



4th International Conference on
Public Policy (ICPP4)
June 26-28, 2019 – Montréal

Panel T06-P05 Session 1

*"Governance of Intersectoral Policies with the Population:
Illusions and Reality"*

*Evaluation and transversal public policies:
race, gender and sexual diversity*

Regina Laisner

São Paulo State University

regina.laisner@unesp.br

Date of presentation

June 26th, 2019



**Keywords: Evaluation. Race. Gender. Sexual diversity. Public policy.
Brazil.**

Introduction

It is notable that the recognition of the importance of evaluation as a fundamental part of the analysis of public policies is growing. This is essential, both for the policy makers themselves and their beneficiaries, so that it is possible to measure the most diverse effects of the policies and their respective programs. In order for this task to be successful, apart from dedicating itself to finding appropriate and refined methods and analysis tools, it is necessary to reflect on the meaning of evaluations as something that, beyond a technical sense, has a political meaning, much more complex and demanding: a democratic sense in terms of the construction of citizenship.

The construction of citizenship, in modern times and in increasingly fragmented and complex societies, has demanded more refined tools in order to face their demands and needs (Brugué, 2008). So, as Fraser (2006) affirms, demands for "recognition of difference" that were raised with more force since the end of the century for the struggles by organized groups.

With the perspective of contributing to this debate, this research, developed in the NEPPs – "Núcleo de Estudos em Políticas Públicas" (Center of Studies in Public Policies) of the São Paulo State University (UNESP/Brazil), proposes to present an evaluation tool capable of exploiting transversal dimensions that corresponds to questions of race, gender and sexual diversity, in the Brazilian case.

In general, the policies on which evaluations are made are sectoral, embedded in a restricted context of analysis, closed to the respective managers, while in practice, the issues surrounding the struggle for citizenship are much broader and cross-cutting. So, in this communication, we seek to propose an evaluation format that considers the various dimensions proposed, as well as the ideas and interests of the respective actors involved.

From this point of view, the broader perspective that marks this research is presented by the understanding that each of these dimensions are established by a process of social construction: social and historical construction of identities that is always collective result, not without conflicts, but nothing natural. Taking this perspective into account, the work will be



presented in two main parts. A first, where race, gender and sexual diversity will be defined, at least in terms of essential indicators, so that it will be possible to specify questions related to each of the dimensions postulated in an evaluation, as well as their connections, in the presented context. In the second part, having this conceptualization as reference, a set of social dimensions will be proposed as a basis for the development of a concrete evaluation tool that includes race, gender and sexual diversity transversally in the social policies of the state and federal levels from the Brazilian government.

Defining race, gender and sexual diversity

The concept of race was developed in Europe within the biological sciences and appropriated as a social explanation during the nineteenth century in positivist studies that tried to define whether population biological determinants were obstacles or contributions to development.

Racial theories supported several nationalist ideologies which were inspired by European liberalism and positivism and developed studies that demonstrated the psychic degeneration of blacks and mestizos and their strong tendency towards crime and their inability to conform to European civilization norms, as in Brazil, in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century. An example of this, in the Brazilian case, was the anthropology work of coroner and psychiatrist Nina Rodrigues in Salvador, whose inspiration was taken from the Italian studies about race. She analyzed black bodies and was immersed in black culture and this resulted in the recommendation of a criminal law applied to black people particularities, because they suffered from the evil of crime. (Rodrigues, 1935)

According to Quijano (2005), the formation of America is closely linked to the construction of social and historical identities that have resulted in the social classification of the population. This classification consists of a pyramid in which the black is in the economic base, followed by the indigenous, who also forms part of the labor force, though he is still seen as someone provided with humanity, and on top there is white population. The construction of this dichotomy between the black as basis of the economy and the white as a dominator was part of a classification marked by race discourse, which defined labor relations, what is seen as culture and the organization of a social hierarchy. Thus, as part of a “civilizational myth”



**4th International Conference on
Public Policy (ICPP4)
June 26-28, 2019 – Montréal**

(Quijano, 2005), race was a social and cultural individual determinant, in which the white race was superior and responsible of govern society, assuring the civilization triumph around the new world.

In Brazil, the mimicry of the elites in relation to European bourgeois, liberal and scientific thought not only laid down guidelines for the end of slave labor, but also it naturalized the discourse that black and mestizo individuals, whether slaves of free, were obstacles to national development, which led Brazil's post-abolition leaders to start whitening policies through European immigration as a key to Brazilian modernization process (Hasenbalg, 1979).

The end of slavery imposed by England was not part of the humanization of exploited black bodies, but the perception that in order to expand industrial capitalism it was necessary to increase the consumption demand and it would only be possible with paid citizens, that is, that had purchasing power. The replacement of African labor force by the European one represented a change of look at the working class: what was previously an unpaid individual, is now seen as a paid one. And according to Quijano (2005), the back body is America has always been related to slavery, to free unpaid work, whilst white work labor has always been seen as deserving of monetary reward. Thus, the liberation of the blacks was not a strategy for the blacks to be paid, but to open space to the paid worker, the white one, this one belonging to the new post-abolition order and representing a sign of development.

Therefore, the race enters human history as an instrument of domination forged by Europeans to justify an exploitation system and the universalization of a view that imposes the European knowledge model as the superior one. And, thus, it means a set of hereditary characteristics that allows group divisions and that is not only related to physical characteristics, but also to cultural and ideological essence. Differently from the term ethnicity, that defines physical and cultural diversity among groups and helps to describe and interpret individuals in a more flexible way according to Guimarães (2002), this expansion does not happen when it regards to non-European people, whose descriptions always convey to a fixed idea of culture and behavior. Due to this reason we decided to work with the concept of race, because Brazil is a racialized society and it needs to be analyzed such as it is, as the black movement itself supports.



**4th International Conference on
Public Policy (ICPP4)
June 26-28, 2019 – Montréal**

Indeed, 130 years after slavery abolition in Brazil there are still deep position and treatment asymmetries between black and white people in the social and economic dynamic of the country. At the same time, it is necessary to comprehend the variations in the Brazilian case.

Black individuals became a large part of the population contingent of citizens due to the end of slavery, what made it a big challenge to construct a national identity that obeyed the principles of purity disseminated by European pseudoscience from a reality of complex ethnical and cultural diversity (Munanga, 1999). Thus, in order to develop themselves as citizens into a racialized society, black people had to accept and submit themselves to an hegemonic point of view about their place in society and how they should behave to be accepted.

This behavior helps to understand that the “black being” is not part of a dark-skinned individual’s construction, but it is rather an identity position created by the white in face of the non-European nations, as Fanon points (2008). The denial of the “other” that is physically and culturally different is part of the process of constructing European identity and self-perception. The dichotomous relation of identity construction ends up creating a hierarchy that justifies the need for superiors to become tutors of inferiors, which ultimately justifies subservience.

Moreover, once they were categorized as the antithesis of civilized white, black usually look for a « runaway of being black » as a survival strategy, what means a pursuit for a white ideal in order to recover their self-esteem (Fanon, 2008).

Historically, the amount of white people in Brazil was lower than the number of black people, what led to the use of mestizos in intermediary positions in the social and economic chain of command. Due to this fact, white fathers used to manumit the mestizo children they had with black slaves, so, they could occupy leading positions in the chain command (Munanga, 1999). This practice has created a distinction among blacks, mestizos, creoles or mulattoes.

A different situation can be seen in the dynamics of the United States of America, where the amount of white people was larger given the demand of checkpoints and, then, where the perception of blacks was much more radicalized. The racist law that applied until 1960 was known as « one drop rule » and it determined that regardless of the individual’s skin color, if he/she possessed a drop of African blood in his/her ancestry, he/she would be considered black, what made the construction of a common identity easier.

The “black being” that Fanon (2008) addresses refers to the expected behavior, to the social position, to the cultural and social habits of the individual and to the black skin,



**4th International Conference on
Public Policy (ICPP4)
June 26-28, 2019 – Montréal**

obviously. In Brazil, the degree of the coloration was added to this relation, this is, how much black the person is had influence. A social imaginary of distinction between black and mestizos was created, so that the clearer the skin, the higher its capacity to reproduce civility, the proportionally opposite quality of darker subjects, those who were farther from the civility ideal.

Thus, the concept of miscegenation in Brazil was called “colorismo” by the black social movement and it was one of the factors for the greater demobilization of the antiracist struggle since it promoted a valuation hierarchy and a rupture with the feeling of solidarity between the freed mestizos and the enslaved blacks by differentiating the blacks among themselves (Munanga, 1999). Besides that, Sueli Carneiro (2004) argues that this distinction reinforced the ideals of whitening the population and helped repressing the inscription of the identity of the black population in Brazilian society.

Those considerations help us to improve our understanding about the racial question in the country, from its social and economic formation, to its more recent re-readings, that is, from a perspective of social construction of the race. It allows a broader, deeper and more dynamic view that facilitates the task of constructing evaluative tools in terms of a citizenship perspective.

On the same direction, it is urgent to discuss the gender issue. As long as the discussion about the condition of women gained space in several areas new reflections emerged about the terms inserted in that universe and their meanings. The first discussions about the origin of inequality between men and women appropriated expressions such as “difference of the sexes” in their first contextualization and, later, they began to question possible naturalizations that could be results of the terms used. Due to that, they frequently spoke of “social construction of the sexes”, which shows such differentiation as a result of social construction (Collin, 2009).

The patriarchy is a structure taken as universal and it was formed as the representation of this conjuncture. It includes relations, institutions, rules and norms and it is ruled by the logic of male domination. Besides that, the patriarchy would be accommodated as a system resulting from historical processes that had at their core the subordination of women to men. This term is very important because it exposes a system that is orientated towards inequality and it has been used to base theoretical discussions for a long time.



**4th International Conference on
Public Policy (ICPP4)
June 26-28, 2019 – Montréal**

Nevertheless, due to its universal and general characteristics that are related to the time and place where it happens and to its structure which is made of physical differences between men and women, the patriarchy has also been questioned in what holds its limitations.

Then, the idea of gender emerged from the 1980s as a new way of understanding these relationships by denying a possible “biological fundamentalism” and by proposing another understanding about how the male and female notions could contribute to the perpetuation of dichotomies as well as to assume the existence of an invariable and universal system (Piscitelli, 2002).

Starting from this point, several intellectuals dedicated themselves to build this term by trying to suppress the gaps presented to the notion of patriarchy and by looking for the origin of this oppression against women. In this process, some researchers stood out because they developed theories that became references and that added new graduations to the concept, such as Gayle Rubin, Joan Scott and Judith Butler in the United States, Rose Marie Muraro in Brazil and Alda Facio Montejó in Latin America.

The American thinker Gayle Rubin stood out as a reference in the 1980s when she developed the notion of the sex and gender system disassociating the biological and cultural side which would be the system responsible for transforming the biological women in a product women, domesticated ones, in her viewpoint (Rubin, 1993). Moreover, according to the historian Joan Scott gender should not operate just as a descriptive tool of the universal context that would apply to any context, but as an analytical tool that escapes from the dualism between the masculine and the feminine. In her opinion, it is important to understand that all these notions are socially constructed (Senkevics, 2012).

The third mentioned author, Judith Butler, has an even wider view towards gender. The intellectual denies identities as fixed categories and she points out that gender should designate the production apparatus, the discursive and cultural way through which sexed nature, or “natural sex”, is produced and established as pre-discursive (Piscitelli, 2002). Besides the order that imposes a specific behavior, the possibility of expressing the gender freely is seen as a fundamental right, as Queer Theory proposes.

Rose Marie Muraro was a feminist pioneer in Brazil in the 1970s that built her legacy by participating in social movements and gender studies. She used to question social bourgeoisie



**4th International Conference on
Public Policy (ICPP4)
June 26-28, 2019 – Montréal**

norms where she was inserted, and it was due to her dedication to gender discussions in society that Brazil began to put feminist thematic guidelines in its policies. She introduced the class aspect into gender studies. Also, she contributed to the consolidation of feminist ideas and of social rights and she was innovative in discussing extensively topics still considered taboo at that time, such as female sexuality.

The last author quoted here is the Latin American lawyer and writer Alda Facio Montejo. She was born in Costa Rica and she made lectures about the incorporation of the perspective of gender into Law, into Human Rights and into International Law in several Latin American universities. She talks about the possibility of achieving equality between the genders and she believes that it is impossible, unless the basic concepts of the western legal logic are redefined, such as human being, citizenship, equality to men and women, equality under the law. All these concepts are wrongly based on the centrality of the white, middle class and straight man.

Based on that and on such authors viewpoints, we decided to use the concept of gender as a social construction because it is out of the biological dualism between the masculine and the feminine. We affirm here that this analytical category must not be used as a justification to inequalities, but it must be used to describe the participatory reality of women in public policies. In Brazil, government and society can be described as patriarchal and male chauvinist and they created management, political, legal and social structures that segregate women from any decision-making and egalitarian role in the most diverse spheres of society, just as it happens to Black population.

Due to this, it urges to point that the struggle of women to decrease the asymmetry in the relationship with men became stronger around the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and it spread throughout the last century, until it reached its apex in the 1960s, when it has been marked by a broad revolution in the field of social customs. Women's demands and struggles for civil, political and social rights have been taking place in Brazil for many years.

By choosing this concept, we address the importance of analyzing and understanding gender not as something immutable and unquestionable, but as a term that is still improving in order to reach a wider view of sexual differentiation and of the one that involves it. As the concept itself becomes more inclusive and a pattern to affirmative actions and public policies of the most recent governors in the country, it implies the inclusion of women and of unusual



**4th International Conference on
Public Policy (ICPP4)
June 26-28, 2019 – Montréal**

identities and it follows towards the construction of a transversal social conjuncture that has less aggressive norms and expectations.

So, we understand it is understood that whether the structure hegemonically projects powers to male gender and, therefore, is a social construction, its transforming potential can be assumed. Besides that, feminism has a lot of shapes and methodological orientations. But, in general, it embraces these notions by showing itself as a large movement that spreads through social, political, philosophical spheres and that argues that change is a possibility in gender relations. Feminism is a political subject who commits to this process, as well as the LGBTI+ population.

Understanding LGBTI+ population (lesbians, gays, bisexuals, transsexuals, transvestites, transgenders and intersexes) around the world is a challenge because gender and sexuality studies are brand new and there is not official data about neither their living conditions, nor about how many people carry these characteristics. These factors make it tougher to plan adequate public policies to them. There are also regional specificities that are important to this discussion, since the social construction processes that are involved in the formation of the society and in its moral norms and values affect those living conditions, mainly when they are related to prejudice.

Furthermore, there are also gender, race and social class differences that are extremely important when you live into a capitalist system with sexist and slaver roots. These are the characteristics that make a cross-sectional perspective essential for the understanding of reality. In order to do that, we will take the Brazilian situation as a base, because it would need much space and much larger study to talk about all the countries which are far from being equals, but that share several historical aspects, such as slavery, Christian background, indigenous genocide, etc. Even so, there are many things they have in common that we can point to and, besides, Brazil sometimes is seen as a reference in the region.

In this sense, there are many recent scientific studies that use queer theory, because it is understood that gender, sexuality and the body itself are social constructions that do not exist outside the discourse. Larissa Pelúcio (2012) argues that nowadays Brazil is one of the most important in this academic field, even though there are some problems. However, such studies do not reach public policies, since Brazilian laws and public policies do not follow these conceptions in general. Rather, they are mostly based on the view that sex is something natural



and gender is something that is socially constructed. Thus, these are the explanations that are linked to the broader perspective that bases this work and, for instance, they can also be found in São Paulo government materials.

According to this vision, human sexuality is a blend of biological, psychological and social factors (Governo do Estado de São Paulo, 2017) and it is formed by complex processes. It is made of biological sex, that is, a set of genetic information that constitute fondling and the primary and secondary characteristics that differentiate male and female. It is important to keep in mind that there are intersex people, those who were born with a combination of male and female biological characteristics, in different graduations. Besides that, this definition allows the perception that biological characteristics are not related to the gender with which the person identifies, since this is a construction.

On the other hand, the sexual orientation or the sexual condition is the affective and sexual attraction that the person has in relation to others, that is, the desire for emotional or sexual involvement. The mostly known one (and that is put as a rule) is heterosexuality whose definition is a person that feels attraction towards people from the opposite gender, in an almost exclusive graduation. Furthermore, homosexuals are divided in lesbian women and gay men and these are people who like people from the same gender, in an almost exclusive graduation.

Historically, the term homosexual has been used for the first time by a Hungarian doctor in 1869, when homosexual relations were criminalized in Germany. In 1970, another doctor, Carl Westphal, wrote a book that described this social identity as an “inversion” regarding sexuality, behavior and character. Gays and lesbian were victims of treatments, hospitalizations, imprisonment and other types of repression based on that sort of pathological view (Mikolsci, 2007). This discourse has been the mostly important vision about the issue for almost a century. It began to change in the 1960s when the Stonewall revolution happened, as we will discuss below (Mikolsci, 2007).

Another term that passed through a change of meaning is bisexuality and there is still a broad discussion about its use. Shrini Eisner (2013) comes up with a definition based in Robyn Ochs vision in which the bisexual person likes and loves people of more than one gender, not necessarily in the same intensity and not necessarily at the same time. This definition seeks to include the multitude of gender experiences within the spectrum of desire by replacing an old view that imposed on bisexuality the man/women binarism (Eisner, 2013). There are also



people that identify as pansexuals, polisexuals and omnisexuals¹ with all the terms referring to similar processes.

At last, there are asexual people, who do not experience sexual attraction even though they can feel affective attraction (Cerankowski; Milks, 2010). Studies about asexuality still are very rare and the ones that exist are focused in few scientific areas, apart from the challenges of reference they found even within investigations about sexuality.

A third aspect that has influence on sexuality is gender identity, that is, the gender that the person identifies with. It is the individuals' comprehension of their belonging in the categories of men, women, in the blend of the two or in none of them and it is different from sexual orientation (Governo..., 2017). According to Berenice Bento (2008: 18-19), “[...] a transexualidade é uma experiência identitária, caracterizada pelo conflito com as normas de gênero².”

To sum up, the comprehension about the characteristics that determine who is man and who is woman varies according to the culture and due to that gender is a product of social reality instead of being a simple combination of biological aspects, as Margareth Mead pointed in the 1930s (Piscitelli, 2009).

So, a large part of the population is cisgender, that is, those who identify with the gender that has been assigned to them when they were born. The other part is transgender, those who have a different gender than the one that was assigned to them based on their genitals when they were born (Jesus, 2012). According to Jesus (2012), there are many views about the term transgender in Brazil, because while some think it is a different category of transvestite and transsexual, others prefer to use other names, such as androgynous, non-binary or queer. Berenice Bento (2008) takes Judith Butler (1990) as a base and argues that transsexuality, transvestibility and transgender are expressions of identity that clash with gender norms that are founded on dimorphism, heterosexuality and idealizations.

On the other hand, it is important to remember that the difference between the terms transvestite and transsexual in Brazil was created by the Medicine, into a pathological background. To its point of view, transvestites were those who took hormonal medicine, but

¹ Nowadays there is a broad discussion about the concept of bisexuality because it has a historical connection to binarism, and this is one of the reasons why many people have chosen other identities to name their experiences. On the other hand, bisexuality can be used as an umbrella term that includes all non-monosexual experiences.

² “Transsexuality is an identity experience that is marked by conflict with gender norms” – free translation.



did not wish to submit to surgeries, while transsexual women wanted to withdraw their penises. Transsexuality is also called gender dysphoria and it was classified as a pathology on the International Classification of Diseases (ICD) until last year and although it is not a disease in the list anymore, transsexual people continue to be stigmatized, especially the poorest blacks and mestizos and those who live by prostitution.

At last, gender role or gender expression are terms that are used to explain social behaviors that are culturally defined as “women stuff” or “men stuff”, such as physical appearance. These definitions change when the society changes, when history changes, and they adapt to the new social understandings and to the knowledge embedded by society.

Thus, Brazilian society carries its own values and signs and its specific standards, above all. These standards help to understand social relations, because societies are dynamic and changeable. In other words, the current way society comprehends social relations has changed in the last decades. However, since Brazil does not have policies to discuss these issues in schools, the common Brazilian citizen does not know how to differentiate the presented aspects (biological sex, sexual orientation and gender identity) and this contributes to increase prejudice.

Precisely by that, it is urgent to study traditional societies and its changes. When the matter is diversity, for instance, several peoples used to recognize the different experiences, that were beyond cisgender heterosexuality, such as the two-spirit indigenous in North America³. Nevertheless, the traditional peoples began to change their way of thinking and to have prejudice through the European colonization process, which base was a European and Christian thought. Later, the strengthening of globalization reinforced those changes. Therefore, terms like race, sex and gender worked as structures of domination (Barbosa; Maso, 2014). As Dias (2001) maintains, the greatest source of prejudice against LGBTI+ community is religion. It had, and it still does, a way of controlling the sexuality by supporting the idea that sexual relations must involve man and woman and they must have reproductive purposes. This idea also had influence on women freedom in the whole America.

According to Facchini (2011), the movement to question these patterns started in the 1940s, when the Center for Culture and Recreation of Netherlands tried to deconstruct

³ Other examples include *Shudo* practice in ancient Japan and the existence of a third gender in India, personified in the Hijras.



homosexuality bad image by publishing the *Levensrecht* magazine (right to live, in a free translation). Whilst a similar movement took place in the United States, with groups as the Mattachine Society and the Daugher of Bilits (Facchini; França, 2009). However, the LGBTI+ Pride Day and month were established due to the Stonewall Revolution date. Stonewall Inn was a pub whose customers were mostly LGBTI+ people, especially those who were outside social patterns. On June 29th, 1969, the police invaded the pub and that action generated a conflict between the customers and the police that took three days to end.

In Brazil, the first actions to defend homosexuality were not in politics, but they included magazines, such as *O Snob* (from 1963 to 1969) and the Brazilian Association of Gay Press (from 1967 to 1968) (Facchini, 2005). However, the homosexual movement in Brazil began to have a political aspect in the 1970s, in the same period of the Military Dictatorship.

To summarize, there are to essential points that need to be drafted in order to link this debate with race and gender ones that were previously presented. First, the transversality as a strategic look because it is different being a white and middle-class lesbian and being a peripheral black gay. And, second, the importance of social participation as a model of social control, because many community achievements were reached due to the hard struggle in search of rights and of citizenship.

Social aspects as a basis for a transversally evaluation with race, gender and sexual diversity

Generally speaking, the perspective that regards these three aspects of the social life is introduced by the comprehension that they are established through a process of social construction: construction of the social and historical identities that lead to patterns that are commonly considered natural. But the cultures tend to be portrayed by virtue of the process of interaction, a product of the social environment and which is responsible for excluding the “essentiality of an authenticity or purity inherent to the cultures” Bhabha (2000). Therefore, the construction of the identity is symbolic and social, and the struggle for the affirmation of one or other identity or difference is always a collective result, which does not come without conflicts, but nothing natural.



**4th International Conference on
Public Policy (ICPP4)
June 26-28, 2019 – Montréal**

Based on these statements, we realize the importance of two fundamental dimensions, when it comes to approach each of these aspects, which are *identity* and *difference*.

According to Woodward (2000), the definition of identity has a strong bond with “difference” and the symbols that help to identify that difference. In that way, the construction of the identity is as symbolic as social and struggles to reinforce identities or the differences among them has material consequences. For example, “men tend to build positions-of-subject to the women taking themselves as reference point. The only mention to women in this case is to the “girls” they “dated.” In this way, women are “the significant of a shared masculine identity, but now fragmented and rebuilt, forming distinguished national identities, opposed.” (Woodward, 2000, p. 10-11). In this case, not only different, but inferior. We realized, thus, that the identity is relational and marked by symbolic differences, but also it is linked the social and material conditions, and defines through the senses and the practice who is included and who is excluded, also living out, in practice, the differentiations.

Woodward (2000) considers that the new social movements which were created in the 1960s brought identity issue as the main flag of their organizations. According to the author, those collective constructions that had been based on the logic of class were questioned and, so, those movements were best defined by identity politics since they were deeply marked by worries about identity: the cultural identity of people who belong to certain oppressed or marginalized group, how this identity is formed and how it can be questioned (Woodward, 2000).

Thus, this identity becomes an important mechanism of struggle that happens in two forms, at least: by the uniqueness of the group, which can, on one hand, lead to an essentialist character or, on the other hand, it can rightly oppose to it by showing that identities are fluid. Anyway, this conception opposes to class reductionism and other fixed categories, it allows the recognition of the complexity of differences and, above all, it questions fixity as something natural. Wherefore, class is still an important reference in the process of constructing identities, it is not the only one.

Bhabha (2000) quotes Fanon to mention this desperate search for pre-ranking and pre-identification of people, whether by class, by race or by ethnicity. This attitude is a denial of the complexity of identities and that is why Fanon would say that neither black is, nor white is. Bhabha (2000) also quotes Fanon to explain the three conditions within the process of



**4th International Conference on
Public Policy (ICPP4)
June 26-28, 2019 – Montréal**

identification: 1) existing is to be called into existence in relation to otherness; 2) the very place of identification is a space of division and 3) the question of identity is never a pre-given identity. It is always the production of an identity image and the transformation of the subject due to that image.

Because of that, Bhabha (2000) allows us to take a step further in the debate about identity insofar as it not only posits that the construction of identity is given in relation to the other and is dynamic, but it is also given in the relation itself. In this case, it does not only address the image of the individual, or the sign, because it would empty the self as a place of identity and autonomy. It reveals a symbolic consciousness, its meaning, the ways in which it is more relevant because it gives identity its integrity and unity. Thus, it draws attention to the dynamism and depth of the composition of identity. The image is just an accessory of identity; therefore, it should never be the appearance of reality. That avoids the pitfall of working with a homogenizer notion of the other and it questions the discursive place from where identities are strategically and individually placed.

Therefore, it is noted that the questions pervade the identity debate can be deeper than the mere absence of difference. Joan Scott (2005) deals with the question of identity in terms of paradoxes, which makes the reflection on the intelligibility of *equality* and *difference* of individual and group rights, as fundamental, so it must be debated together in order to not lose their interconnections

At first, according to the author, the question is driven to the identity of groups and the fragmentation of their representations. Hence, we see two distinct and conflicting views: one sees individuals in an individual way, different from the attribution of one group; and the other view considers that the framing of individuals into groups guarantees greater possibilities of justice in society.

Thinking on elaborating certain policies or measures that aim to eliminate the discrimination, raises the problematic of how to establish the parameters to define which groups of individuals require more attention and special measures. Thus, the problem of equality in terms of group *vs* individuals is questioned as a paradox, for example, the individual autonomy of a black or gay man is only possible through the recognition of his or her own group, and at the same time his autonomy is limited by the group's own standards, something that the jurist Martha Minow has called the "dilemma of difference."



**4th International Conference on
Public Policy (ICPP4)
June 26-28, 2019 – Montréal**

To escape from this dilemma, it is necessary to consider that equality and difference do not present themselves as opposing concepts, but interdependent, and it should be analyzed in its own political compositions, rather than in a moral and timeless way.

Those groups may not reduce the role of the individual by creating stereotypes. A good example comes from feminism, which even being linked to several strands, it follows the same logic. Even not contemplating the choice of some women, the feminist struggle stands for all of them. Thus, the fight against discrimination both refuses and accepts group identities, on which discrimination is based. So on, equality is not the elimination of difference, but the recognition of difference and the choice to ignore or take it into account. Therefore, it is an act of choice, which some differences can be minimized, and others maximized.

The group identity seems to be inevitable in a social and political environment, according to certain differences. This set of differences may favor one group rather than the other, creating tensions between them. Minority groups are not necessarily bonded to the number of individuals belonging to them. They arise through a process of social definitions that are modulated through a process of political or economic differentiation. Scott's argument is that the tension between group and individual identities cannot be resolved, since they are the consequence of how the differences are used to organize social life. The better way to analyze it is relativizing the issues on individual and group identities, understanding how these processes that often produce the absence of equity and differentiation have emerged, considering them part of political and social processes. Therefore, equality must be understood in paradoxical terms, in order to balance opposing interests, seeking to comprehend under which contexts and circumstances these groups and their rights fit together, considering identity as a complex process and susceptible to change, having the politics as a way of negotiating with identities differences, in order to approximate the principles of justice and equality.

This approach becomes possible, according to this works perspective, throughout the analysis of dimension of *recognition*. Taking Fraser (2006) viewpoint as a start, the debate about recognition is based on the initial understanding of two generic prepositions of injustice. The first one is economic injustice which is at the heart of the economic political structure of society. Some examples might include the exploitation in which one is expropriated in relation to its own work; the economic marginalization in which one is submitted to an undesired and



**4th International Conference on
Public Policy (ICPP4)
June 26-28, 2019 – Montréal**

poorly paid job or even the lack of access to any job; and the hardship that is related to inaccessibility to an adequate material standard of living.

Such perspective of economic injustice necessarily leads the concept of class. The theme of class has always permeated the debate on the most diverse social issues, and it is often seen as the main dimension of the current problems. Classes will classify different groups within society so their identification with others of the same social situation is possible. They are defined by Montaña and Doriguetto (2010) as social groups that are neither marked by hereditary issues, nor are marked by law or special privileges. Rather, they are strictly differentiated by the economic question, whether by differences of market or by production. Nevertheless, the same authors recognize that it is necessary to take the specific historical and geographical contexts into consideration since they classify individuals not only according to their part into productive processes, but also due to their part in market and to their living conditions.

The concept of class can't be ignored in any social life analysis. Regarding the central concepts of this paper, which are race, gender and sexual diversity, it won't be ignored too, since the differences of class certainly go through the problems linked to these concepts, especially in Brazilian case. It happens that in this paper due to its field of vision, the class concept won't be part of its analysis axis. At least, it won't be part in a central way. This perspective refers to the second injustice concept of Fraser (2006), that relates to the cultural or symbolic injustice, which it would manifest in social standards of communication, representation, and interpretation. From these standards that builds the cultural dominations, which individuals are submitted to standards associated to another culture, hidden by the process of invisibility or disrespected and defamed as being less in their parameters.

In face of it, it is possible to highlight the given example of Angela Davis (2006) that talks about the beginning of struggle for women in United States in her book "Women, Race and Class". In many ways, it made the struggle of poor white women and black women impossible. The main point of this book is notice how white, middle-class and high-class women were in a privileged position in relation to black women or poor women, that, hence, were not able to propose guidelines and demands from other social groups.



**4th International Conference on
Public Policy (ICPP4)
June 26-28, 2019 – Montréal**

In Fraser's opinion (2006) the policy of recognition is the best way to fight these injustices, just as the policy of redistribution is to combat the economic injustices. This redistribution can involve democratically control of investment, reorganization of division of labor, income redistribution or other ways of transformation of basic economic structures. While the policy of recognition is related to the valorization of cultural diversity of certain cultural products (stigmatized) and identities (depreciated).

However, to the author, it would take to the dilemma of redistribution-recognition, once that the goals of these policies are often antagonistic. Therefore, these movements for justice would be commonly interfering in each other. Whereas the movement for recognition would call attention to the specificities of certain group or would even create these specificities and differences in order to forge a group differentiation with high value, the redistribution would be struggling with differences in search of equality.

In doing so, it is evident the importance of social classes debate to Fraser, who tries to equalize the shock between redistribution and recognition, because she understands that the policies that she calls of redistribution would also reach the recognition goal in the justice perspective if they were successful.

Honneth (2003) is an important reference within the scope of this work regarding a better understanding of the social structures of recognition. The author seeks his inspiration in Hegel to make his notes and highlights three important aspects to be understood: 1) the formation of the practical ego would be linked to the idea of mutual and reciprocal recognition between two subjects, that is, only by perceiving oneself as a distinct being it would be possible to create the understanding of an autonomous Self; 2) There would be for Hegel some forms of reciprocal recognition and the three main would be love, law and ethics; 3) Finally, a sequence of forms of reciprocal recognition would be necessary in order for a successful development of the Self, otherwise there would be disrespects that would lead individuals to struggle for recognition in society.

Furthermore, Hegel is not the only important influence on the author. George Herbert Mead is another writer that can be used to comprehend Honneth's propositions. Mead understands that the process of recognition needs at least two people as well. However, the subject needs to learn to perceive his actions from the perspective of a second person in order to become aware of himself/herself. To Mead, there is a difference between "me" and "self".



**4th International Conference on
Public Policy (ICPP4)
June 26-28, 2019 – Montréal**

While the “me” would retain the activity of that moment as something past, thus representing the image the other would have as reference, the “self” would be the unregulated source of all current actions. Therefore, within the individual’s personality the relation between “me” and “self” compares to the relation between partners in a dialogue.

To sum up, Honneth built his own recognition theory based on these two epistemologies. To him, the patterns of intersubjective recognition are what he calls love, law and solidarity. The first is not related to romantic love, but it has a broader meaning, like a strong connection between two people, whether they are friends, spouses or have blood ties. Wherefore, the second is tied to the comprehension of the rights and duties that an individual has in society. It is through the understanding of a generalized other that it is possible for an individual to recognize himself and others as subjects of the law. Finally, the idea of solidarity is more abstract than the others. This one applies to the experience of subjects to gather as a common resistance due to a political repression that is common to all the individuals of that group. But it is also linked to the solidarity relationships that individuals have among themselves because they feel esteemed, as well as others, in order to take reciprocal esteem for their different ways of living, symmetrically (Honneth, 2003).

It is from these considerations that we conclude the dimensions so far presented, highlighting the relevance of one last dimension: solidarity.

According to Westphal (2008), who makes a historical appeal about this dimension, solidarity is understood as selfless love from a pre-modern perspective; this idea originates from the concepts of fraternity and brotherhood. Still in the pre-modern sense, the Christian concept of solidarity has had a huge influence in the meaning of the term (unit of all people, regardless of origin and nationality). Over time, solidarity has become a principle of State. From that, the aid for poor people has begun to be understood as charity, which has hierarchical differences between donor and recipient. On the other hand, solidarity has become to be constituted by social policies, with the objective of redistributing social risks. Therefore, it has become a State policy.

What caused the European States to make social policies effective was socialism and the workers movement. The precursor to this was Bismarck, in Germany, in 1880, developing a model of social security that took place between the current liberalism and socialism. This model was then implemented in France and the United Kingdom. However, in the model of



Bismarck, solidarity was not yet a principle of State, being only a preventive measure in order to achieve social cohesion. From the second half of the nineteenth century, during the European State of welfare, solidarity was bureaucratized, placed in structures and institutions. Thus, the notion of solidarity has become deindividualized.

However, there is no unitary understanding about solidarism, and in the author's conception, it is concluded that solidarity is linked to both interpersonal relations and political actions. In the understanding of Charles Gide and Leon Bourgeois, authors who are the basis of reference for Westphal, solidarity is the basis of the social system, both in terms of natural solidarity and the desired solidarity. Natural solidarity arises from the consciousness of belonging to a community. The individual's actions are influenced by this context and have consequences in the group to which they belong. Nonetheless, this kind of solidarity does not solve the problems arising from the economic sphere, such as inequality. On the other hand, desired solidarity takes place when the individuals recognize that natural solidarity may generate inequality, and, therefore, they start to use desired solidarity in order to correct the failures of social developments. On this context, solidarity has become to be understood as an ethical category to create concrete actions for the effective use of freedom and humanity.

For Gide, quoted by Westphal (2008), the path to a solidarity society goes through the voluntary association of people in the form of cooperation, which could revolutionize economic order. He also states that, for the desired solidarity to become effective, the State intervention as a formulator of social legislation is necessary. The purpose of the State is to institute justice among its members; although everyone is committed to the welfare of the other. But the State has a coordinating role based on social justice.

For the State to exercise this role it depends, to a considerable extent, on the capacity of civil society to demand it. This is what implies Kauchakje (2008), who understands that the current social movements are important to the consolidation of the political solidarity, that is, in order to demand State measures of social security, to demand the development of social policies from the State, just like other ways of social participation, like councils, forums and NGOs, are indispensable to improve the civil quality of solidarity, and to press the State in what corresponds to its leadership role in this process.

Conclusions



**4th International Conference on
Public Policy (ICPP4)
June 26-28, 2019 – Montréal**

Identity, equality, difference, recognition and solidarity are the main dimensions that will be used, transversely, for the construction of an evaluation, in a democratic sense of citizenship construction, in relation to the public policies of race, gender and sexual diversity.

All the dimensions pointed out are central to this task, especially for groups of individuals who do not have their identity preserved, their difference respected, and cannot even make up for equal treatment so that they are fully recognized within society. That is the case of women who, in a mainly patriarchal society, find themselves in a fight for recognition in the economic plan (work rights and equal pay) and in the cultural plan (fight against the culture of harassment, control of their own bodies etc.). This also applies to the anti-racist debate - because black people still face the denial of their bodies in certain environments, being relegated to the worst places of society (such as underemployment and the need to live in periphery) - and to the sexuality debate, because the LGBTI+ population still has basic life rights denied, rights that are guaranteed to the other cis and heterosexual citizens.

The three groups find themselves daily demoralized, disqualified, unauthorized and stereotyped in the way that they are represented in society. Even more when common characteristics are shared among the groups, what reinforces these distorted representations.

From there is possible to understand the importance of the transversal study of these groups, from these dimensions which, in turn, also intersect among themselves, making theoretical instruments for the future construction of practical instruments that can account for the complexity of the universe of public policies and of these actors. These instruments will be transformed into a set of indicators that could allow, in each policy assessed, the indirect survey, through available secondary data, about these dimensions, as well as the direct survey, attributing voice to the actors involved. In this way, it becomes possible, in fact, to perform a transversal work and to consider the direct participation of the involved.

The way that these dimensions, while theoretical instruments, will be transformed into indicators of data collection of empirical reality is related to the indications of Avtar Brah (1996). This author, when working with the difference dimension, it does not prioritize micro or macro levels. On the contrary, it defends a vision built at the intersection of both spheres, to the extent that it considers the articulating discourses and the practices that are inserted in the social relations, the positions of the subjects and subjectivities.



From there, she states four categories of analyses for the specific dimension of difference, but these categories will be incorporated for each dimensions of this essay: dimension as experience, dimension as social relation, dimension as subjectivity and dimension as identity. Dimension as experience is referred not to something presupposed, but to something that must be questioned. Thus, it is comprehensible that the space of individuals experience is a space for dispute: a discursive space in which each dimension has different positions of the subjects and their respective subjectivities are inscripted. The dimension as social relation is referred to the forms by which every dimension is constituted and organized within the systematic relations through economic, cultural, politic and institutional speeches. This dimension of collective character is not disjointed from the previous one and vice versa. The dimension of subjectivity incorporates the decentralization and heterogeneity of the subjects themselves: they are not unique and fixed, but rather fragmented and dynamic. Finally, the dimension of identity gathers all the previous dimensions, articulating them, not in a simplifying way. Quite the opposite. It explores all its complexity and contradictions. From these categories, the fundamental indicators will be selected, in each one of the policies wanted to be evaluated. Before that, to establish some fixed indicators that can be established as general parameters considered structural, in addition to those considered as conjunctural, by virtue of the design of each policy, as well as its context and location. But this work will be better developed as next steps of the research.

Transversality is, as explained before, still very recent in the formulation of Brazilian public politics. The evaluations of public politics addressed to the groups which we want to work with are also recent. However, transversality is, in general, fundamental as a citizenship dimension and it is especially in the case of assessments and their potential for inclusion of guidelines, such as that of women, the black population and also LGBTI+.

References

- BARBOSA, R. R.; MASO, T. F. (2014). *Possíveis Contribuições de Aníbal Quijano para as Relações Internacionais*. ENEPEX.
- BENTO, Berenice A. M. (2008). *O que é transexualidade*. São Paulo. Brasiliense.
- BHABHA, H. K. (1998). *O local da cultura*. Belo Horizonte. Editora da UFMG.



**4th International Conference on
Public Policy (ICPP4)
June 26-28, 2019 – Montréal**

- BRAH, A. (1996). *Cartographies of Diaspora: contesting identities*. London and New York. Routledge.
- BRUGUE, Q. (2008). *Transversalidad: del concepto a la práctica, de las ideas a los resultados*. Kaliedos Red Fundació.
- CARNEIRO, S. (2004). *Negros de pele clara*. Correio Brasiliense.
- CERANKOWSKI, K; MILKS, M. (2010). *New Orientations: Asexuality and its implications for Theory and Practice*. Feminist Studies.
- COLLIN, F. (2009). *Diferença dos sexos (teorias da)*. In: HIRATA, Helena et al. (Orgs.) *Dicionário crítico do feminismo*. São Paulo: Editora Unesp.
- DAVIS, A. (2016). *Mulheres, raça e classe*. São Paulo. Boitempo.
- DIAS, M. (2004). *Conversando sobre homoafetividade*. Porto Alegre. Livraria do Advogado Editora.
- EISNER, S. (2013). *Bi: Notes for a bisexual revolution*. Califórnia. Seal Press.
- FACCHINI, R. (2005). *Sopa de Letrinhas?: movimento homossexual e produção de identidades coletivas nos anos 1990*. Rio de Janeiro. Garamond.
- FACCHINI, R. (2011). *Histórico da luta de LGBT no Brasil*. In: Conselho Regional de Psicologia da 6ª região. *Psicologia e diversidade sexual*. São Paulo. CRPSP.
- FANON, F. (2008) *Pele negra, máscaras brancas*. Bahia. Editora Edufba.
- FRASER, N. (2006). *Da redistribuição ao reconhecimento: Dilemas da justiça numa era pós-socialista*. São Paulo. Cadernos de Campo.
- Governo do Estado. (2017). *Diversidade Sexual e cidadania LGBT*. São Paulo. IMESP.
- GUIMARÃES, A.S.A. (2002) *Classes, raças e democracia*. São Paulo. Editora 34.
- HASENBALG, C. (1979) *Discriminação e Desigualdades Raciais no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro. Graal.
- HONNETH, A. (2003). *Luta por reconhecimento: a gramática moral dos conflitos sociais*. São Paulo. Editora 34.
- JESUS, J. (2012). *Orientações sobre identidade de gênero: conceitos e termos*. Brasília.
- KAUCHAKJE, S. (2008). *Solidariedade política e constituição de sujeitos: a atualidade dos movimentos sociais*. Brasília. Sociedade e Estado.



MONTAÑO, C; DURIGUETTO, M. (2010). *Estado, classe e movimento social*. São Paulo. Cortez Biblioteca básica do Serviço Social.

MUNANGA, K. (1999). *Rediscutindo a mestiçagem no Brasil. Identidade Nacional versus identidade negra*. Vozes: Petrópolis.

PELÚCIO, L. (2012). *Subalterno quem, cara pálida? Apontamentos às margens sobre pós-colonialismos, feminismos e estudos queer*. Contemporânea.

PISCITELLI, A. (2002). *Re-criando a (categoria) mulher?* In: ALGRANTI, Leila Mezan (Org.). *A prática feminista e o conceito de gênero*. Campinas: IFCH-Unicamp.

PISCITELLI, A. (2009). *Gênero: a história de um conceito*. São Paulo. Berlendis.

QUIJANO, A. (2005). *Colonialidade do poder, Eurocentrismo e América Latina*. CLACSO.

RODRIGUES, R. (1935). *Os africanos no Brasil*. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional.

RUBIN, G. (1993) *O tráfico de mulheres: notas sobre a “economia política” do sexo*. Recife: S.O.S Corpo.

SCOTT, J.W; KLANOVICZ, J; FUNCK, S.B. (2005). *O enigma da igualdade*. Estudos Feministas.

SENKEVICS, A. (2012). *O conceito de gênero por Judith Butler: a questão da performatividade*. Retrieved from <https://ensaiosdegenero.wordpress.com/2012/05/01/o-conceito-de-genero-por-judith-butler-a-questao-da-performatividade/>.

WESTPHAL, V. H. (2008). *Diferentes matizes da ideia de solidariedade*. Florianópolis. Katalysis.

WOODWARD, K. (2000). *Identidade e diferença: uma introdução teórica e conceitual*. A perspectiva dos Estudos Culturais. In: SILVA, T. T ; HALL, S ; WOODWARD, K. *Identidade e diferença: a perspectiva dos estudos culturais*. Rio de Janeiro: Petrópolis. Vozes.