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ABSTRACT

This article addresses the condition of the rights of children and adolescents in Brazil, emphasizing that despite the progress made after the promulgation of the 1988 Constitution, there is still a permanent subordination of these groups to unequal power relations. Despite the rights acquired through extensive social and political movements, there is a persistent demeaning that subjects them to objectifying relationships. The study aims to expand this analysis by investigating other forms of inequality that impact children and adolescents, with special attention to variables of race and socio-economic strata. However, a significant challenge in this research is to avoid the generalization of experiences, taking into account the regional particularities and specific contexts of these groups. The simplification of these experiences may result in a superficial analysis, incapable of capturing the complexity of intersections between race, socio-economic strata, and other identities. The objective is to achieve a deeper and contextualized understanding of the interrelations that impact the lives and rights of these young individuals in Brazil.
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RESUMO
Neste artigo, é abordada a condição dos direitos das crianças e adolescentes no Brasil, enfatizando que, apesar dos avanços ocorridos após a promulgação da Constituição de 1988, ainda há uma permanente subordinação desses grupos a relações de poder desiguais. Apesar dos direitos conquistados através de amplos movimentos sociais e políticos, há uma persistente inferiorização que os sujeita a relações objetificantes. O estudo busca expandir essa análise, investigando outras formas de desigualdade que impactam crianças e adolescentes, com especial atenção para as variáveis de raça e estrato socioeconômico. Entretanto, um desafio significativo nesta pesquisa é evitar a generalização das experiências, levando em conta as particularidades regionais e contextos específicos desses grupos. A simplificação dessas vivências pode resultar em uma análise superficial, incapaz de capturar a complexidade das interseções entre raça, estrato socioeconômico e outras identidades. O objetivo é alcançar uma compreensão mais profunda e contextualizada das inter-relações que impactam a vida e os direitos desses jovens no Brasil.

Palavras-chave: inclusão social, vulnerabilidade, proteção infantil, interseccionalidade.

1 INTRODUCTION

Understanding childhood as a phenomenon intrinsically linked to complex social dimensions, this article discusses the situation of children and adolescents in Brazil, highlighting the intersectionality of inequalities, especially those related to race and class. The methodology adopted involved the analysis of social indicators, the exploration of relevant legislation, and bibliographical research.

Until the promulgation of the 1988 Constitution, children and adolescents were not recognized as holders of full rights. Despite the advances resulting from a long process of social and political mobilizations, a position of inferiority persists that subjects these individuals to objectifying power relations.

This study expands the analysis of inequalities, including race and class variables into the discussion. The theoretical framework is Afro-centered, and the reflection is based on the concept of intersectionality, proposed by Kimberlé Crenshaw, and enriched by the contributions of notable Brazilian intellectuals of black feminist thought: Lélia Gonzalez, Neusa Santos Souza, Nilma Lino Gomes, and Luciana de Oliveira Dias. The methodology used was bibliographical research, analysis of legislation, and analysis of social indicators.
The prevailing inequality in society is not restricted to the dichotomy between rich and poor, men and women, or whites and blacks. It manifests itself, above all, in the disparity between adults and children (BUSTELO, 2007, apud HARTUNG, 2019). This statement, although shocking, reflects the sad reality of broad social acceptance of various forms of domination over the bodies of children and adolescents, even when permeated by oppression and violence.

The historical roots of this inequality can be traced to the legal definitions themselves. Under the old minors doctrine adopted by the Brazilian Minors Codes of 1927 and 1979, children and adolescents were characterized by what they were not: they were not “majors”, they were not “citizens”. It was only with the promulgation of the Brazilian Federal Constitution of 1988, mainly through article 227, that the doctrine of integral protection of the United Nations (UN) was introduced into the legal system, promoting advances in the defense of the rights of children and youth (FUNDAÇÃO ABRINQ, 2021).

However, even with constitutional recognition, the child is still perceived as a second-class citizen (HARTUNG, 2019). This perception is based on the disregard for children's fundamental rights, both by the State and by unequal, violent, and objectifying relationships between individuals, including the family environment and other social agents (HARTUNG, 2019).

The notion of childhood is not a fixed or natural concept, but rather a historical, cultural, and socially constructed product over time, as Monarcha (2001) argues. The author supports the perception of childhood as a distinct phase of life, with its own characteristics and specific needs, not being innate, but shaped and developed throughout history through social and cultural processes. The conception of childhood, according to this view, is influenced by norms, values, institutions, and educational practices present in a given society at a given historical moment.

In the period analyzed between 1875 and 1938, there was a gradual transition of ideas about childhood, when it went from a more utilitarian vision (in which children were seen as labor for work) to a more humanistic perspective concerned with the education and child development (MONARCHA, 2001).
By stating that childhood is a cultural and social construction, Monarcha (2001) highlights that perceptions, educational practices, ideals, and representations about childhood are shaped by the culture, social values, and history of a specific society. This implies that notions about childhood can vary over time and in different cultural contexts, being influenced by social, economic, political, and historical factors.

This critical understanding of childhood as a culturally situated phenomenon is crucial to analyzing and understanding the transformations in forms of education, public policies aimed at children, and social representations of childhood throughout history. The very etymology of the word “infância” (childhood) echoes the historical characteristics of incapacity and inferiority attributed to children. Originating from the Latin infantia, derived from the verb fari (to speak), the word infans (infant) refers to the idea of “one who does not speak” (SILVA, 2016).

In this context, a striking example is the childfree movement, growing not only in Brazil but in various parts of the world. This movement challenges conventional norms about parenting and questions the supposed obligation to have children, raising discussions about the rights and social perceptions of children and young people. The childfree movement is directly related to the understanding of childhood as a cultural and social construction. This perspective suggests that the decision not to have children, advocated by the movement, is influenced by a series of social, cultural, and individual factors that shape the perception of childhood and parenthood.

Deepening this reflection, the next topics in this article will address the history of foster care around the world, the analysis of the childfree movement, and intersectionality in the childhood experience, offering a comprehensive view of the complex dynamics that shape the experience of children and adolescents in contemporary society.
2 HISTORY OF FOSTER CARE AROUND THE WORLD

The first foster care initiatives as a public policy date back to the 19th century, with records in the United States and Canada (DARCANCHY, 2022). One of the first references dates back to 1909, during the 1st "White House Conference on the Care of Dependent Children," held at the White House, where foster care was officially recognized as the best substitute home alternative (JUNIOR et al., 2021).

In the 1940s, Great Britain began to implement foster care following a recommendation from the 1946 Curtis Commission, which advocated that "children removed from their homes should live in conditions as similar as possible to a family environment." (MARSHALL, 1967, p. 156), to the detriment of collective shelters. Subsequently, in the 1950s, Israel adopted the foster family model to deal with the large number of orphaned children resulting from the Second World War (JUNIOR et al., 2021).

From the 1970s onwards, other European countries began to implement family care, such as France, Spain, Italy, and Portugal (DARCANCHY, 2022). During the same period, in 1979, the United Nations (UN) proclaimed the International Year of the Child. During that year, the United Kingdom's National Foster Care Association organized an international conference in Oxford, where it was proposed to create an entity to promote foster care globally. In response, the International Foster Care Organization (IFCO) was founded in 1981, with headquarters in the United Kingdom (IFCO, 2023).

Currently, foster families is the most common form of foster care in many countries, notably Australia, Ireland, Norway and the United Kingdom, where more than 80% of children and adolescents in foster care are cared for by foster families (VALLE; BRAVO, 2013 ), as shown in the graph below. In Brazil, this percentage is just 6%, according to data from the latest SUAS Census, carried out in 2022 (MDS, 2022).
Graph 1 - Use of Family Care in Different Countries

Source: prepared by the author (2023), with data from 2010-2012 from Valle and Bravo (2023), Darcanchy (2022) and MDS (2022)

3 CHILDFREE MOVEMENT

From the 1980s onwards, with the introduction of new contraceptive methods and changes in sexual norms, feminist movements began to bring the option of non-motherhood into public debate, challenging the previously predominant view that the absence of parenthood was exclusively associated with sterility. However, those who make this choice have historically been stigmatized and often labeled as selfish, unhappy, irresponsible, immature, or abnormal (SOMERS, 1993).

As a way of challenging this social prejudice, the “childless-by-choice” movement emerged, which can be translated as “sem filhos por opção”. Later, the term “childfree” also began to be used, which can be understood as both “childless” and “livre de crianças”. Childfree, therefore, began as a social movement to question this compulsory motherhood and to demand greater respect for the individual decision not to have children (CANAVEZ et al., 2020).

As already mentioned, the idea that childhood is a cultural and social construction implies that social expectations regarding parenting and raising children are influenced by norms, values, and cultural representations in a
specific society (MONARCHA, 2001). Thus, the childfree movement challenges this cultural construct by questioning the prevailing narrative that parenting is an essential part of adulthood and that having children is a natural and inevitable choice.

Defenders of the childfree movement argue that the decision not to have children can be a legitimate and valid choice, contradicting social norms that place motherhood/fatherhood as an obligation or an unquestionable objective in adult life. This demonstrates how the conception of childhood as a cultural and social construction directly influences individual choices about having or not having children (BLACKSTONE, 2019).

Furthermore, as Blackstone (2019) points out, the movement questions traditional representations of childhood and parenting, often idealized in society. By rejecting the idea that parenthood is the only way to live a full and meaningful life, supporters of the childfree movement question social norms that exclusively praise the importance of motherhood/fatherhood as a form of personal and social fulfillment.

In this way, by challenging these cultural and social norms, the childfree movement connects with the critical understanding of childhood as a cultural and social construction, highlighting how perceptions about parenting and child-rearing are influenced by broader contextual and cultural factors.

Over the years, however, the movement gained new contours, as it was appropriated by people intolerant of the presence of children and adolescents, which generated a market demand for commercial establishments that restrict access to this portion of the population (CANAVEZ et al., 2020). The expression “childfree” then acquired another meaning, also designating environments frequented only by adults; not because they pose any type of physical, moral, or psychological risk to children, but simply because their presence is undesirable. A recent example of this new trend involved a restaurant in New Jersey, in the United States, which caused controversy on social media by banning entry to children under 10 years old (CRESER, 2023). To justify this type of attitude, the most common complaints are the noise, dirt, and rush caused by little ones.
Therefore, to serve a clientele that values “child-free” spaces, numerous restaurants, bars, hotels, inns and other common establishments have prohibited the entry of children and adolescents (IDOETA, 2019). In Brazil, with a simple search on accommodation websites in any tourist location, hotels and inns can quickly be identified that require a minimum age for booking, or that expressly declare that they do not accept children. Some use more subtle arguments, such as “the environment is not adapted for children”, while others openly admit that the objective is to offer greater peace of mind to customers (IDOETA, 2017).

Some airlines offer passengers, when booking their flight, an indication of the seats occupied by small children so that those who feel uncomfortable with their proximity can choose the furthest seats (SARCONI, 2019). Or even, airlines that delimit “silence zones”, which are entire rows or business class, where children under a certain age are prohibited (CATRACALIVRE, 2016).

Defenders of the childfree movement deny discrimination, arguing that the exclusion of children cannot be compared to that of other human groups, such as people with disabilities or black people, as childhood is a transitory condition that everyone goes through: “No one will be a child forever”, they claim. The weakness of this argument lies in reducing the child to a simple stage in the process of human development, in an adult-centric view that only assumes the adult is a complete human being. “Children are not just human becoming; they are the human, in a diverse, but complete expression” (HARTUNG, 2019, p. 178).

This conception of the child as a “almost-person”, or as a “minor” human being, has already been overcome in Brazil, at least legally, since the 1979 Minors Code was replaced by the Integral Protection Doctrine contained in the Federal Constitution of 1988. From then on, the term “minor” itself fell into disuse to refer to people under the age of civil majority, precisely because it carries this anachronistic view of the individual’s incompleteness, in addition to other stigmatizing representations such as “needy minor”, the “minor offender” or the “abandoned minor”.

The Brazilian Institute for Consumer Protection (IDEC), in 2019, publicly expressed itself on the unconstitutionality and illegality of the conduct adopted by
childfree establishments, as restricting the entry of a certain group violates the dignity of the human person guaranteed by the Federal Constitution (CF), in addition to violating the Child and Adolescent Statute (ECA), as it creates embarrassment or a vexatious situation for the child. Furthermore, the agency still classifies the act as an abusive commercial practice, since the Consumer Protection Code (CDC) prohibits refusing goods or services directly from anyone willing to purchase them with prompt payment. Finally, it clarifies that businesspeople cannot use the principle of free initiative to veto children’s access, except for entertainment and shows with inappropriate content for certain age groups (IDEC, 2019).

Additionally, the legal provisions contained in articles 6, item II, and 39, items II and IX, of the CDC, stipulate restrictions on discrimination in access to services. When considering the vulnerability of children and consumers, it is plausible to infer, through a principled analysis, that such provisions prohibit the practice of denying children access to certain places.

In this same context, it is relevant to mention Legislative Proposal No. 2,004/2015, currently in progress, whose objective is to add to item XIV of article 39 of the CDC the prohibition of constraining or refusing service to consumers who are accompanied by a child or adolescent.

In addition to legal issues, it is necessary to question the moral validity of such behaviors. How can it be considered acceptable for a space for collective use to be mandatorily declared “child-free”, ignoring the fact that we are dealing with individuals? Silence in the face of exclusionary and discriminatory practices, such as those supported by the childfree movement, normalizes intolerance and legitimizes the segregation not only of children and adolescents but also of their families.

In short, reflection on the exclusion of children from certain spaces goes beyond legal issues, reaching a moral sphere. The childfree movement, by defending exclusionary practices, not only disregards the presence of young individuals but also validates the segregation of their families. This discussion of exclusion and discrimination paves the way to further explore intersectionality,
revealing how the interconnectedness of different identities and systems of oppression influences individual experiences in contemporary society.

4 INTERSECTIONALITY

When examining any type of human rights violation, it is essential to consider the diversity of human groups. The category of children and adolescents should not be seen as homogeneous. If discriminatory attitudes have an impact on children, adolescents, and their families, it is essential to consider the possible repercussions for individuals who are part of minority groups. This raises reflections on the specific effects of these discriminatory attitudes on black children and adolescents. Furthermore, it is crucial to consider the ramifications for children and adolescents who simultaneously face racial and socioeconomic discrimination.

Kimberlé Crenshaw (2002) developed the theoretical concept of “intersectionality” to designate the overlap of multiple forms of oppression that fall on some individuals. The researcher's initial focus was to understand and denounce how the intersection of race and gender discrimination limits black women's chances of success. It then expands the scope of the analysis by also considering other axes of discrimination, such as class, disability, age, etc. People who find themselves at the intersection of these axes are subjected to much more complex and intense processes of discrimination.

The main idea behind intersectionality is that different forms of oppression cannot be examined in isolation, as they are interconnected and intersect, creating unique and complex experiences for individuals who are subject to multiple forms of discrimination. Therefore, Crenshaw's (2002) intersectionality highlights the importance of considering the intersections of different identities and systems of oppression for a more complete and accurate understanding of social inequalities and individual experiences in contemporary society.

When approaching the topic “race”, it is important to clarify that the term is not used in the biological context of human races, which the non-existence has been scientifically proven for a long time. As argued by Dias (2010, p. 10), the
term should be interpreted as “a sociocultural construct with little or no biological basis”. Furthermore, Gomes (2005) adds that “race” carries a political meaning, considering the social, historical, and cultural aspects that define it.

Crenshaw (2002) emphasizes that men and women can experience different forms of racism depending on their gender. The goal here is to highlight that black children also face racism in different and possibly more severe ways, due to their unique perception of human interactions and understanding of the world. Additionally, these painful experiences are internalized in their bodies and minds, accompanying them throughout their lives.

There is a phrase that is often repeated at events about the rights of children and adolescents: “Childhood is the ground you walk on your entire life”¹. It is a metaphor to remember that the experiences of this period reverberate throughout adult life, constituting not just a memory, but a fundamental part of being. It is a serious error, therefore, to neglect or underestimate children’s experiences. On the contrary, medicine and neuroscience have exhaustively proven the strong impact of learning from the first years of life, which psychology has also demonstrated for a long time.

Regarding the knowledge produced by medicine in conjunction with social sciences, Harvard University, through the multidisciplinary Center for the Developing Child, has published relevant studies on the effect of racism on the physical and mental health of black children and adults. Some publications make important contributions to the understanding of toxic stress caused by racial discrimination.

According to Shonkoff et al. (2021), in adverse situations, the human body reacts by activating a stress response system, known as “fight or flight”, which is an important defense mechanism for survival in extreme occasions. When the “fight or flight” mechanism is activated, the immune system reacts by producing defense cells to fight the invaders, which causes an inflammatory process. In the short term, it is this inflammation that protects the body from illness and injury.

¹The phrase is attributed to Ariane Ososhiro, but also to Lya Luft.
However, high levels of inflammation for long periods can compromise the functioning of various organs, which is called “toxic stress”.

In the context of structural racism, toxic stress arises as a consequence of daily experiences of discrimination, which accumulate, generating an overload on the bodies of black people. In children, toxic stress promotes wear and tear on brain development and other biological systems, increasing the risk of damage to physical and mental health throughout adulthood. As a result, obesity, diabetes, heart disease, depression and even premature births are more likely to occur (SHONKOFF et al., 2021).

From the perspective of psychology and psychoanalysis, the work Tornarse negro (Becoming Negro), by Neusa Santos Souza (1983), stands out, which represented a milestone in understanding the psychological consequences resulting from experiences of racism since childhood. Souza describes how the “black myth”, characterized by negative stereotypes such as ugliness, dirt and irrationality, is internalized in the psychic universe from a young age, leading black individuals to aspire to an ideal of whiteness – socially positive values generally associated with white people – both for to assert themselves and to distance themselves from this representation.

It is important to note that, as pointed out by Dias (2010), the processes that underlie stereotypes in the collective imagination are not always explicit or recognized.

Even though reactions that imprison black people in a web of prejudice and discrimination are often contained, in the name of good social coexistence, they appear in actions, conscious or not, that repel non-whites, that is, those who do not present on your body the marks responsible for the limits between what is acceptable and what is unacceptable. (DIAS, 2010, p. 13)

Souza (1983, p. 33) brings yet another possibility to understand the issue, through understanding the Ego Ideal from the black perspective. For the author, the Ego Ideal is “a model from which the individual can constitute himself”, created from the “idealizations of parents, substitutes and collective ideals”. The closer the individual can get to the Ego Ideal, the greater their tranquility and
internal harmony will be. On the other hand, the distance from this ideal causes feelings of guilt and inferiority. The suffering of black people, therefore, comes from the construction of a white Ego Ideal, since “they are born and survive immersed in an ideology that is imposed on them by white people as an ideal to be achieved and which endorses the struggle to achieve this model” (SOUZA, 1983, p. 34).

In this incessant search for adaptation to a white society, according to the same author, black people lose the right to spontaneity, as they are always on alert, in a defense position, having to impose themselves all the time to avoid attacks and discrimination. This permanent waking position causes fatigue, as mentioned in some reports in the book, which coincides with the brain wear mentioned from a medical point of view, by Shonkoff et al. (2021), especially in the child's brain.

Given all of the above, there is no way to ignore that inequality affects black children much more heavily than it does for white children. Returning to the concept of intersectionality proposed by Crenshaw (2002), here there is clearly an intersection of two axes of discrimination: childhood and race.

Advancing in the analysis of intersectionality, another axis of discrimination emerges, always closely linked to race: social class. It is possible to draw on the thinking of Lélia Gonzalez (1982) to reflect on the marginalization imposed on black and poor children in society.

Gonzalez (1982) points out the need to combat the psychological conditioning that naturalizes the racial division of spaces. By critically resuming the theory of the “natural place” proposed by Aristotle, the author denounces that precarious housing (such as slums, tenements, invasions, flooded areas, and housing complexes) or prisons are designated as natural places for black people. This highlights both the profound economic inequality between blacks and whites, evident in the color of the individuals who inhabit residential spaces, and the racist police violence intended to frighten and subjugate black people.

As for black children and adolescents, it is suggested to include shelters and the socio-educational system in the “natural place” category. Shelters are
part of the institutional care system designed to receive children and adolescents who have been removed from their families due to rights violations, such as violence, neglect, or abandonment. The socio-educational system is aimed at teenagers in conflict with the law. Both spaces are shrouded in stigma and prejudice and are mostly occupied by black and poor children. The study in question focuses especially on shelters.

In Brazil, 64.3% of children and adolescents in foster care are black or mixed race (CNJ, 2020), a significantly higher proportion than the general Brazilian population, which is 56.3% black and mixed race (IBGE, 2020 ). This highlights the intersectionality between race and childhood. It is not possible to add class intersectionality due to the scarcity of supporting data, although it is widely recognized that the protective measures determined by the rights guarantee system affect poor families more severely.

According to the ECA (BRASIL, 1990), specifically in articles 19 and 34, reception must have a temporary and exceptional character, prioritizing the reintegration of the child or adolescent into their family of origin, the extended family, or, as a last resort, referral for adoption. Adoption is considered an important alternative for children and adolescents to leave shelters. However, black and brown individuals are disadvantaged in this scenario. Despite representing the majority of those available for adoption – 62% (CNJ, 2020) –, they are often passed over by would-be adopters because of their color: 26% of suitors want white children (OAB-RJ, 2021).

The predominance of black children and adolescents among those available for adoption and the preference for white children on the part of adoptive parents corroborate the view of Teixeira (2016), who points to racism as an obstacle to interracial adoptions, as the majority of Black children are adopted by white families.

The table reflects the impact of stereotypes and stigmas linked to black people in adoption procedures. The idea that being black is synonymous with ugliness, inability to study, moral misconduct or incapacity for intellectual activities, for example, stigmatizes black children and adolescents, concretely influencing candidates for adoption. (TEIXEIRA, 2016, p. 9).
To exemplify intersectionality, Crenshaw (2002, p. 14) cites human trafficking, which is highly debated in the context of human rights. In the author’s words: “Not all women are subject to trafficking. [...] The victims tend to be socially marginalized women, those who are unable to compete adequately in the market”. Likewise, not all children are subject to living in shelters, just as not all adolescents are subject to being confined in the socio-educational system. Despite the exceptions that only confirm the rule, the overwhelming majority of children and adolescents in these environments come from poor and/or black families, making the intersectionality of race, class, and childhood clear.

Thus, intersectionality stands out here when addressing the situation of children and adolescents in shelters and in the socio-educational system, comparing it to the human trafficking mentioned by Crenshaw (2002). In the same way that not all women are subject to trafficking, not all children are destined to live in shelters or be included in the socio-educational system. However, the majority of children and adolescents in these situations come from poor and/or black families. This demonstrates intersectionality, highlighting how racial and socioeconomic issues intertwine, disproportionately impacting certain groups of young people. This analysis can be related to the childfree movement, by highlighting the structural disparities faced by these groups, which are often not considered in debates about parenting.

Concerning the history of foster care around the world, the observation of the predominance of children from poor and/or black families in shelters resonates with the historical evolution of this system. This indicates how reception policies often reflect and perpetuate social and racial inequalities, pointing to the need for reforms in the care system for children and adolescents. This connection illustrates how discussions about the childfree movement can intertwine with historical and contemporary issues related to foster care systems, highlighting the importance of considering a broader perspective on the experiences of childhood and families.
5 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

According to the interdisciplinary analysis of the commercial practices of childfree sites and the growing intolerance towards the presence of children, it becomes clear that the impact transcends mere access restrictions. By integrating areas such as social sciences, neuroscience, and psychology, the profound implications of discrimination are perceived on the moral, emotional, and intellectual development of children and adolescents, who are in crucial periods for human formation. The intersectional approach expands this vision, revealing how black children and children from poor backgrounds face more intense exclusion, crossing three axes of domination: childhood, race, and class.

The thinking of authors such as Kimberlé Crenshaw, Lélia Gonzalez, Neusa Santos Souza, Nilma Lino Gomes, and Luciana de Oliveira Dias illustrates intersectionality in these spheres, highlighting its influence on social inequalities. Fortunately, a growing number of governmental and non-governmental actors, institutions, and activists have been engaged in defending and promoting the rights of children and adolescents. Its actions focus on two main fronts: the dissemination of information through social networks and digital channels, aiming at cultural change, and political mobilization to implement intersectoral public policies in favor of childhood.

Notable examples of these efforts include initiatives such as PIA – Primeira Infância Antirracista (Anti-racist First Childhood), a partnership between UNICEF Brazil and Instituto Promundo, which seeks to promote the full development of black and indigenous children through online educational resources. Likewise, the National Pact for Early Childhood, led by the National Council of Justice, aims at cooperation between government entities to strengthen the protection of the interests of children in early childhood.

Thus, by following an approach that combines critical thinking with practical actions, we advance in the search for the inclusion of children and adolescents in social and leisure spaces, reducing their segregation in dominating environments such as shelters and socio-educational systems. The aim is also to promote the protagonism of these young people in different spheres
of society, allowing the appreciation of their forms of expression and, especially, the freedom to explore the world with all the characteristics that wonderfully define childhood.
REFERENCES


