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## Abstract

As part of a broader exercise, the text proposes new theoretical paths that allow analyzing the *body production* processes for the investigation of inequalities phenomena and the exercise of violence. The work presents an extrapolation of Henri Lefebvre's theory of space production and it is supported by the school case as a body intervention one. First of all, the general ideas of some reproduction theories are reviewed to recognize the educational process as an intervention of the *body*. Subsequently, the possibility of thinking about the *body* as *territory,* based on an analysis between the qualities of both categories. The core part of the writing is developed in an extrapolated exercise from Henri Lefebvre's theory of the *space trialectics* applied to the *body production* process. Three main ideas are discussed: the *social* *body* as a social product, the trialectics of the *social body* and the *curriculum* as a *conceived body*.
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## Introduction

This text is part of a series of research works that, as a whole, propose a so-called *body affinity theory*. A theoretical-methodological construction that allows new approaches to the phenomena of social inequalities and the exercises of various types of violence based on the body-institution relationship, from a post-structuralist critical perspective. It would be important to point out that this theory is outlined in four successive essential ideas: 1) *The production of the body*, 2) *the body as a tool that produces value*, 3) *the institution as a distributing device of social objects*, 3) *inequality as bodily affinity.* The purpose of this work is to address the first of them, hoping to address the others in future writings.

The idea of ​​the body as a product starts from thinking about it as a territory-space that is produced from various relationships of conflict and disputes between different social actors. Relationships that materialize in the institutional exercise as an intermediary. In this case, efforts are concentrated on analyzing the process of *body production* in the school institution. Using the Lefebvrian Theory of Space Trialectics, three extrapolations are constructed: 1) *The social body as a social product*, 2) *the trialectics of the social body* and 3) *the curriculum as a conceived body*. Finally, some reflections are presented as a conclusion, as well as some triggering questions for future works.

## The intervention of the body in theories of reproduction

Regarding the educational field, some of the so-called *theories of reproduction* have allowed us to analyze the production of *bodies* in the *school*. These theories are characterized by understanding the latter, contrary to the discourses of universality and emancipation, as an institution whose purpose is found in the socialization of individuals, or rather subjects, with the purpose of contributing to the reproduction of predominant social relations of production. They start from the *school* as an mechanism for the domination of the *body*, understanding also the latter as an instrument for production and capital. On the other hand, the *curriculum*, as an intermediate category, has been used to analyze the specific mechanisms of action on the *bodies*. In turn, this is made up of two parts (Torres, 1991): Firstly, the *explicit curriculum*, stipulated in the official programs and the minimum mandatory institutional contents that are clearly taught. Secondly, the *hidden curriculum*, which is manifested in the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values ​​that are acquired through participation in daily teaching processes and that are never evident as intentional educational goals.

Although not always explicit, theories of reproduction allow us different ways to think about the school intervention on the *body*. In the work of Althusser (1974), for example, the curriculum can be understood as an ideological imposition that acts on the *body* and produces it, according to the interests of the dominant classes. From his structural and Marxist perspective, the school system, along with other superstructure systems (such as religious, family, legal, political, union, informational and cultural), will be understood as a *ideological apparatus of the State*, that its operation reproduces the social relations of production and, therefore, the relations of class and exploitation, typical of the capitalist mode of production. According to the author's ideas, the *school* will fulfill its role, along with the salary, in the process of reproduction of the labor force. This is because, through ideological education, the individual acquires the competence, skill and attitude necessary to insert himself, through work, into the dynamics of capitalist exploitation (Althusser, 1974). (Althusser, 1974).

The theoretical proposal of Bourdieu and Passeron (1996) allows thinking about the *curriculum* as an ordinal mechanism of *bodies*, in the social structure, based on their class condition. These post structuralist thinkers maintain that the *school* reproduces the order of social relations and economic structures modern societies. According to his proposal, this process will occur as a result of the exercise of a series of symbolic violence on the individual, through educational contents based on the dominant classes interests and the establishment of inclusion/exclusion mechanisms, such as the exam and others. In this way, individuals with higher levels of cultural capital, which in most of the cases matches with higher levels of economic and social capital individuals*,* will have the opportunity to thrive in the educational system. While individuals with lower levels of cultural capital tend to be excluded at some point along their journey. Thus, although this theoretical position allows for contradiction and resistance, the educational system functions as a multi-level “strainer,” which filters and accommodates individuals, based on their class, within economic and social relationships and structures.

On the other hand, Foucault's proposal (1975) allows the understanding of the *curriculum* as a normalizing truth discourse that, based on the control of space and activity, produces *bodies* useful for the purposes of the dominant classes. Although this author does not problematize the *school* directly, his contributions to the understanding of it, in the field of theories of reproduction, have an enormous value. From his archaeological exercise on power, Foucault (1975) will present a new generalized political and social anatomy that abandons the logic of violent and explicit repression to adopt the discipline logic. Under this new form, the *disciplinary society* will seek to ensure obedience to its rules and procedures from the *institution*, in its broadest sense. In this case, the educational institution. However, unlike other times, the holder of power no longer exercises repression through explicit physical violence. On the contrary and in a more efficient way, the *power* is exercised from the conquest of *the knowing*, understood as the truth, materialized in the predominant *discourse*, whose unity is formed from the things that are allowed to seeing and speaking, the visible and the enunciable (Tirado and Mora, 2002). Thus, from the ideas of this author, the *school* could be thought, while *disciplinary institution* that acts on the *body*, through the *curriculum* as a truth discourse, as a producer of *docile bodies*: Those bodies that meet a series of characteristics and interest qualities for the dominant social groups.

Beyond the detailed theoretical approaches, what is important to point out here, as a meta-analytic guideline and initial trigger, is that any analysis of the *school will* also be the analysis of the educational process. This seemingly obvious fact will have two key implications. First of all, this process, the educational one, for all the cases, will be the process of the intervention of the *bodies*. Its intention and purpose could not be any other. What would be the purpose of the *school* if it were not the treatment of the *body*? The second implication, especially when starting from reproduction theories, is that the content of said treatment, embedded into the *curriculum*, is not accidental or random, but well calculated, intentional and acted upon, with the purpose of achieving the specific purposes of the actors who intend to dispose of the *body*. These actors may be the State, capital or the individual himself. Thus, starting from these ideas, the *body* could also be thought, as an instrument of interest, as a key and central factor that allows, or does not, achieve a specific goal. And this implies, finally, that we think about a *body* as an object of domination. Therefore, as an object of dispute.

## Body as territory/space

The previous reflections are enough to identify that the idea of *body*, as an object of domination and dispute, finds certain similarities with the idea of *territory*. In fact, as Haesbaert (2020) maintains, since the last century various authors have undertaken the task of establishing theoretical bridges between these two categories. From the *gender theories*, until *decolonial theories*, passing through *indigenous thought* and the same *theories of space* and the *territory*. According to Mazurek (2006), there are four essential characteristics of the territory: a) It is located and has natural characteristics, b) it is built through the process of appropriation, c) it is a product of human activity. y d) is subject to the overlap of different actors/interests/territorialities. Characteristics that allow us to argue the thesis of the *body* as *territory* based on a comparative exercise with the qualities and characteristics that can be attributed to the *body*, based on the ideas of McDowell (2000).

1. Is it localized and does it have specific natural characteristics? The first characteristic of the *body*, both in its biological and social notion, is physical nature. That is, as McDowell (2000) calls it, the *body* as *space* and as a place.
2. Is it constituted through the appropriation process? The same author (McDowell, 2000) will make a distinction between the *body* and the *corporeity*, which is a corresponding category to *territoriality*, understood as the capacity that an entire social group has to appropriate a certain territory (Rincón, 2012). Thus, the idea of *corporeity* of the author implies a principle of power and faculty of appropriation of the *body*. Starting from this idea, as an example, the violent act of one individual towards another, whether physical or symbolic, constitutes a simultaneous act of appropriation (of the violator) and dispossession (of the violated).
3. Is it a product of human activity? Just like *territory*, the *body* should not be understood as an object or set of objects exclusively. McDowell (2000) will return to Grosz's ideas to point out that the *body* cannot be understood as an ahistorical, natural or precultural object. On the contrary, the author points out, the body is a *product*, it is the result of natural social constitutions. however, with greater weight, from external cultural pressures. These are the network of social relations that cross it.
4. Is it subject to the overlap of different actors/interests/territorialities? As already noted, the *body* is subject to appropriation and dispossession. Thus, as long as it represents a value for different actors, it will also be the subject of dispute. The ideas of the *body*, as an object of interest among different social actors, in the *theories of reproduction*, reviewed in the previous section.

Thus, starting from a notable similarity and conceptual correspondence, the idea of *body* as *territory* with the intention of opening a new door towards the problematization of *body*, based on the theories of *territory* and consencuently those of the *social space*. Likewise, it is proposed to build an exploratory theoretical exercise that allows us to think about the production processes of the *body*, in the *school*, from the *theories of space*.

## The production of Lefevbre's space

If you plan to use Lefebvre's ideas regarding the analysis of space, it will be necessary to refer to his masterpiece: *The production of space*. Although the work is extremely extensive, in this case we start from the first thesis proposed by the author in chapter two, *The social space*: “social space is a social product” (Lefevbre, 1974). Three extrapolations are presented. First, the *body* as a social product, based on the discussion around the *space fetish*. Second, the *trialectics of the social body*, as a form of production of the body. Third, the *curriculum* as a *representation of the body*.

### The social body as a social product

From the ideas contained in biological discourses, the *body* could be thought as a purely natural creation. These speeches have been widely criticized, for example, from the *gender theories*, because among other issues such as tradition, religion and some ideologies, these have been the argumentative basis of the groups that have historically advocated the prescriptive division of roles and occupations between men and women. Also those who have rejected the recognition of diverse generic identities. In addition to the *gender theories*, the *theories of reproduction*, such as those presented in the introductory section, have revealed some of the ways in which the *body*, in its social interactions, is nourished, built and shaped.

If the *body* is understood as a *space*, the Lefebvrian view allows a broad discussion of the issue, especially when the author's proposal is based on a denial of the idea of *space* as a natural object. In this regard, Lefebvre constructs a critique of the idea of ​​space as “God's creation”, proposed by the *cartesians*, like *Descartes*, *Malebranche*, *Spinoza* and *Leibniz*. Nor does he subscribe to the idea of ​​space as an *absolute*, a notion proposed by the *poskantians*, like *Schelling*, *Fichte* and *Hegel*. In that sense, Lefevbre points out that, when thinking about *space*, two illusions could apearse. On the one hand, the *illusion of transparency*, which allows the idea that the *space* is innocent, free of traps, dissimulations and hidden elements. On the other hand, the *realistic illusion*, which allows the idea that the *space* is nothing more than a thing, whose content is nothing more than a set of other things. In fact, the author points out that, from the Hegelian proposal, *space* is nothing more than a work of the spirit. A synthetic result of a long and deep dialectical development over time and ideas. In general, from the position of “the philosophers”, as Lefebvre calls them, *space* is something “given” and in “direct origin from Mother Earth” (Lefevbre, 2013:89).

In opposition to the ideas already raised, Lefebvre maintains that the *space* will not be the sole work of *spirit* or nature, but the product of a broad network of social relations that occur in it and with it. To argue in favor of his thesis, the author uses two resources. First of all, it differentiates *the creation* of *the product*. The first one, as a natural creation without utilitarian intention. The second one, as an intentional, planned, executed and objectified creation with an instrumental purpose. Secondly, Lefebvre will resort to the idea of *commodity fetishism*, proposed by Marx in the *theory of value*. While the *commodity*, as a thing or “finished product”, in its immediate perception, will not reveal the series of social relations that produce it. The *space*, thought of the immediate as a thing and a natural creation, will not easily reveal the social relations that produce it either.

At first, Lefebvre's ideas serve to think about the *body*, while *space*, as a result and production of social relations. Would the existence of social interaction be possible without the existence of the *body* as a medium? If social relations are between individuals and the *body* is the place, before any other, where the individual is located (McDowell, 2000), social relations could not be possible without the *body*. But is it possible the existence of the *body* without the existence of social relations? Just like *space*, the *body* should not be considered as a natural creation or object and nothing more, since it is produced from the social relations that occur in it, with it and through it. Even the conception and gestation of the *body*, in a biological sense, wouldn't it be a product of the social relationships that precede it? Growth, care and maintenance, as well as interaction with others, with the family and all the institutions that make up society, will be part of the production process of the *body*, throwing an unfinished process. This is how you come to think of the *body* as a social product. Then, just like the *space*, you won't be able to think about the *body* as something foreign or independent of social relations. To account for the relationship between the *space* and the social, Lefebvre uses the category *social space*. In this case, for the present work, the *social body is used as the* main category.

### Trialectic of the social body

How is the *social body* produced? To answer the very ambitious question, starting from the *body* as a product of social interactions, it would be necessary to analyze each place and moment where these interactions occur. However, encompassing the universe of possibilities is not the objective of the writing. This reflection serves, as a note of caution, to remember that the objective of this is to expand the possibilities in the analysis of the relationship *school*-*curriculum-body*. Thus, the ideas and reflections presented below will be focused on school practice. It will then be the mission of future work to deepen and expand the reflections towards other areas of the *body production*.

Thinking about the *social body* as a *social product*, allows us to return to the idea of *school* as an institution that, in its reproductive purpose of the order of social relations of production, together with other institutions, produces the *bodies*. But, when talking about “production”, one can fall into the trap of thinking about the manufacturing process, linear and mechanical. A deterministic process that, in the case of *school*, causes us to think of it as a uniform factory, with uniform processes and that produces, therefore, *bodies* mathematically uniform. However, as social studies have also allowed us to observe, the educational process, in opposition to deterministic views, is full of contradictions between the actors involved (Torres, 1991). In this sense, the Lefebvrian view offers analytical guidelines that allow us to understand the complexity of this process.

The author maintains that the *social space* occurs as a result of an unfinished process of contradiction that manifests itself in “triads.” From there will come his trialectic proposal which, in essence, postulates the simultaneous contradiction of three types of *spaces*. First of all, the *perceived space*, which refers to the immediate reality where social relations occur. The material space and everyday reality where the physical connections between objects and activities are experienced, without reflection. It is spatial practice and ways of using space. Secondly, there is the *conceived space*. This refers to the *representations of space*, executed by scientists, planners, urban planners and technocrats. Representations from which space is thought about from rational and utilitarian use. It is the representations of the space that set the tone for intervention in it. Thirdly, there is the *lived space*, which refers to the space of representations, where the symbolic makes sense. It is the space of meanings that, above the physical, uses its objects symbolically. The *lived space* It is the dominated and produced space that, although one can aspire to change, is only experienced. Unlike the *conceived space*, which is made and used by scientists for rational intervention, the *lived space* arises and is lived by the “users” and “the inhabitants”. In any case, it is experienced and described by “artists, novelists and philosophers” (Lefevbre, 2013: p. 98). The *trialectics of space*, evidently, will take up the Hegelian dialectic that was previously criticized by the author in question. However, Lefebvre departs from the original idea, maintaining that his trialectical process is not based on successive moments (thesis, antithesis and synthesis). That is to say, with effusive emphasis, none of the three spaces described will be the result of the contradiction between the other two. Rather, the trialectical process of contradiction will occur in all senses, simultaneously and superimposed, to produce the *social space*.

As already noted, the production of the *social body* cannot be referred only to the *school*. However, the important weight of the institution must be recognized, especially in those who have the possibility of accessing it. Thus, starting from the previous ideas, the *school* could be thought as a place of production of bodies. So we could also think about the *trialectics of the social body*. Therefore a typological system of bodies is built. The *perceived body* is the one of everyday reality, the place where the individual is located and materialized. The one of the skin, the organs, and the senses. The one who moves, feeds, uses himself, gets tired and rests. This is the material *body*, which allows the individual to interact with the outside, with others *bodies*, substances and things. On the other hand, the *conceived body* will be the one represented and prescribed by the scientists and architects of the *body*. Just as in the health field there will be doctors, nutritionists, physiotherapists and psychologists. In the field of education there will be educational planners, pedagogues and educational psychologists, teachers, educators and prefects. Even businessmen can also be thought as part of the architects of the *body*. In any case, the *representations of the body* are present in the educational guidelines that prescribe the contents to be deposited and the interventions to be carried out. Visible bodily characteristics, demonstrable attitudes and aptitudes, as well as the ideal knowledge expected in the *body* of the student. Finally, the *lived body* is the one of meanings and ideologies, cultural load and beliefs. This is the type of *body* that lives and experiences, not from a material sense, but an emotional and symbolic one. For example, the one that values ​​or devalues ​​the meaning of *school*, which means, for better or worse, the sex-gender differences of their male and female classmates. The one who recognizes or ignores the importance of law and authority. Who identifies, or does not, with the student community. The one who behaves “well” or behaves “badly” and the one who honors the national flag or protests while doing so.

According to the author, the predominance of each *space,* on others, is not always the same. Rather, their relationship and weight will be determined by the conditions and social context where the process develops. This means that the *space* does not always be produced in the same way, nor in the same sense and order. As an illustration, the *conceived space* for exploitation, predominates over the *lived space* of indigenous populations in Latin America. At the same time the *lived space* of the residents of San Salvador Atenco, in Mexico, prevailed over the *conceived space* by the State, for the construction of an airport. Even the *perceived space* of the Concón Dunes, in Chile, by its very nature, has caused the collapse of various *designed spaces* for real estate production. If this idea is resumed in the *body trialectics*, a corresponding logic can be observed. In the *school*, the *perceived body* by a student with rheumatoid arthritis will be imposed on the *conceived body* by the teacher and the school physical activity program. In other cases, the *lived body* of the student who grows up in a misogynistic culture will prevail over the *conceived body* by the professor who designed the course *culture of peace*. Or, the *conceived body* for the *school* as a workforce, trained as industrial technicians, will prevail over the *lived body* of the student who wanted to be an artist.

### Curriculum as a representation of the body

But possibility should not be confused with probability. Although the examples that have just been reviewed allow us to think about an endless number of possible scenarios where each *body*, the *perceived*, the *conceived* or the *lived*, predominates over the others, we cannot forget the important nuance proposed by Lefebvre, who recognizes the enormous transformations that societies undergo, at a global level, starting in the 18th century, with the so-called *industrial revolution*. Thus, returning to all the previous approaches and emphasizing again the idea of ​​space less as a work and more as a product, the author will find evidence to believe in the *social space* contemporary as a *shape* specific. A product of the ideology that emerges from the predominant *mode of production*. In that sense, Lefebvre points out that, from the aforementioned period, it seems that the *representations of space*, he *conceived space*, have gained enormous weight and prominence in the production of *social space*, especially since disciplines such as architecture and urban planning have been in charge of planning and building cities, from a rational and functional sense, for the predominant *mode of production*.

The author points out that these disciplines operate, apparently, from neutrality. As if the ways of conceiving space were natural and could not be any other way. However, having already revealed the *space fetish*, Lefebvre discovers that, contrary to the immediate appearance, these disciplines will function as an instrument of a manipulative ideology, which arranges and transforms space into *homogeneous*, *fragmented* and *hierarchical* one. As Martínez (2013) maintains, this logic materializes in “repetitive modules, [a] strict hierarchy of space, [the] decomposition of social life, [the] expulsion of the transfunctional [that is, what is not useful] in the city, anomalies and disorientation” (p. 44). This idea should not be confused with an aesthetic appreciation of the *social space*, because the problem does not lie only in the visual and the symbolic. Rather, the author's concern lies in a visible principle of instrumentalization of the *social space*. A space that, beyond being produced, its usefulness also lies in reproduction. The reproduction of what? Nothing else could be expected. In a forceful way, the author refers to the *capitalist mode of production*.

The *curriculum* has not been forgotten as a key concept of this text. Rather, it was necessary to develop the previous ideas to locate it in the process of production of the *social body*. If we start from the social changes, pointed out by Lefebvre, from the industrial transformations and expansions of the 18th century, it would also be necessary to locate that the origin of the *school*, as well as modern educational systems, coincides with these processes (Lawn, 2012). Thus, in contradiction to the discourse that takes as its banner the development of individual capacities for the enjoyment of culture and society (Rawls, 1971), it is recognized that the real pattern that marked the beginning of the institution was the need to create a trained workforce that could meet industrial demands (Coulby et al., 2015). In this way the institution, the school, acquired the goal of socializing individuals with the purpose of contributing to the reproduction of the predominant social relations of production (Torres, 1991): social relations of the *capitalist mode of production*. This is how two very important questions are noted. First of all, it recognizes the *school* as an institution in charge of the production of *bodies* for work. Secondly, it is recognized that the *bodies* to be produced should not be random, but very specific. These *bodies* must have the necessary qualities so that, once their training is completed, they can enter production as a workforce. In this way, under the predominance of the capitalist mode of production, as well as in the urban area, the *representations of space,* the *conceived space*, in the *school*, under the same logic, the *representations of* the *body,* the *conceived body*.

The *representations of the body*, in the *school*, cannot be anywhere else but in the *curriculum*. And it would be necessary to remember that this is not only composed of the contents visibly deposited in the official programs, in the *explicit curriculum*, but also in the contents acquired in daily school practice, although these are not explicitly stated. The reference is made to a *hidden curriculum*. The function of the *curriculum* is, like a medical prescription or a cooking recipe, the prescription of the contents to be taught, the skills to be developed and the activities to be carried out. These practices must be oriented towards the production of a specific type of *body*. The *conceived* *body* by the *architects of the body*. And who are they? They will be the actors involved in its production. These can be the *educational planner*, as an articulator and organizer of the *curriculum*, the *pedagogue*, as a designer of the curricular experience, the *teacher*, as a distributor of the contents and the *prefect*, as an auditor of discipline and foreman of the bodies. But there may be other actors as well. These can be the *businessman*, as original claimant of the *body* and the *government official*, as an engineer of the *body*.

Finally, could we obtain a generalized qualitative image of the type of *social body* that is produced in the *school*? Lefebvrian theory does not offer specific descriptive categories. The same author, in some of his reflections and exemplifications, highlights the difficulty (or impossibility) of establishing generalizing rules that allow describing the entirety of the *social space*. Consequently, we could not establish any generalizing rule that describes the entirety of the *social body*. However, it is possible to extrapolate another idea, which is the correspondence between the forms of production of the *body* and the predominant mode of production where said process takes place. The common characteristic that can be grasped from this correspondence is that, under the *capitalist mode of production*, the production of the *social body* is influenced, to a greater extent, by the *representations of the body*, the *conceived body*. Its predominance lies in its instrumental nature, because at the time that it is produced, as a labor force, it also produces and reproduces the social relations of the predominant *mode of production*. Additionally, the *conceived body*, as far as the *school*, will be the content of the *curriculum*. Therefore, the *curriculum*, as instructive for the production of the *conceived body*, is a key element for the production of the *social body* in contemporary times.

## Final thoughts

Although reproduction theories have allowed us to establish some synaptic points between the *school*, the *body* and the *curriculum*, the exploration of other theoretical perspectives allows us to expand analytical perspectives to understand the multifaceted social processes and phenomena. First, the *education* and the *school*. After, institutional intervention in the *body*. This is the case of the use of the Lefebvrian proposal, whose extrapolation, from the *space* to the *body*, allows us to grasp the meaning of the educational processes, the institutional dynamics, as well as the weight that the actors have, under certain logics, in the production of the *body*.

In general, analyzing the *body* from the Lefebvrian perspective, in the school and institutional environment, allows us to think about it not only as a social product, but also as a setting for the relations of production and, therefore, for the social relations of exploitation and class. Furthermore, the idea of *school* as a “factory” *social body* finds certain convergences with the *theories of reproduction* reviewed in the first part of the paper. The *social body* of contemporary times, from the perspective of the author in question, finds conceptual similarities with the *docile body* of Foucauldian theory. The *body* *conceived*, as a guideline for curricular design, finds similarities with Bourdieu and Passeron´s idea of the “content oriented to the interests of the dominant classes”. Even the *lived body* could have approximations to the Bourdian *habitus*. On the other hand, although Lefebvre theoretically distances himself from Althusserian structuralism and his determinist position, convergences could well be found between his principles of ideological imposition and the instrumentalization of the *body* as labor force and source of value.

Likewise, various questions arise from the exploratory exercise that, in the future, it would be desirable to answer: How are the qualities of the predominant modes of production, of a specific region, transformed into curricular contents, understood as *representations of the body* in the *school?* Or, how are these qualities transformed in the discourses and policies of the institutions? How do economic and cultural dynamics influence and materialize the content of these institutional policies? How are the dynamics of the production of the *body* manifested in different social institutions? How do contradictions manifest themselves in the process of production of the *bodies* at the institutional level? How do resistance phenomena manifest among the different actors involved in the institutional process? What kind of conceived bodies, *perceived bodies and* *lived bodies* fit better or worse into the institutional dynamics? Even further: What are the institutions that intervene and what is their weight in the processes of *body* production? What happens with the *bodies* that do not have affinity to the predominant *representations of the body*? In any case, it is expected that this reflective exercise serve as a guideline for the proposal of future research work.
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McDowell (2000) Género, identidad y lugar. Geografías feministas. Ediciones Cátedra. Madrid, España.

Rincón (2012) Territorio, territorialidad y multiterritorialidad en *Revista de filosofía, política, arte y cultura.* No. 22. Centro Cultural de la Universidad del Tolima.

Tirado, F. y Mora, M. (2022) El espacio y el poder. Michel Foucault y la crítica de la historia en *Espiral*, vol. IX, núm. 25. Universidad de Guadalajara, México.

Torres, J. (1991). El curriculum oculto. Ediciones Morata, S.L. Madrid.