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ABSTRACT

Objectives: The objective of this discussion is to establish a relationship between concepts and historicity of the body, sexuality and domination, from the perspective of Michel Foucault. This is because we understand the body as involved in existing power relations, from and in the various instances of society. In this sense, biopower presents itself as a control mechanism, once well instituted and established in society it is diluted in micro relationships.

Methodology: as part of the challenges of the Education in the Cerrado and Citizenship Research Group, a set of debates were carried out by members of the group. Using Discourse Analysis from a Foucauldian perspective as a tool, the search was to explain historical aspects specific to the constitution of subjects in different sociocultural positions, thus, we sought to make an ethical and aesthetic approach.

Results and conclusion: sexual discourse covered in disguise is no longer supported by mechanisms of oppression, but by mechanisms of ideology that cannot be escaped, as they are everywhere. In this way, we understand that the discourse on the modern repression of sex is sustained by micro relationships and no longer by oppression, an ideological bias passed from father to son, reinforced at school, endorsed by the teacher-student relationship.

Implications of the research: the research leaves questions: will schools being restricted from dealing with the dilemmas of sexuality and gender identities contribute to this move towards freedom of sexual language and the understanding of the real meaning of sex, if restricted to family cultural values? Would it be a return to the values and customs of the traditional Brazilian family?
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RESUMO

Objetivos: O objetivo desta discussão é fazer uma relação entre conceitos e historicidade do corpo, sexualidade e dominação, na perspectiva de Michel Foucault. Isso porque entendemos o corpo envolto nas relações de poder...
existentes, a partir e nas várias instâncias da sociedade. Nesse sentido, o biopoder se apresenta como mecanismo de controle, uma vez bem instituído e estabelecido na sociedade está diluído nas micro relações.

**Metodologia:** como parte dos desafios do Grupo de Pesquisa Educação no Cerrado e Cidadania, dele procederam um conjunto de debates que são realizados por integrantes do grupo, tendo a Análise do Discurso em uma perspectiva foucaultiana como ferramenta, a busca foi por explicitar aspectos históricos próprios à constituição dos sujeitos em diferentes posicionamentos socioculturais, assim, buscou-se fazer uma aproximação ética e estética.

**Resultados e conclusão:** o discurso sexual recoberto de disfarce se sustenta não mais pelos mecanismos de opressão, mas sim por mecanismos de ideologia aos quais não se pode fugir, pois estão em toda parte. Dessa forma, entendemos que o discurso à repressão moderna do sexo se sustenta pelas micro relações e não mais pela opressão, viés ideológico passado de pai para filho, reforçado na escola, chancelado pela relação professor aluno.

**Implicações da pesquisa:** a pesquisa deixa questionamentos: escola sendo cerceada de tratar dos dilemas das identidades de sexualidade e gênero se colaborará para esse caminhar em direção a liberdade da linguagem sexual e do entendimento do sentido real do sexo, se restrito aos valores culturais familiares? Seria um voltar aos valores e costumes da tradicional família Brasileira?.

**Palavras-chave:** Escola, Corpo, Controle, Sexo, Dominação.

RGSA adota a Licença de Atribuição CC BY do Creative Commons (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

### 1 INTRODUCTION

We started this article considering the challenge that a work in the humanities needs to take on in the field of the subjectivities of each subject and in the value that this question implies. Foucault (2007) teases us to perceive life and make it a work of art. Referring to the author's studies, Fischer (2021) shows us that few thinkers brought this coherent writing with them, in the sense of propelling theories and practices in different fields of knowledge, not only in the humanities. We see his action in life and thought, even at that moment in which one does not know, but one does not fail to inquire.

On this path, researcher Rosa Maria Bueno Fischer (2021, p. 2) makes a methodological proposal: "to carry out research that may correspond to an intellectual adventure that becomes drenched in enigmas, is open to bringing pains and pleasures, from moments that are not systematic or systematizing". She calls attention to the need to carry out research that looks for the poetics of the diaries or of the enchantment of manuscripts and personal narratives — the fragile connections between marks and vestiges of an intellectual adventure when we think about ourselves —, and to value experimentation, the registration of minimal things.

When we consider what the author describes to us, for researchers in the area of education, in particular, we reason that it is necessary to feel surprised by an account or writing that "produces in the reader empathy, vibration, restlessness - in short. This is because rare are the cases of research that show themselves as vitality, as living flesh, thorns in our flesh." (FISCHER, 2021, p. 3) and discussing changing identity leads us to this need for writing. This is how personal narratives are felt for this researcher: they have the richness of the creative processes, because, as the subject constructs/constitutes his narratives, it feels to live and to revive it in each one. The author suggests that the wealth of creative processes in their various configurations should be brought to the inside of research. Fischer (2021) warns that we should consider the minimum nuances in order to see a new object of study arise or possible new, sensitive and time-consuming looks at it.
We have to move our thinking, in the face of a series of problems such as these: the impasses and limitations of the operation of writing scientific text, almost always divorced from vitality and esthetic beauty; the frequent opposition between art and thought, in research reports; the lack of clarity as to the possibilities of making the report itself an authorial and genuine text; the rigid hierarchization of data, in the sense of elimination or of the very forgetfulness as regards the minimal occurrences of research, its unexpected deviations and, apparently, less worthy of consideration; the abandonment or negation of the day fragments of the study, as well as the oscillations and new configurations of the object itself and of the action of the researcher throughout the investigative journey. FISCHER, 2021, p. 5.

The researcher demands that the arts and personalities become accessible, because "the life of any individual can be made a work of art" (FOUCAULT, 2014, p. 222). Fischer (2021, p. 9) points out that few thinkers were as consistent with themselves as Foucault, in the sense of linking theory and practice, life and thought, "work in motion; that moment in which one does not know, but does not stop asking; that moment-crossing, in which one suspects something, arguments and data are sought and, at the same time, the scribbles of possibilities of thoughts are drawn". However, we must always reinvent the way if we have to.

2 THEORETICAL BENCHMARK

Let us consider that aspect that reinforces the understanding of our time is to always reinvent the way if it is necessary, to challenge ourselves in turning steps and actions into a work of art. An example of this path to doing academic research is perceived in Fischer (2021) as being of greater inspiration, mainly because we can perceive ourselves in the place of the incompleteness of the work and thought, of our lives, of our histories. The job is to be always accessible to the invitation to creation, construction and reconstruction to close the gaps that the movement of life brings us. Therefore, this text is based on incitement to speech, discussed by Foucault (2011). For it is thus, right from the start, a speech clipping of a participant references us because it invites us to reflect on some singularities.

Why can't I be who I really am? I've always seen them looking at me, and still looking, with difference and indifference. I remember that little by little I realized that I didn't feel like doing the things that boys my age did, I always preferred to be together with my mother. Until one day they called me “little woman” and I didn't even know what that meant. Little by little, I realized that being a “little woman” was something considered wrong and/or bad. What didn't affect me before started hurting me. How many times I went into the bathroom and cried, cried a lot, I didn't want to be like that, I wanted to be like the others, so that they would accept me, so that I could just be one more among them and not be rejected. As a child, I've asked God many times to free me from that "feeling" that acted within me. I just wanted to be normal. And so I grew up without being able to walk softer (rolling), without wearing the clothes I liked, without being able to talk only to the girls, being forced to run after a ball in the middle of the street and pretend that I felt the same warmth that the other boys felt when a girl approached. How many times, I think, from the age of 12, I had to lie that I was liking a girl, or that I thought they were very interesting. I didn't feel any of that, and my friends, my few friends knew that I didn't, but I was testing myself and asking questions related to it, just to see what my reaction would be, and it was hurting more and more.

In church I could witness the story of an older boy than me who, today I know, had the same "feelings" as me. He was the target of ridicule, prejudice, private and public humiliation, and yet I know he did, but he pretended he wasn't. And I was getting ready to feel the same way he did. I couldn't feel what I felt, it was a sin. God would not accept and I would have to tell someone in church to be forgiven, otherwise God would be unhappy with me and I could not be part of the church. And so they were many times, I felt dirty, sinful and unfit to stand before God. It was a relationship of
pleasure in a moment and a feeling of guilt soon after. About sexuality, at school I learned about the male and female reproductive system, nothing else. I didn't find myself in the science or biology textbook, what I felt was not written in the philosophy or sociology textbooks, the teachings of the religious teaching classes only reinforced my pain. In my adult life, I already behaved in a way that society liked, but never enough. I tried to fit into everything that, in a way, was asked of me between the lines. I always wanted to be right and be a good person in society, I knew it would make me a "standard man" who everyone wanted, but not the man I wanted to be. The world imposes many silences on us, and that of not being able to speak what one feels hurts. Not only silence of words, but also having the body silenced hurts, distresses and injures the soul. There are those who can pronounce, express themselves, relate, but as long as it is authorized to be on the rule of what is expected of it. But who decides right and wrong?

This snippet of our participant's speech helps us get into the topic, when he makes the following statement: "I didn't feel any of this, and my friends, my few friends knew that I didn't feel it, but always testing me or asking questions related to it, just to see what my reaction would be, and it hurt more and more. In bringing this reference of speech, our proposal is to discuss the control mechanisms that historically are put in place and that led us to the naturalization of these in us and among us, that arise back there in history, but that much of this still persists, acting on our subjectivities. This is behavior that we think is ours, born with us, but that is nothing more than the mechanisms of docilization, control, domination that have historically been created, to keep us within an order and that we demand of ourselves and others. In the light of the foregoing, from the considerations of Foucault and the historical data that he brings us, added to the speech clippings already inserted in full initially, one can judge what mechanisms were naturalized in us, within what is imposed on us discursively. When talking about such issues, it is indispensable to think about the school and how it contributes to this discipline of body and desire. As the author himself inspires us, the challenge is to make a come and go of history so that we can better understand what is put to us.

The participant states: "I tried to fit into everything that, in a way, they asked for me between the lines. I always wanted to be right and be a good person in society, I knew that this would make me a "standard man" that society wanted, but not the man that I wanted to be". Speech clipping gives us enough arguments to understand that a lot of what we've become is not what we'd like to be. But how to understand, in our time, what is put to us? To better understand it, we consider that, in relation to sex, the seventeenth century was configured in an era of reproach, which was proper to the dominant society. It was understood that defining it would be a difficult task and that first it would be necessary to repress it, to the point of not being cited, taken by modesty and prohibitions that aimed to prevent speech and that, "from being so silent, it imposes silence” (Foucault, 2017, p. 21). As time goes by, there are changes as to how sex is configured in society, previously censored, now an expansion as to its discourse, silenced in the public, stimulated in micro relations. Of course, relentlessly, with language allowed, choosing appropriate words. In addition, it was defined in which configurations of social and local relations could be discussed, or at least with prudence and discretion, "between parents and children, for example, or educators and students, bosses and servants” (Foucault, 2017, p. 22). It is interesting to analyze that there was incentive and, on the other hand, judgment and deliberation, as to the speech. But after time, what changed? It is indispensable to reason that our bodies are still silenced in different ways if they are not in the expected norm, as the testimony itself describes.

In the story, referenced in the author, it is known that increased from the eighteenth century, the discourses about sex, in some cases, in response to the prohibitions, the growth of discourses considered immoral. But it is essential to note that sex has become a part when one
talks about power, power relations, instances of power, precisely because it classifies, promotes or condemns and the figures that are presented in this context is the church followed by the school. In this, it was believed for a time that the detailing of sexual relations and/or thoughts was necessary for the confession to be valid, using it as a means of dominating the conduct and sexual habits of the faithful and students. However, later the church began to demand greater discretion as to the reports made in the confession, and the school also fulfilled its role as formator of norms and forms, bestowed by the family.

Today, religion still has a strong influence on the lives and behaviors of its members, related to sex, to a greater or lesser extent. When our participant, already at the end of the second decade of the 21st century, says that "they were so many times, I felt dirty, sinful and unfit to stand before God. It was a relationship of pleasure in a moment and a feeling of guilt soon after", his speech cut out shows us the interference that falls on the knowledge of the body itself, the body of the other, types of acceptable relationships, masculine and feminine behavior, virginity and marriage, among others and that still persists between us.

Historically, Foucault (2017) points out that, in addition to religious institutions, in the early eighteenth century a discussion began on sex in the fields related to politics, economics and technology that justified this quest for control of the body and its pleasures. There was no attempt to speak in a comprehensive and general manner, there was an intention to examine, to calculate, categorize and specify, by using research and rationalizing the results. Only a while later, about a century later, medicine came forward, doing this service more efficiently. In that context, the concept was that:

One should speak of sex, and speak publicly, in a way that was not ordered according to the demarcation between the licit and the illicit, even if the speaker preserved for himself the distinction (...) it is necessary to speak of sex as something that one should not simply condemn or tolerate, but manage, insert into systems of utility, regulate for the good of all, make work according to an optimum standard. Sex doesn't just judge; it's administered. It takes precedence over the government; it requires management procedures; it must be taken over by analytical discourses. (Foucault, 2017, p. 27)

Sexuality, as described, presents itself as a theme that should or, at least, should be studied and discussed in society, in a broad and reflective manner. But, in principle it is of the utmost importance to know the history of sexuality, especially the types of power, being: the sovereign power, the disciplinary and the biopolitical (or biopower), which is the indispensable theoretical essence for the understanding of the thematic sexuality, as the author instructs us.

Going into the theme, sovereign power is made explicit in an age delimited by the extirpation of products, riches, labor, and forced struggle to the subalterns. Power that denotes the right of detention, seizure, of properties, resources, time, subjects and their lives. However, sovereign power has undergone mutations and appropriation, seizure has been lost as a central focus and a new configuration has emerged, now with the task of instigation, domination, limitation, restriction, surveillance, and stiffness generator submitted to it (Foucault, 2014). That's how we walked to our days.

We know that sovereign power was directly linked to the disciplinarization of bodies, seeing them as machines, which needed to be shaped and sucked into their forces and capabilities. This with the sole purpose of expanding use, malleability and submission, through efficient and economical control processes (Foucault, 2014). As for disciplinary power, it is a configuration of the power employed over life, whose main task is to regulate the population, not to act directly on the individual, but rather on his species. Bodies are subjected to continuous interference and direction, effected through "biological processes" of procreation, birth rate, mortality, longevity, vitality and life perspective, operating in a mechanical way individuals.
The clipping line "The world imposes many silences on us, and the one of not being able to speak what one feels hurts. Not only does silence of words, but also having the body silenced hurt, distress and hurt the soul" reinforces this understanding.

What we know, supported by the author, is that with direct association with capitalism, biopower was made explicit, a conglomeration of techniques constituted in the domination of bodies and in the limitation of populations was found. Much of this was related to the beginning of life, the control of power and knowledge, by increasing knowledge about life and imposing standards, and, in order to survive, death threats receded. From this we understand the role of the school and the way in which it became indispensable to what was intended. Therefore, when talking about the types of power, it is possible to perceive that it is present in people's lives, which is part of the entanglement of situations that may, in principle, not be directly related to the body, but rather is and is the domain of the family, of school and of the sacred. This is because power allows access to the body and sexuality, interferes with health care, how individuals feed themselves, how and where they live, their ways of survival and their whole lives in a broader way. Hence the role of school, the teaching of sciences and biology. It's an intention to control the bodies.

As far as sexuality is concerned, power relations are linked to censorship, accusation and condemnation, but not only to these factors, because one seeks to know how sex is approached. Therefore, what analyzes should be done when thinking about sexuality, religiosity, family and society? Sexuality has always been present in people's lives, as described. When fertilization occurs, or before fertilization, one can already say the relationship between sexuality and the formation of the individual. In the womb, a series of attitudes begins for those who wait for the child to be born - what is his name, with whom he will bear resemblance, what kind of clothes he will wear, with whom he will play -, ranging from these initial small details to the thought of when and with whom he will marry and how many children he will have, thus contributing to the continuity of the same cycle.

All these expectations created, before the birth of the child, are grounded in social, religious, cultural and financial aspects, among others, that those who expect judge ideals. Therefore, a pattern was constructed to be followed. Since childhood, adequate means have been imposed to do everything, from walking, speaking, behaving, eating and dressing. Many children suffer from the impositions made by the family and also by society, in some cases they are not matters that please or leave them at ease. When the participant tells us this statement "How many times I went into the bathroom and cried, cried a lot, I didn't want to be like this, I wanted to be like the others, so that they accepted me, so that I could be just one more among them and not be rejected", he shows us that the boys are destined to follow the example of the father or another male figure who presents himself in the family, must learn the use of tools, to play and like football, to like cars, to be strong, insensitive and to flirt with the girls from a young age. If he does not behave like that, he will not be a "real man" and will distance himself from the model, from the pattern that must be followed, defined by society, also based on the church and on the examples of successful people.

Girls should follow the directions and behaviors of the mother, or other woman who lives together, play with dolls as if they were her children, cook, wash and pass, dress and produce themselves so that she learns how in the future to marry with a "good catch", be delicate and polite. In order for these roles, of being a boy and of being a girl, to be fulfilled, one of the means used is rebuke, an attitude that is done at home, in the church, in school and in society as a whole. So to escape the perfect pattern of society is to be wrong. But what would be the right one? Obey what society imposes and suppress the will, desires and feelings of satisfaction? It seems consistent to us to consider that it is.

Sustained in Foucault (2017), resuming what we initially outlined, we evaluate that the controlled sex of the eighteenth century, may be under a new perspective, but we bring in our
bodies, in our subjectivities, much of what was implanted there. In this way of understanding, the author tells us that in the seventeenth century people talked about subjects linked to sexuality with a certain frankness and naturalness. This fact was notorious, so much so that in the presence of children it was about sexuality in clear words without concern for their presence. When we evaluate that society, not long ago, was distant from all these processes of control of bodies, we reflect that we may not have advanced much as some assume. We may have receded. We talk about this because we stop being masters of ourselves, of expressing our feelings, our desires, and we fall into a dome in which everything we do is associated with whether or not we are approved by our peers and the other eyes that observe us, and the speech of our participant confirms this. And we absorbed that what was imposed on a social interest group, namely the bourgeoisie, became the rule for all. In that context, it was the rise of the bourgeois class in the eighteenth century, a class that was a key part in the world organization as we have until today, that we entered into an era where sex started to be silenced in the public and legitimized itself as a subject to be mentioned only in the alcove of the spouses and for procreation, as we have already argued. There, sex went from the public sphere to the private sphere. Talking about sex has become the subject of private conversations, but it is worth emphasizing that it is not prohibited but restricted.

Further discussing the role of the bourgeois class, from the considerations of Foucault (2017), it is known that it was formed by bankers and merchants who held economic power, but society was stratified, organized into classes, and they did not possess political power. However, with the French and Industrial Revolution the bourgeoisie achieved immeasurable economic intervention in society. According to the author, it was his ascension that guaranteed him space in politics, previously reserved for the clergy and the nobility. This explains her quest to reach a social level of recognition, of values, of concepts that would distinguish her from the popular classes. In this same period, we face the Victorian era characterized as a period in which the United Kingdom imposes itself as world supremacy of advancement and technology, and that of course, could not fail to influence in all areas of society, including in moral/sexual ethics, which here is the relevant fact under discussion, because it arises as speech to establish power relations, according to Foucault (2017), which we are still subjugated and speech clippings confirm this to us. Therefore, fragments of this form of control that was once established are now perceived. In this,

Power relations lead behaviors and condition a imprisonment and a characterization of concepts capable of telling about sex and their experiences, framing sexuality in the technical and scientific parameters that, according to his theory, end up manifesting themselves in all other social spheres - once dictated by the Church and now by scientists (Gomes, 2015, p. 18).

Taking up what Foucault (2017) states, what happened was that in the stereotype created by the bourgeoisie, sex would be discussion that would go from the real to size itself at the level of language, neglecting its natural side and relegating it to an authorized vocabulary and, therefore, restricting its factual truths. In other words, it was decided where, when and how to pronounce on sex. Now, by the speech cutouts inserted, don't we live that in our days? Let us evaluate whether we are not yet afraid to reveal our deepest desires to our peers, who have lived with us for so many years, who know our bodies. Why do we behave in awkwardness in what is so personal to us and, at the same time, so common to those who share our pleasures, our desires, our charms and disenchantments?

In this way, it is emphasized that this was how sex was limited to micro-relationships. Talk about it, just discreetly between parents and children, husband and wife and educators and students. However, between the latter two, the proposal was already an extension of what
society was imposing by default. Homosexuality, then, has always been sin, crime and immoral. Hence we understand the school as a body taming device to meet the demands and standards of a society that was already heteronormative. In this, we need to reason how much the school has remained in this place of controlling bodies, of docilizing forms and norms that imposes what it believes, what the teacher has of personal culture, replicating what is standard in society. What about school biology? Foucault (2017) allows us to affirm that she is a tool of hygienist medicine within the school, with the function of acting in the field of biopower, from the perspective of biopower, politics about bodies.

And in the field of the religious and the sacred, why does a child in school have to pray our father or the bird mary? Is it school or church? Is knowledge bound to the sacred? Isn't the role of the school to build knowledge? If we think that these questions are ours, we are wrong because Foucault (2017) does so in such a way as to arouse how historically we have been shaped, our subjectivities have been adjusted to norms and rules and we delude ourselves that it is something that is always put, that this is human, to confirm, the clippings inserted previously also reinforce such perception. Historically, despite policing, discourses about sex (each with its own specificities) have multiplied, contrary to the Victorian order. In this, sexual discourse took on such magnitude/relevance that, in the ambit of the exercise of power, it institutionalized itself, being allowed to be excavated in the deepest intimacy by the instances of power. When we consider all this dynamics of sex, we arrive at the conclusion that to break with all these mechanisms is something impossible, that is, we are under the aegis of the power of control. He does not proceed from any point, he is in society, in people, in school by the person of the teacher, at home in the person of his parents, his uncles, his grandparents. So, we're fated to all that is normative of sex, and out of that is perversion.

These statements refer us to the early years of discovery of America, when the bare Indians bathed before the Portuguese and were classified as pagans. From this decimated indigenous culture, let us think about what remained in the field for 500 years, in the local dynamics and cultures that mingle between the indigenous and the black brought from the African continent and who was enslaved. One step further, concomitant and combined, in spite of all the mechanisms of subalternation and non-recognition of these subjects, they at all times looked for ways to be accepted by the society that subalternates them. Our attention is focused on showing that much of what has been put forward has come from the historical vices of a Europe that has dominated, dominated, imposed, disrespected and even in our time, this Euro-centric thinking of heteronormativity, religion and social order remains. These possibilities only occurred because of the control and domination devices that the church established from the 2nd century onwards, as Foucault states (2017).

By means of confessions, the church increasingly, in this period, took over the intimacy of the homes and, above all, the sexuality that existed there. In the author's opinion, in order to better clarify the details of the subject, the confessions became more constant and more detailed with the Counter-Reformation, based mainly on the importance given to penance over the desires of the flesh. The confessions required as much detail as possible about any and all aspects of their daily lives that made mention of the sexual side: touches, thoughts, gestures. It is this heritage of commenting all about sex that Foucault (2017) questions, because even without having to confess, we still carry with us the habit of talking about sex in the way that is expected of us, as the participant shows us the challenges imposed on others. In his narrative he says: "In church I could witness the story of an older boy than myself who, today I know, had the same "feelings" as I did. He was the target of ridicule, prejudice, private and public humiliation, and yet I know he did, but he pretended he wasn't. [...]I was already preparing to feel the same as he was going through." Briefly on this it is known that,
The Western man for three centuries has remained tied to this task of saying everything about his sex; that from the classical age there has been a constant increase and an ever greater appreciation of discourse about sex; and that one has expected from this carefully analytical discourse multiple effects of displacement, intensification, reorientation, modification on one's own desire (Foucault, 2017, p. 26).

Then the discourse shows us that there are intrinsic interests in the devices of power when they forbid to talk about sex, seeking precisely the opposite effect and as to this, Foucault (2017) raises the question whether there was censorship about sex, for him, the opposite occurred, constituting itself in a device to produce discourses about sex, more and more discourses, likely to work and be effect of its own economy. In this direction, we then found that the mechanisms of power never wanted sex to be quiet, but rather that it be said and thought for the public by people more learned or trained for it, because they would be able to sustain their speeches. Hence the empowerment of psychology, of psychoanalysis, of medicine, of biology, of the school and of the religious that began and still persists.

Therefore, in the mid eighteenth century, beyond the church and moral discourse, sex went viral within the scope of rationality, now promoted by politics, by economics, acting as power mechanisms, seeking, in a way, to cherish the human in its “transgressions”, making the individual apologize for being so. The participant's speech shows us that, even after 100 years, we crawl surrounded by fear of touching on this subject in society. At the moment, to talk about sex it is necessary to leave aside hypocritical moralism, to overcome the modesty and the refinement of language, so that we can discuss, talk about sex in a way to manage it and not to judge and that is our challenge. For Foucault (2017), in this ordination of talking about sex, it feeds the need to control sexual discussion, occurring that such discourse reached the State, with the understanding that sex needs to be policed.

Hence the term ‘sex police’, which the author's discussions remind us of. These are points that refer to the need to regulate sex by means of useful discussions and not by prohibition. They are changes in behavior in relation to the need for usefulness of sexual discourse for public purposes. The action was coupled with the surprise of the emergence of the population as a political and economic problem. It saw the need not to look separately subject and people, but the population as a whole, attending its various aspects. Thus, it came to understand that the answer to everything was related to sex, since only through its monitoring and control could one prevent or reverse imbalances in society, for example, the high number of population for little available resources, labor and wealth - biopolitics.

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the depth of the theme cited right at the beginning of the text, taken up here for a better understanding, what has come to us from all this articulation about sex and sexuality. It is known that the first is in a dispute between the state and society, since the state wants to take over the sexual practice of the subject, avoiding results that can unleash crises in the capitalist system and become a problem. Here the study of sex is a relationship between biological and economic, and it is what also happens with the sexual discourse of the child, which in reality has not been muted, is only said in other ways and by other people, in other perspectives to have other effects, and, in this way, the state manages to reach its ends by means of sexual discourse as a technique of power, namely, the efficiency of biopower. In this, we understand the role of school and of biology in education. According to Foucault (2017), all discourse about sex is engendered. You control what you should or should not say, and even silence about
something is justified. For the author, everything is meticulously thought out within the discourse to facilitate control. Thus,

One should not make a binary division between what is said and what is not said; one should try to determine the different ways of not saying, how those who can and cannot speak are distributed, what kind of speech is authorized or what form of discretion is required of both. There is not one, but many silences and they are an integral part of the strategies that support and cross the speeches (Foucault, 2017, p. 30).

The author corroborates that in the eighteenth century schools, where there was supposed to be mutism in relation to sexuality, sex permeated a whole logistics, from the architectural set, of the disciplines and their interior organization, thus confirming their early existence, active and permanent, configuring sex as a mechanism of power, acting in the life of the students. Concern raised by the State, considering that their sex would be a public problem.

As for medicine, she was and still is involved in advising the population and educators on the projects presented to the authorities. Since then, there have been mobilizations around adolescent sex, with the intention of containing it, of curbing it. And isn't this what we experience in our times? There remains a great deal of concern and discussion about sexuality that can be experienced early. A whole speech in function of keeping children pure and free of sex. This concern, as we can observe, is linked to the kind of society that one wants to shape and sustain, trying, in a way and in the current context, to repress freedom in the transposition of the words of sexual discourse.

On the other hand, another device that was activated in the intention of originating sexual discourse was medicine that, at first, permeated the diseases of the nerves, then by psychiatry, then by masturbation and coitus interrupted, and by contraception, and, crowning its power mechanism, exclusivity in the domain of knowing about sexual perversions. Justice was another device that increasingly immersed itself in sexual discussion, placing more and more limitations and separations between right and wrong, emphasizing the danger that sex offered and offers in the simple fact of mentioning it. But here we will leave them more aside, attending more to the school, which is the control mechanism in which we are going to insert and of intense power over all.

Faced with such a challenge, it is worth considering the distance between personal guilt and school. According to Foucault (2017), guilt is closely related to the conception of morality and the relationship with the conception of power. Nevertheless, it is important to stress that in our time, guilt is beyond the space of the sacred, entered into other contexts and acquired new arrangements, as our participant's speech well demonstrates. In this way, according to Foucault, confession generates a power relationship in which the listener is in a position of superiority over the confessor. Such a relationship of power is observed in any of the circumstances, whether in the religious relationship, or in the modern scientific relationship, always guided by the hierarchy of knowledge. Let's think that the punishment of guilt is an instrument that is adopted to make the world uniform and to put the animal man to live in society, whatever the cost. For Santos et al. (2018),

In executing the punishment to those who transgress, the punishment is exercised and the adjustment is imposed at the price of pain. But we are always led to think as follows: the punished is the one who causes the damage, so he will receive the punishment. Bringing such a reading to our time, the punishment has reconfigured itself in a daily way, sometimes with others close to it, family members, parents, social neighbors and the co-worker. Let us also consider that the educational process is lavish in these mechanisms of condemnation. In them there is only the adjusted the norm and the unadjusted. In the face of these dynamics. [...] the punishment is given and, in
the case here, it is classified as outside the norm the culprit. He blames himself for being out of step with what is expected of him. However, this does not make the subject better, it only adds fear, prudence and control in seeking adjustment or guilt of the condition of subalternia (p. 6).

When pondering such questions, it is possible to think that the school is and remains the place where the mechanisms of power are acting all the time, the vigil for normativity of behaviors, the framing of the accepted by society, the disciplining of its learners is the main educational objective and we can see this in the speech of our participant. It is in school, through education, that subjects are taken out of their state of savagery and formatted to the norm, according to Valeirão (2009). Reasoning that the school is the place that most meets the demand of personnel, to acquire formation and social ascension, it is a space where one has the opportunity to exercise the relations of power and thus achieve a vast dispersion of the ideologies that the mechanisms of power, control and domination want to bring as truth. In this respect, we understand why we are victims of the education system imposed on us. The school, then, is one of the most propitious places for making power relations effective. Foucault (2017) states that both are not the same thing, but are correlated:

Rather, we have to admit that power produces knowledge; that power and knowledge are directly involved; that there is no power relationship without a correlated constitution of a field of knowledge, nor know that it does not suppose and does not at the same time constitute power relations [...]. In short, it is not the activity of the subject of knowledge that would produce knowledge, useful or aloof to power, but the power-knowing, processes and struggles that go through and that constitute it, that determine the possible forms and fields of knowledge (Foucault, 2014, p. 27).

The author calls these places "kidnapping institutions," the nomenclature of which compulsorily removes the subjects from the broader family and social space and places them in these places to shape them. If in the past punishment was part of the individual's sense of guilt in atonement for his sins, restricting him to the field of the sacred and the profane, a force that is still perceptible, by the speech cutouts that were important to us in this discussion, in our time the force is less. But it was through punishment that one sought to dominate the population, by doing, that through fear, one "walked in the line". However, schools no longer punish students with bodily distress as they once did. This is because it has reconfigured itself in its mechanisms. In this context, the role of invention of "docile bodies" has arisen. With regard to docilized bodies, it is understood that the change in the didactic mechanism of power is due to the fact that, when the body is flagellated, it becomes fragile and unproductive, and by domesticating them, docilizing them, makes them productive, thus better serving the social and political side of the demand thought for the Modern Age, being useful mechanism, according to Santos et al (2018) and Santos (2016). Furthermore, we know that the school is an institution that efficiently articulates the relations of knowledge and power and uses disciplinary devices that aim to make the exercise of power efficient.

In conclusion, this is how we need to take a more critical view of education. It is important to question what students are going to be taught in order to recognize their differences and not to let the school environment in loco be gradually and increasingly oppressive. Although it's too docile. It is in this description that we perfectly understand the role of the school, the exercise of being citizens to fit into the parameters of heteronormative society, nullifying their subjectivities, denying and not recognizing behaviors that come in disagreement with the norm. It is worth paying attention to the diffusion of various concepts that bar, for example, the increase in the birth rate, early pregnancy, the dissemination of Sexually
Transmitted Infections (STIs) and to this is not tied to concern with health specifically, can be controls made not to install situations that hinder governability - biopolitics.

4 METHODOLOGY

Methodologically, the proposal fits the research project "Masculinities in the Plural: images from the perspective of Queer Theory", approved by the Ethics Committee under the protocol number CAAE: 69787217.0.0000.5083. The demand is adjusted and makes up part of the challenges of the Research Group Education in the Cerrado and Citizenship. As a reference, he composes a set of debates that are carried out by members of the aforementioned research project. To better explore the testimony, which serves as a reference, we adopted the analysis of the speech, seeking the senses and how they operate and function, sustained in Foucault (2017; 2014). On this path, Fischer (2001) states that when analyzing speeches one must refuse unequivocal, easy explanations and the insistent search for the ultimate and hidden sense of things.

In this way, one must pay attention to the level of existence of the words and things said and this is equivalent to working hard, allowing the network of senses that go through the discourses to be highlighted in its peculiar complexity, according to Fernandes (2012). To enlarge, Fischer (2021) instigates us to write in action/operation, in sensitive listening and with them learn their ways of creation. The author points out that,

Such a method would operate by fragments and intensities, without abandoning the horizon of something broader - which would mean constructing provisional totalities, sometimes marked by minimal happenings, not always clearly visible. This is a method that is of much greater interest to exceptional, rare, deviant events, and not the great facts that, strictly speaking, are visibly similar to so many others. (FISCHER, 2021, p. 11)

In this way, the proposal here is to carry out an Analysis of the Discourse from a Foucaultiana perspective, as Machado (2006) gives guidance, which helps us to explain historical aspects specific to the constitution of the subjects in different sociocultural positions. Like Fischer (2021), make an ethical and aesthetic approach, because the device brings us closer to the human being, placing it in the foreground to follow and understand the motivations and sufferings. It will be in the study of the construction of the enunciations that the traits of these subject-personages and of the society in which they are inserted are drawn, by means of the analysis of the literary text, in particular of the correlation between discourse and history. Fischer (2015) still clarifies that,

To analyze discourses with Foucault means to accept the rarity of the things said (or of the utterances), it is certainly a type of attitude towards life, an ethical and political attitude, and also intellectual, by which we assume that there is no identity between ourselves and what we investigate, and that thinking is always to navigate in the midst of differences. (FISCHER, 2015, p. 126)

Then, when using discursive sequences of subjects, the search will be for perceiving the speech present in the clippings of their speech and using them as input in this study. It should be noted that, in this tangle of threads that weave and interweave the discourse, some that stand out to others will be taken for analysis and, at the same time, make up the theoretical construction in order to support the concepts of truth, power, discourse, subjectivation and objectivation pinched from the studies carried out by the philosopher Michel Foucault.
For the desired analysis, a path will be covered in which we outline the alterity between trying to perceive the pains experienced by the subjects, confused in their subjectivities and that were evident in their speeches. The proposal is to observe movement, focusing on the discursive relevance according to the meaning offered to a group and to the society in which it is inserted. Fischer (2021) continues his invitation to the methodology that will allow us to emerge from the experience transformed and establish new relationships with our subject of study, concluding that it is necessary to:

Make unimagined incisions in the real. To seek a lucidity that distances us, for moments, from ourselves. Mere words? I do not think so. Each art, each language, each mode of creation teaches us the strength of a present that is never reduced to the trivial: rather, it is dressed up in an ethic of obligations to which we are called, to each other, to ourselves. Of this is made every creation. Also our academic inventions. (FISCHER, 2021, p. 19)

For this reason, in order to carry out our analysis, we detail the presence of polyphony in the constitution of discursivity, which therefore constitutes subjects, identities and subjectivities.

5 CONCLUSION

We began this discussion by making the following observations and questioning: if we ban sexuality from school and limit it to the family, will we in a way collaborate in this journey towards freedom of sexual language and understanding of the real meaning of sex, restricted to family cultural values? Is this the return to the values and customs of the traditional Brazilian family? By reasoning, the readings and the reflection of the ordered scores, we managed to permeate, in spite of the fact that, subtly, the controlling apparatus of the capitalist world with its pungent desire to domesticate society as a whole, according to its interests and, also the power relations that are established in the micro relations within the society itself and the family.

Still, it is worth considering that sexual discourse covered in disguise is no longer sustained by the mechanisms of oppression, but rather by mechanisms of ideology to which one cannot escape, since they are everywhere. In this way, we understand that the discourse to the modern repression of sex is sustained by micro relations and no longer by oppression, an ideological bias passed from father to son, reinforced in school, chancelled by the relationship teacher and pupil. We think in such a sense that we, as teachers, have to review our role within education, rethink our attitudes, not letting what has been placed on us and impregnated fall on our students and continue to replicate so much anguish in society. Of course, the knowledge built in the school has its positive side, but we must be alert as far as we, as teachers, can let these mechanisms interfere in the classroom. In other words, bringing this to the education of the countryside, it is necessary to observe our approaches and attitudes in the micro relationship with the students in order not to replicate what is put, mainly relating to the subalternation of the individual from the countryside to the city.

By this explanation, we understand better what happens in our time, in which the subjects have their sexuality obstructed and carved out in accordance with the normalcy imposed by society, for the simple reason that society cannot be politically and economically unadjusted. It should be noted that it is simple because these mechanisms leave aside any and all burden of subjectivity inherent to the subject exposed to the mechanism, taking no account of anything that concerns the reality and specificity of the individual. It therefore causes great harm to individuals as individuals, distorting their own "self" which may be the cause of various
diseases diagnosed nowadays, after all, who remains healthy having all the time pretend to be who you are? And what is most impressive is how much society sacrifices in order to maintain power.

The relationship between power and knowledge becomes very explicit in situations that we find in the mold of the current schools. We have a verticalized education in which the teacher is the hypothetical holder of knowledge and is above the student, thus establishing power and domination in that environment. In the classroom, it is the teacher who decides what will be studied or done, not respecting the experiences of the students, and so he easily guides what should be exposed, keeping the gear of the power mechanisms activated, just like in a constant live wheel. Also in each school there is a norm to be followed, embedded in its own convictions and bringing some form of indoctrination and control, because, as we well know, education has an ideological bias and there is no way of escaping from it.
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