

Análise do discurso sobre socioeducação e seus domínios simbólicos: uma relação entre sociedade, decolonialidade, ideologia e inconsciente

Gustavo Furtoso¹
Denise Cristina de L. Picanço²
Elenilton Vieira Godoy³

Resumo

O artigo identifica condições de produção de sentido da socioeducação, conceito tanto da legislação penal para jovens quanto de práticas educativas. Uma pesquisa fundamentada na Análise do Discurso (AD) que buscará um diálogo com reflexões decoloniais com objetivo de conceituarmos os domínios simbólicos na teoria da AD apresentada por Orlandi (2017, 2009) como uma tendência ideológica na constituição de sentido; na sequência pensamos segundo a *totalidade* (Dussel, 1996) e a *desumanização* (Freire, 2016) e os definimos como campo de luta entre o ser e o não ser. Por fim realizamos a análise da Parte I do Cadernos Socioeducativos (PARANÁ, 2018), intitulado Marco Teórico-Metodológico da Socioeducação, colocamos em prática a análise dos domínios simbólicos, transitamos nos interdiscursos, efeitos metafóricos e metonímicos da socioeducação presentes no documento e concluímos que há formações ideológicas que exercem uma dominância colonial sobre o ser e as identificamos como ideologias neoliberais e socialistas, também como condições de produção de sentido.

Palavras-chave: Socioeducação. Formações ideológicas. Sentido.

¹ Master's and doctoral student in Education at the Graduate Program in Education (PPGE) of the Federal University of Paraná (UFPR). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8843-8351>. E-mail: furtoso@outlook.com.br.

² PhD in Letters. Graduate Program in Education (PPGE) of the Federal University of Paraná (UFPR). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2234-2090>. E-mail: deisepicanco@gmail.com

³ PhD in Education. Graduate Program in Education (PPGE) of the Federal University of Paraná (UFPR). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8081-5813>. E-mail: elenilton@ufpr.br.

Discourse analysis on socio-education and its symbolic domains: a relationship between society, decoloniality, ideology, and the unconscious

Gustavo Furtoso
Denise Cristina de L. Picanço
Elenilton Vieira Godoy

Abstract

This paper aims to identify the conditions of meaning production of socioeducation, a concept in the penal legislation for young people and in educational practices. The research is grounded in Discourse Analysis (DA) dialoguing with decolonial reflections. First, we conceptualize the symbolic domains in DA theory by Orlandi (2017, 2009) as an ideological tendency in the constitution of meaning; then, thinking according to the totality (DUSSEL, 1996) and the dehumanization (FREIRE, 2016), we define them as a field of struggle between being and not being. We finish by analyzing the Part I of Cadernos Socioeducativos (PARANÀ, 2018), entitled Theoretical-Methodological of Socioeducation, putting into practice the analysis of symbolic domains, transiting into interdiscourses, metaphorical and metonymic effects of socioeducation present in the document and conclude that there are ideological formations that exercise a colonial dominance over the self, identified as neoliberal and socialist ideologies but also as conditions of meaning production.

Keywords: Socioeducation. Ideological formations. Meaning production.

Análisis del discurso sobre la socioeducación y sus dominios simbólicos: una relación entre sociedad, decolonialidad, ideología e inconsciente.

Gustavo Furtoso
Denise Cristina de L. Picanço
Elenilton Vieira Godoy

Resumen

El artículo identifica condiciones para la producción de sentido de la socioeducación, concepto dado tanto a la legislación penal para los jóvenes como a las prácticas educativas. Una investigación basada en el Análisis del Discurso (AD) dialogando con reflexiones decoloniales. Conceptualizamos los dominios simbólicos en la teoría del AD presentada por Orlandi (2017, 2009) como una tendencia ideológica en la constitución del sentido; entonces pensamos según la totalidad (Dussel, 1996) y la deshumanización (Freire, 2016) y los definimos como un campo de lucha entre el ser y el no ser. Terminamos realizando el análisis de la Parte I de los Cuadernos Socioeducativos (PARANÀ, 2018), titulado Marco Teórico-Metodológico de la Socioeducación, colocamos en práctica el análisis de dominios simbólicos, transitamos por interdiscursos, efectos metafóricos y metonímicos de la socioeducación presentes en el documento y concluimos que hay formaciones ideológicas que ejercen una dominación colonial sobre el ser y las identificamos como ideologías neoliberales y socialistas, también como condiciones para la producción de sentido.

Palabras clave: Socioeducación. Formações ideológicas. Sentido.

Introduction

This article emerges from an attempt to put into practice analytical procedures grounded in Discourse Analysis (DA) in dialogue with decolonial concepts, that is, discourses aimed at constructing meanings that break away from power structures established since the colonization of Latin America up to the present day.

Therefore, the goal here is to theoretically ground the concept of symbolic domain through a dialogue with discourse theory and decoloniality, in order to analyze the construction of meaning around the concept-analysis of socio-education. This concept-analysis is closely linked to the discourse of the Brazilian state in the very conception of the laws and regulations governing all work carried out with youth who commit offenses. It is also related to the forms of subjection that exist in our society, which subject individuals to meanings that are inherently tied to the most convenient social and semantic positions for the historically dominant epistemology, namely, the colonial.

We believe that analyzing our society involves a certain complexity due to its entanglement with decoloniality, as we understand, following Maldonado-Torres (2018, p. 35), that decoloniality refers to “the struggle against the logic of coloniality and its material, epistemic, and symbolic effects”: – in the material sense, we see the bodies of youth, mostly Black and from marginalized communities, subjected to actions labeled as socio-educational, historically constructed alongside the colonial power relations present in society; – in the epistemological sense, due to the emergence of urban peripheries as subalternized and oppressed zones, they live in what is metaphorically the “dumping ground,” as Carolina Maria de Jesus (1960, p. 28) wrote, “I classify São Paulo like this: The Palace is the living room. The City Hall is the dining room, and the city is the garden. And the favela is the dumping ground where the garbage is thrown”.

In the favela, in the periphery, reside those who are marginalized by the totality of dominant ideas, condemned by the great knowledge-power forces of colonialism, which have been sustaining subjugated symbols as undeniable truths through modern patriarchal, capitalist, and racist institutions; – and in the symbolic sense, this refers to ways of being, feeling, and understanding the world, which we later come to understand as forms of subjugation, always embedded within symbols of our linguistic system that dictate where everyday speech can be mobilized _ where the meanings given to the Other, the Self, and You are realized.

For this reason, Maldonado-Torres (2018, p.18) asserts that decoloniality “is about the emergence of the condemned as thinkers, creators, and activists, and the formation of communities that join the struggle for decolonization as an unfinished project.” In other words, we understand decoloniality as the struggle of generations bound by historical colonial chains to delinquency, criminalized by racial, cisgender, and capitalist norms; decoloniality is the fight against these chains. Is this not the ultimate goal of socio-education? To resocialize, re-signify, reintegrate, re-educate, and hold accountable regardless of the terminology used, all aim to prevent recidivism in offenses, as these offenses are connected to other forms of colonial oppression (race, gender, and social class).

Therefore, this article aims to understand the conditions of meaning production that represent symbolic domains, as explored in Part I – Theoretical and Methodological Framework of the official document of the State of Paraná titled ‘Socio-education Notebooks: Theoretical and Methodological Foundations of Socio-education,’ concerning socio-education.

To this end, we propose a methodological approach in terms of “modes of questioning data and forms of reasoning” (PÊCHEUX, 1997, p. 51), composed of four questions that guide the analysis of our empirical corpus and the statements:

- 1) What is the event or context within the statement that attempts to bring meaning to socio-education? a) seek interdiscourses.
- 2) What are the possible metonymic and metaphoric effects that can be established with other statements in the analyzed material? a) seek enunciative and ideological omissions.
- 3) What is the unconscious discourse that traverses these omissions? and
- 4) What symbolic domains were perceived by the analyst?

Symbolic Domains: A Discourse Analysis Device

When we chose to consider the concept of symbolic domain, it was because we identified it as a promising synthesis of the concepts we mobilize in our type of analysis, which seeks to bring into motion the meaning effects of the concept of socio-education.

Within the theory of Discourse Analysis (DA) to which we subscribe, the real⁴, that is, the objects in the world that we name such as socio-education, which is our concept-analysis has its

⁴ Reality is an externality that can only be confronted symbolically. The real is that which results from this symbolic mediation and comes to exist for us (ESTEVÃO, 2009).

verbal conditions of existence, which is language as the material space where meaning effects are realized (ORLANDI, 2017, p.45). Thus, to consider language in DA is to think of it as a symbolic order hence the symbolic aspect of our analytical framework. This means that “language is not a perfect system, but it is still a system; it has its order” (ORLANDI, 2017, p.77). When it is said that it is not a perfect system, it refers to the fact that the material form of language appears to us as discourse, and the material form of discourse is ideology. This means that the symbolic system, language, is a space subject to its externality formed by a discursive history and to the ideological confrontations and relations that have driven and continue to drive the means of production. For French DA, ideology and the unconscious are interconnected, thus forming the subject subjected by discursive formations that are under the influence of some ideological trend, which produces a field of meanings that determines what can and should be said by subjects. Explaining:

Subjection is not something that can be qualified. It concerns the nature of subjectivity, the qualification of the subject by its constitutive relationship with the symbolic, through ideology: it is through subjection to language in history. One can only be said to be affected by the symbolic, by the signifying system (ORLANDI, LAGAZZI-RODRIGUES, 2006, p. 19).

There is a foundation by which we are all affected, which subjects us to certain meanings that qualify the subject in the process of the existence of subjectivity, its nature. We consider this to be the "signifying system," a symbolic domain by which we are all affected: the symbolic is the basis of discursive materialities, and the domain is the ideological tendency of discursive formations. These are the conditions of possibility for meaning and the forms of subjection. The conditions for the possibility of meaning are: interdiscourse, what has already been said somewhere in history, the metaphorical or metonymic effect, the polysemic nature of words, ideological and enunciative omissions; and the conditions for the forms of subjection are the ideological formations and their connection with the unconscious. All these elements of our language, of the subject, of discourse, allow for error, misinterpretation, disconnection, affiliations, associations, substitutions, and slips to also have meaning, and not only meaning, but a connection to some ideological formation embedded in the history of discursivities and in historical forms of subjection. This is why language is not a perfect system; it is the "contradictory space of the unfolding of discursivities" (ORLANDI, 2017, p.45).

Therefore, understanding these relationships within our concept-analysis means paying close attention to symbols as entities that refer to the essence of things, because it is through their domains

of meaning, through the power to define what things are, that certain ideologies, which constitute discursive formations, resonate in discourses. In this article, this pertains to the meanings attributed to socio-education. Furthermore, as Discourse Analysis "works on power relations symbolized in a divided society" (ORLANDI, 2017, p. 55): divided by the conscious and unconscious, individual and subject, material and abstract, subjective and objective, rational and irrational, collective and individual, common sense and science, mechanisms of control over life and life itself in its natural state; divided because it is constituted by symbolic domains either in dispute or in communion to assign meanings to objects, control the means of production, and shape forms of subjection. We identify here a methodological path composed of a field of existence of power relations that we aim to highlight in our type of analysis, thanks to our understanding of the concept of symbolic domain.

Domain of the Gestures of Being: Deepening the Understanding of the Symbolic Domain as an Analytical Procedure

When we consider using the word *gesture*, we want to convey a sign, like a signal of a way of being. We do not wish to categorize the being, but rather to reflect on the modes of categorization, of domination of a meaning that subjects a way of being within a subjectivity. Thus, for us, the notion of totality is fundamental, because it is the real in which we exist from birth. In Dussel's view (1996, p. 32), "birth always occurs within a symbolic whole that nourishes the newcomer equally with the signs of its history," meaning that we come to life within a totality. Therefore, there is a dominating symbolic field that not only dominates a set of meanings, symbols, and metaphors but life itself, the being. And its gestures, metaphorical signs, describe perspectives on life from the authors who work with socio-education—a legal measure that has already impacted the lives of 205,845 adolescents (BRASIL, 2018). Therefore, to speak of the symbolic domains of socio-education is to speak about these lives.

The same applies to dehumanization, as, according to Freire (2016), the oppressive situation creates a dehumanized and dehumanizing totality that affects everyone involved in the relationship. It is the distortion of being more into being less, which robs the oppressed of their humanity, immersed in the machinery of the dominating structure that prevents others from being, to the extent that "the structure of their thinking is conditioned by the contradiction experienced in the concrete, existential situation in which it is formed" (FREIRE, 2016, p. 44). Therefore, we are in a society, in an oppressive totality, which is also constituted by symbolic domains, understood as a battleground

between being and non-being, a symbolic, dominating system, embedded in a Dusselian totality and dehumanizing in the Freirean sense.

To further clarify our aim, Orlandi (2009, p. 26) proposes in her formulations that “Discourse Analysis seeks to understand how symbolic objects produce meaning, thus analyzing the very gestures of interpretation, which it considers as acts within the symbolic domain, as they intervene in the reality of meaning.” The symbolic is language as the materiality of discourse on socio-education, and the domain is a set of meaning effects that dominate both semantics and being, and thus, their gestures.

The Construction of the Analysis Corpus: A Brief Context

The official document to be analyzed is Part I - Theoretical and Methodological Framework, authored by Márcia Cossetin, from the Socio-education Notebooks: Theoretical and Methodological Foundations of Socio-education, published in 2018 by the State Department of Justice, Labor, and Human Rights of the State of Paraná.

We consider that decolonial theory can provide the foundation for understanding this society and the symbolic domains embedded within it. If we are thinking about Brazil, then we must take colonization and decolonization into account. Decolonial theory, critically,

[...] reflects on our common sense and scientific assumptions regarding time, space, knowledge, and subjectivity, among other key areas of human experience. It allows us to identify and explain the ways in which colonized subjects experience colonization, while also providing conceptual tools to advance decolonization (MALDONADO-TORRES, 2018, p. 29).

Thus, from these understandings, we can reflect on Brazil within colonized America. One of the key assumptions of decolonial theory, as expressed by Maldonado-Torres (2018, p. 28), is that “colonial logics and representations can continue to exist after the climax of liberation and conquest movements [... and with them] colonization and its various dimensions of struggle are maintained.” Therefore, the subject is understood as a “battleground and a space that must be controlled and dominated” (MALDONADO-TORRES, 2018, p. 43), meaning dominated by the colonizer, affecting their symbols, their being. This allows us to assert that the colonizer is the one who literally creates the colonized, constructs their being, imposes their truth, placing them in opposition: the colonizer is good, the other is bad, and the encounter between the two will always be violent, as it was in their

first confrontation, because it will always be a clash of forces both to dominate (coloniality) and to liberate (decoloniality).

Maldonado-Torres (2018, p. 40) considers that “as a result, the bodies of the colonized and enslaved may be conceived (...) as genderless or with a particular form of gender difference, (...) sexual organs and sexualized parts of the body define the being.” In this sense, we cannot overlook, in any analysis, that Brazil experiences these colonial processes of social classification and control that dominate the being through symbols that describe the colonizer's reality. We also understand that the process of identifying symbolic domains involves the four questions outlined in the introduction, which aim to: capture historical aspects of the discursive formations present in the discourse on socio-education, that is, meanings where, on one side of Brazil, many colonizing forces are at work, while on the other side, youth in conflict with the law persist; identify the metaphors and metonymies of the meanings perceived in socio-education, which also speak to the social relations in our society; investigate ideological relations, since all discourse is positioned in history, in the pre-constructed, to determine which ideological groups are most closely associated with the meanings found; and finally, after addressing history, social relations, and ideologies, present the symbolic domains.

The Event or Context of the "Socio-education Notebooks: Theoretical and Methodological Foundations of Socioeducation"

When asking a text about its event or context, we are not trying to equate event and context, but rather to say that within the event, there is a political, disciplinary, and social context that fills it. According to Orlandi (2017, p. 58), “an event never stops producing meanings,” because it is a physical phenomenon; it is what happens, influenced by something that occurred at some point, somewhere, under the conditions of a given context. When discussing event or context, we understand that a given event within a particular context sustains the meaning of socio-education, and we will look for these two aspects of concrete reality. It is real because, when we read a text, the text itself is the product of a particular event, it is embedded in history, and our act of reading is also an event—the event of the analyst's reading, but also of the person who wrote our text, someone working in the field of socio-education. This reading generates another context, another event.

Just as with a documentary, if a film were our object of analysis, what is shown on the screen would be an “event that speaks of the event” (ORLANDI, 2017, p. 58), because watching the screen

is an event, and what is produced on the screen are events. Our corpus, of course, is not a documentary, but when we ask about the presence of the event or context for a text, or rather, a discourse, we understand that there was an event and a context that influenced its discursive production, which we will seek to describe by delving into the historical affiliations of the author's position. Consequently, these positions reflect characteristics of the position of socio-education itself in its historicity, meaning the history of socio-education is crossed by two forms of meaning production: the history of discourses about the phenomenon of criminalized youth and the practices involved, and the discursive history of the unconscious (as we will explain at the end). Therefore, asking about the event or context is an attempt to capture the historical affiliations involved in the conditions of meaning production, which is the first step in identifying the ideological positions that reside in the unconscious of the meaning given.

That said, we begin by choosing to analyze Part I of the Socio-education Notebooks, first separating what we consider to be a relevant statement to historically locate socio-education, and gradually moving toward other statements and broader contexts. Additionally, since it is an official document from the State of Paraná, it represents the concrete discourse that shapes the internal guidelines of socio-educational institutions in Paraná.

Thus, the text analysis was carried out not by focusing on the argument, its line of reasoning, or an analytical summary of the text's content, but rather on the discursive formations surrounding the concept. To this end, after a careful reading of the metaphorical and metonymic effects of our concept-analysis, that is, the shifts in meaning from socio-education to other meanings (since this is one of the ways we approach discursive formations), we separated the statements in which we identified the presence of this phenomenon of slippage. This allowed us to first capture the events and contexts of socio-education.

The first of the statements (E1) collected allows us to discuss fundamental aspects of both the context of the author of the text and of socio-education.

Socio-education goes far beyond the mere deprivation or restriction of freedom. It is the practice of offering adolescent's tools and guidelines so that they are able to make better choices, finding a new opportunity for social integration (PARANÁ, 2018, p. 9).

The text itself reveals a possible context when, just below the highlighted statement, it affirms that "the government of Paraná has spared no effort to train the staff working in Socio-educational Centers and Semi-Liberty Houses" (PARANÁ, 2018, p. 9). We also find in news reports the name of

Alex Sandro Silva, director of the Department of Socio-educational Services (DEASE), a contributor to the organization of the *Socio-educational Notebooks*, involved in various professionalization actions for socio-educational staff and in socio-educational initiatives with the youth served by the policy.

For the director of DEASE, Alex Sandro Silva, one of the highlights is that Paraná invests heavily in vocational training aimed at adolescents serving socio-educational measures. The socio-education system in Paraná has stood out on the national stage. The State Government, through the Department of Justice, Labor, and Human Rights (PARANÁ, 2018a, n.p.).

We can consider that the State of Paraná, through the institution DEASE, worked to train the professionals from other public organizations in Paraná linked to socio-education. In a broader search on Google with the keywords “DAGASE” and “Paraná,” news about training, state decisions, and socio-educational activities are the most frequent results. All this professional and political activity led to the creation of the Socio-education Notebooks with the aim “of offering adolescent’s tools and guidelines so that they are able to make better choices, finding a new opportunity for social integration” (PARANÁ, 2018, p. 9). The statement highlights that the context which contributed to shaping the event was the fact that the administration, not only of DEASE but also of “the State Government, through the Department of Justice, Labor, and Human Rights,” incorporated into its discourse the notion that “the socio-education system in Paraná has stood out on the national stage” (PARANÁ, 2018a, n.p.).

Regarding Márcia Cossetin, the author of Part I of the Socio-education Notebooks, she brings with her professional experience from serving as a pedagogue for eight years at the Socio-education Center in the state of Paraná (CENSE-Cascavel), which provided opportunities for studies and discussions beyond her work on the subject. In her master's dissertation, the author expresses gratitude “to the detained adolescents, as it was from them that the concerns arose that gave birth to this dissertation, and without whom this work would not have a reason to exist” (COSSETIN, 2012, p. 6). Her engagement with graduate studies in Education at UNIOESTE sparked questions about “the constitution and objectives of socio-education, as announced in the State of Paraná” (COSSETIN, 2012, p. 9). This life experience culminated in her participation in the production of the Socio-education Notebooks.

One of the important points of these affiliations, this network of statements, is that the author first expresses gratitude, as asserted in her dissertation, to the detained adolescents. This is related to E1, as it affirms the need for “a new opportunity for social integration,” in addition to stating that

"Socio-education goes far beyond the mere deprivation or restriction of freedom." These propositions declare a persistent context: the fight for the rights of children and youth devastated by capitalist, racist, and cisnormative worldviews that perpetuate inequalities and the need to detain young people.

In the highlighted propositions, the words *opportunity*, *beyond deprivation*, and *detained* are related to the pursuit of transforming the criminalizing reality that the capitalist-neoliberal society has engendered, for generations, in the lives of poor, Black, and marginalized families. In statement (E1), socio-education is the opportunity to transform the lives of this youth, who are detained for breaking the law, and to integrate them into society. However, this society is cisgender, capitalist, and white.

These issues norms, values, identities that encompass both cisnormativity, whiteness, and capitalism are understood by us as the foundations of a colonial, transphobic, and racist ethic that, together with competition in the capitalist labor market, fail to provide the conditions to survive outside of what is criminalized. Thus, for generations, certain groups have always required punishment. These groups, which we classify as youth up to the age of twelve they are children, and from twelve to eighteen they are adolescents (Article 2 of the Child and Adolescent Statute – ECA)—due to the fact that their families and communities lack the conditions to access or remain in the labor market, in school, in services, programs, and projects, need "tools and guidelines" that will enable them to find "a new opportunity for social integration" (PARANÁ, 2018, p. 9) in a capitalist, white, and cisgender society. This is a context that fills the criminalizing events that lead to a socio-educational need, or rather, "socio-education as the basis for serving adolescents in conflict with the law would be a response to society" (COSSETIN, 2012, p. 176), a response to a criminalizing context.

This response from society and the State to this youth group has been observed in Brazil since the colonial period (RIZZINI, RIZZINI, 2004). However, it was only in 1927 that this response was formalized through legislation, the Mello Mattos Code, known as the 1927 Juvenile Code. An event that clearly exemplifies what we want to illustrate as a persistent, criminalizing context in Brazilian society, present throughout history, is what happened with the shoeshine boy Bernardino:

The 12-year-old shoeshine boy Bernardino was arrested after throwing paint on a person who left without paying for his service. Placed in a jail with 20 adults, the Black boy was subjected to various forms of abuse and then thrown out onto the street. Taken to a hospital, he recounted the incident to journalists. The case garnered attention and sparked debates about the need for specific facilities for children serving some form of punishment. (PARANÁ, [s.d.], n.p.).

This boy, Black, poor, under economic, racist, and gender pressure, remains the most targeted group by the policy. The Mello Mattos Code, after this tragedy, enabled a new path for boys and girls

like Bernardino, stating that they are no longer punishable but subject to measures of assistance and protection. However, the most radical shift occurred when the ECA (Child and Adolescent Statute) explicitly introduced the full protection of children and adolescents into Brazilian legislation. In this shift, the institutions responsible for subjecting children and adolescents to assistance and protection were renamed, with a separation between the abandoned children and those who commit some offense. The latter are sent to places now called socio-educational centers, yet they are still mostly Bernardinos and Bernardinas.

Another context that can be identified in the statement and those related to it is the critique made by the author when she writes, "Socio-education goes far beyond the mere deprivation or restriction of freedom" (PARANÁ, 2018, p. 9). She also means that "it is a challenge to consider the elements and foundations for building a guiding proposal in the sense of overcoming mere adaptation" (PARANÁ, 2018, p. 15).

The critique of technicist pedagogy and competencies, present in the discourse of the corpus, appears when the argument is made that the goal is to pursue an education that does not merely adapt the human being, but rather enables authentic social transformation. This discourse is rooted in the events and context of the early 1980s, with the process of redemocratization, when strong myths began to be questioned, such as the category of the "minor" and technicist education.

The context generated by the ECA (Child and Adolescent Statute) forces those working in policy to develop and implement a socio-educational political-pedagogical proposal that can transform the lives of children and adolescents in conflict with the law a group criminalized not only intergenerationally but also racially, cisgenerically, and economically rather than simply adapting them to their environment (as traditional pedagogies of the market and means of production intended), which would perpetuate evident failures due to their exposure to social inequality and a persistent problem.

In summary, we believe that the events and contexts present as discursive formations of E1, but also of socio-education itself, are:

1) Political and professional coordination to seek efficient service for the criminalized groups of children and adolescents who arrive at the institutions.

2) The persistent economic-racial-gendered inequality that targets its legislative and social punishments at specific groups, ensuring the continuity of this problem in our society, which we refer to as a structural issue, and the constant need to provide a response to it.

3) Criticism of the plasticity of the capitalist system, which molds, reconfigures, and appropriates whatever is necessary to maintain and preserve the neoliberal, white, and cisgender way of life.

The Traps of State Discourse

Our concept-analysis, socio-education, according to Raniere (2014), is connected to the Child and Adolescent Statute (ECA) and the National System of Socio-Educational Services (SINASE). However, educational projects had been carried out by religious entities, political parties, and universities since the 1950s. It was only in the 1980s that social education or socio-education began to gain prominence in discussions. Nevertheless, despite some researchers' criticism of pleonasm or redundancy arguing that education is already social, and therefore, socio-education or social education are the same the fact remains that both the ECA and SINASE are forms of governance, they are discourses that name institutions and work organized around socio-education as a key concept.

In Discourse Analysis (DA), forgetfulness is part of the structure and the very functioning of language. It is through them these acts of forgetting that “spaces of our memory, our historical identity, are constructed, dissolving certified authorship, replacing statements, and producing interpretative gestures in which other (new) sites of meaning are constructed” (ORLANDI, 2017, p. 174). This process only makes sense because the word sense means, according to Orlandi (2017, p. 135), “in relation to,” and therefore, “the entire functioning of language is based on the tension between paraphrastic processes and polysemic processes” (ORLANDI, 2009, p. 36): the relations between sites of meaning. This interplay between paraphrase and polysemy attests to the confrontation between the political and the symbolic, meaning it is in language, as a symbolic system, that ideology and the political are materialized (ORLANDI, 2009). Thus, to analyze using the procedures of paraphrase and polysemy is to touch the edges of the unconscious, tainted by ideology, which stamps discourse in the form of forgetfulness.

Paraphrase is saying the same thing in a different way, and one of the procedures that does this is the metonymic one (a word that pulls another) (ORLANDI, 2017, p. 136), also called enunciative forgetfulness, in which the subject forgets that other formulations are possible and believes

themselves to be the origin of meaning the illusion of the modern subject (ORLANDI, LAGAZZI-RODRIGUES, 2006, p. 21).

Understanding these points, we would like to reanalyze E1, make substitutions with other statements from the corpus, create paraphrases and polysemy from the perceived meanings, and arrive at the metaphors of socio-education: "Socio-education goes far beyond the mere deprivation or restriction of freedom. It is the practice of offering adolescent's tools and guidelines so that they are able to make better choices, finding a new opportunity for social integration" (PARANÁ, 2018, p. 9).

We can create a paraphrase by replacing part of the statement above with others found and extracted from the analyzed material, without changing the meaning given to socio-education: "*Socio-education goes far beyond the mere deprivation or restriction of freedom (...). It is about the possibilities of implementing proposals that serve the individuals in this context, namely: the adolescents who have committed some offense*".

This first paraphrase better explains what is meant by "beyond the mere deprivation or restriction of freedom." Socio-education is drawn to be understood as a proposal. We can then say:

'Socio-education is a proposal.

A proposal carries what will be proposed: some form of support for adolescents who have entered into conflict with the law, or rather, who have been criminalized for their behavior. And this form of support for this youth goes beyond merely depriving them of their freedom. But why does it go beyond? Another paraphrase helps us perceive the meaning of this proposal:

'Socio-education goes far beyond the mere deprivation or restriction of freedom. It involves ways of understanding both the adolescents who have committed some criminal offense and the individuals we seek to shape, considering the broader context and not just the walls of socio-educational facilities and their limitations. It is necessary to have a guiding method, not only for pedagogical practices'.

Since socio-education is a proposal, and we live in a society where modern science instills that rigor requires a well-defined method within a theory, we cannot escape this rule. Thus, beyond merely depriving freedom, the proposal encompasses subjects who are socially accepted and seeks a rigorous method that makes practices not just pedagogical, but rather emancipatory, transforming the lives of juvenile offenders into socially accepted subjects. This argument, implicit in statement (E1), becomes evident through a paraphrase made from the metonymic effect. If we continue with other substitutions, we will delve deeper into the meanings that show socio-education as something beyond the deprivation of freedom:

‘Socio-education goes far beyond the mere deprivation or restriction of freedom. It involves the development of a political-pedagogical proposal aimed at overcoming mere social adaptation’.

In this paraphrase, we find the critique of the plasticity of the capitalist system, as it is the technicist pedagogy of competencies that seeks mere social adaptation, a system that aims to alienate. Here we perceive the deceit, the error, the misunderstanding of language, and where it opens up for the construction of another meaning, already in the polysemic effect that clings to the metaphorical effect, that is, one word for another (ORLANDI, 2017).

At the same time, socio-education has as its discursive formation the interdiscourse, the pre-constructed, the already stated somewhere in history, the discourse of considering what kind of subject we want in a society. As noted in the previous analyzed paraphrase, this society is capitalist, cisgender, and racist, which, by being so, constrains a large part of subjectivities to standards that are expected for every adolescent and child to adapt to. How can one overcome social adaptation if a criminalizing societal model is already presupposed, one that the subject must follow based on pre-constructed standards? We believe this represents a contradiction between discursive formations and what can open up to a metaphorical effect of socio-education, to think of it as:

‘Socio-education is criminalization’.

Since we have entered the realm of polysemy, of the metaphorical effect, a place where the tension between interpretation and description resides, let us now explore the statements in which we believe there is a metaphorical slippage in the meanings attributed to socio-education:

‘Socio-education goes far beyond the mere deprivation or restriction of freedom. It is both an educational task and a social transformation effort, broad and emancipatory’.

In this statement, socio-education appears as a task, meaning it is a job. Thus, it is a human activity that expands its time and energy in transforming natural things into objects, that is, into things for the subject, with both use value and exchange value. For an object to have use value, it must be useful to the subject. More precisely, criminalized youth, given the very nature of our criminalizing society, must be useful to the economic system characterized by income division, race, and gender.

Youth must adapt to this environment, and this will be accomplished through the work of socio-educational professionals, a labor category that has a challenging social function: to provide educational work that transforms the lives of youth from being criminalized to becoming emancipated. This work, embedded in the economic system, carries its exchange value, meaning it has a budget in which every human and material resource used to spend time and energy transforming raw materials (criminalized youth) into objects with use value (employed youth) comes with a cost,

has a monetary value, and involves a circulation of labor and thus of commodities. We must not forget that this daily pursuit of socio-educational objectives is an experience of sentimental value, projecting subjectivities onto the identities of workers amidst the educational challenges while also confronting oppressive social conflicts:

'Socio-education is work'.

The misunderstanding of language opens space for interpretation (and not just for description) and for an event that breaks with the pre-constructed contexts of our concept-analysis. Therefore, when we find, in the metaphorical effect, the slippage of socio-education as a proposal for work, we uncover the affiliation of the concept-analysis with Marxism. This is not only a structuring affiliation of the concept, but we also observe the practical movement of this affiliation: when dialectical historical materialism occupies the meaning of a political-pedagogical proposal that guides the work of individuals over others in order to transform a before (criminalized) into an after (emancipated, socialized, useful), there is an attempt to control youth so that they grow according to the molds of a colonial society, which is capitalist, cisgender, and racist. In other words, there is an effort to control the excesses of youth, to hold them accountable, to educate them, and to reintegrate them into a colonial society through a liberating pedagogy another contradiction, the deception, the misunderstanding of language allowing for another meaning for socio-education.

'Socio-education is control'.

To delve deeper into this metaphorical slippage, we can make another substitution, replacing one statement with another found in our corpus:

'Socio-education goes far beyond the mere deprivation or restriction of freedom. It is reality, it is the basic category of the process of consciousness-raising, it is the practical social activity of concrete historical subjects'.

In seeking the theoretical foundations of social education, we find a quite explicit reference to historical-dialectical materialism dedicated to the process of controlling a social group. This finding becomes significant as we can perceive that this Marxist theory of knowledge has been and continues to be a guiding principle for various forms of struggle against arguments predating materialism, stemming from idealism, positivism, progress, capitalism, patriarchy, etc. A fundamental Marxist thinker for socio-educational thought, cited by researchers and by the very creator of the concept-analysis, Antônio Carlos Gomes da Costa, who dedicates his book to:

Anton Makarenko, a Ukrainian educator, wrote his Pedagogical Poem between 1925 and 1935. In this work, now a great classic, Makarenko, much like Antônio Carlos Gomes da Costa, narrates his experience as the director of the Gorki Colony, an

institution that, during the communist period, catered to abandoned and delinquent youth in the Soviet Union. One of the central concepts of this work is that of social education (RANIERE, 2014, p. 181).

We can infer that social education is the concept historically affiliated with socio-education. This affiliation can be explained: Lenin created the Commission for the Struggle Against Juvenile Delinquency, appointing Maxim Gorky as the chairperson, who then named Makarenko as the director of the Gorki Colony. In Brazil, the version of Makarenko's work arrived in the 1980s, and the publication of the ECA (Child and Adolescent Statute) occurred in the early 1990s. Being a law approved by the National Congress signifies a process of struggle and political contention for the alignment of rights and duties with notions that have gained prominence in the debate for renewal; children and adolescents are not merely minors; they are developing subjects, holders of rights. The struggle in Brazil for the rights of children and adolescents gained momentum with the Federal Constitution of 1988, particularly with Article 227, which guarantees basic rights to children and adolescents, further fueling the debate for the formulation of the ECA.

The ECA (Child and Adolescent Statute) changed the discourse of policies addressing this population, which had previously focused more on repressive and discriminatory control, shifting towards disciplinary and educational control. “The Juvenile Court, under Mello Mattos, structured a model of action that would remain throughout the history of public assistance in the country until the mid-1980s” (RIZZINI, RIZZINI, 2004, p. 29). The 1979 Juvenile Code, which primarily relied on the criminalization of abandoned and delinquent childhood in an attempt to address crime and the destitute, wandering lives spread across cities, was drastically eliminated. Similarly, the confusion between abandonment, at-risk situations, and delinquency was resolved; instead of repressive and discriminatory control, the focus shifted to trying to educate everyone from the abandoned, or rather, those in at-risk situations, facing violations of rights, who must be sheltered in basic care and educational institutions, such as shelters to those who commit offenses, who are no longer sent to the State Foundation for the Welfare of Minors (FEBEM), where abandoned children and juvenile delinquents were mixed, but rather to state socio-educational institutions. For such a significant change to occur, it would only be possible through a process of political and social struggle.

‘Socio-education is struggle’.

In these historical affiliations between the interdiscourses found in the discursive memories captured through the collection of bibliographic data present in the corpus, we can move forward to another substitution using another statement and arrive at a key discursive formation:

‘Socio-education goes far beyond the mere deprivation or restriction of freedom. It is a field that is so complex’.

According to interdiscourse, the pre-constructed, the word complex comes from Marxism, as it understands that the social world is structured, differentiated, and in flux, meaning it is historical.:

Such totality, Lukács (1979, p. 40) states, is a complex of complexes, (...) of complexes in which “every ‘element’ and every part is also (...) a whole; the element is always a complex with concrete, qualitatively specific properties, a complex of diverse forces and relations that act together” (MORAES, 2009, p. 597).

It is from this conception that Saviani (2005) views education as a complex. If the social world is this complex of numerous complexes, what can be said about human activity and human action in these circumstances? How does individual action articulate with the entirety of society? As it is manifested “since the origin of man through the development of educational processes initially coinciding with the very act of living” (Ibidem, p. 7), the socio-educational worker knows that their work is complex.

To conclude this part on the effects of paraphrase, polysemous, metonymic, and metaphorical aspects of socio-education present in the analyzed material, we consider that words acquire meaning by always being “in relation to” other words (ORLANDI, 2017, p. 134), which demonstrates the materialist conception of language, always capable of engendering another meaning. Socio-education takes shape through other words thanks to the effects of structural metaphors and metonymies in our language, which are forgotten in the traps that create tension between the description and interpretation of the concept of socio-education; the tension between our concept-analysis and many other words, which we can list without seeking to establish hierarchical criteria among them, but merely to expose them in the relationship that occurs within our corpus, in the act of trying to establish some meaning for socio-education:

‘Socio-education is: political-pedagogical proposal; service; means; form; control; struggle; social education; work; complex field; transformation’.

The discourse of the unconscious

As previously mentioned, the act of writing belongs to the author of our corpus, Márcia Cossetin, who is embedded in a context. In attempting to assign meanings to socio-education, she navigates the tension between description and interpretation, positioning herself within a certain form

of knowledge about the world. This position of the author, the subject who discourses, is materially linked to her history, not only hers but also that of humanity, to the pre-constructed, to what was once said in some event that has been physically lost in the fabric of life but continues to produce meaning because of the relationship between the unconscious and ideology. “It is not only reason that matters in language,” as Orlandi (2017, p. 155) rightly points out; the unconscious, failure, and emotion also play a role in the game of significations. Discourse, as an “effect of meaning among speakers” (ORLANDI, LAGAZZI-RODRIGUES, 2006, p. 15), is a particular element of ideological materiality that encompasses interconnected discursive formations determining what can and should be said, establishing the subject's position within a certain ideological formation (ORLANDI, 2017). For this reason, according to Orlandi (2017, p. 181), “Pêcheux asserts that ideology and the unconscious are materially linked.”

The words - proposal, means, service, form, control, criminalization - are embedded, according to what we observe in their interdiscourses and events, in discourses related to ideological formations linked to neoliberalism, capitalism, and the dominant class, ultimately to the coloniality of state power. Such ideologies, forgotten in discourse but producing meanings unconsciously through ideological forgetfulness, are perceived when we observe that contemporary industrial and capitalist society, immersed in a lifestyle with neoliberal values, needs to legitimize, with all the apparatus of the State and sciences at its disposal, to ensure means of governing the abandoned and criminalized youth and childhoods, as they end up threatening the ways of life of the modern subject. In other words, it is under the aegis of security and good coexistence that proposals have been erected to solve the issues of delinquency and social inequality, but on the other hand, there is an attempt to maintain the power of a historical subject-form to ensure a colonial way of life, the very way of life that perpetuates inequalities.

The words exposed above are related to public safety, with the citizen being the modern subject. Control, proposal, and service emerge as the position through which socio-education takes on aspects of a means to balance the failures of coexistence in society, as previously mentioned. However, when we assert that Brazilian society itself, due to colonial power, allows childhoods and youth who transgress the rules to continue violating laws for generations, as a structural problem in Brazil, we want to draw attention not only to the security that youth policy provides for an isolated infraction committed by a young human being, typically a Black boy from the periphery. We also emphasize the persistence of services directed at specific groups boys, Black individuals, the poor, women, and

transgender individuals who deviate from the mold of the modern subject and thus, unconsciously, signify the discourses of control of colonial ideology over these groups.

As this aspect is obscured in state discourse, the traces of a persistent unequal reality specifically related to race, gender, and income will always be visible in this forgetfulness. This forgetfulness shows us how materially the punishments rest upon these groups, how they exist within the dimension of ideological forgetfulness in state discourse, and how forgetfulness itself is a structure of language. Therefore, the criminalized groups are linked to the verbal conditions of existence of the meanings consciously attributed. Being materially linked means that these groups are held responsible for the occurrences deemed as misunderstandings that deserve interpretation, upon them are placed the contradictions and the solutions rest. Thus, one of the unconscious discourses is that which seeks to control race, gender, and income to maintain a model of coexistence tied to colonial ideologies.

On the other hand, the words - work, struggle, means, social education, complex field, transformation - are believed to be connected to other interdiscourses and events, to another position within ideological formations, specifically to Marxist, socialist, and emancipatory discourses that value the notion of a pragmatic, historical, and democratic subject.

According to the interdiscourses we have analyzed, the real is historical in that this history is both accumulated from the past and exists as a reality in the present daily life, which is created in a dialectical relationship, meaning the history of the past interacts with everyday history. This is the concrete, the real world, built day by day; this is praxis, where theory guides thought, and thought, in turn, also informs theory in a permanent, dynamic, dialectical relationship. This is the historical and pragmatic reality in which the subject is embedded.

In the production of history and work, class struggle allows for the accumulation of power and means of production within certain classes. When the oppressed class fights for its freedom, learning from the forms of governance and theories of knowledge of socialist ideologies, certain pedagogical values resonate, such as social education, the transformation of reality through praxis, and the complex concrete world.

The contexts following the event: from Marx and Engels contemplating the concrete world in class struggle, Lenin rising to power, and Makarenko as an educator thinking about education for abandoned and delinquent youth as social and emancipatory; to Brazil, with the end of the dictatorship, democratic elections, the struggle for the rights of children and adolescents, and the discursive production of the ECA (Child and Adolescent Statute)—these are events that have generated interdiscourses that are, in a way, producing meaning to describe what this socio-education

is. It is a historical product of this rhizome of struggles for the transformation of reality, aiming to educate the subject to be democratic while also being free, as it is a subject that transforms reality because it is embedded in a complex world of complexities. Socialist ideologies, linked to Marxism, are also an influential position in constructing the meaning of socio-education.

We can conclude that there is a dual foundation found in our analysis regarding what we want to call the discourse of the unconscious of socio-education. We believe in this finding based on our reasoning, reiterating what has been said: that capitalist ideology appears as the position through which socio-education acquires aspects of social control, a way to balance the failures of society in allowing transgressive childhoods and youth; on the other hand, socialist ideology is the position from which pedagogical discourses emerge, where socio-educational workers are positioned, creating daily routines and events in their work to liberate criminalized youth.

We conclude that socio-education emerges from the conflicting and complementary relationship between the two extremes of ideologies: capitalist and socialist, both subjected to the subjectivity of those who discourse about socio-education. The first ideology is obscured in discourse because, when delegated the function of social control through political struggle, it is thanks to a public policy that addresses social issues while simultaneously concealing the ongoing production of events linked to a standard of power associated with a colonizing ideology. This is evident in the continued focus on the same groups for generations, from Bernardino to today.; the second ideology, which acts concurrently with the first by controlling groups, has been tasked with transforming criminalized lives into non-criminalized ones, while hiding the fact that this has only been stated as an achievable goal due to ideologies linked to Marxism. Thus, it is under this conflicting and complementary relationship between the two ideological formations, capitalist and socialist, that the conditions for the production of discourse on socio-education are constructed in our corpus.

Symbolic Domains of Socio-education in the Notebooks

For us, *symbolic domain* is a set of symbols that reflect the real and dominate being and meaning in such a way as to prevent being different, to be another symbol. This dual concept, symbolic domain, was chosen precisely because it can carry the meaning of a collection of symbols, systems of symbols, and a domain of symbols that dominate being in speech, daily life, and relations of meaning. Meaning is given by the symbols that convey something specific about the world because they dominate a

certain sense of being, that is, how the world, others, you, and I are perceived. This includes whiteness, the construction of a white identity, which expands material and symbolic privileges while silencing the debate about white identity in racial relations and in the construction of a beauty standard, reinforcing the social problem of racism (CARONE, BENTO, 2002); cisgender identity (VERGUEIRO, 2016), which reinforces gender-based violence by positioning cis identity as the norm; and the modern-historical subject, who possesses rights and duties, is free, and is accustomed to capitalism. All three of these symbolic domains are present in our society due to colonization, understood as Maldonado-Torres (2018) explains, not only as a past time when Europeans colonized America and shifted trade from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, but as a present, living time where groups are exposed to conflicts inherited from colonial power. Thus, the *symbolic domains*, after analysis and our theoretical foundations, are *ideological formations that exert a certain colonial dominance over being in the world*.

Starting from this premise, to conceive of this colonial dominance over being, we will rely on Freire (2016) to understand the ontological contradiction of being more the historical vocation of people, who always want to be more, learn more, and transform more, but who are transformed into being less, an oppression, an experience of the oppressor's "being more"; and on Dussel (1974) to understand that the reality in which we are embedded is composed of a totality that imposes a meaning on the Other, which is essential for the dialectic of life, philosophy, and the sciences, but is external to this totality and is externalized by it. The first philosopher will help us comprehend oppression and the oppressed, while the second will illuminate the oppressed as free, beyond totality, a victim of it.

Based on the entire analysis, especially regarding the discourse of the unconscious, we recognize that there are important ideological formations for constructing the meaning of socio-education: capitalist and socialist. For them to correspond to what we can call a dehumanizing symbolic domain, according to Freire (2016), it is necessary for the oppressed to be treated as objects. Therefore, any generosity that maintains the oppressed as things is inauthentic, as it is part of the oppressors' ideology to render the oppressed as objects of their dominance. Another point about dehumanization in Freire (2016) refers to the oppressor's fear of the oppressed's freedom, which makes vigilance essential, as there will always be a potential enemy within the oppressed for the oppressor. For this reason, the oppressed will always be prescribed what they ought to be, appropriating everything they can to maintain their oppressive power and to uphold the ontological contradiction of being less. Walsh (2009) refers to this mechanism of colonial power as functional interculturality, which appropriates the liberation struggles of peoples to sustain the neoliberal

system. Thus, we can say that some conditions for producing meanings of socio-education highlighted in our analysis fit these descriptions of the situation of the oppressed as observed in Freire (2016):

1) Persistent economic-racial-gendered inequality that locates its legislative and social punishments in certain groups, ensuring the permanence of this problem in our society, which we refer to as a structural problem, and the need to always respond to it.

2) Critique of the plasticity of the capitalist system, which molds, reconfigures, and appropriates whatever is necessary for the maintenance and preservation of the neoliberal, white, and cisgender way of life.

3) Socio-education is a political-pedagogical proposal, service, means, form, control, and criminalization.

We believe that these three conditions for producing meaning in socio-education correspond to dehumanizing symbolic domains, as they turn youth into objects subjected to interventions through a pedagogical prescription that does not transform the oppressive power structures that allow the persistence of inequalities and the contradiction of the historical vocation of human beings to always strive for more.

The first point is that the unequal reality is a clear oppression of life, of the ability to be more for those who do not conform to the neoliberal, white, and cis way of life. By transgressing any of the rules of the capitalist, racist, and cisgender game, the system the symbolic domain ensures that a response to the problem of transgression is always given within the limits of metaphorical dominance. For the issue of Black, poor, criminalized youth today, the response from the State is socio-education, and its meaning maintains connections with colonial symbolic domains.

The second point is also dehumanizing if we consider that the oppressive ideology perpetuates oppression by appropriating everything that transforms the oppressed into objects. Socio-education, as a means of maintaining the system of oppression, appropriates pedagogical, legal, and psychological knowledge to exercise the power to punish "socio-educationally" - where "educationally" does not apply demonstrating the specific character of socio-education, that is, as a holder of a symbolic domain. So, is it merely to say that socio-education is an inauthentic generous act that the oppressive system offers to "help" transgressive youth groups? Yes, but not only that. We believe it should help, but much depends on the socio-educational work of educators—those on the front lines, believing in a liberating socio-education and moving their pedagogical practices within the socialist symbolic domain.

The third point is also dehumanizing when the proposal is a prescription for how to coexist, which is another characteristic of oppression. Only being more in communion with the being more of others can lead to some form of coexistence. This is only possible for those on the front lines of public policy; in other words, it is in communion that we liberate ourselves from being less. If the proposal does not contain this communion, then it is merely a maintenance of the system of oppression. When the proposal appears as control, means, form, or service to a historically defined group, it reflects yet another characteristic of oppression. Thus, we can say that, so far, the symbolic domains are those colonial ideological formations that, consequently, are neoliberal, capitalist, and tied to the modern subject, which are linked to the conditions for producing meaning in socio-education.

Dussel (1974) teaches us about totality, exteriority, and the analectic method. This method involves surveying all the entities involved in the investigation, identifying the totality of meaning and what lies outside of it. In other words, it pertains to those who agree on a universal notion in which various reasonings can be made and remade, moving from the universal to the particular, but remaining within the totality. In this notion, there exists an entity that is external to the totality, which would be the Other. This Other cannot be understood from within the totality, as it has its own investigative method, its own dialectic within the totality, a horizon that encompasses everything that is, and the Other is not part of that totality.

If we invert the thought and say: there is no youth who commit crimes, there would be no need for society to respond to this problem, as it would not exist. Since it is a real problem, we think about it, we come face to face with it, and we respond to it. This is analectic, this initial contact with the Other. The dialectic that formulates the response based on the analectic attempts, through socio-education, to deny the existence of youth who commit crimes or infractions. To deny is to transform the transgressive young being into one who is no longer a transgressive youth, seeking all answers so that they no longer are and can begin to coexist acceptably in society. Therefore, when the conditions for producing meaning in socio-education appear as:

- 1) Socio-education is struggle, work, social education, a complex field, and transformation.
- 2) Political and professional coordination to seek efficient service for the criminalized groups of children and adolescents who arrive at the institutions.
- 3) Liberation ideology.

We believe that the totality, the reality, of the meaning of socio-education is also linked to a liberation ideology, one that posits that this educational practice, aimed at delinquent groups, will

genuinely liberate and transform the life of the Other, who should not exist as a delinquent, which is why transformation is sought. We perceive an apparent contradiction: if symbolic domains are part of colonial power, how then can liberation ideologies, associated with decolonization and decolonial movements, also be considered symbolic domains? Because, in the same way, they form a set of symbols that reflect a reality, a being and a non-being. From this domain, in relation to the symbolic domain of colonial ideologies, socio-education was produced. A specific location, an institution, a workplace created through the struggle and deconstruction of previous concepts. We believe this is an important relationship that should be emphasized in our attempt to understand the Brazilian concept of socio-education. The political struggle for the approval of the ECA (Child and Adolescent Statute), supported by the humanitarian sentiments of various social movement sectors believing in change and transformation positioned the issue of youth as something complex, and a complex response was provided: socio-education; a practice that is legal, disciplinary, educational, and punitive, existing within a colonial and liberatory totality in which both are in an analectic relationship with criminalized youth, yet it is only the latter that is not being addressed.

Final Considerations

Within all these entities raised regarding the conditions for producing meaning in socio-education, the Other, the Latin American face, is represented by the youth criminalized by the neoliberal, racist, and cisgender society. This is not the aim of the present article, but if we were to dare to seek a decolonial meaning for socio-education, understanding that meaning as an effort to combat the logic of coloniality and its symbolic, epistemic, and material effects, as Maldonado-Torres (2018, p. 36) suggests, socio-education must be based on a pedagogy of the oppressed a pedagogy created from the group for whom socio-education is a response. Let us allow the Other to provide the answer, analytically, not society and social movements. These must continue to fight for and with the voice of the Other. Thus, this would be the decolonial meaning of socio-education:

'Decolonial socio-education is a response from those who endure the socio-educational action'.

However, as highlighted, the general objective of the analysis is not to provide a decolonial meaning, but rather to demonstrate the conditions for producing meaning that represent what we call the *symbolic domains* of socio-education, that is, the set of symbols that reference colonial and

liberatory ideologies. Regarding colonial ideologies, the symbols are: *control, means, form, political-pedagogical proposal, work, maintenance, criminalization, infraction act, capitalism*; while concerning liberatory ideologies, the symbols are: *transformation, complex field, work, social education, political-pedagogical proposal, struggle*.

These words are the symbols found in symbolic domains that relate, share meanings, and establish the conditions for producing meaning in socio-education in Part I – Theoretical and Methodological Framework of the official document *Cadernos de Socioeducação: Bases Teórico-Metodológicas da Socioeducação*. Symbols that were, at some point, a discursive event in the face of the problem of youth entering into conflict with the law, and which, due to historical affiliations and structural forgetfulness in speech, traverse history through the unconscious and manifest themselves in the meanings assigned in the analyzed material.

References

- BENTO, M. A. S. Branqueamento e Branquitude no Brasil. In: CARONE, I. BENTO, M. A. S. (Orgs.). **Psicologia social do racismo – estudos sobre branquitude e branqueamento no Brasil**. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2002, p. (25-58).
- BRASIL, Conselho Nacional de Justiça. Cadastro Nacional de Adolescentes em Conflito com a Lei. Versão: 1.0.1.18. de 2018. Disponível em: <<https://www.cnj.jus.br/cnaclnovo/publico/graficos.jsf;jsessionid=0wNASXY8VQe9J5y73mhHvBCA>>. Acesso em: 1 out. 2020.
- COSSETIN, M. *Socioeducação no estado do Paraná: os sentidos de um enunciado necessário*. 2019.190 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) - Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná, Cascavel, 2019. Disponível em: <http://tede.unioeste.br/handle/tede/4529>. Acesso em: 1 out. 2020.
- DUSSEL, E. **Filosofia de la libertación**. 4ª Edición, Editorial Nueva América. Bogotá, 1996.
- DUSSEL, E. **Método para uma filosofia de la libertación**. Superación analética de la dialética hegeliana. Apartado 332 – Salamanca Espanha; Edicionse Sígueme, 1974.
- ESTEVÃO, Ivan Ramos. **A realidade, entre Freud e Lacan**. 2009. Tese (Doutorado em Psicologia Clínica) - Instituto de Psicologia, University of São Paulo, São Paulo, 2009. doi:10.11606/T.47.2009.tde-09122009-085019. Acesso em: 2021-03-09.
- FREIRE, **Pedagogia do Oprimido** / Paulo Freire – 62ª ed. – Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra (2016).
- FREIRE, P. **A educação na cidade**. São Paulo, editora Cortez, 1991.
- FREIRE, P. **Pedagogia do Oprimido**. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 2005.

JESUS, C. M. de. **Quarto de Despejo: diário de uma favelada**. São Paulo: Francisco Alves, 1960.
MALDONADO-TORRES, N. Analítica da colonialidade e da decolonialidade: algumas dimensões básicas. In: COSTA, J. B.; MALDONADO-TORRES, N.; GROSGOUEL, R. (Orgs.). **Decolonialidade e pensamento afrodiaspórico**, pp. 44-93. Belo Horizonte, 2018.

MORAES, M. C. M. de. “A teoria tem consequências”: indagações sobre o conhecimento no campo da educação. *Educação & Sociedade*, Campinas, v.30, n.107, p. 585-607, maio/ago. 2009.
ORLANDI, E.; LAGAZZI-RODRIGUES, S. (Orgs.). **Discurso e textualidade**. Campinas: Pontes, 2006.

ORLANDI, E. **Análise do Discurso: Princípios e Procedimentos**. Campinas: Pontes, 2009.
ORLANDI, E. **Discurso em Análise: sujeito, sentido e ideologia**; 3ª edição. Campinas, SP: Editora Pontes, 2017.

PARANÁ. **Cadernos de socioeducação: bases teórico-metodológicas da socioeducação**. Organização: Alex Sandro da Silva, Flávia Palmieri de Oliveira Ziliotto, Juliana Biazze Feitosa. Redação e sistematização Andréa de Lima Kravetz ... [et al.]. - Curitiba, PR: Secretaria de Estado da Justiça, Trabalho e Direitos Humanos, 2018.

PARANÁ. Socioeducação do Paraná é referência nacional. *Agência de notícias do Paraná*, Curitiba, 27 de dez. de 2018a. Disponível em:
<http://www.aen.pr.gov.br/modules/noticias/article.php?storyid=100089>. Acesso em: 1 out. 2020.
PARANÁ. Ministério Público do Paraná. *Eca – Linha do tempo sobre os direitos de crianças e adolescentes*. [s.d.]. Disponível em: <http://crianca.mppr.mp.br/pagina-2174.html>. Acesso em: 1 out. 2020.

PÊCHEUX, M. **O discurso: estrutura ou acontecimento**; tradução Eni Puccinelli Orlandi – 2ª edição – Campinas, SP: Pontes, 1997.

RIZZINI, DI.; RIZZINI, I. **A institucionalização de crianças no Brasil: percurso histórico e desafios do presente**. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. PUC-Rio; São Paulo: Loyola, 2004.

RANIERE, É. **A invenção das Medidas Socioeducativas**. Universidade Federal de Pelotas, SC. Tese de Doutorado pelo Programa de Pós-graduação em Psicologia Institucional. Porto Alegre, 2014.

SAVIANI, D. **Pedagogia Histórico-Crítica: Primeiras Aproximações**. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2005.

VERGUEIRO, V. Pensando a cisgeneridade como crítica decolonial. In: MESSEDER, S., CASTRO, M. G., MOUTINHO, L., (Orgs.). **Enlaçando sexualidades: uma tessitura interdisciplinar no reino das sexualidades e das relações de gênero**. Salvador: EDUFBA, 2016, (pp. 249-270). Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.7476/9788523218669.0014>. Acesso em: 1 out. 2020.

Discourse analysis on socio-education and its symbolic domains: a relationship between society, decoloniality, ideology, and the unconscious

WALSH, C. **Interculturalidade Crítica e Pedagogia Decolonial: in-surgir, re-existir e re-viver.**
In: CANDAU, Vera Maria (ORG). Educação Intercultural na América Latina: entre concepções, tensões e propostas Rio de Janeiro: 7 Letras, 2009.