

CARTOGRAPHY AS A METHOD: FORCES AND BECOMINGS FOR DISCOURSE ANALYSIS PRACTICES

A CARTOGRAFIA COMO MÉTODO: POTÊNCIAS E DEVIRES PARA AS PRÁTICAS EM
ANÁLISE DO DISCURSO

LA CARTOGRAFÍA COMO MÉTODO: POTENCIAS Y DEVENIRES PARA LAS PRÁCTICAS EN
EL ANÁLISIS DEL DISCURSO

Juliana Silva Rettich*

Universidade Estadual do Rio de Janeiro

Translated from Portuguese by Filipe Silva de Abrantes¹

ABSTRACT: This essay aims at describing the process carried out during the master's thesis in the Postgraduate Program in Languages, in the area of Language Studies, with the French Discourse Analysis approach, whose pillars are Dominique Maingueneau and Michel Foucault. However, here, the method of cartography will be presented based on a Deleuzian perspective, having as main theoretical support the book *Pistas do Método da Cartografia: pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade*. The result is the possibility of narratively intertwining theory and practice, presenting the power of this method in areas of science beyond psychology. The master's research was based on the law proposal PL 867/2015 analysis, a result of the movement Escola Sem Partido [Nonpartisan School], through the construction of a discursive network, composed of related law proposals, in addition to PL 14111/2015, which typifies the so-called crime of “ideological harassment” in the classroom.

KEYWORDS: Nonpartisan School. Discourse Analysis. Cartography. Method.

* Master and current PhD student at the Post-Graduate Program in Languages of Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, in the field of Linguistics and Language Studies. Currently works as a substitute professor at the Linguistics department of Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro. E-mail: jsrettich@gmail.com.

¹ Master at the Post-Graduate Program in Languages of Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, in the field of Linguistics and Language Studies. E-mail: abrantesfs@gmail.com.

RESUMO: Este ensaio tem como objetivo narrar o processo feito ao longo da dissertação de mestrado no Programa de Pós-Graduação em Letras, na área de Estudos de Língua, com a abordagem da Análise do Discurso francesa, cujos pilares foram Dominique Maingueneau e Michel Foucault. No entanto, aqui, será apresentado o método da cartografia, a partir de uma perspectiva deleuziana, tendo como principal suporte teórico o livro *Pistas do Método Cartográfico: pesquisa intervenção e produção de subjetividade*. O resultado é a possibilidade de entrelaçar narrativamente teoria e prática, apresentando a potência desse método em outras áreas das ciências que não só a psicologia. A pesquisa de mestrado se deu a partir da análise do PL 867/2015, fruto do movimento Escola Sem Partido, com a construção de uma rede discursiva, composta por esse projeto de lei, seus apensados, além do PL 14111/2015, que tipifica como crime o chamado assédio ideológico em sala.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Escola Sem Partido. Análise do Discurso. Cartografia. Método.

RESUMEN: El objetivo de este ensayo es describir el proceso realizado durante la tesis de maestría en el Programa de Postgrado en Letras, en el área de Estudios del Lenguaje, con el enfoque del Análisis del Discurso Francés, cuyos pilares fueron Dominique Maingueneau y Michel Foucault. Sin embargo, aquí se presentará el método de cartografía, basado en una perspectiva deleuziana, teniendo como principal soporte teórico el libro *Pistas del Método Cartográfico: intervención-investigación y producción de subjetividad*. El resultado es la posibilidad de entrelazar narrativamente teoría y práctica, presentando la potencia de este método en otras áreas de la ciencia que no son solo la psicología. La investigación de maestría se basó en el análisis del PL 867/2015, resultado del movimiento Escuela sin Partido, con la construcción de una red discursiva compuesta por este proyecto de ley y sus anexos, además del PL 14111/2015, que tipifica como delito el llamado asedio ideológico en el aula.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Escuela sin Partido. Análisis del Discurso. Cartografía. Método.

1 INTRODUCTION

The beginning of a text may not exactly be its beginning. Cartography helped me comprehend that. The first chapter of a thesis, for example, may not have been the first one written or even the first one thought of. It may even have never been part of the initial research plan, of the hypotheses raised about the chosen theme. It may be that, when thinking research in this way and putting it down in text, what matters is to be honest with your potential interlocutors by presenting them the path you have taken. It truly is about paths. I have understood that it is important to have a starting point – not a fixed, rigid one, with no room for displacements – and at least a reason to start. The destination is pointed out throughout the research path, by allowing yourself, as a researcher, to be implicated by an object as well as to implicate the object. The challenge, then, is not to define the results of research beforehand; it is to allow yourself to walk alongside your research, in a cartographic dance, to live the surprises that an object of study may offer if we do not impose ourselves upon it. It is this very possibility that brings us the cartography method as a productive path of research in Linguistics, more specifically in Discourse Analysis, given that composing the discursive networks materialized by a considerable amount of texts is far from being a “data collection” out of a linearity of results. Texts produced, often in different mediums, with different focuses, may materialize the discourses we propose to analyze. This way of cartographing, mapping, and analyzing the processes involved in this cartographic action has been, as of late, my preferred path when developing my researches in Discourse Analysis.

This paper has the goal of narrating, namely, of putting into words some of the paths I have traversed throughout my master’s degree thesis, and which have not always been so clear. With the title *Do visor na porta das salas de aula à mordada nos professores: uma análise discursiva das redes conservadoras do Escola Sem Partido – Projeto de Lei 867/2015*, I had arrived at my defense in march 2018 with more than a hundred pages that are still not so easy for me to explain. Months later, at an academic event on Linguistics, I was questioned about this “cartography” I had used in my research and had to wait a few minutes to answer. I had realized, then, that it might be necessary to retrace the steps I took throughout two years and try to write them down. For that, I count on my memory more so than I do on what I have written for my master’s degree thesis. And, deliberately, I will count on my memory because I believe it to also be an apparatus of production of subjectivity that gives a new meaning to my master’s degree thesis every time I have to come back to it.

But first, I also need to state from where I come as a subject in constant process of subjectivation. I am a journalist who graduated at Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ); years after graduating, I had decided to become a teacher – I worked at Pré-Vestibular Social do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (PVS-CEDERJ) teaching writing classes – and take a new college entrance exam. I am now also graduated in Languages at Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (UERJ), where I started researching, still during graduation, the Enunciative Approach to Discourse Analysis with Professor Décio Rocha, who was later my advisor during my master's degree in the same university. I have been teaching writing classes for ten years, starting, as I have said, in PVS, and for seven years I have been working at a private school. I am starting the second year of my PhD, also at UERJ, also on an Enunciative Approach to Discourse Analysis, but this time with Professor Poliana Coeli as my advisor.

That said, as cartography is an ever-moving, never-ending process, this essay is divided into only three parts: introduction, cartography as apparatus and potentiality, and final thoughts. But, in addition to the aforementioned objective of narrating, putting into words what we have been doing with the cartography method, there is one more objective: to present cartography as another research methodology option for our academic practices.

2 CARTOGRAPHY AS APPARATUS AND POTENTIALITY

Before I start, I must remind myself why to write down this path, considering I will not finish it now, neither do I know how much *writing-time* I have ahead of me. After defending my thesis, still not sure how to precisely define the results of my analysis on the law proposal PL 867/15 and the *Programa Escola Sem Partido* [Nonpartisan School Program], I have had moments in which I had been assigned the difficult task of explaining how cartography was present in my text, how it was a tool for research, and how it was also an apparatus of production of subjectivity operating over myself when I needed to develop my research. To answer this, I tried to map this path mentally, so I have decided to register it here.

But initially I need to talk about the cartography method. Barros & Kastrup (2015, p.53)² state that “[...] the cartographic research consists of accompanying processes rather than in representing objects”. As I move on with this desire to write about the process I have accompanied during my master's degree, I see myself under the obligation to also relate the process I accompany now while I write about this path I have taken. Thus, this very process is a new path I take.

That said, I have to talk about the forces that traverse me and implicate me as a researcher, Ph.D. student and high school teacher, with many ideas in my head and little time to write them down; I believe it is important to say that this new writing process has been taking place in a fragmented fashion, as are the theoretic readings necessary for it. This back-and-forth way of reading and writing seems to shape itself as a new apparatus of production of subjectivity, which grants me different ways of looking at this object of study, at this text I have proposed myself to write, as well as at my life, keeping in mind, of course, that I am being implicated by all these productions. It is the possibility of becoming through these vectors that continuously traverse us, producing new encounters and displacements. In this new path, I resort to my memory, now conceiving it as yet another apparatus of production of subjectivity, one I feel the duty of bringing up explicitly through the notion that I will not, with the help of my memory, represent a time, a researcher, and an object studied between 2016 and 2018. I am now, however, with this same memory apparatus, creating another time, another researcher, and another object, as I do not represent in this essay what those three elements were back in my master's degree days. Rather, I accompany processes of how time, researcher and object manifest each time new enunciations about them arise – and in this case, I am the researcher.

Before moving on, it is important to specify which concept of apparatus of “production of subjectivity” I have been working with, not only here, but also in other projects. We are subjects in a continuous process of production of subjectivity, which means that subjectivity is processual, it is not a destination. Rather, it is related to the events that shape us through the apparatuses with which

² Track 3 from *Pistas do Método da Cartografia: pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade* [Tracks of the Cartographic Method: intervention-research and production of subjectivity]. The book is divided into eight “tracks” that make up the cartography method, with which I worked throughout my master's degree research as well as throughout this paper.

we have contact. If, to Michel Foucault³, these apparatuses have to do with prisons, asylums, the panopticon, schools, factories, confessions, disciplines, legal measures, etc., I have been favoring Giorgio Agamben's expansion of the concept because, to him, all that is around us and what we interact with can be seen as an apparatus of production of subjectivity. The author states that apparatuses can also be that with no evident relation to power, such as "[...] the pen, the writings, literature, philosophy, agriculture, the cigarette, sailing, computers, mobile phones and – why not – language itself, which might be the most ancient of apparatuses [...]" (AGAMBEN, 2005, p.13). This way of conceiving apparatuses helps us understand that there is a multitude of them, beyond what is enumerated by Foucault, and that they encounter us and traverse us, continuously shaping our subjectivities. While I developed my master's research, the object I had chosen – discourse about Nonpartisan School – presented itself as an apparatus that produces an encounter, allowing new becomings. Besides that, when describing these processes, I produce new enunciations which also present themselves as apparatuses of production of subjectivity to potential readers. As I state in my master's thesis, paraphrasing professor Bruno Deusdará in one of our research meetings, there is no apparatus without a discursive aspect, and, when I talk about discourse, I also talk about language, one of the aspects of an apparatus.

When accompanying the process of this memory of mine, I have repeatedly visited affects that were present throughout two years of reading and analyzing the "Nonpartisan School Program" law proposal. Presently, I wish to recount those affects, put them into words as evident potentiality for displacements. In *Cartografia Sentimental: transformações contemporâneas do desejo* (2006), Suely Rolnik states that:

It is a task for the cartographer to grant language to affects that want to speak. What is expected from the cartographer is for them to be submerged in the intensity of their time and, watchful of the languages they encounter, that they devour the ones that appear to them as potential elements to compose necessary cartographies. The cartographer is, first and foremost, anthropophagic. (ROLNIK, 2006, p.23)

Now, then, I write about the process of making my master's thesis, trying to narrate from a cartographic point of view the processes I then accompanied, keeping in mind that memory is a force that acts upon this object to which I now return, one among many other forces that are and had been acting upon it, all this in a metastability that allows multiple becomings regarding this network which I have been weaving. When speaking of forces that act upon an object, I allude to *track 5* of the aforementioned book *Pistas do Método da Cartografia*. The traditional research method considers the object of research something preexistent, waiting to be unveiled through studies. Following this path that we have decided to take as a research group, it is our understanding that there are forces that produce objects, which is also why we take on the task of narrating these processes of production. Liliana da Escóssia and Silvia Tedesco (2015) state that:

In the context of this book, this text will develop the track which presents cartography as an act of constructing a collective plane of forces. A plane commonly disregarded by traditional knowledge perspectives, it reveals the continuous genesis of empirical forms, that is, the process of production of the objects of the world, among which are the effects of subjectivation. Alongside the stable outlines of what we call 'forms', 'objects' or 'subjects', coexists the plane of the forces that produce them. (ESCÓSSIA; TEDESCO, 2015, p.92)

I have named this new form "master's thesis on Nonpartisan School, titled *Do visor na porta das salas de aula à mordada nos professores: uma análise discursiva das redes conservadoras do Escola Sem Partido – Projeto de Lei 867/2015*". Therefore cartography as a plane of forces becomes the potentiality for a multitude of becomings, both for the object of study and for the researcher, as it makes us realize that whatever I research is an apparatus of production of subjectivity – and so am I one acting upon the object of research – which allows me to be perceptive of the processes throughout the research. What I have written in my thesis was not given, it was not there for me to uncover, it was the product of many implications, many forces, culminating in the final text. This "final text" is not the end of the path since, as a plane of forces, it brings forth the possibility of other productions of subjectivity, and, of interferences over other forms when being read as a thesis.

³ See Giorgio Agamben's *What is an apparatus?*

It seems important to highlight that, upon producing this *enunciation-thesis* in the way I have decided to, by taking the cartographic path in which I must narrate the processes of research and production of my work, I intervene in the world through language. That way, in this present work I also grant language to affects. I cannot say whether these affects are the same ones that had moved me back in my master's research, or new ones that move me now, because to narrate is to construct new forms. I believe it is clear by now that I am reconstructing and producing a new *object-master's thesis* through the memory apparatus and, upon narrating, I construct it also through the enunciative apparatus.

Thinking of memory as an apparatus has been a new path for me to revisit my research trajectory. A path which has led me to surprises by letting me be open to an unpretentious reading of *Pistas do Método da Cartografia* in our research group meetings, since, although I am a Ph.D. student, I find myself at the beginning of the process, which allows me, due to the three years I still have ahead of me, to experiment new encounters upon re-reading texts I had previously read. Now it becomes clearer to me that cartography is about being open to surprises that texts bring us, without forming hypotheses (expectations) about them and without taking a hermeneutic direction to find answers to said hypotheses just in order to conform to expectations and feel the "scientific" pleasure of being correct upon seeing them shape up empirically. On surprises, *track 6* gives us the following:

The cartographer accompanies a process which, if one can say it guides, it does so as a guide to the blind. They do not determine where to take the blind person, rather, they follow him or her blindly, feeling their surroundings, accompanying a process that they too do not know beforehand. The cartographer does not have the "I" as a subject, it has, as a subject, the processes of emergence of the "I" as a destabilization of the points of view that collapse experience into an (interior) "I". (EIRADO; PASSOS, 2015, p.123)

Before advancing, I must step back and make it clear how this method came to be part of my studies. Since 2012, I am part of a research group led by three professors from the Linguistics Department of UERJ, Bruno Deusdará, Décio Rocha and Poliana Coeli. At some point along these years we had read *Pistas do Método da Cartografia* and from those readings were raised questions about what these tracks had to offer as a research method in the field of language, since they commonly show up as a methodology for psychology researchers.

The questions I ask myself today, after reading *track 6*, are *why did I choose this methodology as a path for my research? Was it just because the professors told me to? Or does it resonate with me in a way that I can see its potentiality in the area of studies I have chosen?* In *track 6*, authors Eduardo Passos and André do Eirado (2015) talk about a plan of action – or a research plan – that has as its basis the triad of transversality, implication and dissolution of the point of view. To answer my question about the choice of method, I questioned if I could talk from outside a place in which I am implicated and touched by the readings – which started making sense not only when it comes to research, but also when it comes to the way I inhabit the world. Looking at the thesis I have written, the question was: how would I carry out a discourse analysis with a different method, considering that I am dealing with enunciations whose subjects are not empirical and are traversed by a myriad of processes of production of subjectivity, through which many voices manifest in these analyzed enunciations? And how would I be able to look at this from the outside, objectively, scientifically, to answer all these questions, considering I too am a person in processes of subjectivation, traversed by forces, one of them being the Nonpartisan School law proposal? In other words, there is a network of forces that communicate with each other (transversality) and produce subjectivities in the object of study as well as in the researcher, both being implicated (implication). This network of forces culminates in the account named "thesis", in which my point of view must be dissolute, as I am not a mere observer, I am continuously affected by that which I research and, in return, I also affect my object of study, producing realities through what I write about this object. All this to say that I have no answer that sufficiently embraces a reflection around the chosen method. As I like to say, cartography seems to fit the kind of discourse analysis we work with like a glove.

We have a method! If method is one of the premises of science, we have one. Amid this dispute about what is and what is not science, whether or not we do science, whether we do discourse analysis or just interpret texts, these questions frequently came to me as vectors which reminded me of the responsibility I had by choosing to study this. This responsibility made me carry part of my *corpus* in my bag everywhere I went, and read it over and over so I could be affected by potential linguistic entry points that would help me in the analysis. The *corpus* was the law proposal PL 867/15 – I had not yet started to read its related projects (PL 7180/2014; PL

7181/2014; PL 1859/2015; PL 5487/2016; PL 6005/2016), or the PL 14111/2015, which typifies the so-called crime of “ideological harassment” in the classroom.

Having had contact with cartography before, I knew that I wouldn’t just “collect data” and “discover results”; we know that we construct our *corpus*, as we do with the results of our research, because we are implicated – researcher and object – and, upon writing, our work will be yet another enunciation about that subject, presenting itself as yet another vector of forces acting over that form (the object of research), and producing it once more. This always reminds me of what Paul Veyne⁴ (2014), also cited in my dissertation, has written about the work of Michel Foucault and the concept of discursive practices. Objects do not exist before practices, highlights Veyne; it is the discursive practices that construct the objects and, this way, the written text is yet another materialization of discourses about an object of study. This object of study is brought forth the way it is, precisely because it is studied and narrated in this specific way. Another person who decides to write about law proposal PL 867/15 will also be part of this process of construction of the object PL 867/15, but they will be so through their own implications with PL 867/15, which I can assure will result in a research different from mine.

In the area of language studies, this raises a question about how we are not limited to analyzing enunciations and writing down their linguistic regularities, for example. We construct our *corpus*, we are implicated by it and we implicate it, and, finally, we produce new enunciations about these enunciations with which we have worked on. Our researches end up also being part of the discursive network which the analyzed enunciations are part of.

The process of reading this part of the *corpus*, the law proposals, happened in a way that takes me back to *Pistas do Método da Cartografia*, more specifically to *track 2*, in which Virginia Kastrup (2009) writes about free-floating, concentrate and open attention. As I have said before, there is also a cartographic process in the making of this present work, and I would like to also dwell on its narration in order for both the path taken back then (2016 to 2018) and the path taken now, so it makes sense. I read *track 2* months after defending my thesis (march 2018); when reading this chapter, I felt like I could finally name, that I could finally bring forth what I had done in my research with the potency of the chosen method. I had read my *corpus* with this free-floating attention, not looking for solutions, even though the deadline for a master’s degree course constantly tempts us with the desire to quickly find results that confirm our initial hypothesis. I needed to find a linguistic entry point, but I did not read it over and over looking for a specific one. I kept reading until two of them came to me: one of them was the word “ideology”, since it frequently showed up in fragments such as “political, moral, ideological and religious indoctrination”, which made me wonder what could the voices in these enunciations consider an “ideology”, since, to them, it was not morals, it was not politics, and it was not religion, as we can tell from the wording of the law proposal. The second entry point were the negatives, with which I worked with concepts of pragmatic linguistics to carry out my analysis. However, before approaching those negatives through the lens of “negative polarity”, as suggested by Pragmatics⁵, what caught my attention was the text’s scenography⁶, which reminded me of *The Ten Commandments of God’s Law* for the Jewish and Christian.

⁴ *Writing History – Foucault revolutionizes history*: this part of the book is dedicated to Michel Foucault, as a response to those who accused the philosopher of not doing History, even though he worked with evidences, as the author argues in this book. To Veyne (2014), Foucault is a historian not only because he works with evidences from well-known documents, as many historians do, but also because he works with the fringes of history, with what is not so evident but can explain the successions of facts. Reading about the “fringes of history” triggered a displacement in the starting point of my research, despite being past my starting point when I read it. It was one of those unassuming readings, not even directed at my research, as it was a proposed reading to our entire research group, which still meets every two weeks.

⁵ Oswald Ducrot (1987) develops concepts in the area of polyphony, one of them being the “negative polarity”. As this is not the focus of the article, I will explain this rather superficially: to Ducrot, negative polarity is present in negative statements, as they presuppose an affirmative statement opposed to it. Using my thesis as an example, the statement “teachers shall not indoctrinate students” presupposes that “teachers shall indoctrinate students”. Since it is difficult to imagine a point of view that upholds the idea that “teachers shall indoctrinate students”, we formulated an opposite statement not in the realm of permission, but rather in the realm of possibility. Teachers might indoctrinate; therefore, we shall prohibit this attitude. In other words, the presuppositions of the negative statements I have analyzed are not opposite to the negative statement, which is why referred to them as “bound statements”. Those statements are, in many senses, constructed authoritatively, since the discussion it raises does not establish an opposing point of view, but the same one, with which it has an alliance.

⁶ The concept of “scenography” is Dominique Maingueneau’s, who develops it through an analysis of discourse genres. To the author, each discourse genre hides behind a scenography that legitimizes it. It is the form in which the genre presents itself, in which it materializes. The scenography of *The Ten Commandments* helped me comprehend the aforementioned “bound statements”. “Thou shalt not kill” does not seem to presuppose a point of view that says “thou shalt kill”, rather, it seems to presuppose the possibility of murders taking place.

On the cartographer's attention, Kastrup states:

There are two points to be examined. The first one pertains to the function of attention, which is not simply to select information. Its workings are not of acts of focusing in order to represent the forms of an object, rather, attention works through the detection of signs and circulating forces, that is, of fringes of the ongoing process. The detection and apprehension of material, of scenes and discourses, at first disconnected and fragmented, requires an unfocused concentration, referred to by Gilles Deleuze in his *Abécédair*e as "being on the lookout", whose workings we will discuss further. The second point is that attention, being a complex process, can work in different ways: selective or free-floating, focused or unfocused, concentrated or disperse, voluntary or involuntary; and in different combinations such as voluntary selection, voluntary free-floating, unfocused concentration, disperse focusing, etc. (KASTRUP, 2015, p.33)

While constructing my *corpus*, many things bothered me about the online complaints from parents on the Nonpartisan School Program website. I started questioning why they were always related to social inequality, racism, and gender issues. Why, after years complaining that what is taught in schools is too distant from real-world experiences, do parents not want us to discuss such urgent matters of our country? Maybe my feelings had to do with the erasure of issues pertaining to myself, since not talking about sexism means not talking about us, women's lived experiences in such violent country; not talking about social inequality means not addressing how hard the journey is for those whose family income is below – way below – a thousand reais, while knowing that I got where I had never imagined I would, but many who grew up around me stayed behind, including ones with even worse socioeconomic conditions than I had; not talking about racism simply prevents any analysis of Brazil to be made in class, as it is impossible to think the complexity of our upbringing which is rooted in a culture of slavery that still lingers around in everyday social relations, and it means erasing even further that which affects significant part of my family, whose genealogical tree is difficult to retrace, and in which the process of whitening has always been so violent; not talking about gender and sexuality means perpetuating the existing violence in a country so dangerous for homosexuals – who are our friends, our students, our colleagues, and so on. In other words, not being able to address all these issues in the classroom was – and still is – a frustration that moved me throughout my research, along with the anger I felt towards the *corpus* I had constructed. Professor Bruno Deusdará said this a few times: we must have some kind of relationship with our *corpus*, Juliana's is one of hatred. Hatred is an affect and, as one should, it displaces us. So, amid all those displacements, I reached for other readings that were not immediately related to my work, that were not from the area of Discourse Analysis, but that made me think "one day they may be useful". This way I came across books such as Angela Davis' *Women, Race, and Class* (1983) and Judith Butler's *Gender Trouble* (1990), from which I read fragments here and there, not knowing whether or not I would use them. *Women, Race, and Class* (1983) proved itself useful to me especially when writing the second chapter of my thesis, *A instabilidade da origem vigente e a "ideologia de gênero"*. Also at the time, I was presented by my partner to Rebecca Solnit's book *Men Explain Things to Me* (2014) and, after reading it briefly – as I was not able to dedicate myself entirely to it due to all the deadlines – I was also able to make use of it, especially parts which, much like Angela Davis', questions women's place in society.

These reflections did not come to me solely because I am a woman, but also because Décio Rocha, my advisor, suggested me to read the law proposals related to PL 867/2015, these being: PL 7180/2014; PL 7181/2014; PL 1859/2015; PL 5487/2016; PL 6005/2016, along with PL 14111/2015. The last one had caught my attention in 2015 when I discussed in class an article from *O Globo* that addressed the accusations of "ideologically harassing students" directed at teachers. In this classroom, my students were around fifteen years old, it was at a private school in Rio de Janeiro, and my objective was not to discuss whether or not there was "ideological harassment", as I was not yet aware of the proportions those disputes had taken in Brazil. My objective was to discuss stereotypes regarding adolescents, I wanted to hear from my students their opinion on these stereotypes and how they saw themselves when compared to them. This class functioned as an apparatus for change, it seemed like something powerful had happened there and it allowed other potent encounters in the classroom with that group. They had surprisingly changed their behavior – or it may be that I had changed mine even more. But going back to the construction of my *corpus*, after reading all the aforementioned law proposals, I started following a path in which I considered that the issue they had with discussing gender could be that it discusses the rights of women. The authors of the law proposals placed under the same category the class struggle studied by Marx, the feminist movements, the so-called "gender ideology", and argued that teachers were bringing all of this to classrooms, consequently contaminating children and adolescents, destroying families, and pushing helpless students farther from the truth. There was to me,

then, a network, which I called a “discursive network”, materializing in disperse texts, in a large movement against the “destruction of private property” – meaning not only homes, land and banks, but also family, women and children, those being men’s property.

Of course, all these tracks and paths I have traced were made possible not only through reading the law proposals and linguistically analyzing instances of usage of the term “ideology” and of negative polarity. Along this path, I heard from a colleague about a Facebook page named *Mães pelo Escola Sem Partido* [Moms for Nonpartisan School], and I promptly started following it and keeping track of its posts. There, much like in the Nonpartisan School Program website, there were “complaints” from parents and other guardians about the “appalling indoctrination” teachers imposed upon students, taking advantage of their “captive attention”. What I noticed by reading them is that “indoctrination” refers to themes of social inequality, racism, and gender issues. We cannot talk about unproductive lands; we cannot talk about violence against women⁷; we cannot address the existence of homosexuals; we cannot talk about the place our society, rooted in slavery, relegates black people to on a daily basis. With that, I began to see that what moved the Nonpartisan School Movement and its lobbyists and congressmen was not necessarily, as I had initially supposed, only religious and moral values, but also – and strongly so – an economic matter, since the family is also presented as a property in our patriarchal structure. It is not a coincidence that they have appropriated the feminist motto “my body, my rules” into “my child, my rules”.

To displace women from this structure means not only to displace the patriarchy, but to displace the market. As Angela Davis said, when a black woman moves in our society, all of society’s structures move with her (ALVES, 2017). And same-sex relationships can also be under influence of the market. Gays and lesbians can have “pink money”, but they cannot adopt children, namely, human capital. After much time trying to find a track that could serve as a path for me to understand the intuition I had about the displacement of patriarchy not only being a matter of religious morality, but also of market economy, reading the book *The Birth of Biopolitics* (2004) by Michel Foucault and talking to Luiz Felipe, my colleague who also has Décio as an advisor, I saw another confirmation of this whole network I had been cartographing.

In the second chapter of my thesis – the third one I wrote – there is a section I called *Não discutir gênero: ignorância ou interesse pelos privilégios?*. Here I present an excerpt from it:

The emancipation of women and the legal possibility of same-sex marriage upheld by discussions on gender equality, on respect towards sexual diversity, on shifts in this country’s violent culture towards women and homosexuals, are not only threats to the moral of ‘The Brazilian Family’, but also threats to the market, to its stability and to the liberal order. Social inequality and the lack of freedom to be whatever one wants should not make sense from a liberal perspective; and indeed it does not make sense if we look through the lenses of what liberalism claims to be its purpose in society. Looking at the process will allow us to comprehend that the capital changes when family structures change, especially when those new family structures produce less human capital, fewer entrepreneurs of the self. (RETTICH, 2019, p.63)

The concept of “human capital” can be found in Michel Foucault’s *The Birth of Biopolitics* (2004), which states that: “And as soon as a society poses itself the problem of the improvement of its human capital in general, it is inevitable that the problem of the control, screening, and improvement of the human capital of individuals, as a function of unions and consequent reproduction, will become actual, or at any rate, called for.” (FOUCAULT, 2004, p.228).

Foucault shows us how economic relations changed over time and how we have become what he calls “entrepreneurs of the self”. From there, he develops the idea of “human capital” – I would like to highlight how this recent surge of *coaches* seems to be the most caricatural embodiment of said “entrepreneur of the self” mentality. However, before I proceed, I must outline this network I have

⁷ In 2015, Miguel Nagib, along with Nonpartisan School, start questioning the attribution of grade 0 to students who write, in the written exam of *Exame Nacional do Ensino Médio* (ENEM) – a standardized test for admission in public universities –, compositions that violate human rights, arguing that students had the right to freedom speech. The theme of the 2015 composition was “The persistence of violence against women”. In 2017, during an event organized by the private school I work at, Nagib himself brings back the topic and openly states that it is a right of the candidates to advocate for violence against women. In the same year, a civil lawsuit was issued by the Nonpartisan School Association, questioning the aforementioned grade 0 criteria. The movement wins the lawsuit, and *Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira* (INEP), the Institute responsible for ENEM, suspends the attribution of grade 0 to compositions that violate human rights.

proposed: women deciding about their own lives, including when and whether or not they will have children⁸, and the existence of same-sex relationships may be an obstacle to the production of human capital, unbalancing the market. It is interesting to consider how Latin American countries saw, around the same time, a rise in movements against a so-called “gender ideology”, heavily supported by religious segments, and with no discussions about how we, citizens of these countries, are human capital for large multinationals.

Now weaving this network as a cartographer, memory cannot help me narrate which book came first or which step I first took, nonetheless, whenever I talk about this, what comes to my mind is the image of a map, the map of Brazil, with which I had more contact during my school days. In this map, I often see myself leaving Rio de Janeiro and heading north, maybe towards Maranhão, then I turn back to the central-west, head southward and return to Rio. Along these travels, other books that I had already read resurface and contribute to this process I was living through. I remember now, for example, of Simone de Beauvoir’s *The Second Sex* (1949), also a present from my husband, back when we were dating. That, to me, is evidence of the cartographer’s implication in the process I have decided to take part in my research. To consider the observer’s point of view as objective and unrelated to the object they observe may be one of the biggest fallacies in scientific practice, and it ends up naturalizing the world that the own researcher constructs by narrating the process that led to their results. I believe it is important to remark that what I have just stated does not characterize the results narrated by the researcher as nonexistent forms, in fact, it is just the opposite, they exist precisely because they are enunciated. To evoke Foucault, discursive practices bring objects into existence, objects do not precede enunciation.

In one of the study group encounters, after defending my thesis, I told the group about the places I oftentimes had ideas about exploring as tracks that came to me. In this sense comes another implication of mine: I am a Catholic, and often during masses, I have thought about aspects related to my research. As a Catholic, I have also lived the conflicts of witnessing the Church bring up the topic of “gender ideology”, echo the discourse of Nonpartisan School, and, once again, leave women as an afterthought. Now looking back and writing, I see the aforementioned chapter 2 (*A instabilidade da origem vigente e a “ideologia de gênero”*) as my response to those conflicts, which are forces that traverse me and potentialize my will to conclude the thesis, comprehending said thesis as yet another force that could dispute meaning in the field where the discussion on Nonpartisan School is being held, while many other urgent issues in education need to be discussed.

Also during my roaming, through another colleague from the research group, I got to meet the brother of Fernanda Moura, author of the master’s thesis *Escola Sem Partido: Relações entre Estado, Educação e Religião, e os impactos no Ensino de História* and co-author of the book *Escola “sem” Partido - Esfinge que ameaça a educação e a sociedade brasileira*, both important works for me to comprehend how the Nonpartisan School Movement gained traction and started establishing itself through law proposals. Just as important to me is the work of *Professores Contra o Escola Sem Partido* [Teachers Against Nonpartisan School], led by Professor Fernando Penna, who was part of the board that evaluated my thesis. Their Facebook page also helped me as a source of research and reflection: it made me realize that we, as teachers, have produced forces in the classroom to which Nonpartisan School is a reaction. One of the final stages of this cartography of mine was the evaluation, in which I could hear from Professors Bruno Deusdará, Décio Rocha and Poliana Coeli not only theoretical advice on Discourse Analysis, but also touching speeches on what we do in the classroom. A defeatist, deterministic tone was pervasive in the pages I wrote for my evaluation. I remember Professor Poliana Coeli telling me this and highlighting that I should look back at the power of the school, the power of the teachers, so I could reassess the tone in which I had written my thesis.

Now, stronger than I was before, I believe that the hardest part of cartography is to narrate the process you have accompanied. The writing process took place, as it does now, amidst the insecurity perhaps inherent to those who realize that words construct reality. That notion was also a vector of forces acting upon me, because it was not about an academic title, it was about an enunciation, one which joined the dispute of meanings regarding the profession that I so belatedly chose, and that chose me back.

⁸ It is important to note that this freedom has not yet been fully reached, though many women believe so just because they are now in the labor market. We must not forget that lower class women have been in the labor market for a long time, usually in precarious work environments, and this can still be seen today. It is also worth noting that many of us, even when well-positioned in the labor market, have no complete freedom over decisions regarding maternity, since we are still insecure about our work performance when pregnant, in fear of losing our jobs or having our work hours reduced, thus reducing our income and making it harder to provide for the baby. Also, as it is my case, when you try to conciliate classroom and research, the insecurity doubles, as conducting a research and establishing an academic career while having a job – and needing it – requires availability and disposition.

Aware of this responsibility, there were two major points, which I call vectors of force, I needed to have in mind: I cannot simply interpret texts, and I must be honest with whoever is going to read my work, narrating the steps I took and the choices I made. The first one has to do with the dispute of meanings around what Discourse Analysis is, which is why, following the advice of the three aforementioned professors, I started weaving what I called a discursive network, composed of scattered texts that materialize discourses about the so-called indoctrination in classrooms. Here I remember the concept of transversality, coined by Félix Guattari and discussed in *Pistas do Método da Cartografia*, as soon as in its first track, when stating that intervention is always clinical-political. In this perspective, there are two axes, a horizontal axis and a vertical axis, which I see as vectors of forces that define individuals through this homogenizing pair. On page 29 there is a helpful illustration followed by this passage:

The hegemonic organization of the socius is operated through the opposition of the vertical and horizontal axes (hegemonic coordinates), executing a system of superposition of the higher variables for the creation of a standard measure that equalizes reality. Through this operation, there is a functional equivalence between the adult, heterosexual, white, rich, male higher variables (found in the vertical axis) that superpose on one another, producing an ideal of existence in opposition to one defined as child, homosexual, black, poor, woman lesser variables (horizontal axis). In this system of superposition, the same operation takes place. This operation creates a hierarchy that opposes the differences (man x woman, adult x child, white x black, heterosexual x homosexual, rich x poor) and homogenizes, either by creating an ideal superposition of higher variables (adult-white-heterosexual-rich-man), either through identification and subjection of those “different” from the ideal (woman subjected to men, child to adult, black to white, homosexual to heterosexual) [...] (BARROS; PASSOS, 2015)

The transversal axis is the intermediary in which cartography operates, and I may say so because it is in the transversal axis that both axes superpose, along with the cartographer’s implication, in a dispersion of possibilities to be analyzed – possibilities that would be disregarded if the method was linear, as scientific tradition has it. I will try to translate this idea in the way I constructed and analyzed my *corpus*: in the linguistic materiality, I saw the repetition of the word “ideology” and needed to understand the meanings being disputed around this expression. Although PL 867/2015 mentioned “religious indoctrination” and “political indoctrination”, revealing a presupposed difference between religion and politics, my first hypothesis was, due to the proponents of PL 867/2015 being religious politicians, that there was a discourse of religious morals as a foundation for these texts that promoted Nonpartisan School. This would be one of the hegemonic axes, producing a religious subjectivity, in opposition to another hegemonic axis that produces a nonreligious subjectivity. My implication as a researcher and as a religious person operates in transversality, bringing me the intuition that there could be a place of dispersion in which other becomings can be produced, since “[...] to speak, therefore, of the clinic’s coefficients of transversality is to intensify/to trust more – or trust less – in the becomings that are ever-present in different degrees of opening and in varied potentialities of creation” (BARROS; PASSOS, 2015, p. 27). Following this intuition, I tried to weave this discursive network using disperse texts, scattered around different places, and listening to advice from colleagues at the research group, in order to travel down the path that was opening up to me, and which differed from the path of my initial hypothesis: no, it was not only religious morals that were at stake in Nonpartisan School’s texts, there was also a market value that supported it and enabled them to travel within different discursive communities. “To operate through transversality is to consider this plane in which all reality communicates” (BARROS; PASSOS, 2015, p.27). It is this attempt at making such disperse reality communicate that allows me to say that we do not “interpret texts”, even if we also work with pragmatics, its presuppositions and implications. When we resort to different texts and start cartographing a network, it is a way of showing that the discourse we analyze materialize in a myriad of texts, and this is not guesswork, once we can demonstrate our claims through linguistic entry points.

As for the network I constructed through cartography – which seems like the most adequate method to tackle the dispersion of discursive formations –, for me to say that there is a sexist or racist discourse materialized in the expression “ideology” – differentiated from politics, from morals and from religion whenever the phrase “ideological indoctrination” is used – was only possible when I looked at the complaints from parents on the Nonpartisan School Program website or on the Moms For Nonpartisan School Facebook page, in which I identify that the expression “ideological indoctrination” is used to refer to teachers who discuss issues of race and gender in the classroom. I remember talking to the parents of a sophomore year high school student who had written a sexist composition. The parents were not reporting the school, in fact, they were being called by the school due to the composition their son had written, which was not only unrelated to the proposed topic, but was also another way in which

the student had expressed his unfavorable opinions about women at school. The father, who was very grateful for the attention given by the school, also said that “schools today lean too much to the left, it’s difficult, they discuss themes not suited for schools because students have no maturity. The hallways are full of posters from a campaign against racism, schools should not deal with that”. At the moment I was there just as a coordinator, accompanied by two other teachers who were, actually, responsible for talking to the parents. The antiracism campaign was produced during my writing classes with junior year high school students, after a month of debating the situation of black people in the country, looking for other issues beyond slavery. All this so, at least during our debates, the question of plurality could be raised in this school whose body of students and teachers is predominantly white, whereas black people can usually be found working as janitors, and the explanation for that almost always lies in the past, leaving no space for reflecting on how we systematically reproduce this institution rooted in slavery up to today. However, for that father who I had to listen to, these themes should not be discussed in school.

If one of the vectors of force I have mentioned was responsibility with the theory I set out to study, the other, as I have said, was honesty with potential readers of my thesis, which meant facing the challenges of narration. In *track 2*, Kastrup (2015) explains how cartography means accompanying processes. A common first hurdle is allowing yourself to be a cartographer, accompanying processes while not getting ahead of yourself and without naming them before they even take place; the second hurdle is to narrate this process, narrate how I put myself in the position of a cartographer, narrate what my choices were and why I opted for them, all this while being conscious that narratives construct reality. I wanted, just as I want in this paper, to be honest when talking about my choices, to present myself as a researcher who is implicated by her object and whose object is implicated by her. A researcher willing to find answers different from my hypotheses, open to the possibility of having to reformulate her entire research, to backtrack, if necessary, from Maranhão to Rio de Janeiro, in order to trace new paths towards Pará, for example. I believe that if I started my research thinking that there were more defeats than victories in what I believe to be education, I finished it comprehending that it is possible to find breaches in processes of subjectivation, to crawl through these breaches, to look for transversal vectors and new displacements, new becomings.

3 FINAL THOUGHTS

I arrive at the end of this work in which I tried to take once again the route I took from 2016 to 2018 to produce my master’s degree thesis. Aware that cartography is a method few researchers take as a path in areas other than psychology, I tried to register in this paper what we have been doing with this form of knowledge production. As I said in the introduction, the path is continuous and ever-moving, which made me decide to divide the paper into just three sections: Introduction, Cartography as apparatus and potentiality, and Final thoughts. These thoughts, however, are not so final, since whenever I talk about my research again, another moving process will take place.

Upon finishing this paper, I looked back once again at the beginning of my master’s degree, at the second public university I have attended, in which I have constructed a territory for potent production of life. I started my master’s degree in the same year as one of the largest financial crises in the history of Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, 2016. A crisis that dragged for a long time without being named as a one⁹, considering that in 2011, when I enrolled in graduation, there was already no toilet paper, no air conditioners in classrooms, professors’ salaries were not being paid on schedule and neither were the scholarships of quota students, the bathrooms were dirty, in other words, we lacked elements that effectively allowed us to study, but these absences were not named as a “crisis”. In 2016, the lack of funding put the university to a halt. There was no security in the building, no cleaning staff, no functioning university restaurant, we were in no condition to continue our activities until the bill was paid, including the debts with private companies that offered subcontracted staff –who were then fired *en masse*. It was a portrait of our likely future, now with new budget cuts announced by the Ministry of Education in 2019, because public education is systematically under attack, and Nonpartisan School is yet another way of legitimizing these attacks. Back to my first semester of master’s degree: with no classes, we still had research group meetings so we could somehow live the field of forces of collectivity and the possibilities of multiplicity in

⁹ Master’s degree student at UERJ’s Post-Graduate Program in Languages Ariane Oliveira questions, in her thesis, the concept of “crisis” in the university, analyzing news articles addressing this moment UERJ has been through.

this “one” that was our group, climbing up the stairs together – due to the lack of security staff – to the eleventh floor because the elevators had not seen maintenance in a while. From these meetings, two public events we named *Linguística pra quê?* [Linguistics: what for?] were born, in which we talked about our researches and, beyond that, we showed that UERJ resisted and that nobody could declare its end when our practices prove the potentiality of this university’s existence. At the end of my master’s degree, all this surfaced and composed my 132-page thesis, fruit from countless encounters throughout my life, including two graduations in public universities during a time in this country when I could leave Irajá, suburbs of Rio de Janeiro, and arrive today at a Ph.D. course – I believe I am the first in the family, up until today, who has made it here. To allow all these implications to make themselves present in that research from march 2016 to march 2018, advised by Décio Rocha, co-advised by Bruno Deusdará, Poliana Coeli, and supported by all my colleagues from the research group, is a way of showing how science is made in everyday practice, in encounters and processes. And this needs to be said by us, who are part of the academy. I arrive at my defense on March 26th, 2018, twelve days after the assassination of black congresswoman Marielle Franco, to defend a work that is an answer to those who want to silence us, to interrupt us in classrooms, a place for seeds. And they want this to those who embody potentiality, who embody strength, as still does Marielle.

REFERENCES

- ALVES, A. Angela Davis: “Quando a mulher negra se movimenta, toda a estrutura da sociedade se movimenta com ela”. *El País*. 27 ju. 2017. Disponível em: https://brasil.elpais.com/brasil/2017/07/27/politica/1501114503_610956.html. Acesso em: 30 jan. 2020.
- AGAMBEN, G. O que é um dispositivo? Trad. Nilceia Valdati. *Outra Travessia*, Florianópolis, v. 5, p. 9-16, 2003-2016. Disponível em: <https://periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/Outra/issue/view/1201/showToc>. Acesso em: 9 nov. 2020.
- BARROS, L. P. E.; KASTRUP, V. Cartografar é acompanhar processos. In: ESCÓSSIA, L.; KATRUP, V. PASSOS, E. (org.). *Pistas do método cartográfico – pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade*. Porto Alegre: Salina, 2015. p.52-75.
- COELHO, F. Sombras. *O Globo*, 10 set. 2015. Disponível em: <http://oglobo.globo.com/cultura/sombras-17229639>. Acesso em: 30 jan. 2020.
- DAVIS, A. *Mulheres, raça e classe*. Trad. Heci Regina Candiani. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2016.
- DELEUZE, G.; GUATTARI, F. *Mil platôs*. 2. ed. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2011.
- ESCÓSSIA, L.; TEDESCO, S. O coletivo de forças como plano de experiência cartográfica. In: ESCÓSSIA, L.; KATRUP, V. PASSOS, E. (org.). *Pistas do método cartográfico – pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade*. Porto Alegre: Salina, 2015. p.92-108.
- FOUCAULT, M. *Nascimento da biopolítica*. Trad. Pedro Elói Duarte. Portugal: Edições 70, 2010.
- FOUCAULT, M. *Arqueologia do saber*. Trad. Luiz Felipe Baeta Neves. 8. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2012.
- KATRUP, V. O funcionamento da atenção no trabalho do cartógrafo. In: ESCÓSSIA, L.; KATRUP, V. PASSOS, E. (org.). *Pistas do método cartográfico – pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade*. Porto Alegre: Salina, 2015. p. 33-51.
- MIRANDA, L.; SOARES, L. Produzir subjetividade: o que significa? *Estudos e pesquisas em Psicologia*, Rio de Janeiro, ano 9, v. 2, p. 408-424, 2009.
- MOURA, F. *Escola Sem Partido: relações entre estado, educação e religião*. 2016. 189 f. Dissertação (Mestrado Profissional em Ensino de História) – Instituto de História, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2016.

RETTICH, J. S. *Do visor na porta das salas de aula à mordada nos professores: uma análise discursiva das redes conservadoras do Escola Sem Partido - Projeto de Lei 867/2015*. 2018.132 f. Dissertação (Mestrado) – Instituto de Letras, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2018.

ROLNIK, S. *Cartografia sentimental: transformações contemporâneas do desejo*. Porto Alegre: Editora Sulina, 2016.

SOLNIT, R. *Os homens explicam tudo para mim*. Tradução de Isa Mara Lando. São Paulo: Cultrix, 2017.

VEYNE, P. *Como se escreve a história: Foucault revoluciona a história*. Trad. Alda Baltar e Maria Auxiliadora Keipp. 4. ed. Brasília: Editora Universidade de Brasília, 2014.



Received in June 7, 2019. Approved in January 15, 2019.