



Qualis A1 - Direito CAPES

[Editorial]

Dossier “Ethnographies in contexts of violence, criminalization, and incarceration”

Juliana Farias¹

¹ Departamento de Sociologia do Instituto de Ciências Sociais da Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (ICS/UERJ), Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. E-mail: farias.ju@gmail.com ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1373-4586>.

Natália Lago²

² Departamento de Ciências Sociais da Universidade Federal do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (DCS/Unirio), Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. E-mail: nalago@unirio.br ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3713-9594>.

Roberto Efrem Filho³

³ Departamento de Antropologia e Museologia da Universidade Federal de Pernambuco (DAM/UFPE), Recife, Pernambuco, Brazil. E-mail: robertoefremfilho@yahoo.com.br ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9438-0080>.

Editorial received on 01/20/2026 and accepted on 01/21/2026.



This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.



Rev. Direito Práx., Rio de Janeiro, Vol. 17, N. 1, 2026, p.1-19

Copyright © 2026 Juliana Farias, Natália Lago e Roberto Efrem Filho

<https://doi.org/10.1590/2179-8966/2026/97326e> | ISSN: 2179-8966 | e97326e

Theoretical-methodological provocations

The dossier that we are pleased to present in volume 17, number 1, of the *Revista Direito & Práxis* brings together eight works by authors who dedicate themselves to ethnographic research conducted in contexts of violence, criminalization, and incarceration. Given the growing prominence of these ethnographies in the Anthropology of the State and the Anthropology of Law developed in Brazil, this dossier promotes a collective reflection on a) the complexities of the conditions of possibility for ethnographic work in these contexts, taking into account especially the complicities and contradictions between social mobilizations for rights, justice and reparation and State processes; b) the qualification of documents, records, and archives as technologies of power and, above all, racialization; c) the understanding of prison as a space for differential management and production of life, as well as for the circulation of affections and the formation of bonds; d) the interconnections between experiences of violence and criminalization and relations of gender, sexuality, race, class, generation, and territoriality; and e) the reciprocal practices of state production and of employment and legitimization of violence.

As can be seen, this is a complex set of discussions that are important both to the Social Sciences and to research conducted from the legal field – hence the publication of the dossier in one of the most prominent legal journals in the country. In the articles gathered here, categories central to Legal Theory and State Theory as we traditionally know them are questioned from below, in their ambiguities and contradictions, in the power relations in which they operate or are operated by subjects who are produced even by navigating them. This is an intellectual effort consistent with Gabriel Feltran's (2010) ethnographic perspective of separating the norm from the formulation of analytical categories, so that the norm itself is taken as yet another discourse, practice, or representation to be scrutinized. This is how notions essential to the foundations of the rule of law, such as “crime” and “violence”, are taken not as defining how experience should be, but rather as social experiences that, through ethnography, can be understood contextually and relationally.

This is how we understand “violence” as a multifaceted, malleable category that refers to practices, experiences, languages, contexts, reason for denunciation, and grammar of political mobilization and claiming of rights, serving as a relevant analytical and political vector. Furthermore, we consider “crime” not only as the result of state



normative prediction, but above all as a social relation and a reason of government, a process of criminalization that constitutes subjects, bodies, and territories. Finally, we understand “incarceration” by considering the ways in which prison infiltrates territories and relationships beyond those circumscribed by penitentiary units. These ways of conceiving violence, crime, and incarceration result from intersections between different areas of the Social Sciences and, particularly, Anthropology. Regarding the notion of violence, the contribution of gender and sexuality studies in Brazil to its complexification is noteworthy, particularly through research on spousal murders and what would come to be called “gender violence”, such as the work of anthropologists Mariza Corrêa, Maria Filomena Gregori, and Guita Grin Debert.

In summary, these works provided an opportunity to methodologically approach violence not as a given fact, but as a construct under intense dispute, whose narrative structure pedagogically stimulates learning about moral conventions, reaffirming their importance (Corrêa, 1983). Violence here, therefore, is primarily the political or moral effort of its own definition, which presupposes the effort to configure acts and subjects, such as the victim and the perpetrator. Furthermore, it is a form of communication, albeit a perverse one, between agents who experience unequal power relations, but who should not be analytically reduced to the statuses of victim or perpetrator, at the risk of “victimhood”, that is, the risk of subsuming the victimized person to the archetypal figure of the victim, in other words, the risk of denying the subject and their potentialities and contradictions (Gregori, 1993). Thus, the analyses of the overlapping ways of naming violence (against women; gender-based violence) and of the classifications surrounding what can be framed as “violence” require an effort to differentiate crime and violence, on the one hand; on the other hand, they indicate that the articulation between violence and gender is translated in such a way as to be understood in instances classified as “of the State” (Debert and Gregori, 2008).

More recently, a growing body of Brazilian anthropological research, much of it within gender studies, has been conceiving violence as a grammar for the exercise of public denunciation, political organization, and emergence of new identities and collective subjects, such as different social movements and struggles for rights and justice (Leite, 2004; Vianna and Farias, 2011; Araújo, 2012; Lacerda, 2015; Rocha, 2014; Farias, 2014; Eilbaum and Medeiros, 2016; Barros, 2016; Efrem Filho, 2017a; Silva, 2017; Lago, 2019; Farias, Lago and Efrem Filho, 2020; Azevedo et al., 2022; Escuri, 2022; Cruz, 2024;



Almeida, 2025). In dialogue with the arguments of Veena Das (2020), some of these works highlight the analytical need to pursue not only “traumatic events” as social phenomena deserving of attention, but also their place in everyday life and in the ways in which subjects manage, in ordinary relationships and gestures, the effects of those events. This theoretical-methodological perspective on violence also allows for the understanding of the State as “process”, “practices”, and “language”, distancing itself from its reification and observing its constitution "in action" and, in particular, “on the margins” — that is, amidst territories and subjects normatively understood as "outside" or "opposed" to what is understood as the State.

This is, therefore, a production that pays attention to the debates held from the perspective of the Anthropology of the State and Public Administration (Souza Lima, 2002; 2012) and the Practices of Power (Teixeira; Lobo; Abreu, 2019), both to contribute to the argumentative efforts in rejecting the connection between “absent state” and violence, and to highlight the relevance of analyses on the interdependence between the continuous flow of state production and the production of subjects of rights, in the sense proposed by Aguião (2018). In short, the different ethnographic contexts presented in these studies complexify the approaches to what is understood by violence and indicate some ways in which these notions are mobilized in a “language of rights” (Vianna, 2013).

Given that the struggles for rights and justice addressed in these studies often occur within the context of the accusatory attribution of criminal meanings and practices to specific individuals and territories—generally racialized and whose public legitimacy as subjects of rights or spaces for the exercise of citizenship is routinely questioned—the literature has incited a forceful critique of the normative understanding of “crime”. Therefore, instead of circumscribing crime as a fact (typical, unlawful and culpable, according to Criminal Law) or what certain subjects do in disregard of the previous norm, crime is methodologically understood as a form of constitution of subjects or of "criminal subjection" (Misse, 2010), so that crime is understood as inexorable criminalization (Efrem Filho, 2017b). In this sense, urban ethnographic research has been complexifying the boundaries between the State and crime, legality and illegality (Telles and Hirata, 2007), the moral figures of the “worker” and the “bandit” (Feltran, 2011), in order to perceive the porosities, imprecisions, tensions and slippages that characterize such boundaries and the different agents that cross and compose them.



This theoretical field, therefore, deals with violence and crime considering contexts, relationships, and tensions that imply the production of subjects and apparatuses that are sometimes understood from the category of “State”, sometimes signified as an interlocutor of denunciation, sometimes recognized as a violator of rights. The approach to prisons presented in this dossier follows a similar analytical path in the sense of considering the prison institution in its productive dimension and recognizing the porosities, or “communicating vessels”, that constitute it (Cunha, 2003; Godoi, 2010; Fassin, 2019). In other words, the aim is to investigate imprisonment and its effects on bodies, subjects, and relationships that are produced in prisons and that, in a reciprocal movement, produce the institution (Bumachar, 2016; Godoi, 2017; Padovani, 2018; Lago, 2019; Zamboni, 2020; Sander, 2021). Part of this literature works with gender and sexuality as languages that allow us to understand prison dynamics and the production of subjects within the units and in their surroundings (Padovani, 2017; Zamboni and Lago, 2018; Sander, 2021). Other contributions draw attention to the continuities between prisons and other criminalized urban territories, highlighting, here, the emergence within prisons of organized procedures centered around the acronym PCC - Primeiro Comando da Capital (First Command of the Capital) - which are not restricted to prison units (Biondi, 2009, 2014; Mallart, 2014, 2019; Feltran, 2018). Furthermore, the intersections between violence, the State, and criminalization processes form the basis of the argument of collectives and social movements whose actions produce denunciations against “state violence”, focusing on the prison context and its effects on the lives of incarcerated individuals and “prisoners' families” (Araújo, 2022; Lago, 2022; Bandeira, 2025).

Context of development, background and articulations

This brief organization of contributions and research helps us demonstrate the existence of a remarkable body of work in Brazilian Social Sciences, particularly in Anthropology, that intersects with the themes addressed in this dossier. Our goal is to articulate them within a single debate, deepening the ways in which violence, criminalization, and incarceration can be analytically treated together.

Following this objective, the organization and publication of the dossier “Ethnographies in contexts of violence, criminalization, and incarceration” materialize a



series of dialogues and relationships that have been shaping a broad network of collaborations between authors, organizers and institutions. These networks are produced and consolidated not only through the organization of dossiers, but also through the organization of working groups and roundtables at scientific events, joint participation in debates and examination boards, and participation in discussion spaces within the Brazilian Anthropological Association (ABA), especially in its “Citizenship, Violence and State Management” Committee, which the organizers of this dossier and some of its authors are members of.

It is worth noting that this is not the first dossier under our responsibility. On two previous occasions, we worked together to systematize reflections in scientific journals. In 2020, we published the dossier entitled “Mães e processos de Estado” (Farias, Lago, Efrem Filho, 2020a) in issue 36 of *Sexualidad, Salud y Sociedad - Revista Latinoamericana*, from the Latin American Center for Sexuality and Human Rights (CLAM/UERJ). Then, in 2023, we published the dossier “Gênero, sexualidade, Estado e violência” (Lago, Farias and Efrem Filho, 2023), in volume 55, number 2, of the “Revista Antropolítica”, from the Fluminense Federal University. The first of these dossiers gathered together young female researchers whose work explored the engagements of “mothers”, considering the diversity of subjects who perform and mobilize this category, in specific state processes, struggles for rights, and social conflicts (Farias, Lago and Efrem Filho, 2020b). In due course, the second dossier brought together ethnographic research focused on the reciprocal production between processes of State, gender, and sexuality, considering violence as a relevant political and analytical vector.

“Ethnographies in contexts of violence, criminalization, and incarceration”, our third dossier, follows the title of two homonymous working groups held at events in 2024 and 2025, respectively: the 34th Brazilian Anthropology Meeting, held at the Federal University of Minas Gerais, and the XV Meeting of Anthropology of Mercosur, at the Federal University of Bahia. Some of the researchers who participated in these working groups, as organizers, debaters, and/or paper presenters, are now also included in this dossier. Similarly, some participants from the “Anthropologies Against State Violence” Roundtable, mobilized by the organizers as part of the XV RAM program at UFBA, are also included in the dossier.

First and foremost, this kind of mini-mapping of the relationships between the organizers and authors of the texts grouped here aims to highlight the formation of a field



of discussions, dialogues, and research that is expressed in the various activities described above and, of course, in this dossier, composed of people who are familiar with each other's work and who share a common theoretical and political horizon. Establishing a field like this typically requires a commitment to creating the conditions necessary for knowledge to be discussed, developed, and disseminated. For it to take shape and circulate. As mentioned, the three of us have dedicated ourselves to this endeavor for the past five years. However, for it to thrive, the support of open, innovative, courageous scientific publishing houses, open to collective learning and understanding the fundamental role of knowledge production in the democratic experience, has been essential. This is clearly the case with the editorial staff of the *Revista Direito & Práxis* and, in particular, with Carolina Alves Vestena, who carefully followed – “closely and from the inside,” as anthropologists like to say¹ – the step-by-step process of proposing, discussing, assembling, and publishing this dossier. We thank the magazine and Carolina for this, but especially for believing, like us, that if knowledge is linked to democracy, an essential path to its production lies in dialogue and action with social movements.

The dossier, articles and authorship

The organizers of the dossier “Ethnographies in contexts of violence, criminalization, and incarceration” challenged the researchers gathered here to reflect on the ethnographic practices of their research, which must address, in various ways, dimensions of violence in data production and writing. Violence, considering the polyphonic dimension of the category, requires the attention of all those involved in this proposal. Therefore, it is pertinent to question how to narrate situations or experiences considered violent without failing to reveal the analytical meanings of the scenes and, simultaneously, without revictimizing subjects, movements, and relationships? What ethical and political considerations do anthropologists employ when producing narratives about criminalized contexts? In this sense, the dossier is an effort to systematize discussions and contributions that comprise a coherent analytical body, enriched by the multiple emphases produced by each research in each of their ethnographic contexts.

So, let's get to the eight articles!

¹ The expression is the title of an article by José Guilherme Cantor Magnani (2002).



The essay “A hipostasia da violência: implicações etnográficas e produção de conhecimento junto a movimentos sociais” is authored by the dossier's organizers, **Roberto Efrem Filho, Natália Lago and Juliana Farias** (2026), and discusses some dilemmas of ethnographic research conducted with social movements in contexts of violence, criminalization, and incarceration. The text sparks debates around ethnographic practice and its complex relationships with politics and the State to illuminate the different temporalities of political action and knowledge production, and address what its authors call the “hypostasis of violence”. Thus, categories such as State, violence, and crime are considered in light of their fluidity, ambiguities, and centrality in structuring narratives within fields of research and social mobilization.

The article “A melhor prisão do Brasil: Gestão de números e vidas na Unidade Penitenciária Feminina de São Luís, Maranhão” by **Karina Biondi** (2026) discusses ethnographic work in the “best prison in Brazil”, articulating its argument within a “double perspective”. On the one hand, it produces an ethnography of documents that organizes the ways in which the Government of the State of Maranhão produced the “best prison system” just ten years after the Pedrinhas Massacre, which occurred in 2013. On the other hand, the anthropologist follows her daily interactions with female prisoners in the activities she develops in the prison. The analytical articulation of this double perspective allows the researcher to discuss the rights violations in the lives of the prisoners that shape the criteria for the production of a model prison.

In turn, **Vanessa Sander's** article (2026), entitled “‘Uma onda de suicídios no pavilhão LGBT’: gênero, sexualidade e gestão da vida e da morte no sistema prisional”, focuses on the “wave of suicides” that occurred in 2021 in the LGBT wing of a penitentiary in Minas Gerais. By combining document analysis, participant observation, and the author's own participation as a witness in the legal action aimed at recognizing and repairing the rights violations involved in these deaths, Sander meticulously examines conflicting institutional dynamics and state interventions in the case. State accountability is diluted by the individualization of cases as “self-extermination”, on the one hand; on the other, gender and sexuality are mobilized ambiguously, sometimes allowing access to rights, sometimes supporting the expansion and capillarity of the punitive-prison machinery.

Kellyn Gaiki Menegat and Flavia Medeiros (2026), in their article “‘De que adianta escrever certo se a gente nem sabe se chegou ao destino?’: cartas, afeto e política



na vida de mulheres trans e travestis encarceradas em Florianópolis/SC”, present a reading on the articulations between prison routines and the records that circulate there, especially letters and documents. Based on dialogues with transgender and transvestite women, the authors analytically handle the letters in order to discuss the affective bonds of female prisoners, their demands regarding life in prison, networks of contact between prisoners, family members and researchers, and the state controls to which the writings are subjected.

Agustín Villarreal and Nahuel Blázquez (2026) contributed to the article entitled “Una represión que nunca termina. Organización de familiares y militantes anticarcelarios ante la ‘incertidumbre’, ‘espera’ y ‘confusión’ durante la pandemia de Covid-19”. In the text, the authors ethnographically present the ways in which uncertainty, confusion, and waiting structure the prison experience. Using the Covid-19 pandemic as an empirical focus, the authors follow the actions of family members of incarcerated individuals and of activists in order to understand ways of coping with situations of state violence in prison contexts.

In due course, the article “Violence under dispute: crime, discipline and revenge operations in São Paulo, Brazil”, authored by **Janaina Maldonado** (2026), results from a dense ethnographic investigation that pursues the effects of a cell phone robbery that resulted in the death of an off-duty police officer. The ethnographer examines the aftermath of the robbery and murder, considering actions within the framework of the PCC (Primeiro Comando da Capital) and the revenge operations carried out by the São Paulo Military Police. Maldonado then incites an interesting debate about the unequal distribution of violence and the capacities to exercise and regulate its use.

Evandro Cruz Silva (2026), in the article “Assassinatos jurídicos’: o auto de resistência e letalidade do Estado no século XIX brasileiro”, questions the historical origins of the “auto de resistência”, a document drawn up as a state strategy to legitimize violence against civilians. To that end, the author goes back to public debates, still in the 19th century, in order to question a then-consolidated interpretation according to which the notion of “auto de resistência” was an effect of the Civil-Military Dictatorship that began in 1964. Cruz Silva recognizes the auto de resistência as a device that involves the production of a “state truth” that combines with an “unequal management of violence”.

Finally, **Everton Rangel's** (2026) article entitled “Arquivo racial: o que é e por que você deveria se importar” concludes our dossier and presents a discussion of the



racial archive as an analytical tool, capable of highlighting how racialization is organized and produced through documentary practices and bureaucratic languages. Arguing that documents are the technical infrastructure of state racism, the author discusses ways in which race has been neglected in studies of violence, crime, and justice, before emphasizing the analytical scope of the notion of racial archive “for thinking about the (counter)criminalization of Black people in contemporary Brazil”.

It is in the spur of these discussions, and stirred by the desire for this conversation to continue, resonate, and expand, that we wish everyone wonderful readings!

Bibliographical references

AGUIÃO, Silvia. **Fazer-se no “Estado”**: uma etnografia sobre o processo de constituição dos “LGBT” como sujeitos de direitos no Brasil contemporâneo. Rio de Janeiro: EdUERJ, 2018.

ALMEIDA, Matheus. The police who kill and die the most: radical controversies on state violence and the struggles of victims’ families. *Vibrant: Virtual Brazilian Anthropology*, v. 22, e00801, 2025.

ARAÚJO, Bruna Stéffani Soares de. **Ser família não é crime!**: lutas de familiares de pessoas privadas de liberdade como produção do conhecimento jurídico. 2022. Tese (Doutorado em Direito) – Faculdade de Direito, Universidade de Brasília, Brasília, 2022.

ARAÚJO, Fábio. **Das consequências da “arte” macabra de fazer desaparecer corpos**: violência, sofrimento e política entre familiares de vítimas de desaparecimento forçado. 2012. Tese (Doutorado) – Programa de Pós-Graduação em Antropologia e Sociologia, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2012.

AZEVEDO, Desirée et al. **O massacre no Baile da DZ7, Paraisópolis**: Relatório 1 – chacina policial, institucionalização do caso e a dinâmica dos fatos segundo as evidências. São Paulo: CAAF/Unifesp, 2025.

BANDEIRA, Isadora de Assis. **Cadeia, substantivo negro e feminino (ato III)**: “ele tá preso lá dentro, e eu tô presa aqui fora” – uma etnografia com familiares de pessoas encarceradas em tempos pandêmicos. 2025. Tese (Doutorado em Antropologia Social) – Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, 2025.

BARROS, Rachel. **Urbanização e “pacificação” em Manguinhos**: um olhar etnográfico sobre sociabilidade e ações de governo. 2016. Tese (Doutorado) – Instituto de Estudos Sociais e Políticos, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2016.

BIONDI, Karina. A melhor prisão do Brasil: gestão de números e vidas na Unidade Penitenciária Feminina de São Luís, Maranhão. *Revista Direito e Práxis*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 17, n. 1, 2026.



- BIONDI, Karina. **Etnografia no movimento**: território, hierarquia e lei no PCC. 2014. Tese (Doutorado em Antropologia) – Universidade Federal de São Carlos, São Carlos, 2014.
- BIONDI, Karina. **Junto e misturado**: imanência e transcendência no PCC. 2009. Dissertação (Mestrado em Antropologia) – Universidade Federal de São Carlos, São Carlos, 2009.
- BUMACHAR, Bruna. **Nem dentro, nem fora**: a experiência prisional de estrangeiras em São Paulo. 2016. Tese (Doutorado em Antropologia) – Instituto de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 2016.
- CORREA, Mariza. **Morte em família**: representações jurídicas de papéis sexuais. Rio de Janeiro: Graal, 1983.
- CRUZ, Monique. **“Aqui a bala come, não tem aviso prévio”**: favela, necropolítica e a resistência das mulheres-mães guardiãs da memória. Rio de Janeiro: Autografia, 2024.
- CRUZ SILVA, Evandro. **“Assassinatos jurídicos”**: o auto de resistência e a letalidade do Estado no século XIX brasileiro. *Revista Direito e Práxis*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 17, n. 1, 2026.
- CUNHA, Manuela Ivone. O bairro e a prisão: a erosão de uma fronteira. Universidade do Minho, CCHS, IDEMEC, 2003. Disponível em: <http://repositorium.sdum.uminho.pt/handle/1822/5225>. Acesso em: ____.
- DAS, Veena. **Vida e palavras**: a violência e sua descida ao ordinário. Tradução de Bruno Gambarotto. São Paulo: Editora Unifesp, 2020.
- DEBERT, Guita Grin; GREGORI, Maria Filomena. Violência e gênero: novas propostas, velhos dilemas. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*, v. 23, n. 66, 2008.
- EFREM FILHO, Roberto. **Mata-mata**: reciprocidades constitutivas entre classe, gênero, sexualidade e território. 2017a. Tese (Doutorado em Antropologia Social) – IFCH, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 2017.
- EFREM FILHO, Roberto. Os meninos de Rosa: sobre vítimas e algozes, crime e violência. *Cadernos Pagu*, Campinas, n. 51, e175106, 2017b.
- EFREM FILHO, Roberto; LAGO, Natália; FARIAS, Juliana. A hipostasia da violência: implicações etnográficas e produção de conhecimento junto a movimentos sociais. *Revista Direito e Práxis*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 17, n. 1, 2026.
- EILBAUM, Lucía; MEDEIROS, Flávia. **“Onde está Juan?”**: moralidades e sentidos de justiça na administração judicial de conflitos no Rio de Janeiro. *Anuário Antropológico*, Brasília, n. 1, p. 9–33, 2016.
- ESCURI, Giulia. **“Nossos filhos têm mães!”**: a violência de Estado na Baixada Fluminense. Rio de Janeiro: Telha, 2022.
- FARIAS, Juliana. **Governo de mortes**: uma etnografia da gestão de populações de favelas no Rio de Janeiro. 2014. Tese (Doutorado em Antropologia e Sociologia) – IFCS, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2014.
- FARIAS, Juliana; LAGO, Natália B.; EFREM FILHO, Roberto. Apresentação: dossiê mães e processos de Estado. *Sexualidad, Salud y Sociedad*, n. 36, p. 139–145, 2020a.
- FARIAS, Juliana; LAGO, Natália B.; EFREM FILHO, Roberto. Mães e lutas por justiça: encontros entre produção de conhecimento, ativismos e democracia. *Sexualidad, Salud y Sociedad*, n. 36, p. 146–180, 2020b.



- FASSIN, Didier. **A sombra do mundo**: uma antropologia da condição carcerária. São Paulo: Editora Unifesp, 2019.
- FELTRAN, Gabriel. **Irmãos**: uma história do PCC. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2018.
- FELTRAN, Gabriel. **Fronteiras de tensão**: política e violência nas periferias de São Paulo. São Paulo: Editora Unesp; CEM; Cebrap, 2011.
- FELTRAN, Gabriel. Periferias, direito e diferença: notas de uma etnografia urbana. *Revista de Antropologia*, São Paulo, v. 53, n. 2, p. 565–610, 2010.
- GODOI, Rafael. **Fluxos em cadeia**: as prisões em São Paulo na virada dos tempos. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2017.
- GODOI, Rafael. **Ao redor e através da prisão**: cartografias do dispositivo carcerário contemporâneo. 2010. Dissertação (Mestrado em Sociologia) – FFLCH, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2010.
- GREGORI, Maria Filomena. **Cenas e queixas**: um estudo sobre relações violentas, mulheres e feminismo. São Paulo: Paz e Terra; Anpocs, 1993.
- LACERDA, Paula Mendes. **Meninos de Altamira**: violência, “luta” política e administração pública. Rio de Janeiro: Garamond, 2015.
- LAGO, Natália. Reports of a struggle: prison, gender, and activism in an association of prisoners’ relatives. *Vibrant*, Florianópolis, v. 19, p. 1–16, 2022.
- LAGO, Natália. Dias e noites em Tamara: prisões e tensões de gênero em conversas com “mulheres de preso”. *Cadernos Pagu*, Campinas, n. 55, p. 1–26, 2019.
- LAGO, Natália; FARIAS, Juliana; EFREM FILHO, Roberto. A escrita de processos de Estado: abordagens a partir de gênero, sexualidade e violência. *Revista Antropolítica*, n. 55, v. 2, 2023, e58902.
- LEITE, Márcia Pereira. As mães em movimento. In: BIRMAN, Patrícia; LEITE, Márcia Pereira (org.). *Um mural para a dor: movimentos cívico-religiosos por justiça e paz*. Porto Alegre: Editora da UFRGS, 2004.
- MAGNANI, José Guilherme Cantor. De perto e de dentro: notas para uma etnografia urbana. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*, v. 17, n. 49, p. 11–29, 2002.
- MALDONADO, Janaina. Violência sob disputa: crime, disciplina e operações vingança em São Paulo, Brasil. *Revista Direito e Práxis*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 17, n. 1, 2026.
- MALLART, Fábio. *Findas linhas: circulações e confinamentos pelos subterrâneos de São Paulo*. 2019. Tese (Doutorado em Sociologia) – Faculdade de Filosofia, Letras e Ciências Humanas, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2019.
- MALLART, Fábio. *Cadeias dominadas: a Fundação CASA, suas dinâmicas e as trajetórias de jovens internos*. São Paulo: Terceiro Nome, 2014.
- MENEGAT, Kellyn Gaiki; MEDEIROS, Flavia. “De que adianta escrever certo se a gente nem sabe se chegou ao destino?”: cartas, afeto e política na vida de mulheres trans e travestis encarceradas em Florianópolis/SC. *Revista Direito e Práxis*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 17, n. 1, 2026.
- MISSE, Michel. *O inquérito policial no Brasil: uma pesquisa empírica*. Rio de Janeiro: Booklink, 2010.



PADOVANI, Natália Corazza. *Sobre casos e casamentos: afetos e amores através de penitenciárias femininas em São Paulo e Barcelona*. São Carlos: EdUFSCar, 2018.

PADOVANI, Natália Corazza. Tráfico de mulheres nas portarias das prisões ou dispositivos de segurança e gênero nos processos de produção das “classes perigosas”. *Cadernos Pagu*, n. 51, 2017.

RANGEL, Everton. Arquivo racial: o que é e por que você deveria se importar. *Revista Direito e Práxis*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 17, n. 1, 2026.

ROCHA, Luciane de Oliveira. *Outraged mothering: black women, racial violence and the power of emotion in Rio de Janeiro’s African diaspora*. 2014. Tese (Doutorado em Antropologia Afro-diaspórica) – University of Texas, 2014.

SANDER, Vanessa. “Uma onda de suicídios no pavilhão LGBT”: gênero, sexualidade e gestão da vida e da morte no sistema prisional. *Revista Direito e Práxis*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 17, n. 1, 2026.

SANDER, Vanessa. *Pavilhão das sereias: uma etnografia dos circuitos de criminalização e encarceramento de travestis e transexuais*. 2021. Tese (Doutorado em Ciências Sociais) – Instituto de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 2021.

SILVA, Uvanderson. *Cidadania em negro e branco: racialização e (luta contra a) violência de Estado no Brasil*. 2017. Tese (Doutorado em Sociologia) – Instituto de Estudos Sociais e Políticos, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2017.

SOUZA LIMA, Antonio Carlos (org.). *Gestar e gerir: estudos para uma antropologia da administração pública no Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Relume Dumará; Núcleo de Antropologia da Política/UFRJ, 2002.

SOUZA LIMA, Antonio Carlos. Apresentação: dossiê fazendo Estado – o estudo antropológico das ações governamentais como parte dos processos de formação estatal. *Revista de Antropologia*, v. 55, n. 2, p. 559–564, 2012.

TEIXEIRA, Carla C.; LOBO, Andréa; ABREU, Luiz Eduardo (org.). *Etnografias das instituições, práticas de poder e dinâmicas estatais*. Brasília: ABA Publicações, 2019.

TELLES, Vera; HIRATA, Daniel. Cidade e práticas urbanas: nas fronteiras incertas entre o ilegal, o informal e o ilícito. *Estudos Avançados*, v. 21, n. 61, p. 173–191, 2007.

VIANNA, Adriana. Violência, Estado e gênero: considerações sobre corpos e corpus entrecruzados. In: SOUZA LIMA, Antonio Carlos; ACOSTA, Virginia Garcia (org.). *Margens da violência: contornos estatais e sociais do problema da violência nos contextos mexicano e brasileiro*. São Paulo: ABA, 2013.

VIANNA, Adriana; FARIAS, Juliana. A guerra das mães: dor e política em situações de violência institucional. *Cadernos Pagu*, Campinas, n. 37, 2011.

VILLARREAL, Agustín; BLÁZQUEZ, Nahuel. Una represión que nunca termina: organización de familiares y militantes anticarcelarios ante la “incertidumbre”, “espera” y “confusión” durante la pandemia de Covid-19. *Revista Direito e Práxis*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 17, n. 1, 2026.

ZAMBONI, Marcio; LAGO, Natália. O sexo das prisões: gênero e sexualidade em contextos de privação de liberdade. In: SAGGESE, Gustavo et al. (org.). *Marcadores sociais da diferença: gênero, sexualidade, raça e classe em perspectiva antropológica*. São Paulo: Terceiro Nome; Editora Gramma, 2018.



ZAMBONI, Marcio. *A população LGBT privada de liberdade: sujeitos, direitos e políticas em disputa*. 2020. Tese (Doutorado em Antropologia Social) – Faculdade de Filosofia, Letras e Ciências Humanas, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2020.

About the authors

Juliana Farias, Departamento de Sociologia do Instituto de Ciências Sociais da Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (ICS/UERJ), Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil. E-mail: farias.ju@gmail.com ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1373-4586>.

Natália Lago, Departamento de Ciências Sociais da Universidade Federal do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (DCS/Unirio), Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil. E-mail: nalago@unirio.br ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3713-9594>.

Roberto Efrem Filho, Departamento de Antropologia e Museologia da Universidade Federal de Pernambuco (DAM/UFPE), Recife, Pernambuco, Brasil. E-mail: robertoefremfilho@yahoo.com.br ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9438-0080>.

Conflict of interest statement

There are no possible conflicts of interest in carrying out and communicating the research.

Funding information

This research was not funded.

Data Availability Statement

The data supporting the findings of this study are available within the article.

Statement on the Use of Artificial Intelligence

AI tools were not used in the development of this work.

Editors Responsible for the Evaluation Process and Editing

Carolina Alves Vestena e Bruna Bataglia.

About the translator

Carlos Anselmo Alves, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil. E-mail: carlosapcalves@outlook.com.



Editorial Information

Editors

Dr. José Ricardo Cunha, UERJ, Brasil

Dra. Dra. Carolina Alves Vestena, Universität Kassel, Alemanha

Dra. Bruna Mariz Bataglia Ferreira, UERJ, Brasil

Executive Committee

Maísha Santos, UERJ, Brasil

Maria Fernanda Melo, UERJ, Brasil

Aldo Bivona, UERJ, Brasil

Sara Moreira, UERJ, Brasil

Editorial Board

Dra. Ágnes Heller, New School for Social Research, EUA

Dr. Andreas Fischer-Lescano, Universität Bremen, Alemanha

Dr. Alexandre Garrido da Silva, Universidade de Uberlândia, Brasil

Dr. Alfredo Culleton, Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos, Brasil

Dr. Andrés Botero Bernal, Universidad Industrial de Santander, Colômbia

Dra. Bethania Assy, UERJ, Brasil

Dra. Cecília MacDowell Santos, Universidade de São Francisco, USA; Centro de Estudos Sociais da Universidade de Coimbra, Portugal

Dr. Costas Douzinas, Birckbeck University of London, Reino Unido

Dra. Deisy Ventura, Universidade de São Paulo, Brasil

Dr. Girolamo Domenico Treccani, Universidade Federal do Pará, Brasil

Dr. Guilherme Leite Gonçalves, UERJ, Brasil

Dr. Jean-François Y. Deluchey, Universidade Federal do Pará, Brasil

Dr. João Maurício Adeodato, UFPE e Faculdade de Direito de Vitória, Brasil

Dr. James Ingram, MacMaster University, Canadá

Dr. Luigi Pastore, Università degli Studi "Aldo Moro" di Bari, Itália

Dr. Marcelo Andrade Cattoni de Oliveira, UFMG, Brasil

Dr. Paulo Abrão, PUC-Rs e UCB, Brasília, Brasil

Dra. Rosa Maria Zaia Borges, PUC-RS, Brasil

Dra. Sara Dellantonio, Università degli Studi di Trento, Itália

Dra. Sonia Arribas, ICREA - Univesidade Pompeu Fabra de Barcelona, Espanha

Dra. Sonja Buckel, Kassel Universität, Alemanha

Dra. Véronique Champeil-Desplats, Université de Paris Ouest-Nanterre, França

Reviewers

Adamo Dias Alves, UFJF, Brasil; **Allan Mohamad Hillani**, N SSR, EUA; **Dr. Alejandro Manzo**,

Universidade de Córdoba, Argentina; **Alexandra Bechtum**, Universidade de Kassel,

Alemanha; **Dr. Alexandre Costa Araújo**, UNB, Brasil; **Dr. Alexandre Mendes**, UERJ, Brasil;



Dr. Alexandre Veronese, UNB, Brasil; **Alice Resadori**, UFRGS, Brasil; **Dr. Alvaro Pereira**, USP, Brasil; **Ana Laura Vilela**, UNB, Brasil; **Dra. Ana Carolina Chasin**, UNIFESP, Brasil; **Dra. Ana Lia Vanderlei Almeida**, UFPB, GPLutas - Grupo de Pesquisa Marxismo, Direito e Lutas Sociais, Brasil; **Dra. Ana Paula Antunes Martins**, UnB, Brasil; **Ana Paula Del Vieira Duque**, UNB, Brasil; **Andrea Catalina Leon Amaya**, UFF, Colômbia; **Antonio Dias Oliveira Neto**, Universidade de Coimbra, Portugal; **Assis da Costa Oliveira**, UFPA Brasil; **Dra. Bianca Tavorari**, USP, Brasil; **Bruno Cava**, UERJ, Brasil; **Bruno Alberto Paracampo Mileo**, Universidade Federal do Oeste do Pará, Brasil; **Bryan Devos**, FURG, Brasil; **Dra. Camila Baraldi**, USP, Brasil; **Dra. Camila Cardoso de Mello Prando**, UnB, Brasil; **Camila Sailer Rafanhim**, UFP, Brasil; **Dra. Camilla Magalhães**, UnB, Brasil; **Dra. Carolina Costa Ferreira**, IDP, Brasil; **Dra. Carla Benitez Martins**, UFG, Brasil; **Dra. Carolina Medeiros Bahia**, UFSC, Brasil; **Dra. Cecilia Lois (in memoriam)**, UFRJ, Brasil; **Dr. Cesar Baldi**, UnB, Brasil; **Dr. César Mortari Barreira**, Instituto Norberto Bobbio, Brazil; **Dr. Cesar Serbena**, UFPR, Brasil; **Dra. Clarissa Franzoi Dri**, UFSC, Brasil; **Dra. Claudia Roesler**, UNB, Brasil; **Dr. Conrado Hubner Mendes**, USP, São Paulo, Brasil; **Dailor Sartori Junior**, Unisinos, Brasil; **Daniel Capecchi Nunes**, UFRJ, Brasil; **Danielle Regina Wobeto de Araujo**, UFPR, Brasil; **Dr. Daniel Achutti**, UniLasalle, Brasil; **Dr. David Francisco Lopes Gomes**, UFMG, Brasil; **Dra. Danielle Rached**, Instituto de Relações Internacionais – USP, Brasil; **Dra. Deisemara Turatti Langoski**, Unipampa, Brasil; **Diana Pereira Melo**, UNB, Brasil; **Diego Alberto dos Santos**, UFRGS, Brasil; **Dr. Diego Augusto Diehl**, UNB, Brasil; **Dr. Diego Werneck Arguelhes**, FGV DIREITO RIO, Brasil; **Dr. Diogo Coutinho**, USP, Brasil; **Dr. Eduardo Magrani**, EIC, Alemanha; **Dr. Eduardo Pazinato**, UFRGS, Brasil; **Dr. Eduardo Pitrez Correa**, FURG, Brasil; **Dr. Eduardo Socha**, USP, Brasil; **Eliseu Raphael Venturi**, UFPR, Brasil; **Eloísa Dias Gonçalves**, Panthéon-Sorbonne, França; **Emília Merlini Giuliani**, PUCRS, Brasil; **Dr. Ezequiel Abásolo**, Universidad Católica Argentina, Argentina; **Dr. Emiliano Maldonado**, UFSC, Brasil; **Dra. Fabiana Luci de Oliveira**, UFSCAR, Brasil; **Dra. Fabiana Severi**, USP, Brasil; **Fábio Balestro Floriano**, UFRGS, Brasil; **Fabíola Fanti**, USP, Brasil; **Fátima Gabriela Soares de Azevedo**, Universidade do Porto, Portugal; **Dr. Felipe Gonçalves**, CEBRAP, Brasil; **Dra. Fernanda Vasconcellos**, UFPEL, Brasil; **Dra. Fernanda Frizzo Bragato**, Unisinos, Brasil; **Dra. Fernanda Pradal**, PUC-Rio, Brasil; **Dr. Fernando Fontainha**, IESP/UERJ, Brasil; **Dr. Fernando Maldonado**, Universidade de Coimbra, Portugal; **Dr. Fernando Martins**, UniLavras, Brasil; **Felipo Pereira Bona**, UFPE, Brasil; **Fernando Perazzoli**, Universidade de Coimbra, Portugal; **Dra. Fiammetta Bonfigli**, Universidade Lasalle, Brasil; **Dr. Flávia**



Carlet, Universidade de Coimbra, Portugal; **Dr. Flávio Bortolozzi Junior**, Universidade Positivo, Brasil; **Dr. Flávio Prol**, USP, Brasil; **Dr. Flávio Roberto Batista**, USP, Brasil; **Gabriela Cristina Braga Navarro**, Johann Wolfgang Goethe Univertat, Alemanha; **Dr. Gabriel Gualano de Godoy**, ACNUR, Brasil; **Gabriel Vicente Riva**, Faculdade Vale do Cricaré, Brasil; **Dra. Giovanna Milano**, UNIFESP, Brasil, **Dr. Giovanne Schiavon**, PUC-PR, Brasil; **Dr. Giscard Farias Agra**, UFPE, Brasil; **Dra. Gisele Mascarelli Salgado**, Faculdade de Direito de São Bernardo do Campo - FDSBC, Brasil, **Dr. Gladstone Leonel da Silva Júnior**, UNB, Brasil; **Guilherme Cavicchioli Uchimura**, UFPR, Brasil. **Dr. Gustavo Castagna Machado**, UFPel, Brasil; **Gustavo Capela**, UNB, Brasil; **Dr. Gustavo César Machado Cabral**, UFC, Brasil, **Dr. Gustavo Sampaio de Abreu Ribeiro**, Harvard Law School, USA; **Dr. Gustavo Seferian Scheffer Machado**, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Brasil; **Gustavo Capela**, UNB, Brasil; **Dr. Hector Cury Soares**, UNIPAMPA, Brasil; **Dr. Henrique Botelho Frota**, Centro Universitário Christus, Brasil; **Hugo Belarmino de Morais**, UFPB, Brasil; **Dr. Hugo Leonardo Santos**, UFAL, Brasil; **Dr. Hugo Pena**, UnB, Brasil; **Dr. Iagê Zendron Miola**, UNIFESP, Brasil; **Ivan Baraldi**, Universidade de Coimbra, **Iran Guerrero Andrade**, Flacso/México, México; **Jailson José Gomes Rocha**, UFPB, Brasil; **Janaína Dantas Germano Gomes**, PUC-CAMPINAS, Brasil; **Jailton Macena**, UFPB, Brasil; **Dra. Izabel Nuñez**, UFF, Brasil; **Dra. Jane Felipe Beltrão**, UFPA, Brasil, **Jeferson Mariano**, Brasil; **Joanna Noronha**, Universidade de Harvard, USA; **Dr. João Andrade Neto**, Hamburg Universität, Alemanha; **João Emiliano Fortaleza de Aquino**, UECE, Brasil; **Dr. João Paulo Allain Teixeira**, UFPE, Brasil; **Dr. João Paulo Bachur**, IDP, Brasil; **João Telésforo de Medeiros Filho**, UNB, Brasil; **Dr. Jorge Foa Torres**, Universidad Nacional Villa María, Argentina; **Dr. José Carlos Moreira da Silva Filho**, PUCRS, Brasil; **Dr. José Renato Gaziero Cella**, IMED, Brasil; **Dr. José Heder Benatti**, UFPA, Brasil; **Dr. José Humberto de Goés Júnior**, UFG, Brasil; **Dr. José Renato Gaziero Cella**, Faculdade Meridional - IMED, Brasil; **Dr. José Rodrigo Rodriguez**, Unisinos, Brasil; **Dr. Josué Mastrodi**, PUC-Campinas, Brasil; **Judá Leão Lobo**, UFPR, Brasil; **Juliana Cesario Alvim Gomes**, UFMG, Brasil; **Dra. Juliane Bento**, UFRGS, Brasil; **Lara Freire Bezerra de Santanna**, Universidade de Coimbra, Portugal; **Dra. Laura Madrid Sartoretto**, UFRGS, Brasil; **Dr. Leonardo Figueiredo Barbosa**, UNIFESO, Brasil; **Leticia Paes**, Birkbeck, University of London, Inglaterra; **Ligia Fabris Campos**, Humbolt Universität zu Berlin, Alemanha; **Dra. Livia Gimenez**, UNB, Brasil; **Dr. Lucas Machado Fagundes**, UNESC, Brasil; **Dr. Lucas Pizzolatto Konzen**, UFRGS, Brasil; **Lucas e Silva Gomes Pilau**, UFRGS, Brasil; **Dra. Lucero Ibarra Rojas**, Centro de



Investigación y Docencia Económicas, México; **Dra. Luciana Reis**, UFU, Brasil; **Dra. Luciana de Oliveira Ramos**, USP, Brasil; **Dra. Luciana Silva Garcia**, IDP, Brasil; **Dr. Luciano Da Ros**, UFRGS, Brasil; **Dr. Luiz Caetano de Salles**, UFU, Brasil; **Dr. Luiz Otávio Ribas**, UERJ, Brasil; **Manuela Abath Valença**, UFPE, Brasil; **Marcela Diorio**, USP, Brasil; **Marcella Alves Mascarenhas Nardelli**, UFJF, Brasil; **Marcelo de Castro Cunha Filho**, USP, Brasil; **Dr. Marcelo Eibs Cafrune**, UNB, Brasil; **Marcelo Mayora**, UFJF, Brasil; **Dr. Marcelo Torelly**, UNB, Brasil; **Marcelo Maciel Ramos**, UFMG, Brasil; **Dr. Mariana Teixeira**, Universidade Livre de Berlim, Alemanha; **Dra. Marília Denardin Budó**, UFRJ, Brasil; **Maria Izabel Guimarães da Costa Vellardo**, PUC-RJ, Brasil; **Marcio Camargo Cunha Filho**, UNB, Brasil; **Dra. Mariana Trotta**, UFSM, Brasil; **Dr. Marxo Alexandre de Souza Serra**, Puc-PR, Brasil; **Dr. Marcos Vinício Chein Feres**, UFJF, Brasil; **Dra. Maria Lúcia Barbosa**, UFPE, Brasil; **Dra. Maria Paula Meneses**, Universidade de Coimbra, Portugal; **Dr. Mariana Anahi Manzo**, Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina; **Mariana Chies Santiago Santos**, UFRGS, Brasil; **Dra. Mariana Trotta**, UFRJ, Brasil; **Dra. Mariana Teixeira**, FU-Berlim, Alemanha; **Dra. Melisa Deciancio**, FLACSO, Argentina; **Dra. Marisa N. Fassi**, Università degli Studi di Milano, Itália; **Dra. Maria Cecilia Miguez**, CONICET, Argentina. **Dra. Maria Lúcia Barbosa**, UFPE, Brasil. **Dra. Maria Paula Menezes**, Universidade de Coimbra, Portugal. **Dra. Maria Pia Guerra**, UNB, Brasil. **Mariana Chies Santiago Santos**, USP, Brasil. **Mariana G. Valente**, USP, Brasil. **Mariana Kuhn de Oliveira**, Centro Universitário Ritter dos Reis, Brasil. **Dra. Marta Rodriguez de Assis Machado**, Fundação Getúlio Vargas - Direito GV São Paulo, Brasil; **Mayara de Carvalho Araújo**, UFMG, Brasil; **Mayra Cotta**, The New School for Social Research, USA; **Melissa Deciano**, University of Munster, Argentina; **Dr. Miguel Gualano Godoy**, UFPR, Brasil; **Moniza Rizzini Ansari**, UFRJ, Brasil; **Mozart Silvano Pereira**, UERJ, Brasil; **Mozart Linhares da Silva**, UNSIC; **Monique Falcão Lima**, UERJ, Brasil; **Dr. Moisés Alves Soares**, UFPR, Brasil; **Nadine Borges**, UFF, Brasil; **Natacha Guala**, Universidade de Coimbra, Portugal; **Dr. Orlando Aragon**, México; **Dr. Orlando Villas Bôas Filho**, USP e Universidade Presbiteriana Mackenzie, Brasil; **Dr. Pablo Malheiros Frota**, UFGO, Brasil; **Dr. Pablo Minda**, Universidad Luis Vargas Torres, Equador; **Dr. Pablo Nemiña**, Universidade de Buenos Aires, Argentina; **Dr. Paulo Eduardo Alves da Silva**, USP, Brasil; **Paulo Eduardo Berni**, Universidade Ritter dos Reis, Brasil; **Dr. Paulo MacDonald**, UFRGS, Brasil; **Dr. Paulo Eduardo Alves da Silva**, USP, Brasil; **Pedro Augusto Domingues Miranda Brandão**, UNB, Brasil; **Dr. Pedro de Paula**, São Judas Tadeu, Brasil; **Pedro Pulzatto Peruzzo**, PUC-Campinas, Brasil; **Dr. Philippe Oliveira de Almeida**, UFRJ, Brasil; **Pryscilla Monteiro Joca**,



Université de Montréal, Canadá; **Dr. Rafael Lamera Giesta Cabral**, UFERSA, Brasil; **Dr. Rafael Schincariol**, USP, Brasil; **Dr. Rafael Vieira**, UFRJ, Brasil; **Dra. Raffaella Porciuncula Pallamolla**, Universidade Lassalle, Brasil; **Dr. Ramaís de Castro Silveira**, UnB, Brasil; **Dra. Raquel Lima Scalcon**, UFRGS, Brasil; **Renan Bernardi Kalil**, USP, Brasil; **Dr. Renan Quinalha**, USP, Brasil; **Dra. Renata Ribeiro Rolim**, UFPB; **Dr. Renato Cesar Cardoso**, UFMG, Brasil; **Dr. Ricardo Prestes Pazello**, UFPR, Brasil; **Dra. Roberta Baggio**, UFRGS, Brasil; **Dr. Roberto Bueno Pinto**, UFU, Minas Gerais; **Dr. Roberto Efrem Filho**, UFPB, Brasil; **Prof Rodolfo Jacarandá**, Universidade Federal de Rondônia, Brasil; **Rodrigo Faria Gonçalves Iacovini**, USP, Brasil; **Dr. Rodrigo Ghiringhelli de Azevedo**, PUCRS, Brasil; **Dr. Rodolfo Liberato de Noronha**, UNIRIO, Brasil; **Rodrigo Kreher**, UFRGS, Brasil; **Dr. Roger Raupp Rios**, Uniritter, Brasil; **Dra. Rosa Maria Zaia Borges**, UFU, Brasil. **Dr. Samuel Barbosa**, USP, Brasil; **Dr. Saulo Matos**, UFPA, Brasil; **Dra. Shirley Silveira Andrade**, UFES, Brasil; **Dra. Simone Andrea Schwinn**, UNISC, Brasil; **Simone Schuck Silva**, UNISINOS, Brasil; **Talita Tatiana Dias Rampin**, UNB, Brasil; **Tatyane Guimarães Oliveira**, UFPB, Brasil; **Thiago Arruda**, UFERSA, Brasil; **Dr. Thiago Reis e Souza**, Escola de Direito Fundação Getúlio Vargas - São Paulo, Brasil; **Prof. Dr. Thiago de Azevedo Pinheiro Hoshino**, UFPR, Brasil; **Dr. Thomaz Henrique Junqueira de Andrade Pereira**, Escola de Direito Fundação Getúlio Vargas – Rio de Janeiro, Brasil; **Dr. Tiago de Garcia Nunes**, UFPel, Brasil; **Dra. Valéria Pinheiro**, UFPB, Brasil; **Dra. Verônica Gonçalves**, UNB, Brasil; **Dr. Vinícius Gomes Casalino**, PUC-Campinas, Brasil; **Dr. Vinicius Gomes de Vasconcellos**, USP/PUCRS, Brasil; **Dr. Vitor Bartoletti Sartori**, UFMG, Brasil; **Dr. Wagner Felouniuk**, UFRGS, Brasil.

