

THE NEOCONSERVATIVE/NEOLIBERAL INTERSECTION IN BRAZILIAN EDUCATION AND ITS INTERFACES FOR THE RISE OF LGBTQIA+PHOBIA



<https://doi.org/10.56238/arev6n2-179>

Submitted on: 09/23/2024

Publication date: 10/23/2024

Alexandre Adalberto Pereira¹, Wollacy Esquerdo Lima², Antonio Mateus Pontes Costa³, Tiago Ruan Pereira e Silva⁴, Cleuson da Silva Miranda⁵

ABSTRACT

The article analyzes the intersection between neoconservatism, neoliberalism, and the oppression of sexual and gender diversities in contemporary society. With a scenario marked by growing conservatism, which seeks to restore a traditional social "order", LGBTQIA+ identities face marginalization and violence due to the glorification of an idealized past and the imposition of normative standards. The influence of religious groups and neoconservative movements has restricted discussions about diversity in schools, which should promote a critical and inclusive environment. The research, based on bibliographic data and developed as part of a master's thesis, investigates how these ideologies impact education and perpetuate the exclusion of themes of sexual diversity. The naturalization of exclusionary norms and the perpetuation of the coloniality of knowledge reinforce a hegemonic vision, silencing dissident voices. It was concluded that, to build a fairer society, it is crucial to actively engage in the fight against LGBTQIA+ phobia, racism and sexism, respecting the right to freedom and expression of all individuals. Overcoming conservatism and neoliberalism, through critical and politically engaged education, is a vital step to address LGBTQIA+phobia in Brazilian schools, promoting a space where all identities can coexist and be respected.

Keywords: LGBTQIA+phobia. Education. Neoconservatism. Neoliberalism.

¹Doctor of Education
Federal University of Amapá
ORCID: 0000-0003-4029-1415

²Master of Education
Federal University of Amapá
ORCID: 0000-0002-8583-2994

³Doctorate student in Education
Universidade Federal do Pará
ORCID: 0000-0002-0661-1385

⁴Master's Degree in Education
Federal University of Amapá
ORCID: 0000-0001-8110-0043

⁵Master's Degree in Education
Federal University of Amapá
ORCID: 0009-0002-1269-5316

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary society faces a scenario marked by a growing conservatism, which not only defines rigid social roles, but also inhibits discussions about diversity in its multiple dimensions. Themes related to sexuality, racism and other forms of oppression are often considered radical and alien to what conservatism advocates as normative.

This movement is described by Apple (2003, p. 57) as an attempt to restore a supposed social "order", based on traditions and institutions that prioritize established authority. In a yearning for an idealized past, where "true knowledge" and morality prevailed, these groups seek a return to a social structure that, according to them, would guarantee a higher standard of quality and the protection of individuals against the evils of modernity. This romantic narrative promotes a revival of the "Western tradition", emphasizing patriotic values and conservative methods of education.

In this context, conservative ideology not only resists social transformations, but also positions itself in a hostile way against any form of diversity, reinforcing historical patterns that limit the freedom and expression of subjects. Thus, the need to question and deconstruct these narratives becomes imperative for the promotion of a more inclusive and egalitarian space.

In this environment of resistance to change, contemporary conservatism finds support in a narrative that glorifies an idealized past, suggesting that a return to those times would be the solution to current social problems. This rhetoric, driven by a combination of religious and patriarchal values, directly impacts discussions about diversity, especially on topics such as sexuality, race, and gender. Dissenting voices, which seek to promote inclusive education and acceptance of diversity, are often silenced or discredited, labeled as radical or threatening to the social order. According to Scruton (1994, p.18), "change is a threat to identity, and each change is a symbol of extinction".

In this context, the school emerges as a crucial battlefield, where narratives about identity and belonging are disputed. The school environment, ideally a space for formation and critical development, is often shaped by these tensions, reflecting and often reproducing the inequalities and prejudices present in society. This dynamic becomes even more evident with the advance of legislation and policies that aim to restrict discussions about gender and diversity, characterizing a setback in social achievements.

Therefore, the analysis of the interactions between conservatism, neoconservatism and the struggle for diversity is essential to understand the complexities of contemporary

society. Barroco (2015, p.624) points out that "the conservative movement gained strength in the context of neoliberal policies, presenting itself as a political program based on the government sustained by the defense of neoliberalism, militarism, traditional, family and religious values".

The implications of these ideologies are not limited to the political field, but reverberate in all spheres of social life, directly impacting the school experiences of historically marginalized groups such as LGBTQIA+ people. Based on this premise, this article seeks to explore these relationships, investigating how conservative and liberal narratives shape education and perpetuate the exclusion of the debate on sexual diversity from schools, implying the strengthening of LGBTQIA+phobia in schools.

METHODOLOGY

For the analysis of the corpus of this research, we used bibliographic data (Tozoni Reis, 2009) to improve and update knowledge through a scientific investigation that examines neoconservatism and neoliberalism as an ideological junction and its effects in the political and social sphere, contributing to the strengthening of LGBTQIA+phobia in school environments.

This theoretical research results from a master's dissertation funded by CAPES, linked to the Graduate Program in Education of the Federal University of Amapá, supervised by Dr. Alexandre Adalberto Pereira. The researchers who were part of the construction of the text are members of the Decolonial Studies Group, which involves master's and doctoral academics supervised by the aforementioned professor.

NEOCONSERVATISM AND NEOLIBERALISM: TWO SIDES OF THE SAME COIN?

The rise of religious ideologies in national politics has solidified neoconservatism as a new social order, presenting its principles as "moral values" deeply rooted in religiosity. According to Pinheiro (2015), the religious character emerges as a catalyst for the traditional redesign, gaining strength with the growth of neo-Pentecostal evangelical churches and, in the context of the Catholic Church, through the charismatic renewal movement. These sectors seek to imprint an orthodox bias to socially constructed stigmas, using new languages and strategies that involve advertising, media, diverse cultural products, and an active participation in politics and in the formulation of state laws.

In this scenario, the dissemination of discourses that attack left-wing ideologies, which are seen as a communist conspiracy from previous administrations, has also intensified. To justify this narrative, Moll (2010) explains that the defenders of neoconservatism began to highlight the importance of the free market, recalling the nineteenth-century view that defended the insertion of Christian values in politics as a response to crises and social challenges.

According to Apple (2003) and Freitas (2018), based on the participation of these groups in politics and state laws, there was the false idea of implementing the values of the past as better than those of the present, and with it the struggle for the preservation of cultural traditions. To achieve its intent, "this alliance gives up democracy to guarantee what they conceptualize as 'freedom', legitimizing military and/or legal-parliamentary-institutional coups" (Freitas, 2018, p. 26).

Based on the principles of neoliberalism, a new social configuration emerges, designed by these groups to meet their own interests, according to Freitas (2018), and which need:

[...] to prevent the processes of social organization of the most disadvantaged; not to transfer taxes to the less favored and to bar the processes of income redistribution; to destroy the organization of workers, the performance of unions and confederations; to destroy the performance and organization of movements that fight for human rights; act against immigrants and against actions to preserve the environment; deregulate the performance of corporations; privatize everything possible; proposing almost irrevocable forms of constitutional protection, which avoid the impact of any decisions contrary to the free market, among others (Freitas, 2018, p. 27).

For this destructuring of social organization, neoliberals create a climate conducive to business, competitiveness and, in the same proportion, repression against left-wing ideals, social organizations, unions, with the precariousness of labor rights and the privatization of everything possible. In view of this, neoliberalism is characterized as a political strategy that aims to reinforce class hegemony, conceptualizing itself as a social order that ideologically defends an economic theory that gives the State minimal participation in the institutional order, hypocritically bringing the false idea of social welfare, as conceptualized by Harvey (2008):

Neoliberalism is first and foremost a theory of political-economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be promoted by freeing individual entrepreneurial freedoms and capacities within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade (Harvey, 2008, p. 13).

In this sense,

[...] we can, therefore, interpret neoliberalization either as a utopian project to carry out a theoretical plan for the reorganization of international capitalism or as a political project for the reestablishment of the conditions for the accumulation of capital and the restoration of the power of the economic elites" (Harvey, 2008, p. 27).

With this, Apple (2003) says that it is important to understand that neoliberalism is, in its essence, "capitalism without kid gloves" (Apple, 2003, p. 21). It is important to highlight that, from Michael Apple's perspective, neoliberalism is pointed out as an explicit face of capitalism. The author refers to the term "kid gloves" as something delicate and soft-touched, which makes it evident that neoliberalism is capable of dismantling several rights.

Neoliberalism, understood as a transformation of the operation of capitalism, has instituted new forms of precarious work and the dismantling of rights conquered by workers. This new ideology creates, in turn, a new dynamic of social relations, as Chaui (2006) criticizes:

In its contemporary form, capitalist society is characterized by the fragmentation of all spheres of social life, from production, with the spatial and temporal dispersion of labor, to the destruction of the references that marked class identity and forms of class struggle. Society appears as a mobile, unstable, ephemeral network of particular organizations defined by particular organizations and particular programs, competing (Chaui, 2006, p. 324).

For this new configuration in social relations to be effective, neoliberalism, understood as a theoretical plan for the reorganization of capitalism, has as one of its ideals the destruction of class consciousness, as well as the forms of class struggle. To this end, neoliberalism preaches the "stimulus to fragmented experience centered on the present (summarized to the here and now, without past and without future), to exacerbated

individualism, in a context penetrated by violence, [which] gives rise to new forms of behavior" (Barroco, 2011, p. 206). Corroborating this thought, Harvey (2008, p.15) says that this individualistic characteristic aligned with the political ideal of human freedom "are points considered fundamental for the founders of neoliberal thought, who bring the idea that these principles should be considered as "the central values of civilization".

It is understood that this new ideological direction that joins neoconservatism with neoliberalism values the impossibility of building societal projects distinct from its hegemonic interests. In the words of Souza (2015), conservatism in Brazil ends up taking a position closer to reactionary ideals, ideally guiding the ruling class. "It is from there that they draw part of their ideas about the role of the State, civil and political liberties, markets, large landowners as political subjects, family, property, and so on" (Souza, 2015, p. 208).

In view of this, in order to strengthen capitalism, ideological approximations between neoconservatism and neoliberalism are necessary.

Thus, in order to preserve the established system, the necessary (institutional) reforms must be undertaken. [...] The reconciliation of conservatism with liberalism was completed in the incorporation of the idea that profit is the fundamental mediation of individual and collective development. From then on, the free market came to be seen as the bearer and founder of the possibilities of making human capacities explicit (Souza, 2015, p. 218).

These approximations between both ideologies reveal the nefarious sides of the same coin, based on the preservation of capitalism as an established system, and in this scenario assume an intransigent political character to make reforms capable of legitimizing, in the social discourse, the idea that profit is the fundamental mediation for the development of society, thus limiting the importance of the development of the economy. that individuals have class or identity consciousness regarding their condition. "According to the conservative view, reconciled with liberal precepts, it is only a matter of ensuring the moral qualities necessary for the healthy permanence of individuals in the markets" (Souza, 2015, p. 18).

It can be inferred that common interests circulate among these ideologies, which seek to maintain the established system through a theoretical and practical proposal that aims to implement visions about the free market, individualism, competitiveness, privatization, associated with reactionary worldviews, inducing the false perception that they

are necessary for social well-being, when in practice they generate more inequality, exploitation and social oppression. This common agenda can be understood in the words of Harvey (2008): "neoconservatism is, therefore, perfectly compatible with the neoliberal program of governance by the elite, distrust of democracy and maintenance of market freedoms" (Harvey, 2008, p. 94).

In this way, the common agenda of capitalism makes instrumental use of neoconservative values and neoliberal theory and practice to implement and legitimize practices of oppression, violence of the most diverse, exploitation of labor and withdrawal of social rights, justifying all this in a romanticized vision of an idyllic past, without conflicts, without ruptures, guided by the moral and harmonious order, which in fact never existed, projecting life into a future without utopias, and, at the very least, building human existence in a nebulous present by implanting the false idea that profit is the fundamental alternative for individual and collective development, even using one's own sexuality as necessary for the construction of a society based on the image and likeness of capital.

THE BOURGEOIS REGULATION OF SEXUAL RIGHTS AND THE PRECARIOUSNESS OF LGBTQIA+ LIFE IN SCHOOLS

The new social configuration is based on ideological currents in which sexual rights are subject to bourgeois regulation after capitalism "began to reshape the whole of society, it incubated new bourgeois norms and modes of regulation, including gender binarism and heteronormativity sanctioned by the state" (Arruza, Bhattacharya, Fraser, 2019, p. 52). In this vein, Biondi (2017) says that the need to regulate the capitalist mode lies in the effort to build a society in its image and likeness, submitting it to its essential conditionings, such as the accumulation of capital, economic mechanism, and others.

Among the characteristics of capitalism's modeling, "the phenomena of gender and sexuality require an analysis that indicates the specific traits attributed to them by bourgeois society" (Biondi, 2017, p.133). In this perspective, capitalism tries in every way to form a social standard be its image and likeness, and when it establishes a family standard, which generates biological children, leaving LGBTQIA+ people out of the model that praises heterosexuality in the family standard to the detriment of other sexualities. In this way, "the elevation of the family to ideological prominence guarantees that capitalist society will reproduce not only children, but also heterosexism and homophobia" (D'Emilio, 1983, p. 110).

In this context, Arruza, Bhattacharya, Fraser (2019) argue that capitalism is camouflaged under a discourse that one should not insist on a single model of family or sex. From this perspective, capital's strategy is above all the sale of a standard even of homosexuality, with the aim of selling sex and neoliberalism commercializing it. On the other hand, discourses and practices are created that do not recognize the sexual rights of LGBTQIA+ groups led by neoconservative movements, which value the preservation of morality and the patriarchal family.

For Souza (2021), this freedom that capitalism gives to LGBTQIA+ subjects is expressed in consumption as a way to maintain a "gay normality" based on capitalist standards. These capitalist patterns are based on class, gender, race, and ethnic divisions, in this sense this "gay normality" that "presupposes a capitalist normality", which generates "lasting marginalization and repression of poor queer people, especially ethnic groups" (Arruza, Bhattacharya, Fraser, 2019, p. 72). In this perspective, Missiatto (2021) points out that:

[...] the economic inequalities that determine poverty for specific types of homosexual people while producing a consumerist ideology around sexual and gender diversity based on the construction of an LGBTQI+ image that has nothing to do with respect for plurality, but with the capitalist market. (Missiatto, 2021, p.65).

This consumerist ideology around sexual diversity has caused a certain climate of tension due to the duality of ideologies, on the one hand conservatism wants to repress LGBTQIA+ people through religious and patriarchal discourses, while neoliberalism "serves as a crossing for direct predation for capital" (Arruza, Bhattacharya, Fraser, 2019, p. 73). Another point that is worth analyzing is the connections produced by normative systems, which when they establish a model of "gay normality", also establish standards of LGBT subjects considered "normal". According to Missiatto (2021):

The connections produced by normative systems make the experiences of LGBTQIA+ people heterogeneous enough that they are not socially universalized, and this should not be the goal. The primary question to be considered is how to understand the precariousness of the lives of non-normative people without incurring, accidentally or premeditatedly, the risk of essentializing them. (Missiatto, 2021, p.67)

This false sexual freedom has caused great inequalities between the experiences of LGBTQIA+ people due to the relationship between gender, sexuality, race and ethnicity, these differences in this group have increased the precariousness of the lives of non-normative people. In view of this, it should be understood that "the fact is that, beyond the particularities, what overlaps is that white, homosexual men, with male gender expression, are treated differently by normative systems than other homosexuals" (Missiatto, 2021, p.67). Still for the author, capitalism benefits from inequalities as an economic resource.

In this immensity of inequalities, the false idea of sexual freedom that capitalism provides to LGBTQIA+ people is considered fragile and the target of constant threats by far-right groups that use morality and want to maintain preservation through discourses that value the "protection" of their families against the sexual freedom that is associated with neoliberalism. According to Arruza, Bhattacharya, Fraser (2019), this false idea of sexual freedom provides a series of social changes, such as conquests of legal rights, one of these examples is same-sex marriage, which "does not prevent aggression against LGBTQIA+ people, who continue to experience gender and sexual violence, lack of symbolic recognition and social discrimination" (Arruza, Bhattacharya, Fraser, 2019, p.54).

Neoconservatives and right-wing populists gain support from the masses of the people by claiming the need to protect their families from sexual freedom, these groups have a style of "protection" that places the blame on sexual freedom while covering up the real source of danger, which is capital. In this relationship of ideological duality, the result is the precariousness of social life, especially of LGBTQIA+ groups, which has always been marked by abysses of inequalities, and today in an obscure way has been regulated by sexuality, which is nothing more than an element of production of inequalities at the service of capital. The strengthening of these inequalities has increasingly intensified moral principles and the exaltation of the traditional family, as "capitalist moral austerity is not compatible with a sexual life that, once disconnected from procreative purposes, is not part of the effort of expanded reproduction of the labor force" (Biond, 2017, p.146).

With this, the preservation of traditional families is one of the foundations of this ideological matrix of power, and for this it is necessary to create the false idea of sexual freedom so that violence against LGBTs in all social spheres is normalized in the social discourse. For Biondi (2017):

It is no wonder that the discourse of praising the traditional family, despite all the social transformations of the twentieth century, enjoys a captive place in the public debate. In addition, in the first opportunities, capital highlights the paradigms of gender, as if reconstituting what would be, for it, the natural order of things. (Biond, 2017, p.146).

The rescue of values and the natural order of things appears when the articulations are lost in the false idea of sexual freedom, which makes the groups that resisted lose political strength and naturally accept reforms in society, which increasingly strengthen heterosexual superiority over other sexualities.

This disarticulation through inequalities comes especially from the political scenario through decisions that remove the achievements through struggles for equality from parliamentary agendas and in the same sense create terms that are inserted in the social discourse that attack these discussions in schools, as is the case of "gender ideology", which has in its foundations to reconfigure educational spaces against discussions that cover topics considered inappropriate and that go against to the values of the traditional family, defended by liberal and conservative groups, hears the need to implant in the social discourse a flood of untruths against gender and sexuality studies in education. To this end, according to Junqueira (2019), between the mid-1990s and the early 2000s, the expression "gender ideology" emerged, defended by the authors as a Catholic invention to establish heterosexuality as the center of their anthropology and doctrine, producing a theology in which it is based on attacks against cultural relativism, to feminism and sexual freedom, which encompasses sexual diversity in its entirety.

From this doctrinal formulation, this movement began to reverberate in several countries, where public and private institutions went through a process of removing the public and secular character of schools. As a result, discussions of gender equality, feminism, and sexuality are eliminated because they are seen as "a single, indistinct threat of subversion of family arrangements that are seen, at the same time, as natural, of divine origin, and indispensable to the reproduction of social life" (Miguel, 2016, p.597). Also for the author, these groups gained strength in Brazil from 1990 onwards due to the high effort of evangelical churches in favor of the election of their pastors and religious leaders who began to compose the "evangelical bench" which, especially when it was strengthened, began to become great opponents of issues that encompass diversity in general, such as:

Inclusive understandings of the family entity and policies to combat homophobia, among other topics, fundamentalist parliamentarians ally themselves with different conservative forces in Congress, such as landowners and gun advocates, in a joint action that strengthens everyone. (Miguel, 2016, p.593)

These political alliances began to generate a huge common agenda of self-strengthening and that insert "some of their spokespersons in the universities, the front created with the other sectors of the right leads to such issues being left aside or accepted in their most conservative register in the public debate" (Miguel, 2016, p.594). In view of this, the conservative discourse gained visibility and parliamentary expression, accusing schools of what was commonly disseminated as "ideological indoctrination", and with it, the emergence of a large articulated movement, among the various religious groups in the most diverse institutions, aiming to propose measures to prevent teachers, during teaching, from talking about topics related to gender and sexuality.

From this perspective, teachers began to be labeled as "enemies of the family" who "would seek to confuse children, forcing, for example, boys to wear skirts and play with dolls, while girls would be instigated to get rid of their natural propensity to take care of others" (Junqueira, 2019, p.168). These constant attacks against education have been spreading in social discourse through fundamentalist and conservative religious groups. Among the statements is that teachers were responsible for "usurping parents the leading role in the moral education of their children to indoctrinate them with ideas contrary to the convictions and values of the family".

As a result, teachers are attacked in the exercise of teaching, taxed as encouraging the "eroticization of children", through advertisements in the media and in government programs of neoconservative and neoliberal politicians. These alliances contributed strongly to the growth of attacks against diversity in training processes, in which they brought ideas such as:

[...] students would be encouraged to be interested in masturbation, homosexuality, transsexuality, prostitution, abortion, polygamy, pornography, pedophilia, bestiality, etc. Alarmed, parents are called upon to join in a crusade in "defense of the family" (always referred to in the singular), packaged in slogans such as: "Down with gender ideology!", "Let's save the family!", "Respect the innocence of children", "My son, my rules!", "Boys wear blue, girls wear pink!", among others." (Junqueira, 2019, p. 168).

Therefore, the direct relationship with Jair Bolsonaro's government speeches during his campaign in 2017 is perceived, when he hears a huge spread of fake news, in which they related these accusations to the governments of the Workers' Party. According to Miguel (2016), the Workers' Party came to be presented as the incarnation of communism in Brazil, generating a notable overlap between anti-communism and anti-PT.

From this ideological perspective, inclusion policies, which encompassed gender and sexual diversity issues in education, were and are seen as a mechanism for alienating children because they understood "that children would be the most vulnerable to "gender ideology", which would prevent the consolidation of male or female identity" (Miguel, 2016, p.599). For this reason, the "defenders of the family" both attack educational policies that propose a curriculum open to the themes of gender and sexual diversity and make it a society shaped by the promotion of "systematic misinformation, intimidation, stigmatization of the adversary, and moral panic" (Junqueira, 2019, p.171).

As a result, the invention of gender ideology gained strength and parliamentary representativeness, which directly contributes to the exclusion of sexual and gender diversity in training curricula, in which students fail to understand social problems such as LGBTQIA+ phobia and gender violence, and as a consequence of this, the naturalization of compulsory heterosexuality in school environments, which is one of the major causes of violence against young LGBT people.

THE STRENGTHENING OF LGBTQIA+PHOBIA IN THE IDEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

The discussion about the education and rights of the LGBT population in Brazil reveals an alarming pattern of human rights violations, as highlighted by Ventimiglia (2020). This violation manifests itself in a variety of ways, including the denial of employment and education opportunities, as well as physical assaults and homicides. The scenario becomes even more serious when LGBT individuals belong to vulnerable social groups, such as women, blacks and people with disabilities, who accumulate multiple vulnerabilities and suffer more acutely the consequences of this oppression.

The current social configuration, permeated by conservative discourses and strengthened by neo-Pentecostal churches, is reflected in schools. In these environments, the aim is to protect the so-called "traditional families", resulting in an educational dynamic that perpetuates oppression and exclusion, especially in relation to LGBT students. Rosa (2016, p. 211) characterizes this phenomenon as a process of "schooling" oppression,

evidencing discriminatory practices that range from cruel play to verbal aggression. Without effective interventions, these practices are consolidated and can lead to serious consequences, such as dropping out of school and even suicide for young people who do not feel safe in their school environment.

In addition, the intersection between neoconservatism and cisheteronormativity exerts a significant influence on the school space. Irineu, Oliveira and Lacerda (2020) discuss how the advance of conservative agendas, linked to neoliberal ideals, has generated anti-egalitarian movements that try to eliminate discussions about gender in education. The rise of the Bolsonaro government in 2019 intensified these agendas, with anti-gender demands being massively defended by evangelical groups. This strategy aims to dismantle the struggle for LGBTQIA+ rights and promote setbacks in labor and social rights.

The impact of neoconservatism on the school environment is worrying. Although the school has a fundamental social and political role, fostering students' critical capacity in relation to issues such as racism, sexism, and LGBTQIA+phobia, ideological pressure has limited this function. The school should be a space where individuals with different transversalities meet and live with differences. However, by ignoring these specificities, the educational system perpetuates the coloniality of knowledge, which is marked by a white and heteronormative reference.

This regulatory dynamic is reflected in the way the school acts, naturalizing actions, thoughts, and identities that do not fit into the dominant patterns. Lopes (2020) emphasizes that educational institutions often function as spaces that violate and silence those who are considered different, subaltern or, ultimately, erasable. The education system, therefore, not only disregards the demands of students from marginalized groups, but also reinforces norms that exclude and violate.

Louro (1997) emphasizes that school environments play a crucial role in the formation of identities, shaping perceptions and behaviors that reflect social norms. He observes that, through daily interactions, students learn to accept or reject behaviors and identities, reinforcing the exclusion of bodies that do not conform to heteronormative norms. Ventimiglia (2020, p. 51) complements this analysis by stating that the lack of a safe space to discuss violence and discrimination in schools results in the trivialization of these behaviors, both for victims and aggressors.

Freire (1987, p. 105) already warned of the dangers of ideological neutrality in schools, emphasizing that omission in relation to crucial issues, such as sexual diversity, allows oppressive ideologies to thrive. Thus, by adopting a neutral and disinterested stance, education becomes a fertile ground for the perpetuation of LGBTQIA+phobia. It is essential that schools recognize their responsibility in promoting an inclusive environment where all identities are respected and valued.

CONCLUSION

The analyses carried out in this article highlight the complex intersection between neoconservatism, neoliberalism, and the oppression of sexual and gender diversities in the contemporary context. The growing influence of conservative ideologies in the social and educational spheres has proven to be a significant obstacle to the promotion of an inclusive environment in which all identities can coexist and be respected. The narrative that glorifies an idealized past and the attempt to restore a traditional social "order" culminate in an even deeper marginalization of LGBTQIA+ subjects, who find themselves confronted with normative standards that exclude and violate them.

In addition, the pressure exerted by religious groups and neoconservative movements has restricted essential discussions about diversity in schools, spaces that should foster students' critical capacity. The naturalization of exclusionary norms and the perpetuation of the coloniality of knowledge reinforce a hegemonic vision that silences dissident voices and marginalizes experiences that diverge from the heteronormative standard. Therefore, it is imperative that educational institutions recognize their fundamental role in deconstructing these oppressive narratives and commit to promoting an education that values plurality.

Thus, in order to build a more equitable and just society, it is necessary to actively engage in the fight against LGBTQIA+ phobia, racism and sexism, ensuring that all subjects have their right to freedom and expression fully respected. Overcoming the shackles of conservatism and neoliberalism, through critical education that adopts a political nature, is a vital step towards strengthening the fight against LGBTQIA+phobia in Brazilian schools.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank CAPES for funding the research, we express our gratitude to all colleagues in the Research Group on Decolonial Studies for the weekly discussions and for the criticality in analyzing the processes that surround Brazilian education.

REFERENCES

1. Apple, M. W. (2003). Educando à direita: Mercados, padrões, Deus e desigualdade (D. de A. Azevedo, Trad.; J. E. Romão, Rev. técnica). Cortez; Instituto Paulo Freire.
2. Arruzza, C., Bhattacharya, T., & Fraser, N. (2019). Feminismo para os 99%: Um manifesto (1ª ed.). Boitempo.
3. Biondi, P. (2017). Sexualidade e disciplina do trabalho na ordem social burguesa. Caderno Cemarx, (10). Instituto de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas, Unicamp.
4. Chauí, M. (2006). Cultura e democracia: O discurso competente e outras falas. Cortez.
5. Freitas, L. C. de. (2018). A reforma empresarial da educação: Nova direita, velhas ideias (1ª ed.). Expressão Popular.
6. Freire, P. (1987). Pedagogia do oprimido (17ª ed.). Paz e Terra.
7. Harvey, D. (2008). O neoliberalismo: História e implicações. Loyola.
8. Irineu, B. A., Oliveira, B. A., & Lacerda, M. C. (2020). Um balanço crítico acerca dos direitos LGBTI no Brasil sob ascensão do Bolsonaro. In Diversidade sexual, étnico-racial e de gênero: Temas emergentes (pp. 98–115). Editora Devires.
9. Junqueira, R. (2019). Educação contra a barbárie: Por escolas democráticas e pela liberdade de ensinar. In Educação contra a barbárie: Por escolas democráticas e pela liberdade de ensinar. Boitempo.
10. Laval, C. (2004). A escola não é uma empresa: O neo-liberalismo em ataque ao ensino público. Planta.
11. Lopes, B. (2019). BNCC e o avanço neoliberal nos discursos sobre educação. In Educação é a base? 23 educadores discutem a Base. Ação Educativa.
12. Louro, G. L. (2010). Currículo, gênero e sexualidade: O “normal”, o “diferente” e o “excêntrico”. In G. L. Louro, J. Felipe, & S. V. Goellner (Orgs.), Corpo, gênero e sexualidade: Um debate contemporâneo na educação (6ª ed., pp. 41–52). Vozes.
13. Miguel, L. F. (2016). Da “doutrinação marxista” à “ideologia de gênero”: Escola Sem Partido e as leis da mordaza no parlamento brasileiro. Direito & Práxis, 7(15), 590–621. <https://doi.org/10.12957/dep.2016.22267>
14. Missiatto, L. F. (2021). Colonialidade normativa (1ª ed.). Appris.
15. Moll, R. (2015). Diferenças entre o neoliberalismo e o neoconservadorismo: Faces de uma mesma moeda? Unesp.

16. Rios, R. R. (2011). Direitos sexuais, uniões homossexuais e a decisão do Supremo Tribunal Federal (ADPF 132-RJ e ADI 4277). In R. R. Rios, C. Golin, & P. G. C. Leivas (Orgs.), *Homossexualidade e direitos sexuais: Reflexões a partir da decisão do STF* (pp. 69–113). Sulina.
17. Rosa, M. (2016). *Discursos científicos sobre a homofobia no processo de escolarização: Enunciados e problematizações* [Tese de doutorado, Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso do Sul].
18. Scruton, R. (2015). *O que é conservadorismo* (G. F. Araújo, Trad.). Realizações.
19. Tozoni-Reis, M. F. de C. (2009). *Metodologia da pesquisa* (2ª ed.). IESDE Brasil.
20. Ventimiglia, R., & Menezes, A. B. (2020). *Lgbtfobia na escola: Possibilidades para o enfrentamento da violência*. Appris.