


DEVICES OF SUBJECTIVATION IN THE CONTEXT OF EDUCATION FOR THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY: THE NUANCES OF LEARNING TO BE

 <https://doi.org/10.56238/sevened2024.038-012>

Francisco Ullissis Paixão e Vasconcelos¹, Cleidiana Andrade da Penha Ximenes², Elenilda Teles Frota³, Flavia Azevedo Albuquerque Fontenele⁴, Francisco Jardel Araújo Lourenço⁵, Jane Meire de Freitas dos Santos de Queiroz⁶, Lenna Fernandes dos Anjos⁷ and Maria José Coutinho de Melo⁸

ABSTRACT

This article analyzes, through Foucaultian discourse analysis, the UNESCO report "Education: a treasure to be discovered" (1996), highlighting how its objectives for education in the twenty-first century, although presented under new rhetoric, maintain a functionalist discourse already known and reaffirm the proposition of Education for All as a proposal of subjectivation. The analysis focuses on the titles of the document and its articulation with the proposal of pillars for education that reinforce the idea of education as essential for individuals to "become human" and truly live. Using the perspectives of Foucault and Larrosa, through a qualitative documentary analysis, the text argues that, although the mechanisms presented in the report are distinct from traditional disciplinary devices, the logic underlying the production of the subject persists, now disguised by apparently naïve rhetoric. It is necessary to intend the contexts and public policies, as a way to generate, in the midst of hegemonic discourses, fissures that make it possible to break with the officialized subjectivities that mark the experience of the self.

Keywords: Education for all. Learning to Be. Subjectivation.

¹ Postdoctoral Fellow in Social Psychology
State University of Rio de Janeiro - UERJ
Professor of the Professional Master's Degree in Sociology
Vale do Acaraú State University - UVA
E-mail: francisco_ullissis@uvanet.br

² Graduated in Pedagogy
FAVENI University Center - UNIFAVENI
E-mail: cleidiana0104@gmail.com

³ Master's student in Educational Sciences
Universidad Del Sol - UNADES
E-mail: elenildatf@gmail.com

⁴ Specialist in Public Education Management
Federal University of Juiz de Fora - UFJF
E-mail: flaviaazevedo1@yahoo.com.br

⁵ Specialist in Higher Education Teaching
Anhanguera University - UNIDERP
E-mail: jardel.renova@hotmail.com

⁶ Specialist in Biology, Chemistry and Sociology
Vale do Acaraú University - UVA
Email: janemeirequeiroz@yahoo.com.br

⁷ Specialist in English Language Teaching
Cândido Mendes University
E-mail: dosanjos.lenna@gmail.com

⁸ Specialist in Elementary and High School Methodology
Vale do Acaraú State University - UVA
Email: mazecoutinho@yahoo.com.br



INTRODUCTION

In this work we address the enunciative articulations brought by the document Education, a treasure to be discovered: report for UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the XXI Century, fruit of the Education for All conference, held in Jomtien, Thailand. In this document, four pillars for education in the 21st century are pointed out as essential, among them Learning to Be, which is configured as the final objective of education according to the report.

proposes a critical and in-depth analysis of the important UNESCO document that deals with education in the twenty-first century, from the insightful perspective of Foucault and other authors who contribute to this discussion. The introduction effectively contextualizes the fundamental importance of the topic under discussion, presenting in a clear and objective way the relevance of the proposed new theoretical approach. In addition, it highlights the imperative need to understand subjectivation in the school environment, an essential aspect for the development of the educational subject. The article also delimits the scope of the study, clarifying what will be addressed and what the main objectives of the research are. The structure of the article is presented in an organized way, and the author anticipates the issues that will be explored throughout the work, seeking to instigate the critical reflection of readers on the nuances of contemporary education and its influence on the identity formation of individuals.

School institutions, which did not exist until the fifteenth century, emerged in society to meet the demand of the industrial revolution and were elevated, from the functionalist perspective, to the level of redeemer, the one that would be able to save men from the savagery that prevented them from living together peacefully and harmoniously.

This logic still persists and is expressed in the UNESCO document on Education for the 21st Century, especially in the report entitled "Education, a treasure to be discovered", which brings in its third part, in the guidelines, titles that express the importance given to education as that which is capable of making people participants in society and learners of life suitable for it, in a proposal that includes describing, narrating, judging and controlling oneself.

Thus, the objective of this work was to analyze, in the light of the Foucauldian framework, how the proposals of the document Education, a treasure to be discovered: report for UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the XXI Century, prefigures a path of subjectivation.



NOTES ON THE HISTORICIZATION OF SCHOOL INSTITUTIONS AND THE FUNCTIONALIST PERSPECTIVES

School institutions emerge in a given context of the world geopolitical reorganization and with an intrinsic purpose to it. In this way, we can consider that there is a history of school institutions that is permeated by a function and an ideal of society to be built in order to meet certain perspectives and interests. This is what we will seek to address in this section.

We start from a very particular perspective of historization, thinking about the history of the school from the perspective of genealogy, as thought by Michel Foucault, although in a very modest proposition with respect to the conditions proper to a book chapter.

Foucault, in an attempt to understand how certain discourses, practices and institutions emerged historically and consolidated themselves in the midst of power-knowledge relations, inaugurated a method of historicizing the present (meaning, in general, the understanding of how the present, and its articulations, was constructed and accepted as truth). It is a method that destabilizes teleological and linear narratives, questioning the contingent processes that have shaped the forms of knowledge and power. In this way (to better situate the beginner reader in this epistemological approach) applying this perspective to the origin of school institutions implies deconstructing the naturalized ideas of school as a neutral and truly universal space since always, as well as for the transmission of knowledge, situating it in the midst of the historical articulations that shaped it and made it operate from an emerging proposition of Disciplinary Societies, not only as a means of control, but as a form of production of subjectivities. We will explain this better below.

We consider it fundamental, at first, to bring the perspectives constructed by Foucault (1975) in *Discipline and Punish*, in order to understand the place of the school institution in modern society. For the author, societies have been, over time, organized and made use of different forms to operate social control, of bodies and ways of life, with discourses, permissions and prohibitions specific to each era, always based on the exercise of power (which is positive to the extent that it produces ways of life) and the conjuncture of each moment. He presents three distinct models of society: the first, which he called Societies of Sovereignty, was organized based on the figure of the sovereign with absolute and the mode of punishment through the torture of bodies in public squares. In this society, people allowed themselves to live, and were made to die, so that the focus was on the engineering of death and how it would be exposed to all, with the pedagogical intention of instilling fear, teaching limits and reaffirming the figure of the sovereign as the holder of



power. The second model (and the one we will deal with here) he named Disciplinary Societies, which operate from the replacement of torture by discipline and by techniques of surveillance and education, as a way of imprinting obedience to established norms and by the use of space as a mechanism for controlling bodies. In this society, the focus has become, therefore, to generate ways of life. Thus, people began to make live and let die, with a focus on the development of technology that regulated the ways of being and living in the world. The third, which he called Control Societies, figures, in the context of Discipline and Punish, not as an already fully established reality, but as the emergence of new techniques, which operate through reward instead of punishment, but which cohabit with the modes of the Disciplinary Society.

Let us go a little deeper into Foucault's (1975) thought about how the school became machinery (a machine that puts into operation) proper to the Disciplinary Society. and that has its place in history from the context that originated the European National States (late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries). In the period of transition from the Sovereignty Society to the Discipline Society, there was the eagerness that strong institutions, such as prisons, asylums and hospitals, would be the way to contain social spirits. The modern, institutionalized and republican school was also thought of and founded in the same context as such strong institutions, such as prisons and asylums (these, for a time, figured as central in the bet on social ordering). With the failure of these institutions to cope with the construction of the spirit of the Nation-States, the school emerges as a "safe" bet for the organization and standardization of the functionalist society, becoming the main institution on which the discourse of the redemption of humanity rested. It, the functionalists believed, would take care of bodies and minds, and provide the long-awaited national identity, a peaceful and harmonious coexistence, and a new world order. It was in this context that the idea and discourse of an "Education for All" first emerged.

The school began to be thought of as a place whose practices would consist, in addition to organizing the physical space and the bodies that inhabited it, in developing strategies for the control and management of time and pedagogical practices to inscribe the desired norms in individuals. The organization in classrooms, the division of students into grades by age groups and the use of rigid schedules are strategies of disciplinarization. Foucault explains that "the control of time, the isolation of bodies and continuous surveillance are practices that shape individuals and make them docile and useful" (Foucault, 1975, p. 162). Thus, based on the model of Disciplinary Societies, the school began to operate as a standardization machine, teaching not only formal content, but also obedience, punctuality, and the internalization of social norms.



In this sense, the architecture of schools and the organization of their spaces reveal surveillance and regulation strategies. According to Foucault: "The school, the barracks, the hospital and the prison are spaces that share similar technologies of disciplinization: the vigilant gaze, the functional hierarchy and the standardization of conducts" (Foucault, 1975, p. 172). Therefore, the emergence of school institutions in the modern period is deeply linked to the need for social control and the formation of useful and docile individuals, which points to their unquestionable character of subjectivation. This disciplinary functionality should not necessarily be understood as a conscious and uniform project, but as a set of practices that have been consolidated over time, in response to the economic and political demands of modern societies in transformation.

Thinking about the architecture of functionalist institutions and, therefore, also of the school, plays a crucial role in this process. The panopticon model, described by Foucault, is a metaphor that allows us to understand the functioning of disciplinary power in schools, especially when we analyze both the models of construction of these in pavilions with a central square, as well as the pedagogical practices and routines legitimized within them. Inspired by Jeremy Bentham's proposal for prisons, the panopticon is a device that enables constant surveillance, without the monitored knowing if they are being watched. At school, the constant supervision of the teacher, the inspections of all the acts of the students and even the arrangement of desks and the scrutiny of legitimate bodies in certain positions in the classroom, reflect this principle: "Power is exercised less by violence than by a vigilance that generates obedience and conformity" (Foucault, 1975, p. 187).

We understand, therefore, that the institution of School is inserted in the broader context, composing what Foucault called "biopolitics", which refers to a set of actions and devices that operate in the management of the lives of populations. From modernity, education, now formalized and institutionalized, began to appear as a strategy of intervention in the social body, promoting not only instruction, but also conformity with norms, the dissemination of dominant moral values, and a whole policy of demarcation of the being from these prerogatives of truth.

For Larrosa (2002), therefore, the school is not only a space for the transmission of knowledge, but a place for the fabrication of subjectivities: "Education, by organizing time and space, produces subjects who internalize rules, regulations and ways of being" (p. 58). This mode of production of the schooled subject is crossed by discourses of knowledge-power that seek to normalize conducts and shape behaviors. That is why it is essential that education scholars pay attention, not to an officialized historical linearity, but to the



identification of ruptures and continuities in the ways in which school institutions play their normative role throughout history.

The functionalist interpretations and their ways of justifying the social order, permeated the social imaginary and legitimized the discourse about the school as a neutral institution on the one hand, and essentially beneficial on the other. The only one capable of saving men from their savagery and guaranteeing humanity what is the essence of the human. Émile Durkheim, representative of classical functionalism, for example, conceives education as a necessary process for social cohesion, and that capable of elevating humanity to an idealized social model. He proposes that "Education is the means by which society perpetuates its existence, forming individuals according to their needs" (Durkheim, 1922, p. 47). On the other hand, the Foucaultian perspective questions this neutrality, evidencing how school institutions are configured as instruments of control and subjection, being a fruitful field for the exercise of power. The school, therefore, is not only a reflection of social needs, but an active space for the production and reproduction of subjectivities.

Foucaultian thought, in this sense, allows us to pay attention to the ways in which the school operates, as a central device in disciplinary societies, functioning as a mechanism to echo discourses of normalization and subjectivation, in addition to promoting the experience of the self (we will talk about this later). Therefore, far from being a neutral institution, the school plays a strategic role in the formation of disciplined bodies and minds. Understanding this perspective allows us to problematize the apparently universal and natural character of formal education, opening space for reflections on its practices, discourses that reverberate and its practical purposes from the present.

THE HISTORY OF PINOCCHIO AND THE FUNCTIONALIST SCHOOL INSTITUTION

In order to better understand how the school was thought of in the light of disciplinary societies, its fundamental social role and recognition, and its subjectivating pedagogies, we resort to a narrative that refers to the context of the formation of cities, their opposition to the subversiveness of the streets, and the social dynamics that emerged in this process: the tale of Pinocchio, a narrative full of pedagogical intentionality, which makes explicit cultural and institutional marks of its time, and which presents the school as a central institution in the process of giving life to men, to the point of validating sacrifices and committing energy to the abnegation of everything that is not school and its knowledge (the street, for example), along the lines of what is discussed by Vasconcelos, Benevides and Campani (2012).



The story of Pinocchio, very present in the childhood of many generations throughout modern history, begins with Geppetto, a carpenter who, upon receiving a talking piece of wood, transforms it into a doll, gives it a name and, in the midst of his loneliness, adopts it as his son. However, Pinocchio occupied an ambiguous place: although he could speak and, therefore, he was not completely a puppet, neither was he a child. His condition was, as Jiminy Cricket points out, that of someone with a "wooden head". What was missing, after all, for him to become a real boy?

History tries to make it clear: he lacked responsibility. In order to be recognized as "human", that is, to become a "real boy", Pinocchio would need to acquire attributes essential to the human, such as the ability to act responsibly and possess his own conscience. This transformation, however, would not occur spontaneously, it would only be possible through a pedagogically outlined process. According to Collodi's narrative (1992), Pinocchio would be transformed into a real boy by a fairy (that is, in a touch of magic), at the moment he was already living as such. To do so, it would be necessary for him to internalize and practice the legitimate and expected values of a "real boy". To do this, Pinocchio had to seek, within himself, the elements that constitute humanity. But where to learn to be a human? At school! It would not be in the street, in the fields, or even in the circus that he would find his way to humanity; but it would be at school (Vasconcelos, 2020). It is worth mentioning that in the Middle Ages, and even in earlier times, these places (the street, the fields and even the circuses) were places of learning.

Geppetto sells his coat, buys books/booklets (which for a time was the ultimate symbol of culture and knowledge), and gives them to Pinocchio with the conviction that they and the school would teach him how to live and, consequently, to be able to be a real boy. This is a gesture that shows the unshakable confidence in the school. For Geppetto, the school was not just a space for formal instruction, but the indispensable place for Pinocchio to become a "real boy", a subject like the others.

What we see in this story is a discursive movement that seeks to consolidate the acceptance of school as a safe, beneficial and necessary place for the good life. A regime of truth is inaugurated in the context of the emergence of bourgeois cities, in which the streets, previously spaces for socialization and meetings, came to be perceived as places of "perdition", so much so that when he was seduced by the charms of the street and his freedom, Pinocchio is transformed into a donkey – far from a real boy. This perception echoes to this day, and sustains practices and discourses that legitimize the school as a primordial space for moral, social and subjective formation, that is, promoting the experience of oneself.



This belief was not unfounded. The creative function of subjects attributed to the school is an expression of what Foucault (2010d) identifies as the mechanisms of disciplinary societies that

it sees the subject as a requirement of the discourse, or as a momentary result of disciplinary devices, or even as a product of control practices; The school and the psychiatric hospital are excellent examples of such practices, or rather, they constitute disciplinary and controlling agencies. In any of these cases, it does not presuppose a unitary instance – psychic, social or of any other kind – as a proto-subject. (p, 46).

The modern school, configured as an institution that operates diverse devices, not only transmits knowledge, but also shapes bodies and ways of life (understanding, feeling, living and being). Its "social function" consists, in fact, in mediating the experience of the self, promoting the passage of the individual to the condition of human subject. This function, crystallized since the process of school institutionalization, remains structurally present, reaffirming the disciplinary and normative role of education.

WORLD CONTEXT AND TWENTIETH-CENTURY EXPECTATIONS FOR 21ST-CENTURY EDUCATION AND THE JOMTIEN CONFERENCE

The end of the twentieth century was a period marked by intense political, economic and social transformations worldwide, which rescued the Enlightenment ideal that it is through enlightenment that individuals become human beings. Thus, we saw the expectations around education as an instrument of human development and global integration become a central objective of the spirit of the late twentieth century.

A milestone in this context, the World Conference on Education for All, held in Jomtien, Thailand, in 1990, is the main and most emblematic event of this matrix of thought, and chooses paths that aimed to promote a movement of humanization of man, in order to avoid the great catastrophes experienced by humanity in the twentieth century.

Promoted by UNESCO, UNICEF, UNDP and the World Bank, the conference consolidated the international commitment to the universalization of access to basic education, seen as a fundamental human right and a necessary condition for the social and economic progress of nations, reaffirming the functionalist ideal of education for all. Although we understand that the post-World War II and post-Cold War scenario demanded alternatives for a social organization that distanced itself from barbarism, we cannot fail to point out that the ways in which this occurs always seem to move towards the legitimization of certain knowledges (always white/European/Christian) to the detriment of others, which imprints certain devices that put into operation legitimate ways of life, which always points



to a *modus operandi* of power that, in the context of scientific Western society, is normalizing.

As we said earlier, the Jomtien Conference emerged in a scenario marked by the end of the Cold War and the rise of neoliberalism as the hegemonic economic model in the world. The discourse that linked education, development and global competitiveness gained strength, reinforcing the idea that universal access to basic education would be an effective response to social and economic inequalities that, overcome through the enlightenment of men, would generate a more humane society.

However, from the Foucaultian perspective, we understand that these educational initiatives began to act as government technologies, shaping new subjectivities and regulating populations on a global scale. It is essential to remember that Foucault (1979) emphasizes that power, in modern societies, is not exercised only by coercion, but by the production of knowledge and practices that guide behaviors and govern conducts, and in this perspective, the school emerges again as a great bet for the operationalization and circulation of techniques and discourses that have this objective.

UNESCO's report *Education for the 21st Century: A Treasure to Discover* (1996), prepared under the coordination of Jacques Delors, was strongly influenced by the guidelines established in Jomtien. The document proposes four pillars for education in the twenty-first century, namely: learning to know, learning to do, learning to live together, "to learn to be (we will bring these elements in our analysis proposition). These pillars are justified from the attempt to integrate cognitive, technical, social and ethical dimensions to the educational process, in response to the demands of a globalized and interdependent world. However, these propositions appear in the context of the new world order that emerged in the post-war period, from the movements to promote a new model of governmentality based on global citizenship and new mechanisms for managing populations, aligned with the economic and political needs of an expanding world market.

The Jomtien Conference and the Delors report, following the same functionalist understanding, point to education as an institution on which lies the expectation of accounting for social cohesion and facing complex social challenges such as illiteracy, exclusion and poverty. However, as in Popkewitz (1997), these political-discursive movements operate from a normative ontological perspective, which seeks to standardize educational practices and results, ignoring cultural and local specificities, producing serial subjectivities. This homogenization, promoted in the name of development, can reinforce inequalities and exclusions, rather than overcome them. The proposal of an "Education for



All", therefore, must be analyzed not only in its declared objectives, but also in its practical effects and in the power relations it produces.

The historical context that served as a trigger and justification for the articulations resulting from the Jomtien Conference, brings to the analysis scenario the agonistic of universalist ideals and local realities. Although the UNESCO report seems to recognize the importance of respecting local cultural diversity, what appears as a legitimate movement is the valorization of the white/European/Christian/neoliberalist model (etc.), that is, legitimate knowledge and ways of life based on a certain regime of truth.

From this, we see a model of governmentality in articulation of discourses and practices of state policies that privilege quantitative indicators, such as the number of correct answers in large-scale standardized tests, in addition to the eligibility of specific fields of hegemonic knowledge as more important than others and ordered in reference matrices, enrollment rates and permanence at any cost in school, to the detriment of a qualitative approach that values the particularities of regional contexts, social ills and the production of meaning for different peoples and cultures. From the Foucaultian perspective, these practices of measurement and categorization are configured as biopolitical strategies that aim to order and optimize populations, reinforcing existing power structures.

It is important to emphasize that, when thinking about a standard model for human development, including that of school institutions, based on the neoliberal context of economic progress, the educational agenda of the late twentieth century began to be guided by a technocratic and instrumental view of education. The emphasis on the formation of autonomous, productive and adaptable individuals meets the demands of a globalized economy that favors competitiveness and innovation, with the subjects being produced for this. This model, although it seems to present important contributions to the development of humanity, in addition to economic development, it operates as a subjectivator, marking the experience of oneself, presenting what would be a legitimate and truly human way of life, and placing at the opposite and discordant pole, inferior and with untruth any and all human experience that is not scientific and morally adequate to the models chosen as evolved, adequate and good. Thus disregarding the multiple dimensions of human existence and the complex power relations that permeate the educational field.



METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS

The study in question was an exploratory research since it aimed to provide an approximate overview of the fact investigated (GIL, 2009), developed from the analysis of the UNESCO report for Education in the XXI century.

The stages of the research were: identification of the statements present in the aforementioned report, after studying it; classification of these statements based on the contemporary mechanisms of subjectivation brought by Larrosa (1994) and, subsequent analysis of how these discourses materialize in daily actions within schools.

The research is based on a qualitative approach, using documentary analysis and Foucaultian discourse analysis as the main methodological and data analysis tools. The choice for a qualitative approach is due to the ability of this research model to explore, in a deep way and with greater freedom of approaches and technique, complex phenomena, considering the sociocultural and historical contexts that shape them. As Denzin and Lincoln (2011) point out, qualitative research seeks to understand meanings, practices, and power relations, going beyond description to promote interpretative and critical analyses.

Document analysis, according to Cellard (2008), is a rigorous method that allows the examination of textual sources as objects of study, considering them in their contexts of production, circulation and reception. In the present work, we have chosen as *the locus of analysis*, the UNESCO report "*Education: a treasure to be discovered*" (1996), which consolidated the guidelines of the Conference on Education for All, held in Jomtien in 1990. This document is analyzed as a discursive piece that articulates global visions on education, defining goals, strategies and priorities for the twenty-first century.

For the data analysis, and in line with the epistemological basis of this work, we chose Foucaultian discourse analysis. According to Foucault (1971), discourse is not only a form of expression or communication, but a practice that produces knowledge and exerts power. This perspective allows us to understand how the UNESCO report constructs narratives about education, development and citizenship, fostering subjectivities and proposing models of education on a global scale, in a model of governmentality typical of neoliberal expectations. In this sense, Foucaultian discourse analysis seeks to identify the conditions of possibility for the emergence of certain utterances, examining how they are legitimized and which power relations they sustain.



EXHIBITION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA FROM THE UNESCO REPORT: 'EDUCATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY, A TREASURE TO DISCOVER'

The social function of the school continues to reverberate in contemporaneity, even if under new discursive articulations, without losing the strength that characterizes it. In 1996, motivated by the great transformations of the twentieth century and the uncertainties of the century to come, UNESCO launched the report "**Education, a treasure to be discovered**", projecting "new" goals for education in the twenty-first century. However, in our analysis, such objectives are clothed in a functionalist discourse that is already known, but now presented under more attractive rhetoric.

In the third part of the document, we find titles that reinforce the idea of education as essential for individuals to "become human" and truly live. Examples of this are the chapters entitled "**A passport to life: basic education**" and "**Secondary education: a turntable of a lifetime**" (DELORS, 2003). These titles dialogue directly with the contemporary perspective that positions the school as responsible for "giving life". But, after all, what life are we talking about? Under what parameters and interests is it designed?

Such questions are crucial, as they are part of the discursive production of power as "action on the action of others" (FOUCAULT, 2013a). Although the mechanisms presented in the UNESCO report are distinct from the disciplinary devices analyzed by Foucault (1997), the logic underlying the production of the subject persists, now disguised by apparently naïve rhetoric. In this sense, Larrosa (2011) points to the constitutive character of this rhetoric, by indicating that educational practices, far from being only mediators, function as producers of subjects.

The UNESCO document systematizes an educational model that reflects one of the contemporary pedagogical devices described by Larrosa (2011), places where discourses and assemblages materialize, fostering experiences of the self and constructing reality as essentiality. These devices transform the subject's experiences with himself and produce effects at the representational level as well as at the behavioral and emotional levels.

Larrosa (2011) defines these devices as spaces that modify the relationships that the subject establishes with himself. Pedagogical practices, whether they are school assemblies, therapeutic groups or the confessional, share the characteristic of guiding the constitution of a reflective narrative about oneself. Thus, in the contemporary context, these practices become tools that shape subjectivities aligned with the demands of an accelerated and fragmented society (AMADO, 2009).

Contemporary educational action, therefore, goes beyond technical or productive qualification, aiming at the production of subjectivities through a constant relationship



between the subject and himself. The centrality of this relationship is expressed in reflective terms: knowing oneself, disciplining oneself, regulating oneself (LARROSA, 2011). These verbs not only define the human, but also operate as normative criteria of "being."

Recognizing oneself as a subject in the school setting implies adapting to the norms. The technologies of the self, understood as pedagogical practices aimed at the reflective relationship of the learner with himself, are not limited to transmitting external knowledge, but favor the link between subjectivity and self-experience (LARROSA, 2011, p. 36). In this way, the ontology of the subject is constructed as a historical experience, as Foucault proposes, where the "I" is not something immutable, but the result of continuous processes of subjectivation.

In this context, the UNESCO report proposes the so-called four pillars of education for the 21st century: "**Learning to know**", "**Learning to do**", "**Learning to live together**", to "**Learning to be**". This is exactly how the report brings its statement, to learn everything in order to, above all, learn to Be. Learning to be, in this way, exists as a proposition of integration with others, and expresses the redemptive and subjectivating objective of teaching people to be, in an integral way, human beings adapted to the demands of "cognitive civilization" (DELORS, 2003). It is, in fact, the product resulting from education, whose purpose is not cognitive or critical, but the result of legitimate ways of life, a legitimate way of being thought a *priori*, which makes being actually the interiorization of the outside as if it were always the essence of the self.

Thus, "Learning to be" reflects the processes of governmentality articulated by disciplinary and biopolitical power, legitimizing the school as a space for the interiorization of external norms. This legitimacy is sustained by practices of vigilance and reflection, where the subject narrates and analyzes himself according to imposed references. Thus, the school operates as a pedagogical device that promotes the grammar of self-interpretation and consolidates the normative criteria of what it means to "be" in the contemporary world.

Although the technologies of the self reinforce this normative grammar, it is worth remembering that the subject is a provisional effect, and in micro-relations, there are possibilities for reinvention (MANSANO, 2009). Thus, education, even impregnated with power devices, continues to be a space of dispute, where the being can transcend normativities and reinvent himself.



FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The analysis of the report "Education, a treasure to be discovered", although it presents a rhetoric of innovation for education in the twenty-first century, points to new ways of governing the populations, through the attempt to rescue and perpetuate the functionalist "truths" that link education to preexisting economic and social demands. The four pillars proposed – "learning to know", "learning to do", "learning to live together" and "learning to be" – although apparently comprehensive, can be interpreted as mechanisms for conforming individuals to the social and economic norms in force. This approach suggests a continuity in the social function of the school as an instrument for the production of subjectivities aligned with the expectations of a globalized and neoliberal society.

Learning to be presents itself as a contemporary rhetoric for the promotion of a pedagogy of "being". The study points to the fact that when provoked to say about oneself, what the subject does, in fact, is to take for oneself the norms instilled by the daily experience and discourse, as a measure of oneself.

At the moment when the report points to the need for an "inner journey", it inserts the subjects of education in a process of self-reflection and self-analysis. Therein lies the power of rhetoric since, strengthened by the idea of an essence of being, the subject, supposedly freed to say about himself, but implicitly said by others, dragged by the machinery of rhetoric, constitutes a reflexive unknown of thoughts about himself, determined by devices that produce and capture what Foucault called "experience of the self".



REFERENCES

1. Amado, L. A. S. (2009). Modos de subjetivação: Os dispositivos pedagógicos da mídia e da educação [Modes of subjectivation: The pedagogical devices of media and education]. Available at http://www.febf.uerj.br/pesquisa_midia_educa_subjetividade/subjetividade.pdf
2. Cellard, A. (2008). A análise documental [Documentary analysis]. In J. Poupart et al. (Eds.), *A pesquisa qualitativa: Enfoques epistemológicos e metodológicos* (pp. 295–314). Petrópolis: Vozes.
3. Collodi, C. (1992). *As aventuras de Pinóquio* [The adventures of Pinocchio]. São Paulo: Paulinas.
4. Delors, J., et al. (2003). *Educação: Um tesouro a descobrir: Relatório para a UNESCO da Comissão Internacional sobre Educação para o século XXI* [Education: A treasure to discover: Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the 21st Century] (8th ed.). São Paulo/Brasília: Cortez/MEC/UNESCO.
5. Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
6. Durkheim, É. (1922). *Educação e sociologia* [Education and sociology]. São Paulo: Melhoramentos.
7. Foucault, M. (1971). *A arqueologia do saber* [The archaeology of knowledge]. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária.
8. Foucault, M. (1975). *Vigiar e punir: Nascimento da prisão* [Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison]. Petrópolis: Vozes.
9. Foucault, M. (1979). *Microfísica do poder* [Microphysics of power]. Rio de Janeiro: Graal.
10. Foucault, M. (1997). *A sociedade punitiva* [The punitive society]. In *Resumo dos cursos do Collège de France* (pp. 25–44). Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar.
11. Larrosa, J. (1994). *Tecnologias do eu e educação* [Technologies of the self and education]. In T. T. Silva (Ed.), *O sujeito da educação: Estudos foucaultianos* (pp. 53–75). Petrópolis: Vozes.
12. Larrosa, J. (2002). *Pedagogia profana: Danças, piruetas e mascaradas* [Profane pedagogy: Dances, pirouettes, and masquerades]. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica.
13. Popkewitz, T. S. (1997). *A produção do indivíduo moderno na reforma educacional* [The production of the modern individual in educational reform]. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica.
14. UNESCO. (1990). *World declaration on education for all and framework for action to meet basic learning needs*. Jomtien, Thailand. Available at <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000127583>



15. UNESCO. (1996). Educação: Um tesouro a descobrir: Relatório da Comissão Internacional sobre Educação para o século XXI [Education: A treasure to discover: Report of the International Commission on Education for the 21st Century]. Available at <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000109590>