



DIFFERENCE AND EROTICISM IN MOVEMENT EXPERIENCES ON PHYSICAL EDUCATION

DIFERENÇA E EROTISMO EM EXPERIÊNCIAS DE MOVIMENTO NA EDUCAÇÃO FÍSICA

DIFERENCIA Y EROTISMO EN EXPERIENCIAS DE MOVIMIENTO EN LA EDUCACIÓN FÍSICA

João Paulo Marques

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8499-5997> 

<http://lattes.cnpq.br/3450368076691556> 

Universidade Estadual de Maringá (Maringá, PR – Brasil)

a.marques.jp@gmail.com

Abstract

This article explores issues related to the knowledge-power relationships that sustain the dynamics of production of markers of social differentiation. By exploring literature that deals with the devices of knowledge-power and differentiation, the article explores situations that focus on the markers gender and sexuality, problematizing their crossings in Physical Education. The proposed analysis signals effects of the dynamics of production of differences in the modes of experiencing of bodies and movements in competence practices of Physical Education, as well as eroticism as a tool to approach this dynamic. Thus, the study aims to stimulate reflections focused on the problematization of interventional actions that propose to question the markers of difference in Physical Education, arguing for attention to not reinforcing the pattern of power they question and for the articulation with specificities of the practices in which it intervenes.

Keywords: Knowledge-Power; Difference; Gender; Sexuality; Eroticism.

Resumo

Este artigo explora questões afins às relações de saber-poder que sustentam a dinâmica de produção dos marcadores de diferenciação social. Ao incursionar por literatura que trata dos dispositivos de saber-poder e diferenciação, o artigo explora situações que focalizam os marcadores gênero e sexualidade, problematizando seus atravessamentos na Educação Física. A análise proposta sinaliza efeitos da dinâmica de produção das diferenças nos modos de experiência dos corpos e dos movimentos em meio a práticas de competência da Educação Física, bem como o erotismo como ferramenta para abordar essa dinâmica. Com isso, o estudo visa estimular reflexões voltadas à problematização das ações interventivas que se propõem a questionar os marcadores de diferença na Educação Física, argumentando pela atenção ao não reforço do padrão de poder que questionam e à articulação com especificidades das práticas pelas quais intervém.

Palavras-chave: Saber-Poder; Diferença; Gênero; Sexualidade; Erotismo.

Resumen

Este artículo explora cuestiones afines a las relaciones de saber-poder que sustentan la dinámica de producción de los marcadores de diferenciación social. Al incursionar por literatura que trata de los dispositivos de saber-poder y diferenciación, el artículo explora situaciones que focalizan los marcadores género y sexualidad, problematizando sus cruces en la Educación Física. El análisis propuesto señala efectos de la dinámica de producción de las diferencias en los modos de experiencia de los cuerpos y de los movimientos en medio de prácticas de competencia de la Educación Física, así como el erotismo como herramienta para abordar esta dinámica. Con eso, el estudio busca estimular reflexiones volcadas a la problematización de las acciones interventivas que se proponen a cuestionar los marcadores de diferencia en la Educación Física, argumentando por la atención al no fortalecimiento del patrón de poder que cuestionan y a la articulación con especificidades de las prácticas por las cuales interviene.

Palabras clave: Saber-Poder; Diferencia; Género; Sexualidad; Erotismo.



INTRODUCTION

The analysis outlined in this article explores issues related to the knowledge-power relationships that determine the dynamics of production of modes of social differentiation. Starting from provocations about how we were programmed to socially read the differences, the article explores situations related mainly to the markers gender and sexuality, as well as the crossings of these markers of difference in the ways each person experiences their body and the dynamics of movement when engaging in bodily practices or physical activities (BP/PA) of competence of Physical Education. The purpose of this study is to stimulate reflections to problematize interventional actions that aims to question the markers of difference in Physical Education, given that, in some cases, such actions end by reiterating the pattern of power that seek to subvert, besides present weaknesses in the articulation with the dynamics of the BP/PA by which it intervenes.

The article is based on evidence from an ongoing research, as well as studies that precede it, which indicate that, despite the latency of studies that address the effects of crossings of social markers of difference in people's life experiences – studies that contribute to approaches aimed at reducing inequalities and injustices in different realities –, it is necessary to consider the tendency to hierarchize these markers and their epistemological and methodological implications. As the French sociologist Danièle Kergoat (2010) argues, this trend can be understood, among other elements, by the approach of social relations to which such markers refer from perspectives that assume the conditions of social relations and the positions occupied by people in these relations, respectively, as given conditions and fixed positions. This is an approach that, although it recognizes differences and their intersections, does not allow to question the reasons for the need for the proposition of cognitive models that recognize them. As evidenced by the Afro-Dominican anthropologist Ochy Curiel (2020), this is an approach insensitive to the dynamics of production of these markers, especially because they are endemic to the domain of power that establishes such dynamics, that is, the modern Eurocentric capitalist colonial domain.

Facing the problem of the production and hierarchy of differences in gender and sexuality studies requires conceiving social relations as dynamic and changing relations, in constant dispute and negotiation. For this, it is important to centre the debate on the modes of subjectivation and the capacity of agency of people, to recognize that each one adjusts themselves to social relations and produce it, mutually, building the real possibilities of fighting





forms of exploitation, domination and oppression instituted with this power domain. Thus, denaturalizing the modern colonial dynamics of production of body differences, especially gender and sexuality, implies recognizing and facing the hierarchies of humanities present also in the field of Physical Education. Paraphrasing the Brazilian educator Vagner do Prado (2021, p. 95), this confrontation implies recognizing Physical Education as "[...] technology that produces new forms of life that allow us to question the arbitrariness of the social framing of bodies in reductionisms and fragilities, already well exposed to the regulatory norms of sex and gender."

By focusing on the markers gender and sexuality, as a teacher and researcher sensitive to problems of this order in the field of Physical Education, I assume the 'border position' (Walsh, 2019) of questioning whether, and how, I have stressed dominant epistemologies that naturalize gendered and sexed configurations of bodily practices, in favour of knowledge that is sometimes marginalized and silenced by this power domain. Hence the purpose of this study, as well as the research of which it unfolds, of materializing actions that converge to appropriate approaches to the production of differences that cross and constitute the processes of bodily subjectivation (Marques, 2023) of people, especially when engaging in BP/PA. With this direction, I aim to enable dialogue among peers able to encourage actions aimed at changes that favour the coexistence of diversity of being and knowledge in Physical Education and beyond.

Aspiring to meet the challenge briefly signalled, this article seeks to fulfil the objective of situating mechanisms of production of difference in contemporary societies and their impacts on bodily experiences in practices competent to Physical Education. For this, I propose dialogues with authorships based on the Human and Social Sciences (sociology, education, decoloniality, gender, sexuality), to highlight nuances of power materialized in devices that subsidize specific modes of production of difference. From this emphasis, I resume implications of the production of difference for the field and for the interventional proposals, with special attention to concerns that permeate the teaching and investigative practice regarding institutions of gender and sexuality and the respective differences to which they allude in the sphere of experiences of movement and subjectivation. Finally, I analyse the potential contribution of eroticism, as an epistemological tool, to challenge the difference not by the simplistic opposition that prevails in its social reading, but by the ethics of caring for alterity in interpersonal relationships.





THE PRODUCTION OF THE COLONIAL DIFFERENCE CONSUMABLE IN THE NEOLIBERAL PERFORMANCE SOCIETY

When dealing with the conception of difference amid power relations crossed by age, race, class and sex, in her book *Sister outsider*, the American writer Audre Lorde (1984) points out how the history of Western Europe has programmed people to view human differences as simplistic oppositions: dominant/subordinate, good/evil, superior/inferior. As an effect of this contingency of the civilizing process, the author highlights the expectation generated that oppressed people 'bridge the gap' between their life experiences and the oppressor's consciousness, that is, that they take responsibility for teaching or communicating to oppressors and oppressors their violence and their mistakes. While oppressors keep evasive positions on the responsibility for their actions, "Black and Third World people are expected to educate white people as to our humanity. Women are expected to educate men. Lesbians and gay men are expected to educate the heterosexual world [...]" (Lorde, 1984, p. 115)

The considerations of this author matter to the debate of the crossings of the social markers of difference in the production of subjectivities and in the social management of life, especially given its warning about the need for 'institutionalized rejection of difference' produced in a profit economy. According to Lorde (1984), this economy programs us to respond to differences under three patterns of behaviour based on fear and aversion: ignore them, imitate them, or destroy them. In contrast, "[...] we have no patterns for relating across our human differences as equals. [...]" (p. 115) Because we are all created in a social regime that distorts differences, from the way we name them and the ways we deal with them, our behaviours and our expectations are impacted by such distortions. Hence the consideration of Lorde (1984) that, despite our evident differences (race, class, sex, age), which separates us is rather our refusal to both, recognize it differences as it and to examine those distortions that are endemic within our living. Thus "[...] we do not develop tools for using human difference as a springboard for creative change within our lives. [...]" (Lorde, 1984, p. 115).

Evidence of the importance and lack of tools to deal with otherness, especially cognitive or epistemological tools, are also present in the theory of power proposed by the German Korean philosopher Byung-Chul Han, basilar author for the analysis of contemporary societies in the research that support this article. By analysing structural elements of the functioning of power, Han (2017; 2018; 2019; 2020) contributes to clarifying the problem signalled by Lorde. In the perspective of this author, the differences tend not to be denied or





extinguished, but to be reaffirmed by contemporary social power relations, especially given the functioning of the performance device, considered by the author an expressive regulator of lifestyles and subjectivation in neoliberal economies. Han's theory indicates that the social production of difference occurs amid a specific power dynamic, which also directs fear and aversion to the exacerbated exploitation of difference.

Although power presents varied 'forms of appearance', it has elements that are restructured and preserved in relationships, which, according to Han (2019), consist in a subjectivity, a continuity and a domain. Han shows that for power to establish a domain, that is, a horizon within which it is exercised over the relationships that produce reality, it is necessary that the 'wills to be', imputed by each person in relationships, give continuity to the subjectivity that concerns it. From this continuity results the impact of power in processes of subjectivation, as it modulates and reiterates principles that align the ethical constitution of the subjects to the domain of the intended and/or established power, that is, to the subjectivity endemic to the pattern of behaviour instituted by this domain of knowledge-power (Vigarello, 2016; Agamben, 2017).

In Han's perspective, subjectivity expresses a 'will' or 'potency' to be, that is, a principle of affirmation of something or someone. This 'self-affirmation' materializes itself in intersubjective relations ('I' - ego - and 'other' - alter) and may or may not be reiterated through them. That is why he says that power is 'ipsocentric', that means it turns to its own affirmation in the relationship, insofar as the ego is concerned with a self-awareness in relation to the alter and the respective quest to assert itself. The awareness of the 'will to be' and its reiteration in the relationship foster the conditions of emergence and real materialization of the subjectivity to which this will relates, in the form of continuity of signifiers corresponding to it (Han, 2019). Hence the relevance, for this analysis, of considering that social institutions, as collectively forged and embodied signifiers, impact cognitive abilities and disabilities in dealing with difference in intersubjective relationships (Lorde, 1984).

The wills acting in the relations can use the specificities of the differences perceived between ego and alter to recognize the similarities and otherness as much as to deny them or explore them. Considering the ethical principles of use-exploration and use-care, which modulate the dynamics of all intersubjective relations (Agamben, 2017), it is essential to base the impact of social determinations on the dynamics of relations with differences. In the dynamics governed by the traits of the neoliberal society of performance theorized by Han



(2017; 2020), power relations are strongly crossed and ordered by imperatives of competitiveness, optimization, efficiency, acceleration, among others that ignites, or hyper stimulate, the dimension of the use-exploitation of otherness.

The focus on the dynamics of use-exploitation weakens and, not infrequently, violent the dimension of care, by which respect, recognition, affirmation not utilitarian towards difference are expressed. This is mainly because the restriction of relations to the domain of power circumscribed in that dynamic triggers and makes it work signs that conform the processes of subjectivation to the continuity of a mercantile-business subjectivity. This subjectivity is described by Dardot and Laval (2016), Han (2017; 2020), Braz (2021) and other authors as referring to the 'self-entrepreneurial subject'. It is an 'ideal subject' whose ethical principles are based on the slogan of 'unlimited power', and whose subjectivity is materialized in and by the 'real subjects' via institutions that 'program' for the continuous search for success, integral realization, independence, as well as holding them accountable for being (or not) their best version (and the best), for the conquest (or not) of their desires and for the surveillance and exploitation (or not) of themselves and their relationships to optimize and achieve that slogan.

This synthetic view of the social determinants of intersubjective relations informs about one of the modes of appearance of the effects of neoliberal knowledge-power in the management of modes of subjectivation. From this synthesis it is possible to properly conceive how the power relations inscribed in this domain program us to read the differences, understanding that these effects impact on the production of signifiers that attribute to alterity the quality of 'consumable difference'. The consumerist view of difference, for Han (2017), serves the purpose of institutions according to which the purpose of communication is performance aimed at optimizing efficiency, profit, success, personal fulfilment that focuses identity in the occupational dimension, and other signs translated by the author as 'positivities', or 'positived'.

However, it is fundamental to recognize that these are signs that support the hierarchization of the humanities and that, as such, are inconsistent with subjectivities that do not recognize themselves in these relational dynamics, which do not match the 'ideal subject' fostered by it, or even that are violated by it, whether in the form of erasure, invisibility, denial, oppression, exploitation. The differences thus produced are not only transformed into commodities, but also demarcate and reinforce the colonality of power. As recalls the





Equatorian educator Catherine Walsh (2019), the colonial difference is the overshadowed product of policies of subjectivation founded since the subordination of groups, languages and knowledges to the will of power of dominant figures. This subordination generates a pressure that, although lived in unique ways, has in common the establishment of an oppressive, exploitative, violent and marginalizing power domain.

As Han (2020) warns, the subject of performance is unable to relate disinterestedly. Him or her aims the other as a competitor and perceive the difference as a kind of resource available for self-improvement. For this subject, otherness is read not as a constituent element of the subjectivity with which each one relates, but as a 'something more', as an item of consumption that can and should be assimilated and embodied for success in the search for the existential purpose of constant improvement of self.

However, as the investigated theory demonstrates, this improvement does not promote self-knowledge, or an ethics of self-based on care relationships. On the contrary, it is based on the use aimed at exacerbated exploitation, leading to derealization, exhaustion and an ethical constitution of itself subjectively violent and pathological (Marques, 2023, p. 163).

By subjectifying ourselves to this dynamic, we embody relational modes endemic to it, which program us to read and interpret differences not only in a simplistic and dichotomous way (Lorde, 1984), but also consumerist, exploratory and violent (Han, 2017; Walsh, 2019). With this, our cognitive abilities to perceive and understand the functioning of the power devices that instil such dynamics become limited. Hence Han (2017) argues that contemporary communication dynamics promotes the 'erosion of mental faculties', particularly of thought and analysis faculties. As Seligmann-Silva (2013) points out, this dynamics in 'desensitizes' for its effects of knowledge-power in the identity constitution and in the purposes of life. Lorde (1984) sensitizes us to some of these effects in modes of subjectivation, for example, by punctuating her perception of certain pressure for her to choose an aspect of her own that constitutes her (being black, or being lesbian, or being female, or being a mother) and present it as its 'significant whole', denying other parts of itself.

In the context of neoliberal performance societies, however, the pressure perceived by Lorde tends not to deny other 'parts' of itself, but to the simultaneous emphasis on all of them as 'projects' to be constantly improved and optimized. This emphasis concerns the 'pressure for performance' discussed by Han (2020), which incur in what the author names as 'hell of the equal': a relational model for which otherness does not exist, but in the form of consumable and optimized difference. A model that no longer fractionates and limits the ways





of life, but that depletes them by programming the subjects to explore, freely and incessantly, each element that constitutes them. It is the perception and evidence of a subtle, but significant, change in modes of production and social reading of difference, as well as in modes of subjectivation and exercise of knowledge-power.

For the similarity that preserves with the dynamics in question, the neoliberal subject, 'self-entrepreneur', sometimes does not reach to sensitize his perception to the violence he exerts against otherness. For this reason, the subject-target of such violence, that daily experiences them in the skin and that, therefore, becomes hypersensitive to them, tends to be held responsible – or take the responsibility – for communicating it to the one who exercises them. Putting in suspense the complexity of this responsabilization, whose analysis with due attention does not fit the format and scope of this article, I emphasize my agreement with Lorde (1984) when she says that what weakens our ability to form a common knot in the fight against oppressions, violence and hierarchies is rather our reluctance to recognize differences as such and to face their distortions.

I consider that part of our difficulty or 'reluctance' to recognize differences as such is due to the limits of the tools we have at our disposal and which we use to deal with power relations. Even the intersectional perspective, which better enables us for this dealing in scientific work, currently presents weaknesses in respect with the ambiguity of power relations regarding the study of markers of social differentiation (see Kergoat, 2010; Tolentino; Batista, 2019; Curiel, 2020). Such weaknesses tend to unfold in the hierarchization of differences, as a strategy endemic to organizational dynamics by which forms of giving visibility and deepening the demands of certain groups have been constructed, especially in relation to the proportion and intensity of the violence they are subjected to.

This strategy, however, should not displace us from the border position that allows us to perceive and question this ambiguity. Nor should we be content with understanding the dynamics of power to which we are subject, heading towards conformation with the domain of power that uses this ambiguity for its own maintenance. Hence the importance of Walsh's invitation (2019) to rethink the epistemic models that we activate to produce the logics that underlie the construction of our scientific activity, in academia and beyond. Hence also my concern with the undertaking of investigative and interventional exercises that seek to build possibilities to question and think possibilities of extrapolation of disciplinary limits that violate



experiences related to the experiences of movements practices of competence of Physical Education, as I will address next.

PRIMARY CONSIDERATIONS TO DEAL WITH DIFFERENCE IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION

The studies I have been doing about the relations of knowledge-power, as well as its effects on the production of discourses that sustain forms of differentiation and hierarchization in Physical Education, called my attention to the dynamics of organization of BP/PA regarding social markers of difference. A relevant question that regularly crosses me in these studies concerns the ways in which body differences are perceived and signified, as well as the knowledge produced from such meanings, and how differences are triggered to support the discourses that underlie the organization of a particular practice.

The attention to the concerns emerging with these questions has signalled expensive issues for analysis of the modes of bodily subjectivation that I seek to foster in the field. Among these issues, I highlight the social markers of difference, especially gender, sex, sexuality, ability, aesthetic appearance, race and age, as signs of tension and in dispute in the organization of the dynamics by which the experiences of movement are proposed in relation to BP/PA. A factor observed in this regard is the centrality of such markers in the organization of interventions, whose effects of knowledge-power are not so evident. Although, with the proper referrals, the centralization of interventions in the markers of difference is fruitful to promote critical awareness, dialogical learning, as well as modes of solidary subjectivation (Ferreira Neto; Araújo, 2014; Freire, 2017, Freire, 2020) in general. It tends to reinforce the pattern of power previously explained by articulating interventions to the production of consumable differences and the exploitation of differences themselves.

In the context of dance, for instance, the studies of the Brazilian researcher Janete Silva (2023) demonstrate how, despite the technical skills of classical dancers, features of physical appearance and skin colour act with the effect of 'criteria' for the selection of such or which dancer to represent roles in choreographies, or even with the effect of 'predictors' of the artistic-expressive ability (or inability) of the dancers. As for the practice of dance for two, studies such as those developed by the Uruguayan researcher Jose Seara (2021) and the Brazilian researcher Emanuel Carneiro (2022) demonstrate how gender codes and stereotyped behavioural patterns still determine possibilities and impossibilities of practicing the dances





and answer movement needs specific to this practice, especially given the effects of such codes in the regulation of the environments in which it occurs, as well as in the regulation of dance modes legitimized by such codes.

Some effects of knowledge-power observed by Silva (2023) are expressed, for example, in the discomfort arising from the concern of dancers, since childhood, with their acceptance or not by peers. This is because the physicality of the black female body, with characteristics "[...] related to the hue of skin colour, curly hair, thick lips, flat nose and prominent hip [...]" (Silva, 2023, p. 14) contrast with the predominant aesthetic patterns in ballet, forged on the basis of a specific type of female body: "[...] tall, thin, with fine lines, straight, with aligned hair and predominantly white [...]" (Silva, 2023, p. 113). With this, the forms of violence of these bodies – mainly racial, in this case, but not only – are triggered and embodied by complex and sometimes conflicting dynamics by black dancers in their processes of subjective and identity construction.

In turn, Seara (2021) and Carneiro (2022) demonstrate that dance for two still preserves traditions that conformed the differences of sex, gender and sexuality (mainly) to the cisheteronormativity reflex to the patriarchal sexist society. As effects, the spaces in which dance occurs according to this conformation reaffirm codes or patterns of conduct that violate (symbolic, psychological and physically) people whose bodies and affinities are incompatible with them. Men who want to dance with other men in such regulated spaces, for instance, are often targets of interdictions based on simplistic readings and opponents of these differences. The bodies and desires of elderly women are repeatedly made invisible by knowledge-power crossings that objectify them and mean as less attractive than the bodies of younger women.

Despite the ambiguity of knowledge-power relations, the panorama of exemplified studies is presented in the form of barriers and challenges for people to perform BP/PA. This occurs to the extent that such objectifications and interdictions cause negative experiences with the practices, in this case, the dances, often culminating in their abandonment and the blocking to perform similar activities. However, even if they suffer the violence and pressure for conformity imposed by these relations, they also offer resistance and opposition to them, making use, to some extent, of their will to be and, with this, co-exerting power.

Socially, it is important to evaluate to what extent problematizations such as those aimed at by studies of this order – as well as this article –, extend itself (or not) to the dynamics producing the differences themselves and their effects of meaning and truth. This is because,





with this extension, the forces of resistance approach the structural elements that establish the domain of power, favouring subversive and transforming actions. Already internally to the field of Physical Education, in my understanding, it is appropriate to shed light to discussions that allow to conceive the impacts of these effects on the configuration of the BP/PA.

Situate the markers of difference amid the relations of knowledge-power that configure the organizational dynamics of BP/PA (not only dances) has been a fundamental exercise to recognize the limits and potentialities of Physical Education in the transmission of knowledge related to the universe of human body movement experiences. If there is merit in the considerations of the French sociologist Pierre Parlebas (1981; 2020) regarding the structuring of the profession and the scientific field, Physical Education impacts people's lives the better it covers the motor situations and actions and the needs of movement that concern them. By this, he means that it is important to the field to be guided by the dynamics of the situations in which each practice is organized and characterized, as well as by its coextensiveness to the internal configuration of each person.

Contrary to what a simplistic and dichotomized reading of motor skills implies, this exception does not mean ignoring or denying the effects of social determinants, such as the relations of knowledge-power or the markers of difference but stick to this interactivity. This exception converges with the considerations of the Brazilian researcher Jonas Feitosa about the similarities and differences between the bodies and the experiences of people. When investigating the interactional dynamics in the practice of dance for two, Feitosa (2011) highlighted the importance of prioritizing the processes inherent to interaction and communication established between practitioners, as well as the internal (adaptive) processes responsible for enabling such communication.

Feitosa's research, as well as the considerations of Parlebas, is significant to respond to the concerns signalled, because it invites us to shift our attention from differences as principles of organization of the dynamics of interactions between people in the context of a particular BP/PA. With this, it encourages us to question, in the contexts of our interventions, what would serve to better meet the needs of movement that lead people to seek a specific practice, and not another(s)? In the context of contemporary dance for two, the literature demonstrates that relevant issues regarding the markers gender and sexuality have been the object of increasing interest in research (theses and dissertations) conducted in Brazilian higher education institutions, also articulating, in some cases, markers of race and age, mainly.





However, this literature also signals the methodological trend of centralization in issues of gender (specially) to the detriment of fundamental aspects of the dynamics inherent in the dance for two, as warned Feitosa (2011).

Faced with the scenario described so far, the state of the art demonstrated by these research signals the proficiency of resizing the issues of gender, sexuality and, mainly, body in movement in the dance to two. This is because, although they question the restrictions of movements to gender codes and roles and the traditional configuration of dance in pairs, the proposed methodologies tend to reinforce gender and sexuality differences from these markers to organize their practice. That is, even if they deny the traditional codes or seek to denaturalize them, the existing research shows little effectiveness in confronting the oppressions and violence of gender and sexuality in dance, because it intervenes on the threshold of relationships that seek to subvert and sometimes dissociated from elements related to the dynamics of this practice (Feitosa, 2011; Han, 2019; Curiel, 2020).

The set of these research tends to corroborate the central thesis of Feitosa (2011), reinforcing the importance of directing attention to the processes inherent to the practice and to those who perform it more than the dispositions of gender and sexuality. This does not reduce, however, the urgency of problematizing these markers and refuting the differences that concern them as organizing elements of practices, to make it possible to explore alternatives to creative and pedagogical processes in dance.

It should be noted that the state of the art drawled also showed weaknesses and confusion of the researchers regarding basic concepts to adequately address issues crossed by gender, sex and sexuality differences. In the data set, this evidence converges with the weighting of the researcher and the Brazilian researchers Juliana Pelusso and Fabiano Devede (2021), for whom the scarcity of training programs that address issues of this order, especially in the context of higher education, impact on the difficulty of handling such conceptual tools by the professionals. As a result, there is a strong tendency for content pertinent to these issues to be absent from interventions, or that their treatment is inappropriate, given the absence or fragility of the tools that these professionals have face these issues.



EROTICISM AS A TOOL TO APPROACH THE DIFFERENCE IN MOVEMENT EXPERIENCES

In the tangle of research that supports the observations made, I recognize my studies aligned with the efforts of researchers who seek to foster qualified debate about the markers of gender and sexuality in BP/PA, with special investigative interest in dance for two. At the same time, I recognize myself in the efforts theorized by Parlebas and Feitosa. These authors, among others, motivate me to contribute to this debate through tools that enable me – and maybe my peers – to better measure and deepen knowledge about the dynamics that entangles the investigative object to the relations of knowledge-power. In this sense, I have invested in understanding the categories 'eroticism' and 'homoeroticism', as well as in exercises of translation of these for interventions in the field of Physical Education, to measure their potentialities and their lexical limits.

These two conceptual notions have been shown to be useful epistemological tools to conceive interventional possibilities aligned with the central concern outlined in this last topic, that is, to situate the experiences of movement amid the dynamics of production of differentiations and the processes inherent to the needs of movement that lead people to seek such or what bodily activity. It is an effort to transpose the lexical limits of the categories 'gender' and 'sexuality' without, however, ignoring them, in an attempt to articulate the dimension of the subjective constitution to issues such as the restrictions of possibilities of movement.

Like sexuality, as a libidinal pulsion, erotic is inherent in the pulse of life – eros – constituent of each person. It concerns the vital energy of the human being, although it is popularly reduced to something merely sexual or carnal desires. As demonstrated by Lorde (1984), erotic is a vital force that can be used as a resource of power, empowerment and information regarding the recognition and expression of our feelings, desires, emotions. However, the domination of hegemonic power in the West diminished and suppressed erotic, associating it with the depreciation of the feminine and the belief that it is restricted to sensation, pejoratively qualified as confused, trivial, psychotic.

Lorde (1984, p. 54-55) recognizes erotic as an internal feeling of satisfaction, as "[...] a measure between the beginnings of our sense of self and the chaos of our strongest feelings [...]". According to the author, "[...] the erotic is not a question only of what we do; it is a question of how acutely and fully we can feel in the doing. [...]". That is why it activates erotic as a life





force affirmation tool for each person, “[...] of that creative energy empowered, the knowledge and use of which we are now reclaiming in our language, our history, our dancing, our loving, our work, our lives. [...]”. For the author, erotic is often repressed and used as a power strategy, so recognizing and affirming it is a way of resisting the domain of power in question, especially in the search for authentic connections with oneself and with the otherness.

The British researcher Gareth Longstaff (2015; 2019) offers complementary perspectives to those of Lorde when discussing the concept of eroticism in the context of cultural studies and masculinities. For him, socio-sex systems control individuals and populations via reinforce certain ‘sexed eroticism’ conforming to social roles specificities, that is hetero and homosexuality as social markers of differences. “[...] As a result, [...] asymmetrical desires form in the space between both [homo and heterosexual men]; this is where the politics of the erotic occur [...]” (Longstaff, 2019, p. 24). For the analytical treatment of desires and erotic inclinations that permeate interpersonal relationships, especially between men (but not restricted to them), Longstaff (2015; 2019) improves the concept of homoeroticism, conceiving it as ‘shifting discursive construct’ with “[...] potential to negotiate and negate socio-sexual restrictions that exist between men [...]” (Longstaff, 2019, p. 23).

For being funded by ‘nodes’ among homosexuality, heterosexuality, homosociality and homophobia via social codes and signal that feedback into psychic realities (representation and desire interaction), this construct allows to question how libidinal attraction can be accommodated in a domain that does not reduce it to sexual expressions. This discursive shifting is interesting to conceive an ‘erotic of all desire’ that make able to think about the movement necessities of persons beyond existing pre-discursive resources that restrict the experiences of movement to gendered and sexed codes. It is a construct that encompasses the social production of gender and sexuality differences, but also of BP/PA as homosocial spaces: spaces in which desires are highly regulated.

Lorde and Longstaff helps to conceive how gender and sexuality differences, made regulatory and oppressive cultural codes, impact the subjective constitution. These authorships explain that the erotic dimension, that is, the desires, inclinations and personal attractions, the pulsion and passion that motivate us to action and engagement, is often reduced to simplistic and opposing conceptions of ways of relating regulated by gender binaries (female and male) and sexual orientation (hetero or homo). When dealing with the politics of erotic in the regulation of desires and social spaces, Longstaff presents pertinent elements to question how



the sense of self, the perception of personal tastes and pleasures are (or are not) present in the BP/PA practiced by people as resulting from their experiences of movement within a given practice.

From these contributions stems my interest in the conceptual notions of eroticism and homoeroticism as tools to intervene with the needs and experiences of movement in Physical Education, especially in order to reduce the violent effects of power, in so far as it is not possible to eliminate them. In agreement with Walsh (2019), the perspective of these 'other' forms of intervention implies gathering elements that allow to demarcate responsibility with otherness, to build an open epistemological space in which be possible to work to "[...] transgress the borders of what is hegemonic, internal and subalternized [...]" (p. 15).

Whereas the possibilities for action are designed according to real and local situations, I articulated the categories mentioned to actions proposed in a pedagogical experience with teachers in training in the context of a workshop focused on issues regarding body, gender, and sexuality in two-person dance, from my insertion in a public university in southern Brazil. It is a proposal that emerged from the concern with gestures expressed in the bodies that dance together, as well as the impacts of gender and sexuality differences in this expression and in the dynamic established between them. The workshop was held with 12 teachers of Physical Education in training (undergraduate students), with actions designed to sensitize participants to the perception of forms of violence associated with these markers, as well as problematize implications of the internal organization of the dance for two around codes regulated by them. With this, it was possible to address both gender and sexuality issues as well as processes inherent in the dynamics of dancing as a couple and personal and professional experiences crossed by these issues.

This pedagogical proposal emerged at the interface between two ongoing research projects, in which I work directly. These are two research that propose to identify and mitigate the effects of hierarchies that the domination and coloniality of power produce through differentiation, and especially regarding the access and permanence of people marginalized by such hierarchies in bodily practices of competence of Physical Education. The workshop in question was designed from the articulation of methodological elements that enable the implementation of these two research. This pedagogical experience allowed identifying gaps in the participants' academic training not only about gender and sexuality issues, but also the



interaction between bodies that move together in dance and personal barriers to address these issues professionally.

The workshop was organized in three moments and lasted about three hours. The first moment comprised an initial conversation round, to recognize the participants, their interests in the workshop theme, their previous experiences with the dance for two. The next moment was an experimental dynamic of contact and improvisation in pairs. At this time, each participant was invited to share with the group movements present in their daily repertoire and that were considered by each as pleasant or satisfactory. The third moment prioritized the debate about the interaction between bodies in motion and their crossing of gender and sexuality, having as materiality and subsidy for the discussion enunciative series, extracted from specialized literature in dance for two (theses and dissertations). In these series are contemplated experiences and realities lived by practitioners and professionals who face, dispute and/or perceive such crossings.

It is worth noting that the time initially planned for the workshop was one hour and thirty minutes and that the extension of this forecast was in response to the demands presented by the working group, as well as by the reception of different shared experiences and the engagement of all participants in the construction of learning. It is also worth pointing out that, despite the emphases to which each of the three moments of the workshop corresponds, as a moment and space of materialization of a pedagogical process, they are articulated to subsidize the proposal at all. So that the effects or results of this intervention also reflect the organicity and planning dedicated to the dynamics proposed for the achievement of the learning goal.

The discussions involving gender and sexuality started from experiences and situations shared by the group, at first, which were reinforced and complemented, later, with empirics extracted from the literature. Broad and specific themes were guided, such as machismo, misogyny, harassment, homophobia, transphobia, sexualization, objectification, pornography, sensuality. The participants of the working group pointed out that many issues that pervade these themes are still nebulous and little visible in their formative processes, lacking proper referrals. Among the main limitations indicated are: conceptual understanding of these issues, the ability or inability to perceive them in everyday life, as well as to face it in their respective professional contexts.



Although eroticism and homoeroticism were not the objects of the pedagogical intervention materialized by this workshop, they composed the planning and proposed activities, especially as for the second punctuated moment. An activity that was proposed in this specific moment of the workshop that summarizes the ideas outlined in this article regarding these two conceptual notions as tools to work. The participants were required to present a movement that aroused their pleasure, preferably related to aspects of their personalities or was present in their routines, so that each one would recognize in their movement. Subsequently, it was asked that, in pairs, they share their movements with the other person and, from that act, create other movements through a dance that starts from this sharing. This proposition, associated with the ongoing discussions, was given as a way to unveil the existence of an 'erotic dimension of dance'.

This moment of pedagogical experience privileged the experience of dancing for two free, starting not from instructions of gender, but from movements that arouse pleasure or well-being in the person, having as challenge to communicate this sensation to the other person so that they could experience it together, each in their own way. This pedagogical organization, among other possible, aimed to stimulate the perception of the participants, mainly, that the dance of two can be proposed based on elements that do not necessarily refer to codes of gender and sexuality, nor to sexual. It also aimed to sensitize them and stimulate them to the search for pleasure and well-being through the movements that only the practice of two dance makes possible to be performed. With this, it was possible to reinforce the understanding that each practice is organized by its own dynamic that, built from what motivates each person to perform it, which, preferably, can be the positive experiences arising from how the body can move in this or that practice.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR INITIAL REFERRALS

This article emerges from studies that showed the need and importance of fostering debate about the relations of knowledge-power that produce the social markers of difference, especially among teachers in training in Physical Education. From theoretical incursions that support the understanding of these relationships, I sought possibilities to experience the theoretical transposition into local reality, to mediate tools that could face the understanding of differences as hierarchies, as well as BP/PA organizers. This was possible





through a pedagogical experience resulting from a workshop held in a local reality, focusing on issues of body, gender and sexuality that cross the practice of dance for two.

The pedagogical moment in question is exemplifying the limits and potentialities of approaching the markers of differences through specific conceptual tools, of which I highlighted, in this article, eroticism and homoeroticism. In addition, it is worth noting that, as evidenced by the literature that subsidizes this study, this workshop also showed the lack of conceptual and theoretical issues of gender and sexuality. It also showed the interest and proficiency of teachers in training in interventional proposals that seek to articulate such production to its impacts on the invisibilization of founding elements of the BP/PA with which it works, that is, to its organizational specificities, the invitation of this study.

REFERENCES

- AGAMBEN, Giorgio. **O uso dos corpos**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2017.
- BRAZ, Matheus. Viana. **Paradoxos do trabalho**: as faces da insegurança, da performance e da competição. Curitiba, PR: Appris, 2019.
- CARNEIRO, Emanuel Alves. **Belas tardes de domingo**: maturidade e dança no Ceará. 2022. 145f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação). Universidade Federal do Ceará, Fortaleza, CE, 2022.
- CURIEL, Ochy. Construindo metodologias feministas a partir do feminismo decolonial. In: HOLLANDA, Heloísa Buarque (Org.). **Pensamento feminista hoje**: perspectivas decoloniais. Rio de Janeiro: Bazar do Tempo, 2020.
- DARDOT, Pierre; LAVAL, Christian. **A nova razão do mundo**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2016.
- FEITOSA, Jonas Karlos de Souza. **Danças de salão**: os corpos iguais em seus propósitos e diferentes em suas experiências. 2011. 85f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Dança). Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador, BA, 2011.
- FERREIRA NETO, João Leite; ARAÚJO, José Newton Garcia. Gestão e subjetividade no SUS: o enfrentamento de impasses em tempos neoliberais. **Psicologia & sociedade**, v. 26, n. 3, p. 675-684, 2014.
- FREIRE, Francisca Jocélia de Oliveira. **Gancho redondo, puladinho, pião**: repensando as concepções das danças de salão. 2020. 246f. Dissertação (Mestrado Profissional em Dança). Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador, BA, 2020.
- FREIRE, Paulo. **Educação como prática da liberdade**. 40. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 2017.





HAN, Byung-Chul. **Sociedade do cansaço**. 2. ed. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2017.

HAN, Byung-Chul. **No enxame**: perspectivas do digital. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2018

HAN, Byung-Chul. **O que é poder?** Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2019.

HAN, Byung-Chul. **Psicopolítica**: o neoliberalismo e as novas técnicas de poder. 7. ed. Belo Horizonte, MG: Âyiné, 2020.

KERGOAT, Danièle. Dinâmica e consubstancialidade das relações sociais. **Novos estudos CEBRAP**, v. 86, p. 93-103, 2010.

LORDE, Audre. Age, race, class, and sex: women redefining difference. In: LORDE, Audre. **Sister outsider**: essays and speeches. New York, USA: Crossing Press, 1984a.

LONGSTAFF, Gareth Edward. '**Bodies that strut**': impersonality, desire, *jouissance* and the gay male subject in contemporary media. 2015. 257f. Tese (Doutorado em Arte e Cultura). Universidade de Newcastle, Newcastle, England, 2015.

LONGSTAFF, Gareth Edward. Masculinity and homoeroticism. In: GOTTZEN, Lucas; MELLSTROM, Ulf; SHEFER, Tamara (Eds.). **Routledge international handbook of masculinity studies**. London, England: Routledge, 2019.

MARQUES, João Paulo. Processes of bodily subjectivation and health-illness in performance society: psychopolitics, acceleration of life and self-care. 2023. 184f. Dissertation (Master in Physical Education). State University of Maringá, Maringá, PR, 2023.

PARLEBAS, Pierre. **Contribution à un lexique commenté en science de l'action motrice**. Paris, France: INSEP, 1981.

PARLEBAS, Pierre. Educación física y praxiología Motriz. **Conexões**, v. 18, p. 1-8, 2020.

PELLUSO, Juliana; DEVIDE, Fabiano Pries. Educação física escolar, raça e gênero: uma reflexão interseccional sobre as masculinidades negras. In: DEVIDE, Fabiano Pries; BRITO, Leandro Teofilo (Orgs.). **Estudos das masculinidades na educação física e no esporte**. São Paulo: nVersos, 2021.

PRADO, Vagner Matias do. Transmasculinidades no esporte. In: DEVIDE, Fabiano Pries; BRITO, Leandro Teofilo (Orgs.). **Estudos das masculinidades na educação física e no esporte**. São Paulo: nVersos, 2021.

SEARA, Jose Manuel Alvarez. **Las danzas de salón tango y samba en las ciudades de Buenos Aires, Montevideo y San Pablo, desde una perspectiva de género y diversidad**. 2001. 116f. Tese (Doutorado em Lazer). Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, MG, 2021.

SELIGMANN-SILVA, Edith. Psicopatologia e saúde mental no trabalho. In: MENDES, Rene. **Patologia do trabalho**. 3. ed. São Paulo: Atheneu, 2013.





SILVA, Janete Cristina da. **O corpo feminino negro no balé clássico**: questões raciais, relações de poder e marcadores sociais de diferença. 2023. 143f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação Física). Universidade Estadual de Maringá, Maringá, PR, 2023.

TOLENTINO, Juliana Gonçalves; BATISTA, Nicole Faria. Gênero, sexualidade e decolonialidade: reflexões a partir de uma perspectiva lésbica. **Revista três pontos**, v. 14, n. 1, p. 46-51, 2017.

VIGARELLO, Georges. **O sentimento de si**: história da percepção do corpo, séculos XVI-XX. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2016.

WALSH, Catherine. Interculturalidade e decolonialidade do poder: um pensamento e posicionamento "outro" a partir da diferença colonial. **Revista Eletrônica da Faculdade de Direito da Universidade Federal de Pelotas**, v. 5, n. 1, p. 6-38, 2019.

Dados do primeiro autor:

Email: a.marques.jp@gmail.com

Endereço: Universidade Estadual de Maringá, Departamento de Educação Física, Avenida Colombo, 5790, Maringá, PR, CEP: 87020-900, Brasil.

Recebido em: 01/07/2024

Aprovado em: 01/08/2024

Como citar este artigo:

MARQUES, João Paulo. Difference and eroticism in movement experiences on physical education. **Corpoconsciência**, v. 28, e17994, p. 1-20, 2024.

