



Among laws, decrees and rulings... school inclusion in the neoliberal game

Entre leis, decretos e resoluções... A inclusão escolar no jogo neoliberal

Gisele Ruiz Silva^[a], Paula Corrêa Henning^[b]

^[a] Master in Education of Science from Universidade Federal do Rio Grande (FURG), teacher in public and private schools in the city of Rio Grande, Rio Grande, RS - Brazil, e-mail: gisaruzsilva@gmail.com

^[b] Doctor in Education from Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos (Unisinos), Associate Professor at the Education Institute, at the Postgraduate Program in Environmental Education, and at the Postgraduate Program in Education of Science of the Universidade Federal do Rio Grande (FURG), Rio Grande, RS, Brazil, e-mail: paula.henning@ig.com.br

Abstract

This paper is aimed at performing an analysis of the texts of legal documents concerning school inclusion, by mapping those enunciations that empower the ways of constituting the subjects of inclusion. As the empirical corpus we used the legislation that rules school inclusion based on the Brazilian Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education, 1996. For this task we employed some tools of the theoretical and methodological perspective of discourse analysis in Michel Foucault, operating with the concepts of power, norms, normalization, inclusion/exclusion and (neo)liberal logic. In this stream, we also discussed the concepts of identity and difference. Analysis indicate inclusion as an imperative of

neoliberal governmentality, which is aimed to maintain the highest number of individuals in the market network.

Keywords: Governmentality. School inclusion policies. Foucault studies.

Resumo

Este artigo tem como objetivo realizar uma análise dos textos dos documentos legais que tratam da inclusão escolar, mapeando as enunciações que tornam potentes os modos de constituir os sujeitos da inclusão. Para isso, é tomado como corpus empírico a legislação que normatiza a inclusão escolar a partir da Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional de 1996. Assumimos para esta tarefa a perspectiva teórico-metodológica da Análise do Discurso em Michel Foucault, operando com os conceitos de poder, norma, normalização, inclusão/exclusão e lógica (neo)liberal. Nessa corrente, discutimos também os conceitos de identidade e diferença. As análises realizadas apontam a inclusão como um imperativo da governamentalidade neoliberal, que visa à manutenção do maior número de indivíduos nas redes do mercado.

Palavras-chave: Governamentalidade. Políticas de inclusão escolar. Estudos foucaultianos.

Introduction

This paper is a product of a broader research that aims to analyze the current discourse of school inclusion, having as the scope the statements found in Nova Escola magazine after the implementation of the National Policy for Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education. For this paper, we did an analysis of legal documents regarding school inclusion by mapping the statements that empower the forms of constituting the subjects of inclusion. In this regard, the question that brings us to this analysis is: what are the truths produced by legal documents about school inclusion, after 1996, that dictate the forms of action of the inclusive school?

Aiming to clarify how we dealt with the empirical material, it is necessary to point out some aspects related to Michel Foucault's analysis of discourse, as it is the methodological approach chosen for this study.

To think of a Michel Foucault's method or theory implies breaking with the Cartesian logic of doing research. Unlike the positivist thought, the French philosopher, in conducting his researches, was not guided by a predetermined path, a trajectory beforehand regarded as safe. He would not think of a previously outlined path. When conducting his researches, Foucault traces the path during the path (VEIGA-NETO, 2009). This is not to say that his studies happened in a frivolous way. Far from it! The exercise undertaken by the philosopher in his analysis was to take as starting point units already fully formed, and then disassemble them and reassemble them. In *A Arqueologia do Saber*, Foucault explains:

[...] I will accept the arrangements that history offers me just to question them immediately; to undo them and learn whether we can replenish them legitimately; to see if it is not necessary to rebuild others; to put them in a more general space that, dissipating their apparent familiarity, permits to make their theory (FOUCAULT, 2010, p. 29).

Foucault did not take as a starting point a supposed model for measuring who fits in it or not. To understand how we became what we are, he searched history facts, events, and conditions of possibility that designed the subjects that we became. Thus, in the Foucauldian perspective, the investigations are contingent, historical, dated. If nowadays we think and discuss the possibility/necessity of school inclusion is because we are crossed by different events and situations that allow us to think in one way and not in other.

Foucault suggests that each historical moment is manifested by discourses from different orders, articulated and connected by relations of power, which are placed into operation and dictate the way we think and act in society. According to him, "it is necessary to consider the discourse as a series of events, as political events, through which power is attached and oriented" (2010, p. 254). In this sense, a discourse does not

operate in isolation. For something enter the order of discourse, it must be powered by different instances.

In terms of what we understand as the discourse of inclusion, for it to become what we see nowadays in action, it is necessary that different areas of knowledge operate in its favor. In this case, we see the pedagogical, scientific, and legal discourses, besides the human rights or the media discourses. Ultimately, a number of elements that “belong to a system of power in which the discourse is nothing but a component reconnected to other components” (FOUCAULT, 2010, p. 254). In this sense, the analysis proposed by Foucault consists in “describing the connections and reciprocal relations between all these elements” (FOUCAULT, 2010, p. 254).

To trace the routes of a study, in the Foucauldian perspective, requires remaining in the declaration level. What matters in this case is that “someone said something at some point” (FOUCAULT, 2010, p. 255). The declaration can be understood or called statement. Thus, statements are all “things said” about something, in the case of our study about school inclusion. In this article, we restrict ourselves to what was said or the statements made by the legal texts and official documents that regulate inclusion. By analyzing such statements, we aim to reassemble social, historical, political, and economical scenarios, understanding them as conditions of possibility for something to be said at that time and not at another.

In the stream of these theoretical and methodological contributions, we use the concepts of power, norm, normalization, inclusion/exclusion, and (neo)liberal logic developed by Foucault studies, as analytical tools because of their relevance to the task in question. By entering the harvest of inclusion, we started the discussion about the understanding of identity and difference, as well as the concept of inclusion, assuming it as an imperative nowadays. Then, we problematized the statements presented in the documents regarding inclusion in Brazil, starting on 1996, impelled by the idea that inclusion is much more than a human rights issue (SÁNCHEZ, 2005).

Our interest in analyzing these documents does not involve assigning value judgments about them. We do not intend to pinpoint if there is validity or not in the process of school inclusion. When mapping all efforts exempted by the Federal Government in relation to the global movement to legitimize the practice of inclusion, our goal is to understand what these policies are as well as their impact on the population as a whole.

With these initial outlines, it is time to map some of the concepts necessary to look at the empirical material placed under suspension in this article. Our intention is to enter in the discussions of school inclusion problematizing key aspects of this field of knowledge.

Entering the harvest of inclusion

A characteristic of modern episteme is the desire of order. Therefore, the practice of classification of things was/is necessary to guarantee progress and civility (FOUCAULT, 2002). Thus, in our society, we can observe a number of expressions that are used to name things and beings, working within a project of constitution of modern society.

Such organizational practices are possible when there is compliance with certain standards, rules, and measures that become naturalized through the discourses created by different social instances. But, even though they are eventually naturalized, looking to be something that was already there waiting to be found, these practices are not neutral at all. They are embedded in power relations, participating in a game of power critical to the maintenance of society.

In addressing power relations, it is critical to make it clear the conception of power referred in this study. We are not talking about a power tied to legal terms or to state apparatus (FOUCAULT, 2009). We are talking about a power that is exercised concretely and in detail; that has its specificities, its techniques and tactics. A power that “does not weigh only

as a force that says no, but that in fact permeates, produces things, encourages pleasure, creates knowledge, produces discourse” (FOUCAULT, 2009, p. 8). This is a way of conceptualizing power, based on the understanding that it is present on small daily struggles and not only on the great revolutions. That runs through the entire social body horizontally, forming networks of relationships; and that is not focused on only one subject or state apparatus. We are not denying the existence of these forms of centralized power. We are, based on Foucault studies, relying on another perspective, of a power that is positive and productive. A power whose effects circulate “in a continuous, uninterrupted, adapted and ‘individualized’ way throughout the social body” (FOUCAULT, 2009, p. 8).

This form of power is associated to a type of social organization that emerges especially in the eighteenth century: a disciplinary society. A society that is structured following some rules, following a set of guidelines and regimes of truth produced in the field of modern episteme that, as we have already mentioned, has as first principle the desire for order. Thus, in this episteme, we have the establishment of several categories that emerge from the project of the modern world: the vulnerable, the children, the elderly, the included, among others.

To better understand the construction of these categories, we will look at studies concerning identity and difference. The first question is: identity and difference take place at the level of language. They are, as Silva observes, “the result of acts of linguistic creation” (2004, p. 76). This means that what we understand as identity and difference are ideas, concepts produced by us from the context of cultural and social relations in which we live in. The second question refers to the fact that identity and difference are based on an intrinsic relationship, which means that identity only exists because there is difference and difference exists because we denominate something as identity. We can only say that we are “this” because we understand there is a “that” that we are not. Therefore, identity and difference are coexisting concepts in the cultural and social field.

Another aspect, still concerning identity and difference: although they coexist, they are continually disputed, subject to force vectors and

power relations. In this sense, identity and difference are imposed and not randomly defined (SILVA, 2004). Furthermore, Silva observes that “where there is differentiation — identity and difference — there is this power” (p. 81). A power that includes at the same time it excludes; that determines who gets in and who stays out; that marks, defines, and determines positions of subjects; that divides, classifies and ranks groups; and that normalizes.

To normalize, in the Foucauldian sense of the term, is perhaps one of the major premises of modern thinking. The norm, at the same time it individualizes the subjects, it makes them comparable among each other. According to Ewald, the norm is “a principle of comparison, comparability, a common measure, that is instituted in the pure reference of a group in itself, from the moment that it relates only to itself, without exteriority, without verticality” (1993, p. 86). In other words, the norm can be understood as a big umbrella that covers everything and everyone, classifying them, ranking them, dividing them into groups according to similarities between them. “It [the norm] places itself at the same time on an individual body and on a collective body, of which this individual body is part of and that contributes to make sense of it” (VEIGA-NETO, 2001, p. 115). Thus, the aim of the modern episteme is nothing to be outside the norm. And it is from the ratings that it is possible to decide what is normal and what is abnormal. Normal and abnormal are inscribed within the norm.

Veiga-Neto, explains the practices of the norm:

[...] at the same time the norm allows it to take of the wild externality the dangerous, the unknown, the bizarre — capturing them and turning them intelligible, familiar, accessible, controllable — it allows it to put them in a safe distance to the point that they do not incorporate. This means that, when making an unknown an abnormal, the norm makes this abnormal one more of its cases. Therefore, the abnormal is also in the norm, it is under the norm, protected by it. The abnormal is another case, always predicted by the norm (2001, p. 115).

In the context of contemporary education, the norm, no question, is to be included. In the movement for the inclusive school, emphasized especially after the Law of Directives and Bases of National Education (1996), the proposal — if not to say the requirement — of including everyone in the school premises has been strongly advocated, either by legal documents or by the Federal Government educational programs. For instance, the National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education appoints the target audience of special education. It says “for the purposes of this Decree, it is considered as the target audience of special education *people with disabilities, with pervasive developmental disorders and with high abilities or giftedness*” (BRASIL, 2008, emphasis added by the authors). By specifically naming the members of Special Education target audience, the law determines who should receive specific care (the abnormal), while the others (the normal) are considered as part of the whole. We see here a practice of standardization that classifies subjects by placing them in a certain situation. In the perspective of the inclusive school, normal and abnormal occupy the same space, share the same rights, while the pedagogical practice has to deal with the diversity.

We dare saying that the movement of inclusive education today is absorbed in the logic of the well-being society (FOUCAULT, 2008), in which, from the strategies of population maintenance and risk management, it is expected that the individuals start to regulate themselves. In the next section, we problematize the movement for inclusion, pointing it as a neoliberal strategy of risk management, understanding it beyond the human rights issue.

In the legal documents, the movement for inclusion in Brazil

Appointed as a human rights issue (SÁNCHEZ, 2005), the movement for inclusion has gained strength in recent decades, not only in Brazil but also in the international context. Among the international gatherings that aimed to discuss the rights to education is the World

Conference on Special Needs Education that took place in Salamanca, Spain, in 1994. In the document prepared by the delegates of this event it reads: “We reaffirm our commitment to Education for All, recognizing the need and the urgency of providing education for children, youth and adults with special educational needs within a regular educational system” (UNESCO, 1994).

After the Salamanca Declaration, which took place at the international level, other standardizations were made official at the national level, dictating the course of school inclusion in Brazil. Among them we highlight the Law of Directives and Bases of National Education — Law number 9,394/96; the CNE/CEB Resolution No. 2/01, which established the National Guidelines for Special Education in Basic Education; the Decree No. 6,094/07, on the implementation of the Goals and Commitment Plan for Education; the National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education, in 2008; and more recently the Decree No. 7,611/11, on Special Education and on Specialized Educational Services. The analysis of the legislation mentioned indicated a shift in the forms of care dispensed by the Special Education as well as the target audience for which it is intended. In the following pages, we present statements that constitute these laws, seeking to illustrate the perceived shifts in the inclusion field.

In 1996, the Law of Directives and Bases of National Education — Law No. 9,394/96 — sets new norms for education in Brazil. Among these norms, we highlight the article 58 of chapter V, which deals specifically with the attributions for Special Education. According to the text, it is “the form of education, offered preferably in the *regular school system*, for students *with special needs*” (BRASIL, 1996, emphasis added by the authors). Such statements remind us of two important aspects: 1) the location of the service, and 2) the intended audience to the service.

By specifying the location of the service — in the *regular school system* — the law indicates the institution in which it should be done. Besides highlighting the regular school as the place *for education*, the legal documents highlight the maximum resulted from the modern

project *Everyone in school*. This idea is widely promoted by the Federal Government, Non-profits, and other institutions involved with the inclusion movement. Moreover, by indicating who are the individuals to be served by special education, the existence of a difference between those with special needs and those who we might call *non-carriers*¹ is highlighted. That is, an identity and a difference are emphasized, which are, as we already mentioned, products of power relations, of an inclusion/exclusion game, with demarcation, classification, and standardization borders (SILVA, 2004).

In another document: the CNE/CEB Resolution, No. 02/01, in its Article 5, paragraph I, Special Education is considered as a mode of education responsible for the care of “students with *special educational needs*,” those being the ones that “during the educational process present severe learning difficulties or limitations in the development process that hinder the following of curricular activities” being or not “related to a specific organic cause” (BRASIL, 2001, emphasis added by the authors). The concepts of identity and difference are present in this idea, despite the subtlety with which these events are imposed — for instance, with the removal of the word carriers — because if there are those with needs, there are those with no needs.

Another relevant aspect is that up to here one can say that the process of school inclusion happened focused on specific cases. The inclusion, therefore, within educational institutions, was an action targeted at students that did not achieved the objectives proposed for the grade level in which they were in. It motivate us to think that the process of inclusion consists of a standardization strategy, assumed by educational institutions, supported by a network of power relations that is branched by society as a whole. Furthermore, support classes are implemented, with specialized professionals, inside and outside the school, through the discourse of Education Sciences, either by the field of Special Education, either by the Educational Psychology field. Anyway, various strategies

¹ We use the term *non-carriers* because it was an expression used in the analyzed document.

that at least try minimizing the difficulties of the subject in question are dispensed. In other words, by indicating who needs special attention, the law determines that some need assistance while others do not. Therefore, some individuals must be submitted to the grinding apparatus, while others are dismissed for being apparently normal.

Based on Foucault studies, observing the statements presented by the Law 9,394/96 and by the Resolution CNE/CEB No. 02/01, we believe that the strategies available there to accomplish school inclusion can be seen, from some similarities, as the grinding apparatus of the nineteenth century, ie, as an artifact that sought to correct the incorrigible individuals, in order to ensure social security and control risks. Foucault (2002a) denominates *individual to be corrected* as one of the three figures of the abnormality of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries studied by him. In general terms, the philosopher defines the *individual to be corrected* as one whom, by his incorrigibility, “requires a number of specific interventions around himself, interventions in relation to ordinary and familiar techniques of education and correction” (FOUCAULT, 2002a, p. 73). And even when being the target of corrigibility strategies, both from the family and the grinding apparatus, the individual is incorrigible.

However, when looking at other laws, we can say there was a shift in the understanding and practices of inclusion. That is, the policies that came into effect from 2007, even though they do not disregard or annul previous texts, present the inclusion not only from the perspective of the *individual to be corrected*, but also in the school community in general, since the focus is now given to the pedagogical practice, to the curriculum and its consequences. Two movements are identified in this process: one that expands the commitment to inclusion, reaffirming the need for a system of collaboration among all; and another that suppresses the Special Education as an isolated class, placing it as support for the care of those included. We explain next these statements.

Regarding the expansion of the commitment to the processes of inclusion, the Chapter I of the Plan of Target Commitment All for Education, in its article 1, defines that commitment lies in the

“*combined efforts* of the Federal Government, States, Federal District and Municipalities, acting in *regime of collaboration*, of the families and the community, for the benefit of *improving the quality* of basic education” (BRASIL, 2007, emphasis added by the authors). *Joined efforts, regime of collaboration, and quality improvement* are expressions that refer to us to a social policy and to a system of government that distributes to the entire population the responsibility for social wellbeing. A responsibility assigned to all individuals that gets inculcated in us because of different strategies, throughout our lives, through different discourses. With regard to the second movement we want to present here, the National Policy on Special Education in the Perspective of Inclusive Education claims that “from the references for building inclusive educational systems, the organization of special schools and classes is reconsidered, implying a structural and cultural change in schools so that all students have their specificities met” (BRASIL, 2008).

Here, we realize that by rethinking the organization of schools and special classes, the Policy proposes a generalization in the way students are assisted, which means that the curriculum and teaching practice must meet the needs of any individual in the school system, since this “constitutes an educational paradigm centered on the conception of human rights, which combines equality and difference as inseparable values” (BRASIL, 2008). Therefore, after 2008, every subject should be included in regular classes, of so-called “inclusive schools” (BRASIL, 2008). However, it is worth mentioning that this same Policy that somehow gives an ultimatum to schools, clearly treating inclusion as an imperative of contemporary, continues to point out that there are individuals who deserve more investment in an attempt to bring them to the norm. To guarantee success, institutions need to invest in rectification devices, which are called Specialized Educational Service. The National Policy on Special Education in Perspective of Inclusive Education (2008), as well as the Decree No. 7,611/11, intend to, by including the abnormal subjects in regular classes, not only the guarantee to access to education or the right

to education. For us, these policies aim to normalize abnormal subjects; intend to correct incorrigible individuals.

In this perspective, it is possible to think that the discourse of inclusion presented in the Brazilian law is submerged by a governmental logic sustained by the economic game of the neoliberal state. Despite all the engagement with a discourse of human rights, tolerance, respect for differences, or even *Education as everyone's right*, widely spread by the Federal Government in the last decade, school inclusion policies can be understood as a management strategy of social risk. In the wake of Foucault studies, we understand such policies as an important biopolitical function in the search for population management, through decrease of social risks, allowing the greatest number of individuals participating in the market logic as long as possible.

The inclusion by the neoliberal logic

In the late sixteenth century and early seventeenth, with the end of feudalism and the crisis of the pastorate, a new way of thinking the state starts to be structured. A new form of exercise of power emerges, in which the art of government is no longer centered in the hands of the sovereign and passes to the State – for a reason of state, which focuses much more on the population than on the territory. It is “the passage of a regime dominated by structures of sovereignty to a regime dominated by government tactics” (FOUCAULT, 2008, p. 141); from the focus on the territory to the focus on the population; from an art of governing to a political economy.

In the eighteenth century, when the practices of governing the population were given preferentially through disciplinary strategies, European political science wanted a totally managed society. However, the State faced a number of internal factors that possessed a unique order, besides self-regulatory mechanisms that prevented the realization

of the dream of total management (ROSE, 1996). Then liberalism arises, as governmental reason, using disciplinary and biopolitical mechanisms to manage the population. Liberalism established a new relationship between government and knowledge – to rule it is required to understand — all the possible ways to understand society are seen as positive aspects.

In this form of government, individuals were seen as active participants in the government and, therefore, the liberal strategies depended on disciplinary institutions capable of producing subjects that were able to self-govern and self-regulate themselves. Additionally, liberalism produced the idea of market freedom with minimum intervention of political power and greater independence of individuals (RECH, 2010). Thus, a state “understands society as a whole that must be harmonious by complementary combination of its individuals, each functioning as an indivisible atom, centered and stable” (VEIGA-NETO, 2000, p. 187). In this sense, liberalism is concern about governing a society formed by individuals who are ruled from the outside — as objects — and at the same time, are self-governed — as government partners — “[...] a citizen, with rights and duties, a subject-partner” (VEIGA-NETO, 2000, p. 187).

In the second half of the twentieth century, there is an unfolding of liberalism in Germany and the United States, from which new trends originated neoliberalism. Although it does not erase liberalism, the neoliberalism presents new emphases in the way of doing politics. The American neoliberalism, because of a number of factors, started to guide the economic policies of most West countries. There is an important shift concerning management methods of the economic market: in liberalism, the principle of free market “determines, naturally, the internal regulation of the market and the state itself” (LOPES, 2013, p. 295); while in neoliberalism, this principle is given by the constant stimulus to competitiveness.

One of the main differences between liberalism and the neoliberal system is the type of subject that they need to form to keep the market moving. The liberalism logic was based on free trade, while neoliberalism is structured on competition. In this sense, the interest of the

neoliberal system is to form individuals capable of self-management, “that seek alternatives to be inscribed in the logic of consumption, which is, there is no choice for the ‘outside’: everyone needs to know everything and be everywhere” (RECH, 2010, p. 92).

In this study, about school inclusion in the neoliberal arena, we shared Lopes’ views when the author articulates the inclusion as a political tactic of neoliberal governments. In regard to school inclusion, the author observes that “education, in its broadest sense, becomes a condition so people can operate with the logic of inclusion in all their actions” (LOPES, 2009, p. 154). Also, she extends her explanation by presenting the argument that the inclusion is part of a “set of practices that subjectify individuals so that they start looking at themselves and at others without having as reference boundaries that determine the place of the normal and the abnormal, the included and the excluded” (LOPES, 2009, p. 154).

However, both processes of inclusion and exclusion are not as natural as they seem. Rather, these are social inventions, dating from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In this regard, Michel Foucault discusses, in the courses *The abnormal* (2002a) and *Security, Territory, Population* (2008), the processes experienced in the Middle Age related to the practice of exclusion of lepers and later what he calls the practice of inclusion given by the plague. The author uses these two events — the leprosy and the plague — to explain how the technologies of power get structured in Western societies. In this regard, he explains:

The replacement of the leprosy model by the plague model corresponds to an important historical process that I will call, in a word, the invention of the positive power technologies. The reaction to leprosy is a negative reaction; is a reaction of rejection, of exclusion, etc. The reaction to the plague is a positive reaction; it is a reaction of inclusion, of observation, of knowledge creation, of multiplication of power effects from the accumulation of observation and knowledge. It went from a technology of power that expels, excludes, banishes, marginalizes, represses, to a power that creates, a power that observes, a power that

knows and a power that multiplies from its own effects (FOUCAULT, 2002a, p. 59-60).

The use of these examples — exclusion by leprosy and inclusion by pestilence — noted by Foucault, portrays two technologies of power: sovereign power (law), in the first case; and disciplinary power (discipline) in the second. These technologies, contrary to what they may seem, considering our tendency to linear thinking, do not overlap. What happens is that, due to new social organizations, the emphasis sometimes is given to one technology, and sometimes to the other.

When it comes to a modern society, Foucault (2008) highlights the emergence of other power technology — beyond the disciplinary techniques — based on mechanisms of safety, which is explained by him from analyzes of the smallpox epidemic that affected the occidental population during the eighteenth century. At that time, the smallpox epidemic was managed through an intense observation and control of society in order to know how many people caught the disease, at what age, the injuries observed, the risks for infected individuals, therefore, a whole series of topics that aimed to know more and better everything that involved the disease in order to prevent it. In this sense, the security mechanisms are established as means of population management, in which “the old structures of law and discipline” (FOUCAULT, 2008, p. 14) are not neglected.

This format of government, which is concerned with the security and the decrease of social risks, that acts on the population as a whole, concerned with the management of life, is conceptualized by Foucault (2008) as bio-power; a power over life, that acts not only on individuals, as it happens with the discipline, but also on the social body of the population as a whole, to ensure the prolongation of life and the maintenance of the human species. To make this possible, a number of practices are employed to manage and to organize the social mass. These actions are referred to by Foucault as strategies of biopolitics.

Supported in bio-power, the State assumes a posture of recognition of the existing conditions of the population. Back to the examples of leprosy, plague and smallpox, it can be said that, throughout history, the policies of population control goes from a logic of exclusion — leprosy model — to a logic of inclusion — plague model — and, thereafter, to a logic of control — smallpox model.

As we mentioned, these power technologies act in an articulately way. When discussing issues of school inclusion, we observe a movement that involves both strategies for managing the population and strategies for disciplining bodies — a game in which we are all involved. If on one hand the biopolitical strategies of governing the population take place in order to get to know and govern individuals, ie, to include them; on the other hand, they conform with the interests of the State, in maintaining and enhancing the lives of people.

According to neoliberal state reasoning — experienced by us in Brazil — for the maintenance of the state at least two rules must be followed: 1) no one can stay out of the “nets that support the market game” (LOPES, 2009, p. 109-110); 2), although at different levels of participation, “everyone should be included” (LOPES, 2009, p. 110). For these rules to be followed, the State needs to create more and more strategies that benefit the greatest number of people; and that these people, through consumption, production, participation, can keep the State and the market in operation.

According to this logic, policies and outreach programs are developed aiming to decrease poverty and social risks. For instance, we can mention the programs *Plano Brasil sem Miséria*, *Ação Brasil Carinhoso*, *Bolsa Família*, *Vale-Gás*, *Pró-Uni*, *Fome Zero*, among others. Public policies that guarantee access to formal education to individuals with special needs should also be mentioned. These governmental activities that serve the population can be understood as biopolitical strategies of social risk management, once they intent to ensure the safety of the population through government actions and programs.

Final thoughts

In this article, we sought to problematize the truths that are produced by legal texts regarding school inclusion, from 1996 on, which dictate the operation of inclusive schools. In this regard, we identified some of the aspects that comprise the school machinery today, looking at how the historical and political contexts affect population management formats.

In order to end this writing, we come back to Foucault's (2009) considerations when stating that these strategies of power should not be seen as negative. For him, as we already mentioned, power is positive, it is productive, and it takes places in networks. Thus, if on one hand, the State makes use of strategies that capture us, on the other hand, making use of these strategies is advantageous for us. At the same time we are disciplined — not only by educational institutions, but also by a range of discourses that constitute us — so we can get in the game, there are several policies and strategies that entice us to stay in it. Additionally, in a way, we also want to stay in the game and stay in pairs (LOPES, 2009). For that to happen, “the State's actions [...] must be initiated so that even those who do not have ways to generate resources to support themselves are able to spin, minimal and locally, a network of consumption” (LOPES, 2009, p. 112).

In short, what we saw happen, especially in the last decade, was an outbreak of productions in the field of inclusion that not only named individuals, but also outlined the paths that should be covered by them — and by us. The concept Education for All has provoked a shift: the focus that initially was given to programs intended to directly assist individuals with special needs is now given to the community as a whole. More than acting on the abnormal, policies of continuing education for teachers and theoretical subsidies to rethink school curricula received investments. This is the understanding of inclusive education which intends to define a new model of curriculum that addresses “how to reform schools, the educational practices and teacher training, with the aim of providing quality education that fits the characteristics of all students” (SÁNCHEZ,

2005). An understanding of education that seeks to articulate actions, extend commitments, and put the responsibility for the progress of all in the hands of the largest number of individuals possible.

These are some strategies that consider different ways of teaching, aiming to capture the largest number of individuals; subsidized by different fields of knowledge, they define the way we must behave and, because of that, end up spreading what we call inclusive education.

References

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. *Lei n. 9.394/96 – Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional*. Brasil: MEC, 1996.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Secretaria de Educação Especial. *Resolução n. 2/01 – Diretrizes Nacionais para a Educação Especial na Educação Básica*. Brasil: MEC/SEESP, 2001.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. *Decreto n. 6.094/07 – Plano de Metas Compromisso Todos pela Educação*. Brasil: MEC, 2007.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Secretaria de Educação Especial. *Política de Educação Especial na Perspectiva da Educação Inclusiva*. Brasil: MEC/SEESP, 2008.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Secretaria de Educação Especial. *Decreto n. 7.611/11*. Brasil: MEC, 2011.

EWALD, F. *Foucault, a norma e o direito*. Lisboa: Veja, 1993.

FOUCAULT, M. *As Palavras e as coisas: uma arqueologia das ciências humanas*. 8. ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2002a.

FOUCAULT, M. *Os anormais: curso no Collège de France (1974-1975)*. São Paulo: M. Fontes, 2002b.

FOUCAULT, M. *Segurança, território, população: curso no Collège de France (1977-1978)*. São Paulo: M. Fontes, 2008.

FOUCAULT, M. *Microfísica do poder*. Rio de Janeiro: Graal, 2009.

FOUCAULT, M. *A arqueologia do saber*. 7. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2010.

LOPES, M. C. Inclusão como prática política de governamentalidade. In: LOPES, M. C.; HATTGE, M. D. (Org.). *Inclusão escolar: conjunto de práticas que governam*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2009. p. 107-130.

LOPES, M. C. Norma, inclusão e governamentalidade neoliberal. In: CASTELO BRANCO, G.; VEIGA-NETO, A. J. (Org.). *Foucault: filosofia & política*. 1. reimp. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2013. p. 283-298.

RECH, T. L. *A emergência da inclusão escolar no governo FHC: movimentos que a tornaram uma verdade que permanece*. 2010. 182 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos, Novo Hamburgo, 2010.

ROSE, N. El gobierno en las democracias liberales “avanzadas”: del liberalismo al neoliberalismo. In: *Archipiélago: Cuadernos de Critica de la Cultura*, Barcelona, n. 29, p. 25-41, verano 1996.

SÁNCHEZ, P. A. A educação inclusiva: um meio de construir escolas para todos no século XXI. *Inclusão: Revista da Educação Especial*, Brasília, n. 1, p. 7-18, out. 2005.

SILVA, T. T. A produção social da identidade e da diferença. In: SILVA, T. T. (Org.). *Identidade e diferença: a perspectiva dos estudos culturais*. 3. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2004. p. 73-102.

UNESCO. *Declaração de Salamanca e linha de ação sobre necessidades educativas especiais*. Brasília: Corde, 1994. Available at: <<http://portal.mec.gov.br>>. Access on: Jun. 9, 2013.

VEIGA-NETO, A. J. Educação e governamentalidade neoliberal: novos dispositivos, novas subjetividades. In: PORTOCARRERO, V.; CASTELO BRANCO, G. *Retratos de Foucault*. Rio de Janeiro: Nau, 2000. p. 179-217.

VEIGA-NETO, A. J. da. Incluir para excluir. In: LARROSA, J.; SKLIAR, C. (Org.). *Habitantes de Babel: políticas e poéticas da diferença*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2001. p. 105-118.

VEIGA-NETO, A. J. Teoria e método em Michel Foucault: (im)possibilidades. *Cadernos de Educação*, Pelotas, n. 34, p. 83-94, set./dez. 2009.

Received: 10/15/2013

Recebido: 15/10/2013

Approved: 04/18/2014

Aprovado: 18/04/2014