every day to learn. There is an excess in this girl’s statements,



one that is repeated in the words of the students as well as the teachers, who insist on teaching and learning in conditions that undermine those processes that constitute, after all, the very purpose of school.

Over the course of years, we have been able to confirm that that bold commitment to schooling despite all odds is permanent, and this regardless of claims that school does not meet the needs of young people, that the internet offers them something that school does not appear capable of giving. The following chart depicts students' commitment and assessment of school.

It's important to go to school because	School's level of socio-geographic vulnerability			
	0.10 -0.20	0.21 -0.30	0.31-0.40	+40
Access to future studies	85.3%	84.7%	74.9%	73.1%
Education to be a good person	58.9%	66.8%	61.2%	75.4%
It will help me in some way, no matter how small	48.1%	36.1%	39.9%	45.4%
Access to employment	89.2%	98.2%	94.8%	96.2%
It will help me participate in society and be able to defend my rights as a citizen	76.9%	76.7%	70.4%	80.7%

SOURCE: OWN ELABORATION ON THE BASES OF "ENCUESTA A ESTUDIANTES DE ESCUELA SECUNDARIA" CEDESI. EHU. UNSAM (2010-2011).

Both that girl who goes to school to learn and the above chart offer another perspective: they betray a staunch commitment to schooling and an assessment that differs vastly from the public image of schools, especially of schools in slums, and of students. The few times the schools where this research was performed are mentioned in the press, it is to report bad news. But other things happen there as well. In fact, in all cases the values in the chart are much higher for schools located in slums than in other areas. While it was perhaps predictable that students would affirm that school would increase access to employment, the positive responses to other questions like "it will make me a better person" are surprising. Despite everything—reformist rhetoric, learning apparatuses (Simons & Masschelein, 2008), focus on performance, the teacher-coach (Grinberg, 2008), and so many other discourses that compose the *episteme* of schooling in these times—there is something at

schools that refuses to be undermined. Or, rather, at school those discourses come up against alternative figurations that defy both outdated authoritarian modes of education as well as “you-can-do-it” management logic.

CLOSING REMARKS

As Deleuze pointed out, “Michel was amazed by the fact that despite all the powers, their underhandedness and their hypocrisy, we can still manage to resist. On the contrary, I am amazed by the fact that everything is leaking and the government manages to plug the leaks. In a sense, Michel and I addressed the same problem from opposite ends” (1986, p. 21). These opposite ends, which we believe are increasingly present in times of crisis, are exactly what we have attempted to describe here. This implies, among other things, denying the slums (Grinberg, 2011, 2013) and calling them abject, on the one hand, and students insisting on their wants and desires as they fight in and for school, on the other.

Thus, in times of crisis we come upon the configuration of these new ways of exercising power through technologies of the self-founded in a spirit of freedom and responsibility. These define a new framework in which we are called on to take responsibility for, direct, and redirect a self that is always-already at the border. We have attempted to show how this new configuration and its contradictions are expressed in the daily life of schools located in shantytowns.

A question arises: when everything melts away, the struggle lies in staying put, in being present, in putting stock in the existence of an institution that consists of something more than an isolated individual. When crisis becomes the most stable state of affairs, we find students who struggle for the continued existence of schools as well as a place for themselves in them. Second, before the image of abjection and apathy that are so often bestowed on these neighborhoods and the demand to foster resilience, we find young people who jump walls to get into school; these young people do not passively accept the negation that weighs them down and attempts to undermine their existence as subjects with a future.

In the current process of government, rationality is conceived (and enacted) in a fragmentary fashion. Narratives of permanent crisis express just that: the refusal to conceive of government and, hence, of the social as a



whole. This means that governmentality has become syndromic, the conduct of fragments. Under this logic, management acts in a number of ways: in the absence of a whole, subjects, institutions, and communities must take responsibility for themselves. In the specific case of education, this logic does not mean homogenization for the sake of an ideal but just the opposite, that is, inclusion that leads to tolerance of diversity and glorification of the Self and individual potentials. A rationality of fragments defines government that takes the shape of a non-narrative where education is the key space in which subjects are called on to make themselves. The school by no means eludes this logic but is, rather, reinterpreted as community institution left to manage itself as best it can. This dynamic is crucial to understanding these times. We think in fragments and, hence, operate on fragments such that—as with financial capitalism—if a part collapses the system remains intact. In this framework, it may be possible to read processes of subjectivation as well as the crisis and uncertainty to which we have grown accustomed as an episteme of government.

This is the framework in which we have undertaken the study of the complex network of relations, tensions, and struggles that these processes take on in the daily life of subjects and institutions with their struggles, fissures, and contradictions. Our field notes provide political diagrams of the ways that conduct is conducted, of governmentalities, modalities that can only be grasped in an incomplete state but that express modes of everyday assemblage.

REFERENCES

- ARABINDOO, P. (2014). Urban design in the realm of urban studies. In M. Carmona (Ed.), *Explorations in Urban Design: An Urban Design Research Primer*. London: Ashgate.
- ARMELLA, J. (2015). *Dispositivos pedagógicos y tecnologías de la información y la comunicación. Un estudio socio-pedagógico en escuelas secundarias públicas emplazadas en contextos de pobreza urbana*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina.
- BALL, S. J. (2013). *The education debate*. UK: The Policy Press.
- BAYAT, A. (2000). From 'Dangerous Classes' to 'Quiet Rebels'. Politics of the Urban Subaltern in the Global South. *International Sociology*, 15(3), 533-557. Retrieved from <http://iss.sagepub.com/content/15/3/533.full>.



pdf+html

- BUSSI, E. (2013). *Hacer escuela secundaria en barrios de degradación ambiental y pobreza urbana extrema: estudio en torno de los dispositivos pedagógicos en la sociedad del gerenciamiento*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. UNSAM, Argentina.
- BUSSOLINI, J. (2010). What is a Dispositive? *Foucault Studies*, 10, 85-107.
- BUTLER, J. (2002). *Cuerpos que importan. Sobre los límites materiales y discursivos del "sexo"*, Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- CASTRO-GÓMEZ, S. (2010). *Historia de la gubernamentalidad. Razón de Estado, liberalismo y neoliberalismo en Michel Foucault*. Bogotá: Siglo de Hombre Editores.
- CHATTERJEE, P. (2008). *La nación en tiempo heterogéneo y otros estudios subalternos*. Argentina: Siglo XXI Editores.
- CHOI, J.-A. (2006). Doing poststructural ethnography in the life history of dropouts in South Korea: Methodological ruminations on subjectivity, positionality and reflexivity. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19(4), 435-453.
- COLE, D. (2013). Lost in Data Space: Using Nomadic Analysis to Perform Social Science. In R. Coleman & J. Ringrose (Eds.), *Deleuze and Research Methodologies* (pp. 219-237). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- COLEMAN, R. & RINGROSE, J. (Eds.) (2013). *Deleuze and Research Methodologies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- CORCINI LOPES, M. & HATTGE, M. (Eds.) (2009). *Inclusão escolar: conjunto de práticas que governam*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica Editora.
- CORCINI LOPES, M., LOCKMANN, K., & HATTGE, M. (2013). Políticas de Estado e Inclusión. *Revista Pedagogía y Saberes*, 38, 41-50.
- DAVIS, M. (2007). *Planeta de ciudades miseria*. Madrid: Foca.
- DEAN, M., (1999). *Governmentality. Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage Publications.
- DELEUZE, G. (1986). The Intellectuals and Politics: Foucault and the prison (Interview with P. Rabinow and K. Gandal). *History of the Present*, 2, 20-21.
- DELEUZE, G. (1988/1989). *Pericles y Verdi. La filosofía de François Châtelet* (U. Larrazeleta & J. Vázquez, Trans.). Valencia: Pre-textos.
- DELEUZE, G. (1992). What is a dispositive? In T. J. Armstrong (Ed.), *Michel Foucault Philosopher* (pp. 159-168). Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheafs.
- DELEUZE, G. (1994). *Lógica del Sentido* (M. Morey, Trans.). Barcelona: Paidós.
- DELEUZE, G. (2004). *Desert Islands and Other Texts, 1953-1974* (M. Taormina, Trans.). New York: Semiotext(e).
- DELEUZE, G. (2005). *La isla desierta y otros textos* (J. L. Pardo Torío, Trans.). Va-



- lencia, España: Pre-textos.
- DELEUZE, G. & PARNET, C. (2007). *Dialogues II* (H. Tomlinson & B. Habberjam, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- FEARNLEY, L. (2005). 'From chaos to controlled disorder': Syndromic surveillance, bioweapons, and the pathological future. *ARC Working Paper*, 5.
- FENDLER, L. (2001). Educating flexible souls: The construction of subjectivity through developmentality and interaction. In K. Hultqvist & G. Dahlberg (Eds.), *Governing the child in the new millennium* (pp. 119-142). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1991). "La gubernamentalidad". In R. Castel et al. *Espacios de poder* (pp. 9-26). Madrid: Ediciones de la Piqueta.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2000). *Defender la sociedad*. Argentina: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2006). *Seguridad, territorio y población*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2007). *Nacimiento de la biopolítica*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2009). *El gobierno de sí y de los otros*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2014). *Del gobierno de los vivos*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- FOUCAULT, M., & TERÁN, O. (1983). *El discurso del poder*. Mexico City, Mexico: Folios Ediciones
- GADELHA, S. (2009). Governamentalidade neoliberal, Teoria do Capital Humano e Empreendedorismo. *Educação & Realidade*, 34(2), 171-186.
- GADELLA, S. (2013). Empresariamiento de la sociedad y el gobierno de la infancia pobre. *Revista Colombiana de Educación*, 65, 233-256.
- GRINBERG, S. (2008). *Educación y poder en el siglo XXI. Gubernamentalidad y pedagogía en las sociedades de gerenciamiento*. Buenos Aires: Ed. Miño y Dávila.
- GRINBERG, S. (2011). Territories of schooling and schooling territories in contexts of extreme urban poverty in Argentina: Between management and abjection. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 4(3), 160-171.
- GRINBERG, S. (2013). Researching the Pedagogical Apparatus (*Dispositif*): An Ethnography of the Molar, Molecular and Desire in Contexts of Extreme Urban Poverty. In B. Coleman & J. Ringrose (Eds.), *Deleuze and Research Methodologies* (pp. 201-218). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- GRINBERG, S., GUTIÉRREZ, R. A., & MANTIÑAN, L. (2012). La comunidad frag-



- mentada: gubernamentalidad y empoderamiento en territorios urbanos hipergradados. *Revista Espacios Nueva Serie*, 2, 154-172.
- GRINBERG, S. & LANGER, E. (2014). Struggling for knowledge in times of cognitive capitalism: youth and school in contexts of urban poverty. *Knowledge Cultures*, 2(4), 152-171.
- JONES, G. A. (2011). Slumming about: aesthetics, art and politics. *City*, 15(6), 696-706.
- KRISTEVA, J. (1988). *Poderes de la perversión: ensayo sobre Louis-Ferdinand Céline*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI Editores.
- LANGER, E. (2014). *Dispositivos pedagógicos en las sociedades de control: prácticas de resistencia de estudiantes y regulación de las conductas en escuelas secundarias en contextos de pobreza urbana del Partido de San Martín*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina.
- LEGG, S. (2011). Assemblage/apparatus: using Deleuze and Foucault. *Area*, 43(2), 128-133.
- MAGUIRE, M., BALL, S. J., BRAUM, A. (Eds.). (2012). *How schools do Policy: Policy enactments in secondary schools*. New York: Routledge.
- MASSCHELEIN, J., SIMONS, M., BRÖCKLING, U., & PONGRATZ, L. (2006). The Learning Society from the Perspective of Governmentality. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 38(4), 415.
- MASSEY, D. (1993). Politics and space/time. In M. Keith & S. Pile (Eds.), *Place and the politics of identity* (pp. 141-161). London, Routledge.
- MCFARLANE, C. (2011). Assemblage and critical urbanism. *City*, 15(2), 204-224.
- NOGUERA, C. (2013). Crisis de la educación como crisis de gobierno. Sobre la ejercitación del animal humano en tiempos neoliberales. *Revista Colombiana de Educación*, 65, 43-60.
- NOGUEIRA, C. & MARIN, D. (2011). Educar es gobernar: La educación como arte de gobierno. In R. Cortés Salcedo & D. Marín Díaz (Eds.), *Gubernamentalidad y Educación. Discusiones contemporáneas* (pp. 129-151). Bogotá: Instituto para la Investigación Educativa y el Desarrollo Pedagógico, IDEP.
- PETERS, M. A. (1996). *Poststructuralism, Politics and Education*. Westport and London: Bergin & Garvey.
- PETERS, M. A. (2001). Education, Enterprise Culture and the Entrepreneurial Self: A Foucauldian Perspective. *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, 2(2), 58-71.
- PETERS, M. A. (2010). Three Forms of the Knowledge Economy: Learning, Creativity and Openness. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 58(1), 67-88.
- PETERS, M. A. (2013) "Radical Openness: Creative institutions, creative labor

- and the logic of public organizations in cognitive capitalism”, *Knowledge Cultures*, 1(2), 638.
- POPKEWITZ, T., OLSSON, U. & PETERSSON, K. (2006). The Learning Society, the Unfinished Cosmopolitan, and Governing Education, Public Health and Crime Prevention at the Beginning of the Twenty-First Century. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 38(4), 431-449.
- PRÉVÔT SCHAPIRA, M. F. (2002). Buenos Aires en los años ‘90: Metropolización y desigualdades. *EURE*, 28(85), 31-50.
- RABINOW, P. & ROSE, N. S. (2003). *The essential Foucault: selections from essential works of Foucault, 1954-1984*. New York: New Press.
- RAO, V. (2006). Slum as theory: the South/ Asian city and globalization. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30(1), 225-232.
- RAO, V. (2008). Pirating Utopia: Mumbai at the End of the Planning Era. In R. Mehrotra & P. Joshi (Eds.). *Mumbai Reader 07*. Mumbai: Urban Design Research Institute.
- RINGROSE, J. & RENOLD, E. (2010). Normative cruelties and gender deviants: The performative effects of bully discourses for girls and boys in school. *British Educational Research Journal*, 36(4), 573-596
- RINGROSE, J. (2011). Beyond Discourse? Using Deleuze and Guattari’s schizoanalysis to explore affective assemblages, heterosexually striated space, and lines of flight online and at school. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 43(6), 598-618.
- ROSE, N. (1999). *Powers of Freedom: reframing political thought*. U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- ROSE, N. (2007). *The Politics of Life Itself: Biomedicine, Power, and Subjectivity in the Twenty-First Century*. USA: Princeton University Press.
- ROSE, N., O’MALLEY, P. & VALVERDE, M. (2006). Governmentality. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 2(5), 83-104.
- ROY, A. (2011). Slumdog Cities: Rethinking Subaltern Urbanism. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 35(2), 223-238.
- SIMONS, M., & MASSCHELEIN, J. (2008). Our ‘will to learn’ and the assemblage of a learning apparatus. In A. Fejes & K. Nicholl (Eds.), *Foucault and Lifelong learning: Governing the subject* (pp. 48-60). London: Routledge.
- SLATER, T. (2009). Missing Marcuse: On gentrification and displacement. *City*: 13(2), 292-311.
- STUART, E. (2009). *Terror and Territory: The Spatial Extent of Sovereignty*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- VEIGA-NETO, A. (2006). Educação e Pós-Modernidade: impasses e perspecti-



- vas. *Educação Online*, 2(1).
- VEIGA-NETO, A. (2013). Gubernamentalidad y educación. In *Revista Colombiana de Educación*, 65, 19-42.
- VEIGA-NETO, A. & CORCINI LOPES, M. (2011). Gubernamentalidad, biopolítica e inclusión. In R. Cortés Salcedo & D. Marín Díaz (Eds.), *Gubernamentalidad y Educación. Discusiones contemporáneas* (pp. 105-126). Bogotá: Instituto para la Investigación Educativa y el Desarrollo Pedagógico, IDEP.
- YOUDELL, D. (2006). *Impossible Bodies, Impossible Selves: Exclusion and Student Subjectivities*. Netherlands: Springer.
- YOUDELL, D. & MCGIMPSEY, I. (2015). Assembling, disassembling and reassembling 'youth services' in Austerity Britain. *Critical Studies in Education*, 56(1), 116-130.

*

Received: September 4, 2015

Final version received: December 15, 2015

Published online: December 30, 2015



**TRAINING THE HUMAN ANIMAL:
BIOPOLITICS AND ANTHROPOTECHNICS**

CARLOS ERNESTO NOGUERA-RAMÍREZ

cnoguera@pedagogica.edu.com | Universidad Pedagógica Nacional,
Grupo de Historia de la práctica Pedagógica en Colombia-GHPP, Colombia

DORA LILIA MARÍN-DÍAZ

dllmarind@pedagogica.edu.co | Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, Grupo de Historia de la práctica
Pedagógica en Colombia-GHPP, Colombia

ABSTRACT

This article presents a reflection about the training process, the culture of the human animal. Based on analyses by Nietzsche, Foucault and Sloterdijk, we argue that the recognition of humans as a technical animal was the basis for modern government art. It analyzes the demographic policy of the dawn of modernity that was one of the first biopolitical operations, the result being the overproduction of biological humans and the subsequent emergence of a set of disciplinary anthropotechnics for its government. The unforeseen surplus of this technique operation was the essential requirement for the configuration of the rationality of liberal government with its liberal anthropotechnics and with them the mass production of sovereign human beings: mobile and flexible identities that self-produce, through the *Operation of techniques that can choose according to their own needs and desires*.

KEY WORDS

Government; Conduction; Training; Individualization; Learning.



SISYPHUS

JOURNAL OF EDUCATION

VOLUME 3, ISSUE 3,

2015, PP. 110-131

Training the Human Animal: Biopolitics and Anthropotechnics

Carlos Ernesto Noguera-Ramírez | Dora Lilia Marín-Díaz

PRELUDE. THE CULTURE AS TRAINING AND SELECTION

In his *Report to an Academy* (short story by Kafka written in 1917) (Kafka, 1971) Red Peter, an ape, or we should say, a former ape, emphatically shows us the meaning of training, repetitions and the difficult learning process necessary for his transformation into becoming a human. Even though it is a short and particular story, Kafka's story about his old ape-hood life points out clearly the conditions of humanization: firstly, Red Peter said it was about finding a way out. He had been injured and captured while he drank by the shore of a river of the Gold Coast. In a cage and loaded to be sold to some trainer in Hamburg, Red Peter soon concludes that he has to find a way to be able to live. It was not about an escaping, or seeking freedom. In his *Report to an Academy* he clarifies:

As an ape, perhaps, I knew that, and I have met men who yearn for it. By for my part I desired such freedom neither then nor now. In passing: may I say that all too often men are betrayed by the word freedom. And as freedom is counted among the most sublime feeling, so the corresponding disillusionment can be also sublime (Kafka, 1971, p. 285)



He did not want freedom, only a way out, and that was possible thanks to a little reassurance that preserved him from any attempt of escape, otherwise, it would have ended in him being recaptured or killed. That initial tranquillity let Red Peter observe and imitate the men that looked at him with great curiosity: he easily managed to spit, then smoke a pipe, but he had great difficulty with the liquor bottle. Many failed attempts until one day, in one of the parties he approached, he grasped a liquor bottle that some sailor accidentally left in front of his cage, and with the astonished eyes of those present, he skilfully uncorked it, put it into his lips “and without hesitating, without twisting my lips, like a drinker from way back, with rolling eyes and gurgling throat, really and truly emptied the bottle; threw it away, no longer like someone in despair, but like an artist” with a human voice, he called out “Hello” leaping into the human community, although it was only after some months that he was able to pronounce a word again. He had found a way out. Once he disembarked in Hamburg, he quickly opted for the *music-hall* instead of the zoo: “And so learned things, gentlemen. Ah, one learns when one has to; one learns when one needs a way out; one learns at all costs. One stands over oneself with a whip; one flays oneself at the slightest opposition” (Kafka, 1971, p. 289).

That learning, that imitation, that training, that repetition is permanent, continued, that way out that Red Peter found is what Nietzsche calls culture, culture meaning training and selection. Culture is the prehistoric activity of men, in Nietzsche’s “Morality of custom”, which precedes in universal history (Deleuze, 1986), is the generic activity (generating):

... the actual labour of man on himself during the longest epoch of the human race, his whole prehistoric labour, is explained and justified on a grand scale, in spite of the hardness, tyranny, stupidity and idiocy it also contained, by this fact: with the help of the morality of custom and the social straitjacket, man was *made* truly predictable. (Nietzsche, 1994, p. 36)

Deleuze tells us in his Nietzschean reading (1986) that any historical law is arbitrary, but what is not arbitrary, what is prehistoric and generic, is the law of obeying the laws and the conscious culture, precisely, in creating habits to force men to obey the laws, and in the end, to train them (and this is an aspect that any pedagogue can’t forget... Although some contemporary “pedagogues” believe, maybe in a romantic or Rousseauian way, that obedi-

ence is unworthy of the human). The human was the result of a long process of training, of shaping the wild and indomitable. And that was only possible through creating a conscience, which means to raise an animal who is able to make promises, an animal with will memorize, and that mnemonics was perhaps the most terrible and sinister of the human prehistory:

When man decided he had to make a memory for himself, it never happened without blood, torments and sacrifices: the most horrifying sacrifices and forfeits (the sacrifice of the first-born belongs here), the most disgusting mutilations (for example, castration), the cruellest rituals of all religious cults (and all religions are, at their most fundamental, systems of cruelty)—all this has its origin in that particular instinct which discovered that pain was the most powerful aid to mnemonics. (Nietzsche, 1994, p. 38)

The creation of that memory was not, then, a memory of the past, a memory footprint (animals have that memory); it is about a new memory in the history of the earth: a willingness memory, a memory that points to the future, it is a memory of words, the ability to promise, to keep the word even in adversity. In this way, mnemonics allows men to take responsibility and converts him in the only animal able to make promises, the only animal with a conscience. And that uncanny ability, the exotic plant on the earth, can only be cultivated for millennia and not exactly in a smooth and gentle way, but only with martyrdoms, sacrifices, and cruelty.

That hard and prehistoric crop, as the painful, dedicated, constant, cruel work that Red Peter charged himself, produced the most mature fruit of his tree: the sovereign individual, the autonomous individual, situated beyond the morality of custom (Nietzsche, 1984). This is the individual that we can recognize in ancient Greek culture: not the man who obeys the law, but an individual legislator who is defined by the power over himself, over destiny, over law; in that way, it is about the freedom, the irresponsibility because he does not have to answer and he does not have someone who answers. It is no longer a debtor: the responsibility-debt, created as an effect of the prehistoric culture, disappears, because he now participates in the right of the gentlemen, of the owners: “The morality of customs, the spirit of the laws, produces the man emancipated from the law” (Deleuze, 1986, p. 137). And that is what Nietzsche calls the moment of culture from the post-historic point of view.



There was another moment of culture: the historical. Culture (generating force, the activity of the pre-history) was captured by reactive forces: the history was like the degeneration of culture, its own denaturalization. Thus, over the generic activity social organizations, associations, communities (races, towns, classes, churches, States) were incorporated that acted and act as parasites. It is about the reactive forces that they take, that occupy a generative activity with the purpose of building collectivities or herds (Deleuze, 1986). From the sovereign individual of the post-historic, we went on to the domesticated man, the gregarious animal, docile, sick, and mediocre: “Training procedures are used but in order to turn a man into a gregarious, docile and domesticated animal. Training procedures are used but in order to break the strong, to sort out the weak, the suffering or the slaves.” (Deleuze, 1986, p. 139).

The main problem of this moment of historical culture is that the responsibility-debt lost its natural active character that contributes to the liberation of humans and becomes unpayable. In the domesticated human, the pain is internalized and the responsibility becomes culpability. Christianity as a culture, as an activity of formation, under the pretence of rescuing humanity, intensified its debt and made it unpayable because god himself has offered himself in sacrifice to pay the debt of humanity. In turn, the State and its law (rights and duties), with its police in the classic sense, with its public instruction, tries to train a good subject and a citizen for its own benefit, for the growth of its forces and resources.

To some ears, Nietzsche’s style will sound, no doubt, grotesque, excessive, but also biologist, prejudiced, undemocratic and even delirious. Fortunately, his thoughts are still alive (in spite of) and today, in the politically-correct age of “light” culture, this actualization is for the work of an eccentric character (considered by many as racist, pro-aristocratic, a right-wing ideologist, proto-Nazi, publicist, etc.) (Castro-Gómez, 2012): we are referring to Peter Sloterdijk. This contemporary German philosopher, whose work is part of the Nietzschean tradition—and in line with other thinkers like Heidegger and Foucault—, updates the essential of Nietzsche through the concept of “anthropotechnics”.

Despite some criticism, Sloterdijk’s language is less vehement, but very provocative. His interpretation and updating of Nietzsche took him to produce a type of “general theory of the exercise” based on the idea that man is a living being emerged from repetition, exercise, training. Equally, his approximations to the biology and anthropology and his distance of the per-

spectives “culturalists” are clearly perceived in the use of concepts like “immunity system” that help to understand the human life and its purpose. About the biological [the author said]:

In the course of man’s mental and socio-cultural evolution, two complementary systems have developed for the pre-emptive processing of injuries: firstly the socio-immunological methods, especially legal and solidaristic ones, but also the military ones by which people resolve their confrontations with distant and foreign aggressors and insulting or harmful neighbours; and secondly the symbolic or psycho-immunological practices on which humans have always relied to cope—with varying success—with their vulnerability through fate, including mortality, in the form of imaginary anticipations and mental armour. (Sloterdijk, 2013, p. 23-24)

In this perspective, the human being is a *homo immunologicus* that in the face of danger and surplus of life, builds a symbolic armour; he’s the man who struggles with himself on his own; for this reason, he can be characterized as a *homo eticus*, the *homo repetitivus*, the *homo artist*, the animal of training, of exercise. It is clear that the Nietzschean’s substrate of the culture (the crop) is humanity’s prehistory. And like Nietzsche (and Foucault), Sloterdijk’s perspectives are localized on the path of the quest for illustration, for Kantian critique, from there his idea of a *co-immunism* (not communism) that is none other than a new immunological system in which the self and the foreign are not separate, where the victory of the self does not imply the defeat of the foreign, where humanity would act or would operate as a *superorganism* and no longer as an aggregate organism. But that will only be possible through some anthropogenics that have to be obeyed for those who want to live adopting some exercises and habits for the survival of the community.

Certainly, the *co-immunism* is unlikely, that is why it is worth as a wager and as a challenge for an exploration of the highest summits of humanity. We do not know about the future, but we can desire higher summits to climb. However, every system produces surpluses or remains that are unpredictable. As well as the prehistoric culture directed to create a memory in the animal that forgot, it led however to a fruit as the individual sovereign, the historical culture has borne fruit: that is to say, the excess of an unexpected effect, a kind of mutilation. The historical culture of training in the form of State and church, intended to produce a disciplined animal, produced, in addition, the



high bourgeois culture (Sloterdijk, 2012). The disciplinary wager of a self-regulated individual for the benefit of the State and the church produced the undesired effect of Rousseau, for example, and with it, the social contract and the revolution. The Rousseauian naturalism, its beliefs in the natural goodness and in the capacities of the human being is part of a new way of driving itself and the others that aspire a gentle government, without excesses, without direct external pressures: the full confidence in the gracious nature that only requires space, time and freedom to develop the primeval humanity withered for the civilization and its pretentious school (teaching). But this Proposed of freedom and nature was not, however, a renunciation to the crop, to the training. Nothing stranger to that government than the idea of “letting go” or of a wild abandonment. It is about a strange way of leading the government: hiding it or, even better, transferring it to the adult, from the professor to the “environment”, to nature. That was clearly understood by the pedagogues of the active school that pretended, against Rousseau’s posture, to return to the renovated school the natural “environment” of the childhood.

The liberal government not only came to diffuse and settle, but also produced a group of undifferentiated repetitions that are expressed in that *laissez-faire* contemporaneity: the renunciation of control under the idea of self-regulation of the organic and economic forces, specific to a neoliberal government. In other words, neoliberalism is the age of the *selfishness systems* (self-referential systems) that work for their own benefit, becoming non-functional in a broader way in the totality of the system. The so-called contemporary and the search for happiness and personal achievement. And it is located under the sign of the individual subject of an identity. Equally, it occurs with the idea of thinking the human as a permanent learner, as a businessman of his own human capital whose success or failure only depends on the quality of his elections and his abilities to leave his competitors offside.

INDIVIDUALIZATION AND LEARNING: SELFISHNESS SYSTEMS

The ideas of Comenius (1592-1670) are found in the center of the historical culture of training, the one that was conformed between the State and the church, with the purpose of producing a disciplined animal. In the work of this Moravian are condensed many of the ideas that help the construction



of the “*typographaeum vivum*, [the school] a living typesetting apparatus that would populate the world with masterpieces of human print. (Sloterdijk, 2013, p. 540). The 17th century was testimony to the emergence of a universal education project, the *pampaedeia* and with it, a machine of human orthopedics: the modern school. A workshop where the education of all should take place; that linked the disciplinary technique (associate to the monitoring and punishment) with the *telos* of the human perfection, and its purpose was to guarantee the collective production of the individual differential.

If in the time of Comenius, the human model was in the image and likeness of god, in such a way that mass production was of the highest possible level of individuals, from the 20th century training of human beings to practice with new machines and in some cases with no more gods than the individuals themselves. Before, as now, the technical project not only made humans from its raw material, but also became the product of their own production. Decipherment of itself, production of itself, knowledge of itself that helps the systematic confection of a way of being human defined for the demands of its model: man himself. Humans that after centuries of anthropotechnics became configured of itself and of the humanity.

The modern concern for the human formation was articulated around the question for the exercises, the behaviors, the routines, the habits that are driven by individuals to achieve a particular way or not. Even though this concern seems to be closer to the monastic medieval practice, or to the sportive and dietetics of the last century, it is important to recognize that in the total of collective or individual activities that humans practice in different moments of their history, the present exercise is perceived as a key element of the most diverse ways of practice life. That *askesis*, the exercise that leads the shaping of life through repeated and regulated activities, becomes the axis that characterizes human life and those are based on the emergence of that specific modern power and contemporary that Foucault calls Bio-power.

Before entering into that discussion, it is necessary to point out that in the repetition and in the regularity of the exercise is possible to recognize the “autoplastic rules of human shaping” (Sloterdijk, 2013, p. 548), those who are in the center of constitution of modern life and that refer to the retroactive effect of every action and every movement on its own author. In this perspective, is possible to say that every action generates its author and, as the reflection acts in the person who reflects, the emotion does it in those



who experience it, the exercise in those who practice it, the work in the worker, etc. It isn't surprising that in the open field research about learning, emerged didactic reflections that brought the individual that learns as the center of the educative process (an active agent) and to the learning as its fundamental process.

If defining and establishing the 'I' was the purpose of the discipline in previous centuries, changing and transforming that 'I' for the action of individual itself began to be the purpose of learning during the 20th century. Such change is not a minor issue because it was fundamental in the consolidation of actual forms of government, those regulated for the competition in the economic and professional sphere. Learning is today an important strategy for the conduction of the individuals that consider themselves as autonomous agents and businessmen, *Freelancers*: individuals willing to transform and increase their capital to achieve the social and professional ascent, in a world ruled by a general market economy.

In other words, it is in that period that we call modernity that they organize, adjust and operate self-direction and individualization in a process that can be denominated as a constitution of educative societies (Noguera-Ramírez, 2012). It is a moment in which accommodating and adjusting practices occupied a central place in the pedagogy and, through those, techniques were implemented that focused the attention of the individual in his interests and needs as drivers of the actions that they have to operate on itself. Learning—as notion and practice—acquires then a central place referring to the necessity of having all the social and personal settings in order, that every individual, as a learning subject, acquires the necessary skills and abilities required for “learning to learn” and, as such, “lifelong learning”.

In this regard, it is important to point out that, even when school has an important place in the social education, its presence does not define the educative character in it, what implies, beyond the school, its walls, and practices, that every individual have the compromise and the obligation to keep learning in every aspect and throughout his lifetime. This was an issue pointed out by Comenius when he considered the world a big school—*panscolia*—in which individuals spent their life. He conceptualised the existence of many schools throughout life: prenatal, childhood, adolescence, youth, adulthood, old age, and death “school” (Comenius, in Noguera-Ramírez, 2012).

The displacement that happened between 17th and 19th centuries represents the step from instruction to learning, through education; this produc-

es an emphasis in the techniques destined to the own leading of the desires, of the needs and interests as a new way of producing a governed subject. In that process, individuals start to practice own techniques of those things that we associate with the constitution of a nationality and a free government. Education became the scenario for acquiring learning that enable individuals to conduct their own life, and that is why we can affirm that education is closer to the action of leading or conducting than to the action of instruction or teaching some things. Education focuses its action on the particular quality of learning and in the adaptation of an environment, where every individual has the possibility of developing and exercising those things that are considered proper of their nature.

In the beginning of the 20th century, alongside learning, they grant privilege and power to the use of the techniques of self-reflection and self-control that, centuries before, configured some forms of Christian pedagogy (Hunter, 1994). Pedagogic practices that, for Popkewitz (2008), rested on old driving tools, its purpose and its priority where not simple copies of the disciplinary practice, but the incorporation and updating of exercises and techniques of individualization for the production of self-government subjects; those were the sources of a pedagogical technology that enabled the appearance of

[...] Site of 'spiritual disciplines' (owners practice or relating to and Governing the self), embodied in the pastoral relation between teacher and student. [...] It is the 'game of the shepherd and the flock' of Christianity itself, with its characteristic joint monitoring and self-examination, obedience and self-regulation that it continues to provide the core of the moral school technology long after they were deleted their doctrinal support. (Hunter, 1994, p. 21)

This self-reflection assumes and conforms to the *selfishness* systems in which the pedagogical actions occupied an important place in the production and transformation of the experiences that individuals have of themselves and their constitution as modern subjects. In this regard, the scholar activities with boys, girls and adults that are purposed through informal groups (spiritual therapy, mental cure and religious), or even those divulged in books, videos and motivation conferences, self-help, personnel management, etc. are pedagogical practices (of conduction) that try to modify reflexive relations with the subjects, as they are part of some devices of subjectivities that produce the (so-called) "human person" (Larrosa, 1995).



In the perspective of “general ascetological theory”, it is possible to understand that the modern and contemporary individual is fundamentally exercitant-trainer that deals with the production of his talents and stimulates, from practical rituals, habits and customs that use the potential that he has inside and in which he recognized himself as potentially superior. This is the precept of human superiority that is at the center of modern concerns with the moral conduction and the construction of identity. So, the moral orientation of individual actions is configured as the sense axis in the production that the individual makes of it, as a subject that is able to respond for himself (Taylor, 2001).

The construction of the precepts that guide human actions determined the *telos* that directs the sense of the relation that the individual establishes with itself and with others in a process that is based on the construction of identity: “Let us define what it is and what is not important for us” (Taylor, 2001, p. 30). In other words, it is in the identity produced as a correlation of moral valuation (the ones we accepted as a guide behavior) where we define many of the actions that we are willing to do in ourselves to achieve objectives and individual and social goals. That “I”, that modern *self*, rather than being a previous *datum*, is the result of the actions directed to us, for ourselves and for others, in the process of constitution as individual subjects.

The process of identification promoted and nurtured for the compulsion of creating and modeling the autobiography, its ties, and nets to withstand the social changing conditions that express the complex technical line of individualization that produced man since his pre-history until today. The functional identification as an element that gives unity to the *self* and makes it possible to guide the individual and collective ways of life. The modern individualization can be described as that permanent process of constant identification, through which, in the last centuries, we have tried to consolidate a way of interiority that we denominated “I” (Beck, 2004).

In general terms, we can say that between the 18th and 19th centuries the configuration of rationality of the liberal government oriented the wide and massive diffusion of speeches and practices in the subject that act over it, which is recognized through an identity and its transformation, depends on its own action. In this context, the educational practices focus the attention of the professors in knowing more about the students and the attention of the students in knowing more about themselves, about their own interests, wishes, and needs. Those practices related to the knowledge of oneself began

to have increased acceptance and importance, it started to be a part of school life and other areas of the personal and social world. The individual learner is no longer the individual of the identity that is searching for the definitive self; on the contrary, he is a permanent exercitant, an *unfinished cosmopolitan* (Popkewitz, 2009) who, as a responsible agent, sole owner of his future, is related to the *selfishness* systems based on practices and speeches that made him an active subject, a subject of learning.

BIOPOLITICS AND ANTHROPOTECHNICS

Modernity, which could never be anything but radical, secularized and collectivized the practicing life by breaking the longstanding asceticisms out of their spiritual context and dissolving them in the fluid of modern societies of training, education and work. (Sloterdijk, 2013, p. 566).

The techniques of vigilance and control, associated to the monastic ways of life, jump to the stage of the political life in the period of the constitution of the administrative European States, between the 16th and 17th centuries. It was about a process of secularization of the pastoral power (Hunter, 1994), through its ascetic practices—linked to small communities in the Middle Ages—which entered into the social and collectivized world with the development of disciplinary practices; what radically transforms the ways of thinking and acting life of the majority of individuals that were part of the newly-formed administrative European States. It was not only about the entrance of an arsenal of techniques intended for the auto-production of the subject and the invocation of the improvement of life itself, but of the collectivization and non-spiritual group of exercises and techniques for the auto-production of a modern subject, a governmental subject.

The intensive call to an exercitant life made of modernity an age of techniques “transformed into a universally addressed and multifariously answered metanoetic imperative. Its transmitters were primarily the modern State and the corresponding school, at first, supported energetically by the clergy of all confessions”. (Sloterdijk, 2013, p. 574). The call for global fitness supposes one of the most radical transformations in human life, thanks to the constitution of different scenarios for the collective and individual



training. The way of life which associates and makes life and rules indistinguishable—as was the case of the *monastic communities*, its rule's life and its ideal common life *Koinos bios* (Agamben, 2013)—we went to the styles of *modern and contemporary life* in which the individual proclaims himself as a producer and sovereign of his own existence.

The wide diffusion of ways of exercising life was at the heart of political dispositions that were the key to demographic control of the population that lived in the administrative (or absolutist) State, and later the moderns. The production of exercitant subjects that are found in the center of form of bio-power—the anatomo-politics described by Foucault—and operate under the premise of bringing life to useful subjects for the needs of a powerful State, a mercantile and a fiscal State, that its foreign policy requires a dedicated and disciplined army and a diplomatic corps, and also an infrastructure and a sustained institutionalism for a body of workers that consider themselves as productive and independent and that were able to tribute the necessary taxes for the design of the economy and private property.

Those new subjects work for their own benefits, in function of the State and its institutions, it was about a relation that strengthens the individualization process and social relationships, that presupposes a changing of emphasis in the exercises of power: from sovereign forms to disciplinary, or better still, the privilege of techniques and strategies to the production of individuals and, thus, a power focused on life. A displacement that can be considered a governmentalization of the State (Foucault, 2006), because it is no longer about ruling over or leading a territory, it is about governing or driving the individuals that, from now on, are going to be considered the population.

State and church considered and promoted the practice that made the subjects constitute as a government subject: a source of enrichment and a strengthening that the State has the responsibility of its administration, through policy practices (Foucault, 2006). The political life associated with the production and the government of the individuals was expressed, among other things, in an alliance between the moral of the church and the growing “Reason of State” translated into the articulation of three key issues: mandate of reproduction and maternity over women, related to the exile of the midwives-witches and the submission in reproductive marital relations, defended and promoted first by the Catholic faith and then, also, by the Protestant faith (Badinter, 1981); and the identification and differentiation of childhood, what develops a legislation against the infanticide—con-

sidered since that moment as a crime, not only against humanity but also against the State (Ariès, 1962). The social correlates of this alliance generate a population growth that provided the State with unlimited sources of human material and that, paradoxically, leads to overpopulation; this, among other historical and social factors, impacted on the State organization and the Reason of State that produces it, bringing them to update: those were the conditions of the emergence of a rationality of liberal government and of a group of anthropotechnics associated with the production of humans that were adequate to it.

The emergence of a series of government problems for the multitude of people outside the system—those who were not part of the workforce or the military force—constituted one of the focuses of the policy practices that try to use the “prime matter” and through the institutions like school, the army, hospitals, workshops, etc., produce governable subjects; however, the impossibility of a complex regulation force to an important transformation in the strategies of behavior that continue linked to politics for the government of life, those that lead, for example, to the discussion about the social State and the production of speeches associated to the human rights (Foucault, 2007).

In other words, the over-production of human beings as a result of the biopolitics operation of the modernity found its answer in the anthropotechnics action of a disciplinary character that has as its purpose the production of humans by their *removal from the world*, not as the old ascetic’s style, but through institutions of confinement and insulation. This social biopolitics articulated a group of anthropotechnics that the educational institution was responsible for managing. At the same time that the school reduced the overload educational had the family also reduces the possibility of abandonment and death of unwanted and abandoned children. The school—with its techniques of confinement, monitoring, teaching and punishment—helped the functional formation of the family, but also, and overall, it was in charge of producing human beings: the school was responsible for the human raw material and transformed it into a beneficial subject, or at least into a someone who was safe in the society.

¹ The same one that is valid today and that is possible to be perceived in almost every speech of a religious denomination or in the State institutions in different parts of the western world, the same one that doesn’t allow intervention in the life of the born and unborn, terminally ill, etc.



This process read from in another perspective shows that the disciplinary anthropotechnics found in the techniques of individualization, associated to the identity, a key tool for its development. This individualization constituted one of the most economic emerging strategies of government of the last centuries: with it came the natural belief of the human as characterized by the possession of an identity and a particular interiority—internal depth—that would be the source of internal morality that guides the individual conduct (Taylor, 2001). In this regard, the process of governmentalization of the European States can be read in the key of emergence and used in the techniques of individualization that meant the introduction of group exercises of “conducting conduct” as an axis of the relationships that subjects establish with themselves and with others.

The implementation of an anthropotechnic disciplinary and individualistic arsenal that had as a purpose the strengthening of the State, left in the hands of the schools and teachers a group of proceedings that were looking to install in the youngest (infants and young people) the moral and ethical precepts of the Christian humanization. However, that mandate produced an unexpected surplus: the transformation of first and outside purpose—the one that oriented the implementation of the disciplinary anthropotechnics, between that the school practices—for a second and inside purpose. From the State and society as purposes, it went on to the individual and its inner as a purpose. The individualization turns the subject into the actual purpose of the promoted techniques and, in that sense, the inside was constituted in the objective of the actions that the individual made over it and over others. Perhaps the emergence of the notion *Bildung* (formation or self-training) in the German tradition is a good example of this movement. In this one, the purpose of any pedagogical process is expressed in terms of the differentiated and private construction of the individual interiority. Was then the rupture between the Reason of the State and the Reason of the School (Sloterdijk, 2012), that was evident in educative reforms that have been promoted for centuries, and that can be understood as an attempt to the reposition of the State as reason of the anthropotechnics.

The practices and discourses about the defense and protection of life acquired different emphasis and expanded its vocabulary and legalization in the two hundred years that followed, which led to focusing the attention on the necessity of recognizing particularities and individual needs, associated with an idea of individual nature. However, we cannot forget that it was in

the period of the absolutist State that emerged one of the first biopolitics operations—the democratic policy—and that this one gave way to the first forms of modern anthropotechnics: discipline. These last ones are owed to “the technical aspect, the mastering of the procedure that brings about the desired result in discrete, explicit and controlled steps”. (Sloterdijk, 2012, p. 439) The disciplines are the anthropotechnics that enable not only the production of adequate and functional humans—workers, students, military masses that feed the government machinery and the institutions that become more and more necessary to govern the population—but also a series of educators committed to the fabrication of humans. Through school and other modern institutions that projected not only the citizen for new world but also the new world.

The belief in natural and particular needs of individuals, with anthropotechnics associated with their own production and conduction (education, for example) started to be defended as rights of a free subject which, to know more of itself, of its possibilities to defend his rights, to know more about himself, about his possibilities, and to achieve his full personal development, he needs freedom. The practices of production of free individuals, took some of the disciplinary techniques and articulated them to new purposes, in those where the way and the end were the individuals: that was the emergence and adjustment of the anthropotechnics that we can classify as liberals; those that did not stop developing until today as a security dispositive that emerged in the 18th and 19th centuries, and that only found possibilities of deployed in the 20th century, associated with the confirmation of free-market and free-competition economy.

In other words, the techniques oriented towards identification, inherent to disciplinary anthropotechnics, were articulated to the naturalist and liberal discourses that promoted knowledge of the own individual nature, as the attention to the particular interest understood in harmony with the acting and behavior of the population. The natural self-regulation of the social, economic and personal processes was an enunciation that framed how they started to manage the resources and the individual possibilities and, in that regard, it displaced the uses of regulation external techniques, according to the exercises and techniques of self-regulation oriented to construction of identities.

In the middle of this transformation, notions such as interests, desire, experiences and learning emerged in the pedagogical speeches and



were aligned with the traditions or pedagogical modern cultures—Francophone, Anglophone and German (Noguera-Ramírez, 2012)—, with the emergence of speeches about personal relationships, autonomy and self-management that is related to the definition of identities for themes of race, gender, nationality, and age, among others. The educational topics, of identity and the emotional development, have been configured as a fundamental issue for the recognition and the definition of the individual markers that allow one to accept and recognize the differences and, from there to guarantee the conduction for the own actions of the individuals (Marín-Díaz, 2015).

In the course of the 20th century, individualization was given its greatest expression and in that process the government strategies were completely oriented to the actions of an individual responsible for his own condition. The implementation of a group of liberal anthropotechnics leads to the production of many humans in charge of themselves. Subjects that have the ability to learn, transform and adapt and achieve what is necessary to what are now their unique goals: success and power. The imperative *metanoético* is the permanent transformation of the individual: it's not about a subject who can be defined in permanent identities, but a subject of mobile and flexible identities that auto-produces himself permanently, through the operation of techniques that he can choose depending on his needs and wishes.

In contemporary Western societies, the individual is the only responsible for his government and for the achievement of his dreams. He has to be in charge of his own production increasing the value of change in the market of human capital. In these advanced liberal societies (Rose & Miller, 1992) it is possible to recognize a group of techniques and programs, throughout which ways of self-government that act in the small details of individual life are promoted: recording techniques and calculation, work habits, development actions for professional skills, space design, etc.; those contemporary techniques or anthropotechnics act in the production of individual styles of life, but especially of human beings who are defined for the autonomy, responsibility and competition; all of these are values that constituted in resources, of intangible assets that make all of them leaders of themselves (Castro-Gómez, 2010).

CLOSE: INTERIORITY AND INDIVIDUALIZATION

The emergence of the individual busy conducting his own life, concerned with ‘himself’, and who has to operate a series of exercises upon himself to become human, is the tale of a long, painful and tragic process of domestication that managed to make the “blond beast”²—the one who wandered hungrily for goods and victories (Nietzsche, 1994)—a submissive and docile human for the social life. It is about the training and selection from a pre-historical activity of man to a process of domestication, which consists of training the larger predator ‘man’ and turn him into a gentle, civilized, pet. A transformation that was about marking the externality of the world, enclosing man in the city limits and in the social life, and bringing it to turn inward, to build an interiority, his inner life, like that other place where, in the future, he was destined to vagrancy, stalking, and hunting.

The emergence of the ‘selfconsciousness’, the ‘self’, the ‘soul’ is the emergence of the disease that he succumbed to, the beast-man under the pressure of the most terrible transformations that he had endured until then, a change that took him from the nomadic life to sedentary life and left him permanently enclosed in a sphere of society and peace. It was a process in which the animal-man trained himself: communities, social groups, cities, states, lifestyles that men themselves invented, and strongholds, through which the old free instincts were limited, the instincts of the wild man—hostility, love, pleasure de persecution, assault, change, destruction...

Nietzsche teaches us that this was how was produced what we call today interiority, self, consciousness. Men who, due to the lack of enemies and of external resistors have been locked into the oppressive regularity of manners, as Peter the Red, ended up finding themselves, that prey to go, to stalking it and trying to hunt it. Turning on itself, the self became more dense, and the human now had to work with himself full-time. A learning job was the declaration of war against the old instincts which until then his strength, his pleasure and fear inspired (Nietzsche, 1994) an action upon himself that caused him to ‘build’ a ‘find’ in himself, in his ‘inside’ the new guidelines for life that he proposed as collectively.

² Those beautiful, good, noble, and happy men that were described for Nietzsche, in his genealogy of morality.



With the necessary domestication for life with others began the construction of an interiority that even today must be described, delineated, known and conducted. It was time for the emergence of a process of individualization that took us from the creation of the first forms of a 'self' in Greek antiquity to more elaborate forms of self-identity in the course of modernity and found its extreme expression in the contemporary 'human capital'. An action demanded, from the start, setting different techniques and exercises of humanity production by its human, that were articulated with precepts, through which life was oriented with others (Marín-Díaz, 2015).

Overall, the process of individuation is the correlate of multiple and complex exercises of anthropotechnics systems that were organized in Western societies and produced particular ways of being governed and governable subjects. The modern way of ascetic life has the form of a non-religious asceticism, or "training and corresponds to a form of reality that requires the individuals, to wait like that, *fitness, fitness sans phrase*" (Sloterdijk, 2012, p. 426). It is a non-spiritual form of exercise that allows different spaces and stages of individual and collective life, and that enables experimenting with various forms of construction of the individual as a subject of government.

This meant, among other things, that what was called the 'elevation' of life, a characteristic of medieval pastoral practices, became an imperative of life for all individuals: an imperative drive that marked our ways of being modern. Broadly speaking, we could say that what we call modernity would be nothing more than the time in which such ascetic practices were displayed in all Western societies, in the form of generalized discipline. The asceticism without spirituality allowed transformation of some European societies and that, between the 19th and 20th centuries, other societies in the world did the same. Sloterdijk suggests that this happened because

The people in this part of the world who, because of their head star practice, forced all other civilization on the planet to join in with the training systems they had introduced. The proof: among the outpaced nations, only those that knew how to implant a sufficient degree of didactic stress through a modern school system managed to leap forwards. This succeeded most where, as in Japan and China, an elaborated system of feudal conditionings facilitated the transition to modern disciplines (...) Asian tigers have regained ground,

and while modern European purse haughty frown at what he considered an imitation, new competitors from around the world have made the ancient principle of learning based on their success. (Sloterdijk, 2012, p. 426)

In the lecture of the process of training and individualization and its articulation with complex systems exercise is evidence the group of historical, moral and anthropotechnics transformations that involved human domestication and the important role that education, in a strictly modern sense, occupied in them.

Today we are witnessing the construction of other societies, those in which the government of one and all has to do with lifelong learning; it seems that this need for a common life that led to human domestication, the construction of the interiority as an old anthropotechnics, has begun to disappear. At a time when the individual does not need more than himself to achieve success and happiness, the other appears as a dispensable element, in order to learn, is not necessary to teach or educate, it is an adaptive behavior whose innate and instinctive basis allows the agency (individual) to drive their behavior efficiently in a particular environment.

The age of learning is the moment of Western history in which the individual is required to act as an agent of his own behavior, as an individuality that has his own interests, individuality and powers to explore and exploit, to learn or develop skills, information to be processed or disposed of, choices which have to be made carefully if they want to be successful and happy—or at least happy because in the age of post-duty (Lipovetski, 1992) a certain hedonism becomes not only possible, but desirable as a great ideal of life.

REFERENCES

- AGAMBEN, G. (2013). *The Highest Poverty: Monastic Rules and Forms-of-Life*. Stanford: Stanford University press.
- ARENDDT, H. (1996). *Entre el pasado y el futuro [Between past and the future]*. Barcelona: Editorial Península.
- ARIÈS, P. (1962). *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life*. New York: Vintage Books/Random House.



- BADINTER, E. (1981) *The myth of motherhood: An historical view of the maternal instinct*. London: Souvenir Press (E & A).
- BECK, U. (2004). *Poder y contrapoder en la era global: la nueva economía política mundial*. Madrid: Paidós Ibérica.
- CASTRO-GÓMEZ, S. (2010). *Historia de la gubernamentalidad. Razón de Estado, liberalismo y neoliberalismo en Michel Foucault*. Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre.
- DELEUZE, G. (1986). *Nietzsche and philosophy*. London: Continuum.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2006). *Seguridad, Territorio, Población*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2007). *Nacimiento de la biopolítica*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- HUNTER, I. (1994). *Rethinking the School. Subjectivity, bureaucracy, criticism*. Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- KAFKA, F. (1971). *The complete stories*. New York: Schocken Books Inc.
- LARROSA, J. (1995). *Tecnologías del yo y educación. Notas sobre la construcción y la mediación pedagógica de la experiencia de si*. In: Larrosa, J. (Ed.). *Escuela, poder y subjetivación*. Madrid: La Piqueta.
- LIPOVETSKI, G. (1992). *Le crepuscule du devoir*. Paris: Gallimard.
- MARÍN-DÍAZ, D. (2015). *Autoajuda, educação e práticas de si. Genealogia de uma antropotécnica*. Belo Horizonte, MG: Autêntica.
- NIETZSCHE, F. (1994). *On the genealogy of morality*. Cambridge University Press.
- NOGUERA-RAMÍREZ, C. (2012). *El gobierno pedagógico. Del arte de educar a las tradiciones pedagógicas*. Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre Editores, GHPP.
- POPKEWITZ, T. (2009). *Sociedade da Aprendizagem, cosmopolitismo, saúde pública, prevenção à criminalidade. Educação e realidade, 34(2)*.
- ROSE, N.; MILLER, P. (1992). *Political Power Beyond the State: Problematics of Government. British Journal of Sociology, 43(2), 172-205*.
- SLOTERDIJK, P. (2013). *You must change your life. On anthropotechnics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- TAYLOR, C. (2001). *Sources of the self: the making of the modern identity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

*

Received: September 4, 2015

Final version received: December 15, 2015

Published online: December 30, 2015



**BIOPOWER AND EDUCATION
SELF-CARE, SUBJECT AND TRUTH**

MARCO A. JIMÉNEZ

marcoacatlan@gmail.com | Acatlan School of Higher Studies, Mexico

ANA MARÍA VALLE VÁZQUEZ

anvallev@gmail.com | Center of Research and Teaching in Humanities of the state of Morelos, Mexico

ABSTRACT

Our thesis here is that the relation between bio-power and education is found in the care of oneself, the subject and truth. We consider bio-power to be one's self-government/discipline and that of others and that this discipline is possible in the subject-truth relation just as it is in one's self-care. The questions that guide our reflections are: *What is education in the sense of biopower? How does one constitute the subject in relation to oneself, in relation to others and truth?* According to Foucault, biopower is a form of the "exercise of power" that has as its objective the biological life of the human; it is the exercise of power over the bodies of the individuals. Such exercise might exist in the self-care practices (*epimeleia heautou*) just as in the practices of "truth-telling" (*parresia*).

KEY WORDS

Biopower; Self-care; Truth; Subject.



SISYPHUS

JOURNAL OF EDUCATION

VOLUME 3, ISSUE 3,

2015, PP. 132-155

Biopower and Education: Self-Care, Subject and Truth

Marco A. Jiménez | Ana María Valle Vázquez

INTRODUCTION

Our thesis here is that the relation between biopower and education is found in self-care and truth-telling. We consider that biopower is a self-government/discipline along with others and that this discipline is possible in the subject-truth relation. If truth and it along with the subject are universal or particular, we would not be discovering the gist of the discussion, but rather establishing that the constitution of subjectivity nowadays stems from the governing of some over others toward a condition of the government of oneself as government of others. The reflection we attempt from the epoch of Foucault provides us with a creative glance at this modernity. The question which guides our reflections is: What is education in the sense of biopower? In other words, how is the subject constituted in relation to oneself, in relation to others and in relation to the truth?

To tackle the above question, it is important to consider that it is different to talk about the government of oneself and of others as *self-care* (*epimeleia heautou*) than it is to truth-telling (*parrhesia*). Foucault analyzes the first or former in the figure of Socrates and his relation to Alcibiades, while *parrhesia* is dealt with in Plato as Dionysius's master.

In accordance with Foucault, biopower consists of “ways to ‘exercise power’ with the aim of the biological life of humans; it is the exercise of power over

the bodies of individuals” (Castro, 2011, p. 55). Such exercise might exist in the practices of self-care as well as in the practices of truth-telling. Biopower appears as power over life and death even though in our case, we only care about the first, that control and dominion of the body as biological life, constituting self-care and truth-telling. Self-care and truth-telling consist of a type of power over the lives of oneself and of others; they are a way of affirming life mastering itself, governing and controlling itself; they are a way to ensure a life founded in care and truthfulness.

Today we know that the body is not only a component of the human in terms of sexuality, but we also know that bodies in themselves cannot occupy other bodies. Why does one establish the subject? Also, one now recognizes that it is not only established to atone for guilt or either for the contemplation of the highest truth or simply for one’s great pleasure and happiness.

Why does self-government and truth-telling become integrated to a practice of government of others? It is not because one denies the existence of discursive orders of genealogies or particular desires that in their condition of word, institutional regulations, corporal appetites, subjugate and attempt to dominate the human in such a way that we try to ignore these conditions that, in order to call them in a certain fashion, are functional or structural to human nature. In other words, life is not a discursive order; it does not end in its pure genealogy nor is it the result of some symbolical articulations.

SELF-CARE AS BIOPOWER

It should not seem strange to us that Foucault’s last reflections were centered on a relationship between body and soul; undoubtedly, his Christian-Catholic genealogy appeared in his courses dealing with hermeneutics of the subject. From there he fashions hermeneutics or then, rather, becomes interested in the way certain subjects interpret themselves (another thing), a matter that of course calls for reflection. It is somewhat paradoxical to take up the question of subjectivity and truth in relation to the topic of self-care and later try to refer it to the field of education. Effectively, it is odd considering that the questions of truth, subjectivity and, more than anything else, education are constantly remitted to knowledge, even of the world, of others or of oneself as an exclusive matter of the conscience.



“Know thyself” is the maximum by which, since Delphos, philosophy and other forms of knowledge of humans has been guided. It is the prescription that, par excellence, connects the relationship between subject and truth. *Gnothi seauton* in some way refers to a psychological introspection or a type of self-knowledge, in essence, or to our relationship of salvation to God and not at all to certain rational conditions as to what we are. In short, it is not about a moral precept that appears before us as good or bad or that permits us to know, with no doubts, our beings in the world.

To know, to be conscious of oneself in the Ancient World, has to do with a set of rules, of rituals related to the very act of consulting an oracle. Foucault, now, identifies in his text *Hermenéutica del sujeto* [The Hermeneutics of the Subject] three precepts regarding knowing how to question: the *meden agan*, which means nothing in excess, and absolutely refers to what we today understand as ethical behavior or moderation in the consumption of certain products. The second precept is *eggue*, which refers to being cautious; in other words, when one consults the gods one has to be cautious not to commit oneself to that which cannot be carried out. And in third place, the *gnothi seauton* is that which implies examining thoroughly the questions one wants to ask, how many and how to interrogate the gods. In short, it is about prudence in what one asks for, in what one expects from the gods, in being cautious in one’s commitments made with them, and remembering that she or he who interrogates the gods is mortal and, as such, should be aware of her/his strengths and limitations.

All of the above makes us think that the Delphic precept of knowing thyself is linked with the idea of self-care and not with some psychic or moral restlessness as it is nowadays interpreted to be and even less with the superiority of the conscience as regards experience. In other words, it is about a practice that perhaps can be reduced to the art of knowing how to question, very much in consonance with another experience—that of self-care.

Let us see, briefly and following Foucault, what this notion of *epimeleia heautou*, of self-care, means:

- It is about a general attitude, a way of considering things, of being in the world, taking action, dealing/socializing with other subjects. *Epimeleia heautou* is an attitude: in respect to oneself, in respect to others, and in respect to the world.



- It is a type of attention, of looking. Of attending to oneself, projecting the look to the exterior. It is about paying attention to what one thinks and to what happens as a result of thought. In that sense it is linked to the word *melete*, which means both exercise and meditation.
- *Epimeleia* does not only mean attention or general or global interest regarding oneself, but that one is preoccupied in particular with the techniques or actions behind one's taking charge of the subject, of how to purify, modify and transfigure it; in other words, of how one goes about establishing the subject. For example, the techniques of meditation, of memorization, of examining one's conscience, those of verifying representations as they appear in the mind (Foucault, 2002, p. 28).

It is now not an exclusive issue of a dietary measure, an economic stance or a rule of one's own, regarding sexuality, as to how we reveal ourselves in *The Use of Pleasures*, but one of a broader question that places subjectivity in a reflection that goes beyond that of hermeneutics and analyses; it is about, more than anything else, an experience of the spirituality of the subject or rather of a practice and pragmatic nature of the spirituality of the subject. Practice understood to be exercise and pragmatics as experience. Exercise understood as sets of activities that permit having the condition of existence, corporality, and mentality. And the experience is that which allows us to become transformed upon ending it; that places us in a location radically different from that we were in.

Foucault rightly insists on the conjunction existing between truth and spirituality, an irrefutable union in the eyes of the ancient Greek philosophers. Effectively, the first philosophers were the first educators as truth and human transformation walk arm in arm, and the former is impossible without transfiguration and this cannot happen without access to truth. The question regarding the subject-truth relationship should be posed from a pedagogical environment given that it involves "how" and "how should" the subject wants to be.

With the idea of "self-care" an interruption is produced. Perhaps all that that for the Greek world, up to the V century BC., is found connected to what Deleuze and Guattari (2005) denominate the relationship between the "plan of immanence" and nature; in other words, the opening of a gap between the social elements, such as they are given to us, and the natural world. The Homeric past will lose its mythical meaning, the gods will no longer be on

the side of mortals, the other beings of the Universe, but will be converted, coupled with philosophy and certain laws in mandates and precepts that will come to be known as ethical principles that go along becoming transformed into universal scenarios of human chores. The relationship between subject and truth, found in self-care, will be radically transformed and, with it, their disciplines.

Precisely, the trial of Socrates can be considered the water part, as the calling to care for oneself. Nonetheless, this separation of earlier thought also implicates one's own duplicity; on the one hand, the idea of self-care as related to truth, reason, and the divine mandate, and on the other, of oneself attending the body and soul, not beyond the good and evil, but linked with the good and evil in a way of production of subjectivity and truth centered on one's own experience with others, with "La Polis", with things made by humans.

If indeed in *Apology* that Plato himself wrote (concerning Socrates) it states the direction one has to take is one's self-care, what Foucault shows us is that this is a complicated question in that one must locate the constitution of the subjectivity. Below is what Socrates said about it:¹

My good friend, you are a citizen of Athens, a great city famous for wisdom and strength; are you not ashamed to spend so much trouble upon heaping up riches and honor and reputation, while you care nothing for wisdom and truth and the perfection of your soul? And if he protests that he does care for these things, I shall not at once release him and go my way; I shall question and cross-examine and test him, and if I think he does not possess the virtue

¹ In the FCE translation from the *Hermeneutics of the Subject* by Michel Foucault, it is translated as follows: "What! Dear friend, you are an Athenian, citizen of a city that is bigger, more famous than any other due to its science and power, and do not blush upon tending to [*epimeleisthai*] your fortune with the aim of increasing it as much as possible, just as in your reputation and honors; but as to your reason, truth and soul, which you have to improve tirelessly, do not worry about it and do not even take it into consideration" [*epimeleia, phrontizeis*].

Socrates, [Foucault says], remember, nonetheless, what you always said and still you are very decided to say to those you meet and plead to: You all worry about a lot of things, your fortune, your reputation, but not about your own selves. And to continue:

"And if one of you answers, affirm that you take care of them [your soul, truth and reason; M. F.], do not believe I am going to leave it alone and immediately go away; no, I will interrogate the person, examine, dispute in depth. Young or old, citizen or foreigner, I will act as such with whomever I meet; and especially with you all, my fellow citizens, because we are close by blood. Well, that is what God requires of me, listen well; and I believe there was nothing more beneficial for the city than my jealousy in carrying out such an order" (Foucault 2002, p.21).



he affects, I shall reproach him for holding the most precious things cheap and worthless things dear. This I shall do to everyone whom I meet, young or old, citizen or stranger, but especially to you, my fellow-citizens, inasmuch as you are my own people. For be assured that such is heaven's command; and I believe that no better piece of fortune has ever befallen you in Athens than my enlistment in the service of heaven... (Plato, 1997, pp. 29d-30a).

From there to Saint Paul, and up to our days, there exists a complete line of continuity very akin to Western thought in that the soul is favored over the body in order to be in consonance with God, or that all sense of experience be guided, by reason, toward truth. No one in the Homeric world, in *The Iliad* or *The Odyssey* could be imagined fulfilling the will of God and seeking truth via the *logos*. The “natural” and the “human” are separated by philosophical concepts. In a strict sense we could say one turns to the birth of philosophy just as we know it and with that to a knowledge-power with which one clarifies the myth and seeks to base it in reason. Nonetheless, let us return to the techniques themselves such as the discipline of body and soul in one’s self-care.

Let us try, rather, to find out what oneself is. It is not about knowing who you are or knowing your abilities, your passions, if you are mortal or immortal or why you come into the world; this, in a methodological or formal sense, as Foucault affirms, serves a purpose, but it is not the nature of the question. It is also not about the body since the body does not serve, per se, as a body, just as a human as a mixture of body and soul. Well then, as Foucault says, what thing the body is worth is the soul.

But as you can see, this soul, to which we approach via the curious reasoning of “making use of something” [...] has nothing to do with, for example, the body-imprisoned soul, which needs liberating, as in *Fedon*; it has nothing to do with the winged soul mate that one has to channel in a good direction, as in *Phedro*; neither is it the soul that possesses an architecture with a hierarchy of instances that we have to harmonize as in *The Republic*. It is the soul only in that it is subject to actions, the soul in that it is useful to the body, the organs, its instruments, etc. [...]

[As such making use of] means: honor the gods, worship them, do with them as you should. The expression *hippo kresthai* (making use of a horse) does not mean taking a horse in order to do what one wants with it. It means that

one has done as one should and that you used it in keeping with the rules of art implied by the team of horses or cavalry, etc. [In that sense Foucault says, it is not the same as making use of one's passions for something, abandoning oneself for them, and the same applies to ire, it is not the same as making use of ire, abandoning oneself to it, it is about the soul as a subject] (2002, p. 66-70).

The soul acts over the body, but not as it wishes but conforming to the conditions of the body that, in turn, would be nothing without the soul's presence. In some way the soul incarnates itself in the body and the one or the other by themselves are nothing. Where do the soul and body come from? What enables them to exist? In one sense, they spring from the existence of others, and in another sense, from biological energy—that which remits us to biopower. As Spinoza would say, “No one knows what a body can do”.

If the soul occupies the body, who, then, occupies the soul? Undoubtedly, the other souls, the other subjects. To occupy oneself, then, is impossible without occupying others. To occupy oneself is to take care in terms of self-discipline and control. We can say that the soul exercises a power over the body, “a power that is positively exercised over life, which procures to manage it, increase it, multiply it, exercise precise controls and general regulations over it”. (Foucault, 2012, p. 129) We know well that to arrive at the truth, it is not enough to be in good standing with God or to be right, but that these are directly related to certain technologies per se, along with some practices that have been present since Ancient Greece just as in other villages and civilizations up to our own days.

To educate is not only a passing of the knowledge of the old generation to the new, but about the whole exercise of certain practices, traditions, and experiences. To view education in some way as a biopower means conceiving it either positively or negatively. To educate is not a synonym of doing something good, which is an old conception of it. Underneath the perspective of biopower is the implication that self-care is a practice that can have many edges. For example, nowadays the exercise over oneself makes us recognize that one finds spirituality lacking, that we have tossed aside the particular, the own for a generality in which we do not recognize ourselves, call it society of knowledge or education for competences, that are imposed on us as inevitable.

To educate as self-care is a way of considering things, of being in the world, of acting with self-respect and respect for others; it is a way of life based on the *epimeleia heautou*, a way of introducing biopower because it is



an exercise of power over oneself and others and has as a finality life itself. Taking care of oneself, paying attention to what one thinks, does, says, and to what happens to our thought process, with our actions and words, is a form of biopower. It is about being able to meditate a little, about talking with ourselves and with others about daily life, of looking within our actions regarding others and within the things that surround us, of examining our conscience about things that, although simple or useless in appearance, comprise our ordinary lives. Self-care is being under a type of exercise that imposes upon us “another relationship” with life.

Nowadays we know that those rules and regulations, not only of Ancient Greece but of our more recent ancestors, seem to have become blurred, that any alternative for today’s education could seem either too idealistic or extremely utilitarian. Notwithstanding, the question of self-care keeps emerging as a reality, whether in its antithesis such as automatism and selfish alienation or as ways of joint coexistence, which seeks in the experience of daily life to make sense of this world.

Education, truth and subject get out of hand. What is the purpose of education except the search for truth? One can “do” in and for knowledge, but one can also try via experience and practice to recognize that conscience is not conscience of itself but rather of a thing, which is a great advantage. The search for truth does not negate the recognition of multiple truths. Nonetheless, if education resided in the particular truth of each person one would have an answer to many things, such as the actuation many times of science. But if there were no search for truth, everything would end up as individual truths. In that sense truth cannot be reduced to a simple symptom located in a lack of something or an absence. To compare truth with eternal laws, be they divine or structural, cancels all possibilities of the experience as creative and places the subject in the position of an instrument, always a slave in the service of a master. By the same token, if everything appears to be relative or circumstantial, we lose subjectivity in that anything we do could be or not be and in such a case to act or not to act becomes the same. An education directed toward the ability to act, toward the experience of the subject, toward its own transfiguration in the recognition that the aforesaid guarantees no benefit or recovery from something, causes one to recognize education as biopower or as a type of exercise over oneself.

SUBJECT AND TRUTH AS BIOPOWER

As Foucault says, on the one hand, we would have the philosophical preoccupation that one does not question what is true or false, but rather what one does to ensure that there exist truth and falseness and that one can or cannot differentiate between one and the other. Philosophy is an experience of thought that crosses all boundaries of life and science; it is not a discipline per se but a task that allows the subject access to truth, to its conditions and limitations. Truth-telling implies that the truth is not in writings, in laws, in standards, in rules, or in advice or illusions or the ideal. In other words, not only is it an empirical matter or something transcendental, but rather its immanence resides in the act of telling, in the experience it produces in the situation or circumstance of the exercise of power this entails.

The relationship between spirituality and truth that so interests Foucault provides three characteristics. The first consists of the fact that the truth is never fully given to the subject. The second indicates that the subject per se does not enjoy the right of having access to the truth. And lastly, that truth is not given through an act of knowledge; rather, one requires a practical modification of the subject that converts it in a certain sense and to a certain point into another subject, into the subject of truth.

The price of truth lies in the integrity of the same subject in which it is put into play. And we ask ourselves along with Foucault: How is the subject capable of truth nowadays? The concept of truth that currently reigns is that which we have been given due to knowledge and due only to knowledge, something that undoubtedly has not ceased to represent certain transformations, renunciations, and agreements of the subjects with themselves and with others. Of course, among other renunciations of our time we can mention the question concerning truth as it is completely identified with knowledge. Truth-telling, speaking the truth, does not exclude errors or wrong choices. Also, an error is a component of truth, even as far as scientific truth; this fact allows asking continuously: How many times does one say something untruthful and at the same time one is mistaken? Here, beliefs come into play. Someone, possibly a saint, a martyr or a hero, can die for truth and be completely mistaken. What is true today is false tomorrow, which does not subtract one iota of the veracity of truth-telling. The aforementioned information links truth-telling with the courage of the truth and not with knowledge.



In fact, the question for the different truths does not necessarily lead us to the question for the Truth. It is not about the sum of the parts responding to everything. Foucault himself affirms that his question was not about the different truths, but that he asks himself about the Truth. But what good is asking about the Truth? To try to confirm a previously-existing universe or to create a new one? Experience appears to indicate to us not one or the other. The question for the Truth brings us to recognize a process, a route toward wherever, although we never arrive. Therefore, what is important in this journey of “telling” the truth is to work the truth and it is this practice and experience where one finds the ineffable highway to truth. Seen from another perspective, it is about an exercise of the consumption of life, of a vital expense which becomes dynamic along the highway to truth. In that sense, there are two options: those who imagine a point of departure and point of arrival, fulfilled or not, and those who set out on a journey from an unknown location to an uncertain end. This latest concept of the Truth is more related to wisdom than to knowing things. The Western tradition imposes reference points; in other words via knowing. Other versions navigate, or drift to be specific, in search of wisdom. It is worth saying that drifting does not refer to going to pot at the depths of absolute chaos, but to the contrary; by drifting we understand it as the tension between the current imposed upon us and the singular forces that, at times, resist and at others sweep one away.

Therefore our doubts concerning that excess of “epistemologization” of the humanities (of history, anthropology, pedagogy and even the reduced epistemology of philosophy), which attempt to provide certainties and assurances to that which in itself is uncertain. To create a logical and analytical road toward the Truth has been the effort of all philosophy from the time of Socrates to our days. Also represented today as excess of information, founded in a post-modern time, are words devoid of sense and meaning. If it is true that this unequivocal truth has excited and provoked its alter ego, the equivocal, the relativistic as the other temple of knowledge, the other side of the same coin, it also applies that when one thinks about self-care, it does not mean producing a third alternative form of knowledge to the two that are revealed for that would imply continuing along the same route.

This is about a distinct ethic that in no way remits and reduces the subject to a private field or zone. Self-care, in the ethical-political category, does not exempt the individual from general sovereignty, but, on the contrary,

part of the individual; it takes the particular as a constitutive experience that creates the general, but at the same time rejecting it. In that sense, and as Foucault states, there is a double reference to the illustration or example: inasmuch as in the act of self-constitution of the subject and simultaneously as a critical interrogation task done by this subject.

But what is the truth concerning knowledge, how is it produced, what are its aims? The modern truth is due to two circumstances: on the one hand, are those we could call internal that imply a set of rules, standards and formal conditions, methods, study tools, verifications, interpretations, analyses and types of expositions. On the other hand are the externals that have to do with ways to practice, of understanding, to reason, socialize, accept and “instrumentalize” the postulates of said truth, of knowledge.

It is true that the Truth responds to a set of rules that discriminate between what is true and what is false; we could say it is a form of tautological truth as that of the sciences, especially mathematics, and not for this reason leave off being linked to power; on the contrary, it is this latter one that always gives life to the Truth. Yet, there is also a form of truth that, to give it a name, is daily, which comes from experience and practice and that on occasions responds to the truth of knowledge, but some others reveal themselves before it. It is another truth and, consequently, another power, a way different from subjecting oneself. What we find are regimens of truth production. As such, seeking the truth is not a metaphysical issue that takes us to the only infinite and authentic truth but to that truth that we must think and live. This latter one differs from that concept which considers, in one fashion or another, that there is a plan in the universe, a cosmos, a structure although neither does one take comfort in accepting that all is chaos; it is more like what Guattari (1996) would say: it is about “chaosmosis”² or of the irreducible tension among order, the recognizable and disorder, uncertainty.

2 As Guattari says: “My perspective consists of moving the human and social sciences from the scientific paradigms toward ethical-aesthetic paradigms. The problem is no longer knowing whether the Freudian Unconsciousness or Lacanian Unconsciousness offers a scientific answer to the problems of the psyche. These models will only be considered in the nature of institutional production which are promoted according to their impact on psychiatry, the teaching of subjectivity, among others, inseparable both from the technical devices and university or mass media... in a more general way, one must admit that each individual, each social group creates its own system of the modernization of subjectivity; in other words, a certain cartography made of cognitive points of reference but also myths, rituals, symptomatology, and from the standpoint that each one of them positions itself in relation to its affects, its anguish, and tries to administer its inhibitions and drives.” (1996, p. 22)



One can think that with this it is an effort to negate knowledge, but it is not; it is about not accepting that that has been and is the only path to the truth. That it entails a certain type of subjectivity which seems to attack the same idea of the subject in which, historically, we recognize ourselves. Also, it is certain that there is no return to the past and that this modernity is nothing but the infinite forging of subjects, although nowadays we are aware of the risks that question the same possibility of the world.

On the other hand, for Foucault the truth that is linked to the subject and that is present in self-discipline and the discipline of others is *parrhesia*. In keeping with what Foucault has stated (2010, p. 161-184), there exist four conditions of *parrhesia*.

- Formal condition: that found in a democracy; that is linked to tribal organization and that gives its inhabitants the right to voice their opinions concerning the problems that concern their city. However, as we will see, it is not about anyone voicing just any kind opinion, but what is of interest in this formal condition is the possibility of community organization.
- Condition of completeness: refers to the feeling of accomplishment due to the ascendancy and superiority of some. It refers to being in the “first row” in the “first rank” given that one forms part of a small group of persons who make up the outstanding citizens, about the line of “soldiers” at the helm or, in other words, the row of directors or rulers (*kubernetes*) who steer the boat. It is the condition of authority in that one belongs to the group one can, due to his/her position, and ruling.
- Condition of truth: the need for a rational *logos*. Strength, potential, power exercised, the exercise of the power of one who ascended and has the floor, exercising her/his right to speak. The ability to reason, ability to think or the energy to be critical which, as we will see, entail practice and effort.
- Moral condition: the courage and bravery in the struggle manifested in the rivalry of those who preoccupy themselves with the city, the conflict, let us say, fairness or competition among the words of those who ascended. It is an agnostic condition, in that one is in the *agon*, of the practice of truth-telling. Given that the *parrhesia* only appears in a conflict, the truth-telling is threatened by the confrontation.

We can say they are conditions of truth-telling: organization, authority, reasoning, and conflict. These four conditions are necessary in order to exercise power as the discipline of self and of others.

In these four conditions of truth-telling it is certain that there is a contest among different persons of the first rank, and they are the most influential and, as such, must and can assume the risk, the courage to impose their decision upon their followers. “It is a parrhesiastic agreement: I tell you all the truth; you all follow it if you wish, but if you do, consider yourselves part of the consequences, whatever they may be, and do not make me the only and exclusive person responsible.” (Foucault, 2010, p. 187) This parrhesiastic agreement is a form of biopower as even war is waged in name of the existence of everyone, there is an agreement in which one takes up the motto “kill in order to be able to live”. (Foucault, 2012, p. 129). *Parrhesia* is an exercise of power aimed at producing vital forces and to make them grow and orderly. In the life of the “parrhesiasta” the power of truth-telling establishes her/his strength.

This parrhesiastic agreement is exclusively supported by the same *parrhesia* and not by a false or bad *parrhesia*. There are three aspects that identify bad *parrhesia*: 1) anyone can speak; 2) what one says represents the opinion of the majority; and 3) the person who speaks guarantees her/his own security and her/his own success. It is a mistake to confuse democratic³ *parrhesia* with the possibility of anyone speaking or everyone and that they say whatever they wish. Just because everyone can speak, does not mean everyone can tell the truth. With democracy, the important thing is not that everyone or anyone says something, but the interest lies in the exercise of power as truth-telling. What requires *parrhesia* is the practice of power in the telling. Therefore, the *parrhesia* of democracy accepts that only some can tell the truth. Here is located the paradox extant in the democracy-*parrhesia* relation since “there is no true discourse sans democracy, but that discourse introduces differences in this one”. (Foucault, 2010, p. 195)

The exercise of power found in truth-telling is impossible if words lose their strength and meaning. Empty words are no good concerning *parrhesia*. Truth-telling does not overflow with meaningful words but that they

3 It is important not to confuse democracy, where what reigns is the power of the “demos”, of the villages that comprise “La Polis”, with the degeneration of democracy as the government of the poor. The “demos” are not poor and they have their “first ranks” and their “climbers”.



enable the exercise of power. We ask ourselves if nowadays truth-telling is possible considering the “erosion” of words: justice, love, freedom, pain, hatred, truth, beauty, otherness, differences, wisdom, fear, anguish, cynicism, will, nature, ire, violence, education, power, etc. It seems that nowadays anybody talks about just anything; everyone expresses her/his opinion, but few exercise *parrhesia*, not because they cannot, but because of the difficulty, almost impossibility, to expect meaningful words. “One must have thoughts, and not only points of view!” (Nietzsche, 2009, p. 40) Now, every attempt at truth-telling is considered unproductive, incorrect and absurd.

Parrhesia is the root of the process of governing, this term understood as government of oneself and of others. But, what does this self-government consist of in order to govern others? Where does the biopower that empowers biopolitics lie? What does it mean to teach a prince who exercises or will exercise power? Foucault analyzes these questions in Plato’s Letter VII, where he must act as a pedagogue of whomever inherits the power in Syracuse; rather, of Dionysius the Young. It is important to say that, in democracy, *parrhesia* is focused on the government of the people; in other words, on many, and the *parrhesia* of the monarchy is directed to the government of one, the monarch. The qualities of teaching the monarch truth-telling can be applied to those rising (politically) within democracy.

Foucault differentiates the political-educative relationship found between Socrates and Alcibiades from that relationship that is extant between Plato and Dionysius. Both masters must speak truthfully to their disciples to educate them, “persuade them concerning truth and with it to govern their souls, the souls of those who have to govern others”. (Foucault, 2010, p. 237). Alcibiades, as one who is rising as regards democracy, wants to place himself in the “first rank”, he wants to govern Athens by himself. The *parrhesia* between Socrates and Alcibiades is taken as *kayos* (opportunity or occasion). For his part, Plato has an internal “obligation” which links him to Dionysius, who now enjoys first status in such a way that his philosophy changes to *ergo* (work or task). And it is not the same to teach taking advantage of an opportunity as when it is done in fulfillment of a job. Opportunity is a chance to exercise *parrhesia*, the job entails effort and production. And this does not mean that in opportunity there are no effort and production; nonetheless, the exercise of truth-telling as work demands such effort and production. Let us say that energy and manufacturing are indispensable requisites of *parrhesia* as work. Philosophy, as a political-educative practice,

is not only logos but, fundamentally, work, understood as effort or energy, and as a productive effort. Plato's work is to exercise *parrhesia*, exercise logos and, with that, practice philosophy. It is not about giving good advice to the ruler, "but instead, with the exercise of *parrhesia*, one seeks to practice veridiction with reference to power. Truth-telling is an exercise of power or a practice of biopower as vigor in life.

Foucault identifies three processes or "circles", as he calls them, of the political mission of the pedagogue or of the teaching of *parrhesia* to the ruler. First, is the circle of listening. Plato must make himself heard, know how to speak and with that, govern; at the same time Dionysius must be willing to make one listen; in other words, obey. For example, Plato (1992, p. 330 c-d) says in Letter Seven:

The first thing the advisor of a sick person needs to do, if the patient follows a regime harmful to his health, is to suggest a change in lifestyle; if the patient is willing to accept, the advisor must give him new prescriptions, but if the patient refuses, I would still consider him a good man and a good doctor if he refuses to accept further consultations. [...]

Whenever I am asked for advice [truth-telling] regarding an important matter referring to one's own life, such as the acquisition of assets or the care of the body or the spirit, if I consider that his usual behavior conforms to certain demands, or if I think that he will follow my advice regarding the matters for which I am consulted, I will do so whole heartedly and not just as a way to get rid of him by downloading my conscience [...] Precisely with this same criterion with respect to his own city must the wise man live by; if he thinks that his city is not well governed, he must say it, so long as he does not talk in haste or put himself in danger of death.

Listening and keeping quiet imply paying attention; at first, oneself and, later, the other one. It is not possible to be silent in order to hear if one does not control one's impulses to speak. Here the student hushes up not out of ignorance, lack of knowledge, fear or indifference, but because one is obligated to listen, one must learn to restrain her/his voice. To obligate one to listen is to practice veridiction with reference to the power of ruling so that the other one (student) obeys. Let us consider a world full of information, mainly proportioned by the mass media, one so crowded with communication that in the social networks and *microblogging*, it is difficult to silence. She/he who is



not on Facebook or Twitter does not exist, some say; notwithstanding the fact that both communication platforms are fed largely by opinions of everybody in the world in which anything is said by anyone; hence, better not to exist. The problem lies in the accessibility of the whole world, in the flexibility of opinions, in the waste of words that profoundly damage one's capacity to listen and keep quiet. Probably one of the greatest evils of humankind is this self-exhibition. To be exposed to the waste of words profoundly weakens the exercise of *parrhesia* as the practice of making oneself heard because, faced with the lack of power to keep quiet, it is impossible to make oneself heard.

In *parrhesia* what is exercised is truth-telling on the teacher's part, as is keeping quiet on the students' part. Due to this Foucault relates three elements of the practice of medicine to the exercise of the teacher of *parrhesia*. The teacher makes her/himself heard only when things are going bad; she/he prescribes while persuading at the same time; in other words, she/he must say what has to be done but, also, explain why it has to be done and she/he must always consider the whole and not only a part of the problem; think completely about the regimen of the city as if it were a regimen of the body. It is necessary to feel that oneself, life, the world and certain things are not well; one must have the strength to trust that something can be done and that, although it may be only for an instant, it is possible to be well, not individually but universally.

The second circle is of the practice (*pragmata*). These are all the activities, the difficulties, the practices, the exercises, and ways to be applied, of which completion requires an effort. The method for this practice consists of putting the intelligence, memory and reflection to work. *Pragmata* here refers to everything we apply ourselves to, it means "let's do it", thus an alert intelligence, good memory and the ability to reflect must occur in everyday life; and this demands great energy, let's say it "demands a lot of work"; Foucault says (2010, p. 250) that the apprentice should not moderate his efforts and must work all the way until the end of the road.

Plato (1992, p. 340b-341a) in Letter Seven says:

First of all he should corroborate if Dionysius was really inflamed like fire by philosophy [by the exercise of *parrhesia*] [...] Well, there is a very discreet process to perform this test [...] the philosophical work needs to be explained in its entirety, as well as all the work and efforts required [...] [He must put forth] all his efforts with those of the guide who is directing him and not

slow down until he has fully reached all the objectives, or finds the necessary strength to be able to walk without his instructor. This is the mood that the man lives with, devoted to his ordinary activities, whatever they may be, but always mindful of philosophy and to a daily lifestyle which grants him along with sobriety an alert intelligence, memory and capacity for reflection.

Different from the knowledge of self in relation to one's personal well-being, this is not about a conversation, but rather following a path, to work and carry out strenuous exercises. Nor is it the devotion to external realities, but the practice, in everyday life, to learn, to remember and to reason. It is not about the change of view, but of the work, or even better, of the exercise on oneself, which is the practice of self on self. The method, as a practice of *parrhesia*, demands intelligence, memory and reflection. Intelligence is the astuteness to resolve conflicts, an example of that is Odysseus, the *polus pragmata* (he of many resources); memory is the ability to remember, the capacity to retain perceptions and facts; and reflection is an action of thought which allows you to change direction, to look into the folds of reality, and with that make decisions.

Intelligence, memory and reflection are the fundamental skills to: learn easily (*eumathes*), to remember or memorize what has been learned (*mnemon*) and to reason or use reasoning when making decisions (*logízzesthai dynatos*). "It is the practice in everyday life, that kind of day-to-day activity, within which an individual should [with great effort] display himself *eumathes* (capable of learning), *mnemon* (capable of remembering) and *logízzesthai* (capable of reasoning)."

To exercise power over oneself, as a practice, implies willingness to set the body toward every day work. Here, work is viewed as an effort to learn, to memorize and to reason, and work as in the production or manufacturing of something. What is produced by the practice of truth-telling? In the area of currency exchange or finance it seems to us very little, but a lot in the specific effects of decision-making or elections made as *parrhesia*, both individually as well as in public. In other words, as ascending in democracy or as first by status in monarchy, the product of the practice of truth-telling lies in whether or not to go to war, to write a law or not, to finance or not certain social or cultural projects, etc. The decisions made as a consequence of *parrhesia* produce concrete things that mark the life of a whole community. The aptitude to learn, to memorize and to reason by the parrhesiastic student, serve his exercise of power as they have been practiced in body and soul.



He does not practice these skills as ornaments of life, as vanity or stamps of pride, but rather as substantive aspects of his work. The parrhesiastic is the most practical and pragmatic of all mankind. He practices and acquires experience in his work, transforming work itself into his own practice and vital experience. It is, as we said, a pragmatic practice of spirituality.

Finally, there is the circle of knowledge, which refers to the learning of things themselves. For somebody to be able to say that they know something, five elements are required: 1) name, 2) definition, 3) image, 4) to have the right opinion on the matter, and 5) “to know the thing itself” which means to practice and confront the aforementioned. It is about knowing what it is, how it is and why a certain thing is the way it is, be it: politics, power, justice, body, work, education, etc.

To be heard, coupled with practice and knowledge, are political missions of the teaching of *parrhesia* to the ruler. The three processes are exercises in power, and in and of itself the teaching of *parrhesia* is biopower as much as government of itself as to the government of others. The teaching of *parrhesia* is immeasurable to the school and the curricula even though both are used as a first instance. The *parrhesia*, as a fundamental quality of biopower, is the practical exercises over oneself, in the form of listening, practice and knowledge. Life-changing, strenuous and difficult exercises for those who perform them.

FINAL THOUGHTS

We must change our view in order to modify the horizon of the known. The truth lies in our own transformation. It is about having a plurality of perspectives so as to prevent our remaining immobilized in a fixed point of view. And just as Foucault would say (1986, p. 12): It is important to think in a different way, and perceive in a different way, because there are times in life “in which the question of knowing whether it is possible to think differently from what you already think, and to perceive differently from what you already see is essential to continue contemplating and thinking”.

We have to question our own historical account with the criteria of truth that have been instilled into us as individuals, to reflect, such as Foucault has mentioned, on the basis of a new ethic that links all individual action in line with the collective interests. The care of oneself and truth-telling not to think of ourselves based on a new psychic structure, but precisely because



we have the need to occupy ourselves in a different way, with new questions that contradict the continent of truth inscribed in this modernity.

As Wilhelm Schmid says (2002, p. 27)

What currently comes to the fore is not the hermeneutics of self, but the practice of me which can become a praxis of freedom. That is, the essential point is no longer the question of whether or not we have conquered “freedom” or if we have given up on it; the decisive point is the development of praxis. The issue has to do with personal decisions that we must make at all times, every step of the way. This choice is decisive when closing or opening the horizon of possibilities. The total absence of practice in matters pertaining to personal election is when the *aporia* that immobilizes us presides.

It is, firstly, a strong sensitivity endowed with a capacity to observe and the openness to experience. In this sense, it is a form of knowledge, how to identify yourself in the world, the perception of oneself and of knowing how to behave. It is, as Foucault says, the “art of living”. Meanwhile, how should I transform myself to *be able* to access the truth? The care of oneself and truth-telling are abilities, skills, exercises that figure and disfigure life itself. The biopower is the art of living, it implies the capacity of personal election in the sense of being able to opt, to accept or reject how we live. The ability to establish a foundation of the individual, that isn’t in ontological terms, nor based upon relativist pragmatism. It means to assume the formation and transformation of oneself as a way of life.

It is precisely in the work upon oneself, on certain practices, of imposing on ourselves certain rules of behavior, but mostly in the possibility of transformation to oneself, as ethics is achieved and with that a way to live life. As has been said, life itself does not just happen. It must be gotten, practiced, exercised and rehearsed so it can live. Create your own lifestyle, an aesthetical existence.

It is clear that we have adopted a strategy of biopower, as creator and creative, in a positive and alternative sense to the alienating forms, coercive and submissive, of the alienation and suppression of desire prevailing in this globalized world. Biopower is also a form of negative control.

As a subject, truth, conscience and sensitivity are the limits within which we are constituted. To suggest biopower as a way of life means to recognize ourselves in the forms that we create from certain techniques of self as every day practices, which allow us to govern ourselves and to transform what we



are into something different, occasionally opposed to rules and institutional norms, and at times accepting them, but never as eternal and immutable, only as a strategy for the transformation of our subjectivities.

In this sense we can identify an important difference between the concept that establishes that the possibility of the transformation of the subject, of the care of oneself and the practice of self with a corrective and formative sense that does not depend on being young, as Socrates seemed to imply when addressing Alcibiades in the *Banquet*, and neither is the issue of truth-telling only possible in adulthood or old age. Doubtless, one is never too young to take care of oneself or for truth-telling, as it is never too late for the elder to take care of themselves or give truth-telling a try. All of the above makes us think of the possibility of going back to being what we never were, as Foucault says (2002, p. 105):

We must heal ourselves, even when we are young. A doctor, of course, has a better possibility of success when consulted at the onset of the illness and not at the end. Anyway, although one does not make it right when we are young, there is still time to do it. Even though we toughen up, there exists the means to right it, to correct ourselves, to be back to what we should have been but never were. To be what we never were: this, it seems to me, is one of the elements, one of the fundamental issues of the practice of self.

In the practices of self, as caring for oneself and truth-telling, lays the constitution of subjectivity and biopower. To be back to what we never were, demands the governing of self and of others who exercise power. Biopower, which is *epimeleia heautou*, consists of an attitude, closer look, purification, modification and transfiguration. *Parrhesia*, is the ability to express everything, to be heard, as a practice and as work.

With this it is clear that if we accept accessing the truth only as conscience, we would be limited by a reasonable subjectivity. We will be in effect making the illustrated postulate of being able to conduct ourselves following our own reason, and thus will be autonomous, no doubt, of our own sensitivity and affections, we will carry on through the world as perfect automatons, capable of functioning, but alien to our own bodies and to another form of subjectivity that can effectively be risky, especially considering the principles of immutability, indifference and insignificance that characterize our times.

To bet on the difference, to the day-to-day asymmetries, to the local, not as privilege of the private over the public, but as the only current venue for the production of truth, of creation and the ethical-political realization. This does not imply the need to abandon the universal, but to accept that in what is imposed on us as globalization we do not recognize ourselves as sensitive individuals, instead we are being treated as pieces of a market that in spite of everything is always relying on the concrete, in a defined space not only as a liquid abstraction or global speculation. For Peter Sloterdijk, for example, the inequalities and the differences are what allow us to face an ever-increasing indifferent world, a state of things where we hold on to one's own language, habits, what is different from what has been established by prevailing concepts.

The lack of capacity for the future has a name: *monoglosia*, that is, to hold on to our native language. According to the modernists, the world should be constructed in such a way that all admissible situations could be expressed in *basic English*: if at airports and in discussions of board of directors this has proven to be highly useful, why not also in all other circumstances. For a similar reason—due to the resistance to the spread of developed cultural praxis—positivist planners are outraged by the science of the spirit in general, and especially by the literary and musical training plans. It is clear to them: a reading of *Fausto* takes entire days, *War and Peace* entertains the reader for several weeks; however, those who want to familiarize themselves with Beethoven's piano sonatas and with Rihm string quartets have to spend several months. (Sloterdijk, 2007, p. 309)

We will be true individuals not only through our conscience, but also through our daily practices, the everyday training with others, at home, with our family, at school, in college and privately. Accepting that institutions no longer exist as we knew them as they have succumbed under the control of society⁴,

4 “All the enclosed institutions are undergoing a general crisis: jails, hospitals, factories, schools, families. The family is an “interior” crisis, just as are the other interiors (the student, the professional, etc.). Competent ministers constantly announce the supposedly necessary reforms. Reform schools, reform industry, reform the hospital, the army, the jail; but everyone knows that, in the long term, these institutions are done with. We pretend only to manage the agony and maintain people occupied while these new forces that are already calling at our doors are installed. It is about the *societies of control* that are teaching these disciplines.” (Deleuze, 1999, p. 278)



that there is an instituting process bigger than ourselves, but which is not foreign to us.

But also, and above all, in recognizing that what constitutes the world is the nonsense. To assume the nonsense as the impulse for a different world and chaos as constitutive of our own subjectivity, allows us to raise the need to create other institutions where, at least partially and temporarily, we can be recognized. Education as biopower is the nonsense that enables life.

REFERENCES

- CASTRO, E. (2011). *Diccionario Foucault. Temas, conceptos y autores*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI editores.
- DELEUZE, G. (1999). *Conversaciones*. Valencia: Pre-textos.
- DELEUZE, G. & GUATTARI, F. (2005). *¿Qué es la filosofía?* Barcelona, Anagrama.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1986). *Historia de la sexualidad, El uso de los placeres, 2*. México: Ed. Siglo XXI.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2002). *La hermenéutica del sujeto*. México: F.C.E.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2010). *El gobierno de sí y de los otros*. México: F.C.E.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2012). *Historia de la sexualidad, La voluntad de saber, 1*. México: Ed. Siglo XXI.
- GUATTARI, F. (1996). *Caosmosis*. Buenos Aires: Manantial.
- NIETZSCHE, F. (2009). *Sobre el porvenir de nuestras escuelas*. Barcelona: Tusquets.
- PLATO (1992). *Cartas*. Madrid: Gredos.
- PLATO (1997). *Apología de Sócrates*. Madrid: Gredos.
- SCHMID, W. (2002). *En busca de un nuevo arte de vivir*. Valencia: Pre-textos.
- SLOTERDIJK, P. (2007). *En el mundo interior del capital. Para una teoría filosófica de la globalización*. Madrid: Siruela.

*

Received: September 4, 2015

Final version received: December 15, 2015

Published online: December 30, 2015



NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

JULIO GROPPA AQUINO. PhD and M.A. in School Psychology. Main professor in the graduate program in Education, School of Education, University of São Paulo (USP). Head of the Researchers Collective on Education and Power Relations (CoPERP/USP). Productivity Grant Fellowship Holder at CNPq.

SILVIA M. GRINBERG. MA and PhD. Professor of Sociology of Education, director of the Centre for Studies in Inequalities, Subjectivity and Institutions (National University of San Martín, UNSAM) and researcher at the National Committee of Science and Technology in Argentina (CONICET).

FABIANA AUGUSTA ALVES JARDIM. PhD and M.A. in Sociology (PPGS/USP). Professor-researcher at the School of Education (USP), within the field of Sociology of Education. Head of the group of researchers about Governmentalities, Ethics and Subjectivities (GES/USP).

MARCO A. JIMÉNEZ. Professor-researcher of the Acatlan School of Higher Studies, graduate degree in Pedagogy from the School of Philosophy and Letters from the UNAM and a graduate degree in Humanities and Social Sciences from the UNAM. Professor of the Philosophy of Culture and Sociology of Culture seminars.

PATRICIO LEPE-CARRIÓN. PhD of Philosophy (Chile). Postdoctoral researcher at the Faculty of Education, University of São Paulo. Researcher responsible for the Fondecyt Program, N°11140804, Department of Pedagogical Studies (DEP), University of Chile.

MAURA CORCINI LOPES. PhD and M.A. in Education. Undergraduate in Special Education. Main professor in the Graduate Program in Education at University Vale do Rio dos Sinos (UNISINOS). Head of the Study and Research Group in Inclusion (GEPI/UNISINOS/CNPq). Productivity Grant Fellowship Holder at CNPq.



DORA LÍLIA MARÍN-DÍAZ. PhD in Education. Professor at National Pedagogical University (Colombia). Member of the Pedagogical Practices History Group (Colombia), Studies and Research in Curriculum and Postmodernism Group (Brazil) and Study and Research on Inclusion Group (Brazil).

CARLOS ERNESTO NOGUERA-RAMÍREZ. PhD in Education and M.A. in History. Professor at National Pedagogical University (Colombia). Member of the Pedagogical Practices History Group (Colombia), Studies and Research in Curriculum and Postmodernism Group (Brazil) and Study and Research on Inclusion Group (Brazil).

ANA MARÍA VALLE VÁZQUEZ. Professor-researcher with the Center of Research and Teaching in Humanities of the state of Morelos (Mexico).

ALFREDO VEIGA-NETO. PhD in Education and M.Sc. in Genetics. Full professor (retired) from the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS). Guest Professor (on a permanent basis) of the graduate program in Education of UFRGS. Head of the Research Group in Curriculum and Contemporariness (GPCC/UFRGS).

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

PUBLICATION FREQUENCY

3 issues per year

Each number will focus on a specific theme. Along with the articles, the journal will include other research materials such as case-study reports, experiences and inquiries, conceptual and methodological discussions, on-going research papers and book reviews.

SUBMISSION

Authors are requested to submit their papers electronically by using the e-mail sisyphus@ie.ulisboa.pt or our website <http://revistas.rcaap.pt/sisyphus>

SUBMISSION DECLARATION

Sisyphus – Journal of Education only publishes original articles, explicitly under the strict condition that they have not been published already, nor are they under consideration for publication or in press elsewhere (excluding abstracts or writings extracted from conferences or theses). Articles must be sanctioned by all authors in order to be published.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR AUTHORS

Review criteria

All submitted articles must be rigorous, technically precise, and should put forward a progressive perspective in relation to the state of the art. They should also elucidate and circumscribe the significance of the subject matter, as well as the conceptual and methodological orientations; the research enquiry; the revision of the correlative and most relevant publications on the subject; and the presentation of all results and conclusions. The manuscripts must be essentially problematical; that is, they should draw research vectors that open up new theoretic

cal paths while suggesting methods to deal with intrinsic interrogations. They must also add new perspectives to current writings.

In order to be published, the articles must focus on issues that can resonate with an international audience, which is why they should promote and be engaged in wide-ranging issues and debates that can be inscribed within a non-local agenda.

Language and use of language

All articles must be written in English (U.K.), so that they may be read by an international audience. National, colloquial terms and idiomatic expressions should be avoided. Non-discriminatory language is mandatory for all manuscripts: any words or expressions conveying social prejudices are to be avoided.

Articles

Length: Articles submitted should not exceed 10,000 words.

Abstract: An abstract of 150 words is required for all submitted papers. It must synthesize the article's main query, its results and conclusions.

Key words: Each article should have 3 to 5 key words.

Use of word-processing software

All articles should be submitted in any editable format (docx, doc), and formatting should be minimal.

References

All submitted articles must follow APA Style, 6th edition. For detailed information, please see the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 6th edition (www.apastyle.org).



BIOPOLITICS, EDUCATION AND LATIN AMERICA

JULIO GROPPA AQUINO
& MAURA CORCINI LOPES

BIOPOLITICS, EDUCATION AND LATIN AMERICA

Introduction by

Julio Groppa Aquino and Maura Corcini Lopes

WEARING FOUCAULT'S CLOGS:

BIOPOLITICS IN BRAZILIAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Julio Groppa Aquino and Fabiana Augusta Alves Jardim

POLICIES OF SOCIAL ACTION AND INCLUSION

AND CURRENT BRAZILIAN TENSIONS

Maura Corcini Lopes and Alfredo Veiga-Neto

INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION IN CHILE: COLONIAL

SUBJECTIVITY AND ETHNO-GOVERNMENTAL RATIONALITY

Patricio Lepe-Carrión

GOVERNMENTALITY AND PEDAGOGICAL

APPARATUSES IN MANAGEMENT TIMES

Silvia M. Grinberg

TRAINING THE HUMAN ANIMAL:

BIOPOLITICS AND ANTHROPOTECHNICS

Carlos Ernesto Noguera-Ramírez and Dora Lilia Marín-Díaz

BIOPOWER AND EDUCATION: SELF-CARE, SUBJECT AND TRUTH

Marco A. Jiménez and Ana María Valle Vázquez

ISSN: 2182-9640 08



9 772182 9640

