

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY AND COLONIALISM PERSISTENCE IN EDUCATIONAL DAILY

Flávia Maria Cavallo Pfeil ¹; Maria Helena Rodrigues Navas Zamora ¹

ABSTRACT

This article proposes to reflect on some effects of colonialist persistence in education. Putting into question the cultural hegemony imposed by Eurocentrism, which is intrinsically racist, and reproduced in educational institutions, some of its implications in the teaching/learning process and sociability of students in basic education in public schools in Brazil were analyzed. Therefore, we trace some of the lines of force that constitute and sustain the current educational logic, from the dialogue with Gregório Barembliitt, René Lourau and Michel Foucault, as well as scholars of the impacts of violent colonization processes, such as Frantz Fanon, Anibal Quijano, Catherine Walsh, Vera Candau and Paulo Freire, and also authors who deal with the historiography of public education in Brazil, such as Gaudêncio Frigotto. This analysis triggers the coloniality that constitutes our school education, contributing to the overcoming of individualizing psychological approaches in the school environment.

Keywords: coloniality; school; school psychology.

Psicología Escolar y persistencias del colonialismo en el cotidiano educacional

RESUMEN

En el presente artículo se tiene como propuesta reflexionar sobre algunos efectos de las persistencias colonialistas en la educación. Poniéndose en cuestión la hegemonía cultural impuesta por el eurocentrismo, intrínsecamente racista, y reproducida en las instituciones educacionales, se analizaron algunas de sus implicaciones en el proceso de enseñanza/aprendizaje y sociabilidad de estudiantes de la educación primaria de la red pública de enseñanza en Brasil. Para tanto, subrayamos algunas de las líneas de fuerza que constituyen y sostienen la lógica educacional vigente, a partir de la interlocución con Gregorio Barembliitt, René Lourau y Michel Foucault, así como estudiosos de los impactos de procesos violentos de colonización, como Frantz Fanon, Anibal Quijano, Catherine Walsh, Vera Candau y Paulo Freire y, aún, autores que tratan de escribir la historia de la educación pública en Brasil, como Gaudencio Frigotto. Este análisis deflagra la colinealidad que constituye nuestra educación escolar, contribuyendo para a superación de abordajes psicológicas individualizantes en el ambiente escolar.

Palabras clave: colinealidad; escuela; psicología escolar.

Psicologia Escolar e persistências do colonialismo no cotidiano educacional

RESUMO

O presente artigo tem como proposta refletir sobre alguns efeitos das persistências colonialistas na educação. Colocando em questão a hegemonia cultural imposta pelo eurocentrismo, intrinsecamente racista e reproduzida nas instituições educacionais, foram analisadas algumas de suas implicações no processo de ensino/aprendizagem e sociabilidade de estudantes da educação básica da rede pública de ensino no Brasil. Para tanto, traçamos algumas das linhas de força que constituem e sustentam a lógica educacional vigente, a partir da interlocução com Gregório Barembliitt, René Lourau e Michel Foucault, assim como estudiosos dos impactos de processos violentos de colonização, como Frantz Fanon, Anibal Quijano, Catherine Walsh, Vera Candau e Paulo Freire e, ainda, autores que tratam de historiografar a educação pública no Brasil, como Gaudêncio Frigotto. Esta análise deflagra a colonialidade que constitui nossa educação escolar, contribuindo para a superação de abordagens psicológicas individualizantes no ambiente escolar.

Palavras-chave: colonialidade; escola; psicologia escolar.

¹ Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro – Rio de Janeiro – RJ – Brasil; flaviacavallopfeil@gmail.com; zamoramh@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Working in the School Psychology field in municipal schools in a city in the state of Rio de Janeiro, there is a great demand for action in cases of students who have difficulties in learning and/or sociability. As a rule, these are students who find themselves in what is conventionally called “age-year distortion”, that is, with the age group above the expected for the school year they are attending. Another situation in which School Psychology is called upon is in the case of students with challenging behaviors, who refuse to follow certain school rules.

The diagnostic hypotheses raised by the technical teams to justify both the “delay” and the “bad behavior” almost always point to learning and/or behavioral disorders. These are, therefore, children and adolescents who would need referrals for different types of assessments – psychological, neurological, speech therapy, psychiatric – supposedly capable of detecting what makes them unproductive in school life. Once the possible causes of the “deviations” have been identified, they must begin a treatment to “correct the problem”. The psychologist must carry out the screening already at school, identifying which assessments are necessary, calling the family and making the appropriate referrals.

This type of demand certainly doesn’t reach the psychologist only in public schools. However, in this article, this cut is not arbitrary. In a society historically marked by great social and racial inequality, very different educational spaces are reserved for different social groups. Likewise, the ways of perceiving and referring to the difficulties presented by the students present significant differences.

Often, demands for “correction of deviants” arrive without any consideration of the context in which they are identified. At most, they rely on an analysis that reduces to blaming the families, who are often identified as “unstructured” and, therefore, inadequate, pathological. The sociocultural dimension is seen as less important and only solutions are presented that revolve around the subject, what is characteristic of his nature and that prevents him from adapting to the norm (Foucault, 1998, 2002, 2009). Apparently, it is his intrapsychic self that needs to be modified and adapted to the established rule.

At the Psychology service, this demand comes as a problem for a student, family or even a community, identified as the most problematic. As a result, we have a significant increase in the waiting list for individual specialized care and the so-called “school dropout” – students who drop out of school, entering the world of work early (formal, informal or illegal). Meanwhile, the school seems shielded, not questioning itself.

In this article, without intending to deny possible

psychic compromises that interfere in the learning and socialization process, we analyze the intrinsically racist Eurocentric character of educational institutions in Brazil and its implications in the teaching/learning process and sociability of basic education students. Such analysis takes place through a theoretical review, but that dialogues with a field of experiences, which is called at strategic moments in which the sharing of lived experiences contributes to the understanding of the ways in which power games take place in practice. Authors from Institutional Analysis, Michel Foucault, are brought here, as well as researchers who reflect on the colonization processes, with peculiar aspects in the way of thinking and doing education, such as Frantz Fanon, Anibal Quijano, Catherine Walsh, Paulo Freire and Vera Candau.

MODERN SCHOOL AND THE PRODUCTION OF DOCELE BODIES

According to Baremlitt (2002), a society is “a fabric of institutions that interpenetrate and articulate among themselves to regulate the production and reproduction of human life on earth and the relationship among men” (p. 27). Lourau (1993) states that institutions are not observable, stable things, but contradictory dynamics, movements forged in history, in social-historical time, but they are logics that regulate human activities, establishing what should and should not be done. They can be formally announced, in the form of laws and norms or manifested through habits, social conventions and behavior regularities.

For Institutional Analysis, the set of forces that act in institutions to produce permanence is called “instituted” (Lourau, 1993; Baremlitt, 2002). The instituted represents the *status quo*, that which is established and even naturalized. Foucault (2002) points out that the instituted is constituted from games of truth always articulated to knowledge-power strategies, which establish certain rules thought of as incontestable, separating the legitimate from the illegitimate, the normal from the abnormal, right from wrong, etc.

It is by being materialized in concrete devices, in “organizations” (Baremlitt, 2002), that institutions (with an abstract dimension) fulfill the function of regulating life. Organizations are sets of material forms that materialize the options enunciated by institutions, consisting of smaller units, such as establishments, that is, places where human agents play a leading role in the practice, operating technical devices to reproduce the institutional logic.

From this perspective, the school is an establishment and has a concrete base, like the building and equipment. Agented by professors, managers, employees and their technicians, this establishment works to reproduce the logic of educational institutions – laws, norms and

guidelines that prescribe how to socialize and instruct an individual so that he or she can integrate into society.

According to Candau (2011), what is instituted about school education was built from the political-social and epistemological matrix of modernity, which sought the common, the homogeneous, the universal. In this logic, a model is instituted that does not consider the multiple modes of existence, disqualifies collective experiences and creates fixed and totalizing norms.

Foucault (2009) points out that during the 18th and 19th centuries, disciplines assumed the character of general formulas of domination, giving rise to disciplinary societies. Under the security justification, disciplinary devices are triggered, operating a constant division between what is normal and what is abnormal, which every individual is subjected to. These are devices that will be constituted from the composition of control and correction techniques for those considered abnormal, developed within “kidnapping institutions” (Foucault, 2009, p. 122), such as school, factory, prison, hospital, etc. Institutions that work with techniques to extract the totality of individuals’ time and control their bodies, transforming the body into work force and time into work time.

These changes respond to the consequences of the profound economic, political and social transformations experienced during this period. According to Veiga-Neto and Saraiva (2011), the modern school functioned as the main device to discipline bodies, thus enabling the consolidation of industrial capitalism. It became, they claim, “the most widespread institution of kidnapping, its action being much more decisive for the constitution of disciplinary societies than other institutions” (Veiga-Neto & Saraiva, 2011, p. 6).

Thus, starting from the notion of governmentality, brought by Foucault (2008), the authors understand why modern States have taken school education as a privileged institution, paying special attention to the establishment of its objectives and ways of functioning. Foucault (2008) defines governmentality as a set of government practices whose object is the population, as the most important knowledge of the economy and as basic mechanisms of security devices (Machado, 1998; Foucault, 2008).

According to Veiga-Neto and Saraiva (2011), school education, in tune with modern political rationality, at the same time totals and individualizes subjects. This is because, “if on the one hand, the school constitutes unique individualities, creating subjectivities that are thought to be unique and indivisible, it also creates subject positions subordinated to a social whole, outside which each subject does not even make sense” (Veiga-Neto & Saraiva, 2011, p. 9). This movement prevents the individual from being thought of or from thinking of himself as a subject – subject of and subject to.

In this sense, the view of school education as fundamentally aggregating and promoting critical thinking can be questioned. It appears in modernity based on disaggregation – the caesura between the normal and the abnormal, the fit and the unfit. Modern governmentality creates the school – an educational establishment whose architecture, management and pedagogical and educational techniques adopted are primarily aimed at disciplining and standardizing student bodies.

In countries that suffered colonization, the role of governing bodies, which founded the school, takes on even more complex contours. The disciplinarian and standardization aimed at and promoted by school institutions are based on a model of normality that has Europe as a reference. Thus, an “educated” and “intelligent” individual comes to be understood as one capable of introjecting and performing to the full the Eurocentric model of the subject of knowledge, that is, in a certain way of being, seeing and operating in the world. On the other hand, on those who fail to reach such a model and, even more, on those who reject it, there is generally a violent normative educational imposition, based on control, surveillance, punishment and exclusion.

RACISM, COLONIALITY AND BIOPOLITICS

Fanon (1980), a Martinican psychiatrist and radical anti-colonialist, understands racism as a consequence of the specific form of capitalist exploitation that was colonialism. It is part of the set of power strategies that act in the systematic oppression of the people.

The concept of coloniality was created by Quijano (1997), a Peruvian sociologist, to explain the continuity of colonial forms of domination after the end of colonial administrations, not extinguishing with independence or decolonization. There is in the creation of this concept an attempt to explain modernity as a process deeply linked to the colonial experience.

Walsh (2009) points out that the matrix of coloniality has race, racism and racialization as central, constitutive and founding points of relations of domination. The central landmark for the contextualization of cultural diversity is found in the historical articulation between the idea of race as an instrument of classification and social control and the development of world capitalism – modern, colonial, patriarchal and Eurocentric.

For Quijano (1997), a “coloniality of power” establishes and fixes a racialized hierarchy, where whites (Europeans) occupy the top, followed by “mestizos”, “indians” and “blacks” seen as common and negative identities. In this context, binary categories such as east-west, primitive-civilized, mystical-scientific, traditional-modern serve to “justify superiority and inferiority, rationality and irrationality, humanization and

dehumanization (coloniality of being) and presuppose Eurocentrism as a hegemonic perspective (coloniality of knowledge)” (Walsh, 2009, p. 15).

Foucault (2005), in his studies on power, points out that the eighteenth century marks the process of entry of phenomena inherent to human life in power calculations. According to him, at that moment, processes related to human life began to be considered by the mechanisms of power and knowledge, inaugurating a form of power that he called biopower, which developed in later centuries. By investing in the living body, by valuing it, managing its forces in a distributive way, biopower includes it in a controlled way in the production and consumption apparatus and is of great importance in the development of capitalism.

What is produced in the action of biopower is not only the docile individual and useful to capitalist interests, but the very calculated management of the life of the social body, which Foucault (2005) called biopolitics. Population is seen as a problem that is at the same time scientific and political, biological and of power, which must be treated through global mechanisms so that global states of regularity are reached.

In biopolitics, the community is seen as a biologically homogeneous set that, in order to be maintained, needs to be regulated through policies not only for the organization and proliferation of life, but also for sanitation, which fulfill the function of freeing the population’s body from its internal infections, their anomalies and their contagions. In this process, Foucault points out, racism is a fundamental mechanism of power, as it is it that will define “a cut between what must live and what must die” (2005, p. 304). The organization and hierarchical qualification of individuals in races fragments the biological field that power was responsible for, lags behind, within the population, some groups in relation to others (Foucault, 2005).

If taken into account as an analytical category, race/ racism is capable of revealing “many ways of exercising oppressive power and favoring our understanding of society and the subjectivity it produces” (Zamora, 2012, p. 564). The “race” continues to produce perceptions about supposed moral characteristics of individuals considered as not belonging to the white “race”. Their bodies are also viewed pejoratively in relation to white, being unfavorably compared to ethnocentric aesthetic ideals. This look focuses on the relationship that subjects establish with bodies, which are constituted from dissatisfaction, incompleteness, generating a constant effort to cover up the characteristics that make it out of step with the imposed model (Souza, 1983).

For Guattari and Rolnik (2007), the mechanisms of segregation, infantilization and blaming act producing feelings of inferiority, loneliness, dependence, incapacity

and guilt on those who experience other ways of expressing themselves and feeling the world. With regard to inferior cultures throughout history this is especially true. Thus, they are expected to remain in subordinate positions, not resisting and showing gratitude. Its history as a potential for revolt and resistance is erased; its leaders and inspiring forces are eliminated.

Thus, coloniality continues to operate, cutting across all institutions. Racism is updated, gaining new forms of expression, apparently subtler, but no less perverse.

FREE AND MANDATORY PUBLIC SCHOOL IN BRAZIL

Candau (2011) points out that, in the process of cultural homogenization that preceded the construction of Latin American national states, school education played a prominent role. It was one of the main ways of diffusing and consolidating the common Eurocentric culture, adopting pedagogical strategies that contributed to the silencing and/or invisibility of voices, knowledge, colors, beliefs and sensibilities.

Frigotto (2005) states that in Brazil, even with the constitution of the republican regime, the political practices of the elites, which reiterate forms of subordination and associated sharing, have not been erased. According to the author, until the 1930s, the forces of the old republic dominated, centered on agrarian oligarchies, among which education was a privilege of a few. In this way, the popular classes, especially the blacks, continued to be relegated to illiteracy or, in some cases, to primary education.

According to Frigotto (2005), in 1920, in the contradictory plane of the struggles of the emerging industrial bourgeoisie and the agrarian bourgeoisie, the reduction of illiteracy began to interest industry, opening up space for access to public schools. It is from this opening that, in the mid-twentieth century, the so-called “national education systems” were created, whose organization was inspired by the principle that education is a right for all and a State duty.

For the new order that is installed, the marginalized are those who did not have access to desirable knowledge in a formal school context. In this context, the school is elected as the instrument to transform everyone into citizens, “redeeming men from their double historical sin: ignorance, moral misery and oppression, political misery” (Zanotti, 1972, quoted by Saviani, 1999, p. 18). Education, seen as an instrument of social equalization and, therefore, of overcoming marginality – an accidental phenomenon that individually affected a certain number of members of society – thus assumes a very coercive function. A homogenizing force, whose role is that of cohesion, ensuring the integration of everyone into the social

body. For Ferreiro (2001, cited by Candau, 2011), the public, free and mandatory school of the 20th century, is heir to this movement.

o create a single people, a single nation, eliminating the differences between citizens, considered equal before the law. If citizens were equal under the law, the school should contribute to generate these citizens, homogenizing children, regardless of their different origins. Charged with homogenizing, with equalizing, this school could barely appreciate the differences (Ferreiro, 2001, quoted by Candau, 2011, p. 242).

Paulo Freire's studies (1979, 1987) in the field of education allow us to understand that the elites of societies that were formed from a colonization process reproduce their logic, as this is what guarantees the maintenance of their privileges. In this sense, it can be considered that the creation of public education establishments, free and mandatory, is fundamentally based on the need to dominate and occupy individuals from the poorest strata, considered a moral risk for the project of a nation that the elite white developed in the late nineteenth century, with the aim of maintaining its privileges (Nascimento, 2005; Coimbra, 2000). Based on the racist colonial logic, the educational proposal for the subordinate classes constitutes one of the main axes that make up the biopolitical management of the national territory.

At the same time, we cannot disregard, throughout history, counterpowers and resistances present in everyday school life. As stated by Nilma Lino Gomes (2017):

Education is not a fixed field, nor is it just a conservative field. Over time, it is possible to observe how the educational field is configured as a restless space-time, which is at the same time inquiring and questioned by different social groups. As a space for human formation and through which the most different generations, ethnic-racial groups, people of different socioeconomic origins, creeds and religions pass through, it is possible to reflect both the institutional processes of education (primary education schools and universities) as well as educational experiences popular, social, youth and adult, differentiated and anti-racist, built in everyday life and in social struggle processes, are full, at the same time, of incredible dynamism and conservative tension (p. 25).

However, we also observe that the founding colonial perspective of educational institutions persists and operates constant captures in movements that seek to produce ruptures with the systems of domination. As a

rule, in the daily life of the school, we see, for example, a constant neutralization of the discussions and actions proposed by affirmative policies. Often, it is the teachers who politically sustain these discussions and practices in their classrooms alone, without support and even under threats from the management teams and education departments.

Walsh (2009) points out that, if modernity/coloniality historically functioned from patterns of power based on exclusion, denial and subordination, in contemporary times it takes place under a multiculturalist neoliberal discourse. In the school context, such discourse can be understood as a mode of capture operated by the persistent colonial logic, which crosses and constitutes educational systems even today.

Candau (2008) brings three perspectives considered by her as bases for the different approaches to multiculturalism. The first of these is assimilationist multiculturalism, which considers multicultural society in the descriptive sense. It admits the existence of inequality of opportunities, but from that point onwards, it adopts an assimilationist policy, which favors everyone to integrate into society, being incorporated into the hegemonic culture. A policy of universalizing schooling is promoted, but the monocultural character present in its dynamics is not questioned, either with regard to the curriculum or in the context of the relationships among the different actors.

The second approach is that of differentialist multiculturalism. It emphasizes the recognition of differences, guaranteeing spaces in which they can express themselves as the only way for different sociocultural groups to maintain their basic cultural matrices. Access to social and economic rights is on the agenda, but, at the same time, the formation of homogeneous cultural communities that have their own organizations (schools, churches, clubs, associations, neighborhoods) is privileged. In the view of the author Candau (2008), in many current societies, in practice, it ended up favoring the creation of sociocultural apartheid.

Interactive multiculturalism or interculturality is defined by Candau (2008) as critical and resistance multiculturalism, which is based on a political agenda of transformation. This approach comprises ethnic, sexual and class representations as a product of social struggles over signs and meanings, privileging the transformation of social, cultural and institutional relations in which meanings are generated. It conceives of cultures as continuous movements of construction and reconstruction, whose roots are historical and dynamic, not watertight. Culture takes on a conflictive character, where the difference must be affirmed within a critical policy committed to social justice.

In the school context we know, assimilationist

multiculturalism is predominant. Multiplicity is treated as a synonym for hierarchical difference and, in this way, as adversities to be overcome. A look that reaffirms the coloniality of the system, having important effects on subjective formations and thus tracing paths to failure.

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY AND THE “DEVIANTS”

In the daily life of a school psychologist, it is common to receive from the members of the school teams the complaint that most students fail in school life for “not wanting anything”, “being lazy” or having some cognitive deficiency. However, it is not uncommon for students to face a long and tiring journey to get to school, making it difficult for them to actually be lazy. So why are they uninterested? What is being offered to these youths by society and specifically by the school, so that they “want nothing”?

As a professional, in meetings with students to understand these demands, it was possible to perceive their discouragement in relation to the school, but not in all its aspects. A frequent complaint is about the content – about why and what for to learn it. This lack of meaning is often pointed out as a reason for not being interested in classes and denounces, to a large extent, the abyss between these contents and the experiences lived by students in their different contexts.

Another common complaint is about the school's format. “Boss”, “hell”, “crap”, “obligation”, “laziness”, are terms used by adolescent students when asked in groups about what the school represents for them. When the discussion is deepened, they explain that they understand that the school's function is to teach, but they identify the classroom as the place of “sameness”, monotony and passivity. It seems that they do not feel active in the learning process and signal dissatisfaction with the objectification that this space imposes on them.

The psychologist Maria Helena Souza Patto (1988) observed that, even though there had been advances in research on the situation of the school and teaching, attributing the blame for “school failure” to the student was still a strong trend. Psychological knowledge was added to the organicist medical view of education to explain that, in addition to student's deficits, school difficulties were the result of the environment in which the children lived.

As Candau (2011) points out, throughout the history of education we have identified some milestones in the discourse on the difference in the pedagogical field, among which the psychological framework, learning theories and developmental psychology. However, the fact that such theories focus on individual aspects of a psycho-affective nature end up presenting a very limited conception of the subject of learning, practically disregarding the socio-historical and cultural dimensions.

Heckert and Barros (2007) point out that educational policies in the 60s and 70s were elaborated based on assumptions from the theory of human capital, combined with explanations arising from the theories of marginality and cultural deprivation. These also constituted strategic tools in the elaboration of compensatory social policies, which had the objective of containing social conflicts. The authors emphasize that the theories of cultural deficiency or deficiency, forged in the US in the 1940s – and fostered in the 1960s, from the protesting movements of racial minorities – were brought to Brazil in the 1970s. This movement established, based on psychological and pedagogical diagnoses that pointed out low-income families as being incapable of raising their children, programs whose objective was to replace them.

According to the authors, some of the productions in the field of Psychology contributed to the individualization of school performance and social inequalities, as they developed research aimed at the psychological characterization of disadvantaged groups. Characterizations that had as a parameter “behaviors, attitudes, habits, linguistic style, modes of sociability, among other categories found in social groups with greater purchasing power” (Heckert & Barros, 2007, p. 114).

Under an alleged neutrality, norms of behavior were established, so that a psychological profile of the families and children of the popular classes – fixed in a place of lack – was drawn. Anything that escaped the established model of normality was disqualified and must be kept under close surveillance, corrected and/or silenced.

We observe that this perspective is still at the base of the production of school failure. From it, individualizing and prejudiced explanations are built about the learning processes and sociability of certain students, basing them sometimes on biological phenomena (learning and/or behavioral disorders of intrapsychic or neurological origin) sometimes on social phenomena (such as “unstructured families”, poverty, cultures seen as inferior), seen as diseases that threaten the collective being (BATISTA, 2005).

These practices reveal how coloniality is present in educational discourses and approaches to this day. Patto had already pointed to this presence when she concluded that the production of school failure is based on racial and social prejudice, on the “strength of ideology in a country marked by colonialism, slavery, the capitalist mode of production and the cultural tricks that justify them” (1988, p. 77).

For Arroyo (2012), there is an anti-pedagogical history that persists and is updated since the colonizing undertaking. In his view, this anti-pedagogy is revealed by the bodies-life of childhoods not recognized as part of official, economic, cultural and pedagogical history.

Childhoods erased by belonging to inferior racial social groups and/or excluded by this narrative, constructed by the group that defines itself as superior: the white elite group. Bodies that from an early age are thought of as non-educable, non-human. "The vision and treatments, even the fears of their bodies reveal that they are seen as barbaric, without limits, aggressive, instinctive. Violent. Bodies more than precarious, sub-human" (p. 40).

This process severely hits the development of children and adolescents. Not taking into account the tensions that run through the student's entire cultural, historical and political trajectory, the educational institution places them in a position of "failure" that is very difficult to overcome.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The school educational model established is based on racist colonialist precepts that are far from being surpassed. This finding prompts necessary questions. How can the psychologist act in the field of school education without knowing the power games that cross and constitute it? What do you agree with when dealing with students' learning and sociability problems through approaches that focus only on the individual? How to contribute to the construction of a society where differences are not treated as deviations to be corrected, but as equally dignified ways of existing?

Martín-Baró (2017) states that to build new horizons it is necessary to consider and assume the perspectives of the oppressed majorities. However, it is necessary to decolonize our practices, theories, institutions, views, affections, relationships. As well as, it is essential to broaden our perspectives, know and spread historical and social narratives built from counter-hegemonic references.

Deconstructing the colonial logic naturalized in us and in our practices is what will allow us to advance, as Arroyo (2012) suggests, in the construction of an epistemology and ethics of bodies, emancipatory from so many inferiorization and concealment. This construction is only possible after attentive listening to the many voices that make up our stories, breaking with structures that organize them into vertical degrees of importance.

REFERENCES

- Arroyo, M. G. (2012). Corpos-infância precarizados que interrogam nossa ética profissional. In: Arroyo, M. G.; Silva, M. R. da, (Eds.), *Corpo-Infância. Exercícios tensos de ser criança. Por outras pedagogias dos corpos* (pp. 23-54) Editora Vozes: Petrópolis.
- Barembliitt, G. (2002). *Introdução à esquizoanálise* (2ª Ed). Belo Horizonte: Biblioteca Instituto Félix Guattari. (Original publicado em 1992)
- Batista, V. M. (2005). A Nomeação do Mal. In: Menegat, M.; Neri, R. (Orgs.) *Criminologia e Subjetividade* (pp. 123-133). Rio de Janeiro: Lumen Juris.
- Hecket, A. L. C.; Barros, M. E. B. de. (2007). Fracasso escolar: do que se trata? Psicologia e educação, debates "possíveis". *Aletheia*, 25, 109-122.
- Candau, V. (2008). Direitos humanos, educação e interculturalidade: as tensões entre igualdade e diferença. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, 13(37), 45-56. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-24782008000100005>
- Candau, V. (2011). Diferenças Culturais, cotidiano escolar e práticas pedagógicas. *Currículo sem Fronteiras*, 11(2), 240-255.
- Coimbra, C. M. B. (2000). Classes Perigosas: uma pequena genealogia. In: Ferreira, G.; Fonseca, P. (Eds.), *Conversando em casa* (pp. 56-65). Rio de Janeiro: 7Letras.
- Fanon, F. (1980). *Em Defesa da Revolução Africana* (Pascoal, I., trad.). Lisboa: Sá da Costa. (Original publicado em 1969).
- Foucault, M. (1997). *Resumos dos do Collège de France (1970-1982)* (A. Gaher, trad.). Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar. (Original publicado em 1994).
- Foucault, M. (1998). *Microfísica do Poder* (R. Machado, trad., 4ª. Ed.). Rio de Janeiro: Edições Graal. (Original publicado em 1979).
- Foucault, M. (2002). *A Verdade e as Formas Jurídicas*. (Machado R.; E. Morais, trad., 3ª ed.). Rio de Janeiro: Nau Editora. (Original publicado em 1996).
- Foucault, M. (2005). *Em defesa da sociedade: curso dado no Collège de France (1975-1976)*. (M. E. Galvão, trad.). São Paulo: Martins Fontes. (Original publicado em 1997).
- Foucault, M. (2008). *Sociedade, Território e População. Curso dado no Collège de France (1977-1978)*. (E. Brandão, trad.). São Paulo: Martins Fontes. (Original publicado em 2004).
- Foucault, M. (2009). *Vigiar e Punir* (R. Ramalhete, trad., 36ª ed.). Petrópolis: Vozes. (Original publicado em 1975).
- Freire, P. (1979). *Educação e Mudança* (12ªed.). Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
- Freire, P. (1987). *Pedagogia do oprimido* (17ªed.). Rio de Janeiro, Paz e Terra.
- Frigotto, G. (2005). Escola pública na atualidade: lições da história. In: Lombardi, J. C.; Saviani, D.; Nascimento, M. I. M. (Eds.), *Educação Pública no Brasil: História e Historiografia*. (pp. 221-239) Campinas: Autores Associados.
- Gomes. N. L. (2017). *O movimento negro educador: saberes construídos nas lutas por emancipação*. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- Guattari, F.; Rolnik, S. (2007). *Micropolítica: cartografias do desejo* (8ª ed.). Petrópolis: Vozes.
- Lourau, R. (1993). *Análise Institucional e práticas de pesquisa*. Editora UERJ: Rio de Janeiro.
- Machado, R. (1998). Por uma genealogia do poder. In: Foucault, M. (Ed.), *Microfísica do Poder* (4ª ed.). Rio de Janeiro: Edições Graal.
- Martín-Baró, I. (2017). *Crítica e libertação na Psicologia*.

Petrópolis: Editora Vozes.

Nascimento, M. L. (2005). Internação de Jovens pobres: Prática que atravessa a história. In: Menegat, M.; Neri, R. (Eds.), *Criminologia e Subjetividade* (pp. 149-156). Rio de Janeiro: Lumen Juris.

Patto, M. H. S. (1988). O fracasso escolar como objeto de estudo: anotações sobre as características de um discurso. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, n. 65, p. 72-77.

Quijano, A. (1997). Colonialidad del Poder, Cultura y Conocimiento en América Latina. *Anuário Mariateguiano*, 9(9), 113-121.

Saviani, D. (1999). *Escola e democracia: Polêmicas do nosso tempo* (32ª ed.). Campinas: Autores Associados.

Souza, N. S. (1983). *Tornar-se negro ou as vicissitudes da identidade do negro brasileiro em ascensão social*. Rio de Janeiro: Graal.

Veiga-Neto, A.; Saraiva, K. (2011). Educar como arte de governar. *Currículo sem Fronteiras*, 11(1), 5-13.

Walsh, C. (2009). Interculturalidade crítica e pedagogia decolonial: in-surgir, re-existir e re-viver. In: Candau, V. (Ed.), *Educação intercultural na América Latina: entre concepções, tensões e propostas* (pp. 12-42.). Rio de Janeiro: 7 Letras.

Zamora, M. H. R. N. (2012). Desigualdade racial, racismo e seus efeitos. *Fractal Revista de Psicologia*, 24(3), 563-578. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1984-02922012000300009>

This article is part of a PhD research under development, carried out at Post-Graduation Program in Clinical Psychology from Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro, supported by CAPES.

This paper was translated from Portuguese by Ana Maria Pereira Dionísio.

Received: April 11, 2019

Approved: May 25, 2021