

ARTIGO

FOUCAULT, EDUCATION, AND THE NEOLIBERALISM

RODRIGO DIAZ DE VIVAR Y SOLER¹

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7286-3129>
<rsoler@furb.br>

RAFAEL ARALDI VAZ²

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1617-4761>
<araldivaz@yahoo.com.br>

PATRICIA TATIANA RAASCH³

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6290-8351>
<profpatriciaraasch@gmail.com>

LARA NADINE KANITZ PACKER¹

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8780-5677>
<nkpacker@furb.br>

MIGUEL ALOIS PITZ E SILVA¹

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8202-7351>
<miguel@furb.br>

¹ Universidade Regional de Blumenau (FURB). Blumenau, Santa Catarina (SC), Brasil.

² Rede Pública de Educação do Estado de Santa Catarina. Lages, Santa Catarina (SC), Brasil.

³ Universidade Regional de Blumenau (FURB). Pomerode, Santa Catarina (SC), Brasil.

ABSTRACT: This paper considers the foundations of a possible Michel Foucault critique of neoliberalism and its relationship to education. We will attempt to demonstrate how neoliberalism, in Foucault's thought, should be understood as a way of life and as a government practice responsible for the production of modes of subjectivation identified with self-entrepreneurship as the aesthetics of neoliberal existence based on a bibliographic survey that covers the works developed by Foucault from a political history of governmentality. At first, we go through the contours of Foucault's thinking around a genealogy of the arts of government and the processes of subjectification. The second moment is dedicated to trying to understand the effects by which neoliberalism is constituted as an ethos responsible for producing the experience of a capitalized and financialized education. Our final considerations are dedicated to the elaboration of a critique of the neoliberal governmentality regime based on the contributions made by Michel Foucault and your criticism.

Keywords: Michel Foucault, neoliberalism, education.

FOUCAULT, A EDUCAÇÃO E O NEOLIBERALISMO

RESUMO: Este artigo procura pensar as bases de uma possível crítica empreendida por Michel Foucault em torno do neoliberalismo e da sua relação com a educação. Desenvolve-se uma leitura bibliográfica que percorre os trabalhos elaborados por Foucault a partir de uma história política da governamentalidade. Procurar-se-á demonstrar que o neoliberalismo, aos olhos de Foucault, deve ser compreendido tal qual um modo de vida e uma prática de governo responsável pela produção de modos de subjetivação identificados com o empresariamento de si mesmo como estética da existência neoliberal. Em um primeiro momento, serão percorridos os contornos do pensamento foucaultiano em torno de uma genealogia das artes de governo e dos processos de subjetivação. O segundo momento será dedicado a procurar compreender os efeitos pelos quais o neoliberalismo constitui-se enquanto um *ethos* responsável por produzir uma experiência de uma educação capitalizada e financeirizada. Finalmente, nossas considerações finais serão dedicadas à elaboração de uma crítica em torno do regime de governamentalidade neoliberal a partir das contribuições elaboradas por Michel Foucault.

Palavras-chave: Michel Foucault, neoliberalismo, educação.

MICHEL FOUCAULT, LA EDUCACIÓN Y EL NEOLIBERALISMO

RESUMEN: Nuestro artículo busca reflexionar sobre las bases de una posible crítica realizada por Michel Foucault en torno al neoliberalismo y su relación con la educación. A partir de un relevamiento bibliográfico que abarca los trabajos desarrollados por Foucault a partir de una historia política de la gubernamentalidad, intentaremos demostrar cómo el neoliberalismo, a los ojos de Foucault, debe entenderse como una forma de vida y como una práctica gubernamental responsable de la producción de modos de subjetivación identificada con el autoemprendimiento como estética de la existencia neoliberal. En primer lugar, recorreremos los contornos del pensamiento de Foucault en torno a una genealogía de las artes de gobierno y de los procesos de subjetivación. El segundo momento está dedicado a tratar de comprender los efectos por los cuales el neoliberalismo se constituye como un *ethos* responsable de producir una experiencia de educación capitalizada y financiarizada. Finalmente, nuestras consideraciones finales están dedicadas a la elaboración de una crítica en torno al régimen de gubernamentalidad neoliberal a partir de los aportes de la crítica de Michel Foucault.

Palabras clave: Michel Foucault, neoliberalismo, educación.

INTRODUCTION

What are the strategic elements of the governmentalization of life as operated by neoliberalism? This question is fundamental to establishing a connection, based on the contributions developed by Michel Foucault around a genealogy of the governmental practices in our Western society. In its multiple projects, we find in Foucault's trajectory a problematization concerning how we are constituted by distinct, reflected practices of government. Such practices can be read as undulating movements through which we are subjected to both strategies of knowledge and practices of power, and also as modes of subjectivation. In this way, knowledge, power, and subjectivation compose the triple effect through which we recognize ourselves as individuals, and it is precisely from this perspective that the studies developed by Foucault (2011; 2012) on governmentalities are innovative, by perceiving neoliberalism not only as an economic strategy, but as a regime, or rather, an art of government. An important aspect of this art of government consists, according to Foucault (2012), in the reinvention of the bio-political strategy of control over the population. Unlike the devices linked to the strategies of sexuality, racism, and medicine, neoliberalism makes up its condition of applicability based on what Foucault (2012) calls economic historicity, proposed by intellectuals such as Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman, for example. This economic historicity presupposes that market reality, free competition, and the phobia of the state should be instrumentalized by a longitudinal program that should profile all institutional programs and projects since the first half of the 20th century. It is about producing a model of control over conduct mediated by the rule of ample competition not only between enterprises but also between subjects. Such indicative ends up producing, in the words of Lemos, Galindo, and Nascimento (2016), the modulation of conduct referring to the commodification of subjectivation processes through the entrepreneurialization of oneself. Corroborating this reading, Deleuze ends up showing that

We find ourselves in a generalized crisis of all means of confinement, prison, hospital, factory, school, family. The family is an "interior" in a crisis like any other interior school, professional, etc. The relevant ministers keep announcing supposedly necessary reforms. Reforming the school, reforming industry, the hospital, the army, the prison; but everyone knows these institutions are doomed in a more or less long term. It is only a matter of managing their agony and occupying the people until the installation of new forces is announced. It is the control societies that are replacing the disciplinary societies (DELEUZE, 1992, p. 220).

As these words suggest, the question posed by neoliberalism consists in thinking about the unfoldings of freedom of consumption and, at the same time, subjecting the individual to the indicators of financialized capitalism whose proposal is "[...] to reform the State and shape society [...]" (FOUCAULT, 2012, p. 160). The control model of neoliberal governmentality no longer goes through the process of disciplinarization but through the management of flows in which the experience of individuality is linked to the modes of corporate lives. In the context of education, these elements emerge as a mode of veridiction through which knowledge and actions in this field begin to tense their effects, from the development of curricular strategies through the development of new methodological tools to the engagement of educators, managers, and students in projects articulated by the neoliberal art of government.

In this article, we present possible elements of the Foucauldian problematization around the relation between neoliberalism and education, based on possible clues left open by the French intellectual, especially in his works built after the second half of the 1970s. In the first moment, our considerations will focus on how we can trace, in a project called political history of governmentality, the elements of a genealogy of the arts of government and its possible resonances around the processes of subjectivation. In the second moment, we will try to dwell on the correlations between the ethos of neoliberal rationality and the emergence of a capitalized education, which has as its goal the production of individuals clearly identified with the vector of *Homoeconomicus*, the subject of interests that maximizes its profits while obtaining it with the least effort possible. Finally, our considerations are dedicated to explaining the reasons neoliberalism presents itself as a way of life and, as such, can be read, based on Foucauldian

critique, in the sense of trying to think of other strategies that are not so harshly marked by this style of governmentality.

TOWARDS A READING OF THE LIBERAL ART OF GOVERNMENT

A political history of governmentality is, without a doubt, an important tool for problematizing strategies of knowledge, practices of power, and processes of subjectivation. The emergence of such a tool can be found in the class of February 8, 1978, when Foucault shows that:

I would like to start going a little through the dimension of what I have called the ugly word that is "governmentality". Supposing, therefore, that "to govern" is not the same thing as "to reign", is not the same thing as "to command" or "to make the law"; supposing, therefore, that to govern is not the same thing as to be sovereign, to be suzerain, to be lord, to be judge, to be general, to be proprietor, to be school-master, to be a teacher; supposing therefore that there is a specificity of what it is to govern, it would be necessary to know now what kind of power this notion embraces. (FOUCAULT, 2011, p. 155–156).

As these words imply, Foucault (2011) believes that governmentality should be understood from a broad perspective responsible for profiling everything from the institutional aspects of sovereignty to the modulation of government procedures through which we recognize ourselves as subjects. In particular, this process of modulation of conduct allows us to visualize, in the Foucauldian kaleidoscope, the conditions of possibilities for the formation of the historicity of the practices of government. According to Albuquerque Junior (2011), this path recognizes that the multiplicity of reflected practices of government were introduced in society through four undulatory movements, beginning with the emergence of pastoral power and progressing through the birth of the state, to the emergence of the first forms of economic liberalism and the structuring of neoliberalism as a way of life. Thus, we intend to affirm that the problem posed by this political history of governmentality seeks, in the first instance, to take into account the ruptures from different control procedures on the ways in which "men are governed" (FOUCAULT, 2011, p. 164). However, in a subsequent moment, this project unfolds in front of a political role of problematization of our own current time. In *Omnes et Singulatim*, Foucault (2015) alerts us that one role of intellectual practice comprises to critique against not only ideological structures or repressive practices but also the elements of the governmentalization of existence. In this essay, Foucault (2015) recognizes that the role of this critical surveillance attitude is to proceed to analyze the various technologies through which the exercise of governmentalization is responsible for the production of both the games of objectification and the games of subjectification. That is, for Foucault (2015), it is not enough just to say that the capillarity of the practices of power and the regimes of discursivities underlie the control over subjects. It is necessary to highlight that, correlated to this process, there is the governmentalization of behaviors, responsible for indicating how we recognize ourselves as individuals, based on the reflected practices of government. In the same way, Senellart (1995) argues that this double procedure promoted by Foucault comprises the necessary criticism of the reflected practices of government from the emergences and provinces of this mosaic through which these regimes of governments circulate, because

From there, the big question that guided his research was to know how the phenomenon of the management of the population's problems could take place in the context of liberalism, which "is concerned with respecting the subjects of law and the freedom of initiative of individuals. If neoliberal governmentality can only be exercised under the weight of the suspicion that one "governs too much", it is constituted as a technique of rationalization of the exercise of power over the population having as an end not its maximization, but the requirement to govern from society and for society. (DUARTE, 2013, p. 53).

In a liberal governmentalization, since modernity, according to Foucault (2012), our society operates around double rationality: the first, in the reliefs of a totalizing state reason—in what corresponds to its institutional apparatus—and the second, a form of government inscribed in the

horizons of individuality, responsible for laying the foundations of the statement that one always governs too much. Broadly speaking, liberalism is not, for Foucault (2012), only an economic doctrine, or a legal practice, but the ethical curvature of the art of government that fits, on the one hand, the *res publica*, and, on the other, the reliefs of the modes of subjectivation.

The impact of the concept of liberal governmentality is a matter of subjectivation. In this sense, it is necessary, according to Senellart (1995), to ask ourselves about the forms of governmentalization to which we are bound since the emergence of liberalism and its machinic composition of a subjectivity that hates the state but is servile to the market's ordinances, a subjectivity that is conservative in the customs but liberal in the economy, and a subjectivity that, above all, stands out for the propagation of the discourse of voluntary servitude of the financial system's indicators.

From the technologies that unfold in the formation of what we can call a liberal governmentality ontology, we can understand, on the basis of liberal governmentality, the indicative of life management correlative to the managerial processes responsible for making the individual someone who can be governed. Such ontology can be understood from the Foucauldian observation that, with liberalism, emerges the singular experience of subjectivities that are subjected to economic ornaments favorable to the rules of the market, liberalism speaks of a subject that must seek in itself its security and, its salvation. For Carvalho (2011), liberalism replaces the Hobbesian Leviathan with the obscure individuality of the invisible hand. It is because of these aspects that Senellart problematizes that

How to govern, however, if one governs too much? Such is, for Foucault, the question that makes liberalism an original governing practice, linked, in its operation, to the permanent critique of itself. It is for this reason that he sees it as "a form of critical reflection on governmental practice" (Foucault, 1990, p. 116). Criticism is not only of the despotic practices of the absolute state, but of the rationality of government itself, as a principle that structures society (SENELLART, 1995, p. 8)).

In this scenario, we can see the formation of a kind of *chiseling of liberal subjectivation*, resulting from a continuous and growing defense of individual liberties against any form of control that does not obey the dynamics of natural economic laws and also the interests of maximizing profits with the least amount of effort. The most interesting point in this process of refinement comprises the foundations of the art of government, which are much more concerned with guiding the ordering of conduct, considered susceptible to the economic market, than with establishing the guidelines of a security program. With the liberal art of government, there emerges the thesis that a liberal rationalization experience operates its procedures throughout society based on the statement that one can never govern too much. We are facing a technology that, according to Foucault (2012), comprises the strategic management of capillary practices, responsible not only for the control but for the systematic governance of the very modes of subjectivation. Herein lies the originality of the liberal art of government: presenting itself as a technology that lays the groundwork for a subject that governs itself by incorporating elements linked to the truth of the economic market and of bio-politics itself in its modes of action and conduct.

Addressing a population, the biopolitical state governs people, not as subjects subjected to a central power, but as individuals who actively participate in the production of collective life. The European biopolitical governmentalized state is thus consolidated as the modern democratic state, the result of a process of historical construction involving different technologies of power (GALLO, 2017, p. 86).

In this sense, we can articulate the reflections promoted by Michel Foucault between the liberal art of government, the modes of subjectivation, and the forms of life that become manifested by economic orientations. Now, the question that remains is: what are the effects of this liberal rationality, this governmentalization, and economic management in the field of education, based on the investigations, or rather, based on the clues left by Foucault in his project of a political history of governmentality?

The formulation of such a question is essential for us to perceive another possibility of glimpsing the effects of the liberal art of government upon education from three fundamental

perspectives in this debate. The first one comprises the possibility of perceiving the school not only as a disciplinary institution, or even as an environment in which the most varied ideologies are propagated, but as a governmentalization machine. The second perspective reflects the possibility of perceiving the school institution as an effect of the liberal agencying responsible for producing different processes of subjectivation. Finally, with the emergence of the liberal art of government, education has become a political problem, because freedom can only be understood as a process of improvement, entrepreneurship, and competitiveness, in which economic devices must be continuously introduced in the daily life of schools. That is, they should not only be part of the environmental routine of these spaces but also inscribed in ways of life sensitively marked by the logic of the market. More than ever, the liberal art of government assuages education by bending it to the production of a corporate governmentality and a subjectivation readily related to the interest game of the economic market because, according to Dias da Silva (2015), such elements make up the performance of the administration of subjectivities.

It is in this context that the liberal art of government will emphasize, in the educational field, a whole process of a permanent search for the reinvention of the dynamics related to the role of education, not as an instrument of control, surveillance, and disciplinarization but mainly as a resource responsible for intensifying the strategies of what Veiga Neto (2013) calls the consumer society. Because of such conditions, Foucauldian thought about the political history of governmentality is configured as a fundamental experience to think the criticism around the processes of constitution of conduct in the context of education, allowing us to trace the modes of subjectivation from which the liberal art of government is linked to educational devices in the contemporary context.

THE ETHOS OF NEOLIBERAL RATIONALITY AND CAPITALIZED EDUCATION

Neoliberal education is characterized as a way of life. That is, a reflected government practice responsible for instigating in subjects the capitalization of their subjectivation processes, which results in the production of molecular flows. These flows are inscribed in the project named by Saraiva and Lockmann (2019) as educationalization. This means that, in the context of neoliberalism, education is no longer a property of either the State or the school, since it should saturate all spaces and discussions in a new model of society. This perspective is inscribed in the critical observation that

The school that formerly found its center of gravity not only in the professional value but also in the social, cultural, and political value of knowledge, a value that was interpreted, moreover, in very different ways according to political and ideological currents, is oriented, by the current reforms, towards competitiveness objectives that prevail in the globalized economy. (LAVAL, 2019, p. 13).

It is in the wake of this debate that neoliberalism begins to inscribe in the very structure of education the elements of pedagogical governmentality responsible for intensifying the entrepreneurial strategies of education, and, in this sense, the school becomes a mirror of the nomenclatures commonly associated with the panoramas of the financial system. The indicators, or rather, the management flows, the creation of productivity indexes, the accentuated flexibilization of curricular programs, and the commodification of human relations themselves, in which learning becomes synonymous with the undertaking, become part of the educators' routine. According to Costa (2009), this model of the reflected practice of government ends up straining the effects of a permanent and systematic culture of entrepreneurship as a condition, *par excellence*, of the role of education.

We find, from the provocations launched by Foucault in *The Birth of Biopolitics* (2012), some clues to the structuring of this neoliberal rationality and its correlation with education. When discussing the historical *a priori* of US neoliberalism, Foucault (2012) mentions the role, both political and epistemological, of the Chicago School studies developed in the first half of the twentieth century. In so far as their political role is concerned, the economists of the Chicago School were responsible for harshly criticizing the restructuring plan of Europe in the post-war period. On the epistemological level, the same economists vehemently opposed Keynesianism and the constant interventions, part of what we roughly call here State capitalism.

It is in this scenario that US neoliberalism becomes the great global model, especially from the 1970s on, in the sense of operating the ordering of public policies responsible for reflecting not only the minimization of the role of the State in civil life, but also operating in the institutions themselves a set of experiences linked to the formation of a preponderant feature that places the orientation and systematization of the financial market as the regulator of social practices, subjectivation processes, and individuals' life projects. More than ideas, the American neoliberalism produces subjectivations linked to the contours of the financial market.

In the context of education, the apex of this neoliberal perspective was the creation and, later, the diffusion of the human capital theory as a strategic governance device developed by many Western countries, especially since the 1980s. This event can be summarized by looking closely at Foucault's words.

The interest, I believe, of this theory of human capital lies in: the fact that it represents two processes: one that we could call an incursion of economic analysis into a hitherto unexplored field, and, second, from there and from this incursion, the possibility of reinterpreting in economic terms and in strictly economic terms a whole field that, until then, could be considered, and was considered, non-economic. (FOUCAULT, 2012, p. 303).

It is precisely this non-economic aspect of which Foucault (2012) speaks that interests us, because, according to him, human capital designates a set of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that favor the performance of work and produce economic value in everyday social practices. Therefore, human capital is much more than a theory: it seeks to inscribe itself in the constant process of improvement of the subjects' competencies. In other words, human capital operationalizes the unfolding of the worker-machine into the individual self-entrepreneur, responsible for subjectivating himself and seeking to get the same yields at the level of his desires as a company. Consequently, we can ask ourselves: What is the value of human capital in the context of education?

The demand for a minimally satisfactory answer leads us to realize that, first of all, this model of governmentality ends up inserting into educational policies and the economy as a mode of veridiction. According to Klaus, Hattge, and Lockmann (2015), such practices can be understood through the permanent systematization of administrative management of educational subject conduct. Second, human capital promotes the twisting of the epistemological foundations of the market economy into the educational context. Finally, human capital produces the formatting of an experience of educational subjectivation in which the student must recognize himself as a protagonist and defender of the interests of capital. That is, instead of studying to acquire autonomy and criticality, the student must, from an early age, learn to operate within the logic of the financial system, modulating himself, from a subjective point of view to the gears of the neoliberal control devices.

Still, on the consequences of human capital for education, it is worth mentioning the fact that the American neoliberalism promotes a strategy of deconstruction of the relationship between capital and labor, perfecting the control device through a new dynamic between capital and income. That is, neoliberalism dismisses the role of surplus value as a condition of exploitation and, therefore, of revolt, to intensify the enunciation that the subject, since his early years in the school system, can, with a lot of discipline, become an investor, a rentier, or an operator of the financial system. According to Lazzarato (2017, p. 14), "social policies, on the contrary, install everywhere a "minimum" (a minimum wage, a minimum income, and minimum services) to force the entrepreneur himself to launch himself into the competition of all against all."

It is in this context that, at the end of the last century, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) developed two reports inspired by the neoliberal rationality of the Chicago School. The first document, dated 1971, operationalized what that institution referred to as the correlative effect between an educating city and permanent education. The second document, organized by Jacques Delors in the 1990s, sought to establish the four pillars of education for the 21st century, as follows: a) Learning to know; b) Learning to do; c) Learning to live with others, and d) Learning to be. It is not our intention to perform an exegesis of each of these pillars. We intend to illustrate how these statements operate as regimes of governmentalities. These documents explain the

reasons why, according to the Chicago School, education should be seen as a process of permanent reform. That is, neo-liberal education must be applied as a continuous process of innovation, creativity, respect for the competition, and competitiveness, typically market-oriented.

However, as Noguera-Ramirez (2011) points out, it is important to realize the correlation between the effects of neoliberal governmental rationality and education not only in the field of public policies developed since the second half of the twentieth century but also its effects of dispersion and subjectification in the processes of subjectivation. This observation implies the fact that neoliberal governmentality must be understood as a diagram, a fruition between economy, culture, history, politics, and subjectivities. All these forces constantly collide with each other in intensifying experiences that link the problems of the government of the self, of others, and of biopolitics itself. In other words, what we intend to suggest is that, beyond a structural perspective, the problem of neoliberal governmentality in education can also be analyzed from the perspective of the processes of subjectivation, since these processes consist of the production of an ethical curvature characterized, in turn, by the moment in which discourses and practices reflect in the individual himself the undulatory movements of a way of life, that is, a way of the subject relating to himself. According to Deleuze,

The challenge posed by this diagnosis is to problematize the neoliberal elements, from their insertion in the daily life of educational institutions to the promotion of the applicability of procedures responsible for criticism around the typically neoliberal ways of life. More than ever, the experience of Foucauldian thought ends up indicating to us the construction of new spaces for an education pertinent to the context of other modes of subjectivation not so harshly affected by neoliberal governmentality. The flows of contra-conduct can operate as heterotopic emergences of critical and emancipatory education. Such elements reflect the possibility of thinking about autonomy and the construction of a collective history for the constitution of the critique of the apparatuses of capture. In this context, the issue of thinking about education as a matter of governmentalization arises, with a focus on the technological procedures of government produced by experiences in formal and non-formal educational spaces. This means that, instead of focusing on the usual analyses about the formation and organization of the educational structure, we can, based on the suggestions raised by Foucault, face the challenge of signaling a critique of how, since the second half of the last century, neoliberalism has been consolidating itself as the management style par excellence of the government of conduct in educational spaces, movements of a way of life, that is, a way of the subject relating to himself. According to Deleuze,

This derivation, this displacement, must be understood in the sense that the relation with oneself gains independence. It is as if the relations on the outside bend, bend to form a lining and let a relationship with oneself emerge, constituting an inside that bends and develops according to its dimension: the enkrateia, the relation with oneself as domination, "is a power that is exercised over oneself within the power that is exercised over others" (who could claim to govern others if they do not govern themselves?) to where the relation with oneself becomes "a principle of internal regulation" concerning the constituent powers of politics, family, eloquence, and games, of virtue itself (DELEUZE, 2005, p. 107).

However, as Noguera-Ramirez (2011) points out, it is important to realize the correlation between the effects of neoliberal governmental rationality and education not only in the field of public policies developed since the second half of the twentieth century but also its effects of dispersion and subjectification in the processes of subjectivation. This observation implies the fact that neoliberal governmentality must be understood as a diagram, a fruition between economy, culture, history, politics, and subjectivities. All these forces constantly collide with each other in intensifying experiences that link the problems of the government of the self, of others, and of biopolitics itself. In other words, what we intend to suggest is that, beyond a structural perspective, the problem of neoliberal governmentality in education can also be analyzed from the perspective of the processes of subjectivation, since these processes consist of the production of an ethical curvature characterized, in turn, by the moment in which discourses and practices reflect in the individual himself the undulatory

It is in this scenario that neoliberal governmentality can also be understood from a look directed at subjectivation. In other words, Deleuze (2005) speaks of a subject that aestheticizes itself from

an ethical curvature linked to governmental programs. However, we must ask ourselves: how do the diagrams of the neoliberal model unfold in the context of education? This question goes through the horizon where Foucault's (2012) problematization around the figure of *Homoeconomicus* is inscribed. This figure, for Foucault (2012), comprises the very applicability of the neoliberal model, whose focus is on a subject that aestheticizes and builds its ethical experience based on the rules coming from the economic market and financial systems. The novelty presented by Foucault (2012) around this reading consists in the thesis that *Homoeconomicus* understands the fundamental feature of the neoliberal governing strategy because he establishes a relationship with himself that is of the order of conducting his life with the economy as the reflected practice of an ethical government. This means that the conduct of *Homoeconomicus* comes from the economic intelligibility grid. This path can be understood from a double movement: first, the central thesis that economics would be the key to the contextualization of how the subject should relate to and govern himself and others. The second, on the other hand, reflects the systematization and the continuous search for the establishment of an increasingly effective standard around the conduct of individuals linked to economic practices produced by the utilitarian sense of neoliberalism. According to Madruga and Henning (2019), with *Homoeconomicus*, we are faced with an experience that goes beyond the meaning and duty of conduct. We are facing an ethos that interpellates the game of stimuli through which the subject must operate his conduct if he wants to recognize himself as an individual within the pattern of the economic market. In this sense, if we want to establish a critique of education within the project of neoliberal governmentality, we need to realize, according to Foucault's guidelines (2012), how relevant the focus given not only by institutional programs and public policies is but also the systematic modulations by which educational institutions end up producing agencying related to the affective aspects of their students. As if these institutions adopted, as a fundamental criterion, much more the modular aspects of the constitution of subjectivity than the development of programmatic and disciplinary contents. More than an education concerned with disciplining, we have the configuration of an experience responsible for consecrating the existential elements aimed at the dynamics of entrepreneurship and the entrepreneurial nature of oneself. The fundamental element of this ethos can be associated with what we know as cognitive capitalism. We infer that, for Foucault (2012), cognitive capitalism would be a kind of unfolding of the reflected practice of governance of *Homoeconomicus*. This observation includes the fact that, in the context of education, the emergence of technologies and digital devices ends up increasingly driving the unfolding of educational institutions, whose factory-like operability - since the emergence of the disciplinary society - has been replaced by zones of intensity and creativity, in which students are entrepreneurs and teachers are competence managers. In this ethical rationality, education becomes inscribed in the project of the political history of governmentality as a capture apparatus, modulating the individual's behaviors, whose very existence must be capitalized.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

As we have seen throughout this paper, the relations between Michel Foucault, education, and neoliberalism are inscribed within the project of the political history of governmentality. This means that, beyond its economic dynamics and, consequently, its exclusion strategies, neoliberalism should be understood as a reflected practice of government whose effects are felt through the production of modes of subjectivation. That is, what the Foucauldian reading ends up indicating is that, correlative to the economy, neoliberalism profiles and acts as a way of life regulated by the dynamics of the financial system.

In the context of education, this scenario can be analyzed from the diagnosis that neoliberalism promotes an unfolding of disciplinary elements for the careful management and governance of student performances, teachers, and the educational institutions themselves. In this sense, we have witnessed undulating movements in educational practices since neoliberalism, in which the disciplinarization of bodies (FOUCAULT, 1987) is increasingly criticizable in the eyes of a governmentalization of conducts. According to Aquino (2013), neoliberal rationality in education gives freedom a central role in everyday education. However, such freedom operates as a governmental

resource as an ethical procedure through which educational governance is placed as a direct strategy for the manufacture of a subject of capitalistic desire (ROLNIK; GUATTARI, 1988).

In this way, it can be seen that the contours of a neoliberal art of government impact the processes of subjectivation in the context of education. This path may end up allowing us to trace not only the economic and quantitative implications of this regime of government, but also the presence of a way of life linked to veridiction, or, as Foucault (2009) points out, to a regime of truth in which the constitution of the subject goes through the subjection to the devices of the governmentalization of life.

The challenge posed by this diagnosis is to problematize the neoliberal elements, from their insertion in the daily life of educational institutions to the promotion of the applicability of procedures responsible for criticism around the typically neoliberal ways of life. More than ever, the experience of Foucauldian thought ends up indicating to us the construction of new spaces for an education pertinent to the context of other modes of subjectivation not so harshly affected by neoliberal governmentality. The flows of contra-conduct can operate as heterotopic emergences of critical and emancipatory education. Such elements reflect the possibility of thinking about autonomy and the construction of a collective history for the constitution of the critique of the apparatuses of capture.

In this context, the issue of thinking about education as a matter of governmentalization arises, with a focus on the technological procedures of government produced by experiences in formal and non-formal educational spaces. This means that, instead of focusing on the usual analyses about the formation and organization of the educational structure, we can, based on the suggestions raised by Foucault, face the challenge of signaling a critique of how, since the second half of the last century, neoliberalism has been consolidating itself as the management style par excellence of the government of conduct in educational spaces.

REFERÊNCIAS

ALBUQUERQUE JUNIOR, Durval Muniz. A Pastoral do Silêncio: Michel Foucault e a dialética revelar e silenciar no discurso cristão. *Bagoas - Estudos Gays: gêneros e sexualidades*, v. 5, n. 6, p. 69-89, 2011. Disponível em: <<https://periodicos.ufrn.br/bagoas/article/view/2328/1761>>. Acesso em: 17/05/2011.

AQUINO, Julio Groppa. A Governamentalidade como Plataforma Analítica para os Estudos Educacionais. In: CASTELO BRANCO, Guilherme. VEIGA NETO, Alfredo (org.). *Foucault: filosofia & política*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2013, p. 195-211.

CARVALHO, Juliana Maria de Almeida. Poder no Mercantilismo e no Neoliberalismo: uma introdução comparativa sob a luz da intervenção estatal. *Revista de Geopolítica*, v. 2, n. 1, p. 137-145, 2011. Disponível em: <<http://www.revistageopolitica.com.br/index.php/revistageopolitica/article/view/27/27#>>. Acesso em: 18/05/2021.

COSTA, Sylvio de Sousa Gadelha. Governamentalidade Neoliberal, Teoria do Capital Humano e Empreendedorismo. *Educação & Realidade*, v. 34, n. 2, p. 171-186, 2009. <<https://doi.org/10.14393/REVEDFIL.issn.0102-6801.v29n57a2015-p199a223>>.

DELEUZE, Gilles. *Foucault*. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 2005.

DELEUZE, Gilles. Post-Scriptum: sobre as sociedades de controle. In: DELEUZE, Gilles. *Conversações*, São Paulo, v. 34, 1992, p. 219-226.

DIAS DA SILVA, Roberto Rafael. Educação, Governamentalidade e Neoliberalismo: contribuições foucaultianas para o estudo das políticas de currículo. *Educação e Filosofia*, v. 29, n. 57, p. 199-223, 2015. Disponível em: <<http://www.seer.ufu.br/index.php/EducaoFilosofia/article/view/22731/17972>>. Acesso em: 20/05/2021.

DUARTE, André. Foucault e a Governamentalidade: genealogia do liberalismo e do Estado moderno. In: CASTELO BRANCO, Guilherme. VEIGA NETO, Alfredo (org.). *Foucault: filosofia & política*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2013, p. 53-70.

FOUCAULT, Michel. *Governo de Si e dos Outros*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2009.

FOUCAULT, Michel. *Nascimento da Biopolítica*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2012.

FOUCAULT, Michel. *Omnes et Singulatim: uma crítica da razão política*. In: FOUCAULT, Michel. *Ditos e Escritos IV: estratégia, poder-saber*. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2015, p. 348-378.

FOUCAULT, Michel. *Segurança, Território, População*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2011.

FOUCAULT, Michel. *Vigiar e Punir*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1987.

GALLO, Silvio. Biopolítica e Subjetividade: resistência? *Educar em Revista*, n. 66, p. 77-94, 2017. Disponível em: <<https://www.scielo.br/pdf/er/n66/0104-4060-er-66-77.pdf>>. Acesso em: 20/05/2021.

KLAUS, Viviane. HATTGE, Morgana Domênica. LOCKMANN, Kamila. Genealogia foucaultiana e políticas educacionais: possibilidades analíticas. *Perspectiva*, v. 33, n. 2, p. 665-687, maio/ago. 2015. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5007/2175-795X.2015v33n2p665>>.

LAVAL, Christian. *A Escola Não é Uma Empresa*. São Paulo: Boitempo editorial, 2019.

LEMOS, Flávia Cristina Silveira. GALINDO, Dolores. NASCIMENTO, Maria Livia. Considerações Sobre o Empresariamento da Vida. *Barbarói*, n. 46, p. 6-21, 2016. Disponível em: <<https://online.unisc.br/seer/index.php/barbaroi/article/view/5564/5992>>. Acesso em: 28/08/2021.

MADRUGA, Elisângela Barbosa. HENNING, Paula Corrêa. A aprendizagem em tempos de Homo oeconomicus cyber. *Revista Diálogo Educacional*, v. 19, n. 63, p. 1616-1637, 2019. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.7213/1981-416X.19.063.AO03>>.

NOGUERA-RAMIREZ, Carlos Ernesto. *Pedagogia e Governamentalidade: ou da modernidade como uma sociedade educativa*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2011.

ROLNIK, Suely Belinha. GUATTARI, Félix. *Micropolíticas: cartografias do desejo*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1988.

SARAIVA, Karla. LOCKMANN, Kamila. O Molar, o Molecular e a Educacionalização do Social. *Revista Educação e Cultura Contemporânea*, v. 16, n. 45, p. 215-246, 2019. Disponível em: <<http://periodicos.estacio.br/index.php/reeduc/article/view/3746/47966821>>. Acesso em: 21/05/2021.

SENEILLART, Michel. A Crítica da Razão Governamental em Michel Foucault. *Tempo Social*, v. 7, n. 1-2, p. 1-14, 1995. Disponível em: <<https://www.revistas.usp.br/ts/article/view/85117/88016>>. Acesso em: 18/05/2021.

VEIGA NETO, Alfredo. Governamentalidades, Neoliberalismo e Educação. *In*: CASTELO BRANCO, Guilherme. VEIGA NETO, Alfredo (org.). *Foucault: filosofia & política*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2013, p. 37-52.

Submetido: 15/07/2021

Aprovado: 12/08/2022

CONTRIBUIÇÃO DOS AUTORES

Autor 1 – Coordenador do projeto, conceitualização, análise de dados, desenho metodológico, validação, escrita do texto.

Autor 2 – Conceitualização, coleta de dados, validação, escrita do texto.

Autor 3 – Revisão e comentário do texto.

Autor 4 – Coleta de dados e revisão de texto.

Autor 5 – Coleta de dados, comentários e revisão de texto.

DECLARAÇÃO DE CONFLITO DE INTERESSE

Os autores declaram que não há conflito de interesse com o presente artigo.