

**THE CONTRADICTIONS OF POST-MODERN TEMPORALITY IN THE LIGHT OF
THE NEW CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC**

***AS CONTRADIÇÕES DA TEMPORALIDADE PÓS-MODERNA, À LUZ DA
PANDEMIA DO NOVO CORONAVÍRUS***

***LAS CONTRADICCIONES DE LA TEMPORALIDAD POST-MODERNA, A LA LUZ DE
LA NUEVA PANDEMIA DEL CORONAVIRUS***

Eduardo DUQUE¹
José Francisco DURÁN VÁZQUEZ²

ABSTRACT: This article reflects on how much we live in a time of increasing complexity, which seemed to have already overcome all problems, given the security that confidence in scientific and technological processes seemed to have returned to us. But when these processes, as now happens in the Coronavirus pandemic, show their weakness, they reveal, as never before, their weaknesses. These are the weaknesses that result from depositing all the objective value in these processes, believing that in them was the capacity to redeem us from all our ills. Running after innovation and success at all costs, without ethics, without respect for nature and for others, without regard for the past and without anchoring the future in it, reduces the stability and structural security of the societies and individuals that compose them.

KEYWORDS: Time. Temporalities. Social change. Pandemic. COVID-19.

RESUMO: Neste artigo reflete-se sobre o quanto vivemos numa época de crescente complexidade, que parecia já ter superado todos os problemas, dada a segurança que a confiança nos processos científicos e tecnológicos parecia ter-nos devolvido. Mas quando estes processos, como agora acontece na pandemia de Coronavírus, mostram a sua fragilidade, eles revelam-nos, como nunca tinha acontecido, as suas debilidades. Fraquezas essas que resultam de depositar todo o valor objetivo nesses processos, acreditando que neles estava a capacidade de nos redimir de todos os nossos males. O correr atrás da inovação e do sucesso a todo o custo, sem ética, sem respeito pela natureza e pelos outros, sem consideração pelo passado e sem nele ancorar o futuro, reduz a estabilidade e a segurança estrutural das sociedades e dos indivíduos que as compõem.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Tempo. Temporalidades. Mudança social. Pandemia. COVID-19.

¹ Portuguese Catholic University (UCP), Braga – Portugal. Professor at the College of Philosophy and Social Sciences. Integrated Member of the Center for Communication and Society Studies at the University of Minho (UM). Doctorate in Sociology (UCM) – Spain. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4719-3148>. E-mail: eduardoduque@ucp.pt

² University of Vigo (UVIGO), Vigo – Spain. Professor of Sociology. Doctorate in Sociology. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7440-0168>. E-mail: joseduran@uvigo.es

RESUMEN: *En este artículo se reflexiona sobre el modo en que habitamos una época de creciente complejidad, que semejaba haber superado todos los problemas, dada la seguridad y la confianza que parecían conferirnos los procesos científicos y tecnológicos. No obstante, cuando estos procesos, como ocurre ahora en la pandemia de Coronavirus, muestran su fragilidad, revelan, como nunca anteriormente, sus debilidades. Debilidades que son la consecuencia de depositar todo el valor objetivo en dichos procesos, creyendo que en ellos estaba la capacidad de redimirnos de todos nuestros males. Haber perseguido la innovación y el éxito a toda costa, sin demasiados principios éticos, ni respeto por la naturaleza y por nuestros congéneres; sin tener en cuenta el pasado ni anclarse en el futuro, ha reducido la estabilidad y la seguridad estructural de las sociedades y de los individuos que las integran.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Tiempo. Temporalidades. Cambio social. Pandemia. COVID-19.*

Without time, social change would be inconceivable

The human being, throughout history, has always wanted to understand time, to foresee the future (BOURDIEU, 1998). For this, traditional societies used oracles and prophecies. Modern man has imposed methodical knowledge, based on scientific reason, frequently resorting to planning and foresight. The future resists easy and docile predictions, due structural reasons, related to the nature of society (RAMOS, 2007). However, the dynamism of modernity needs and wants to know it. Those who limit themselves to what is happening do not even understand what is happening. Imagination has replaced much of the space given to observation (ROUANET, 2012). The future has become an enigmatic time, due to the complexity of the world, opaque and incapable, focused on innovation and interwoven in a web of interdependencies. Prediction and prospective may be far from our capabilities, due to their irreducible uncertainty.

Man has always been equipped with instruments (means) for predicting the future, but bumped into the element of innovation and unpredictability, preventing him from obtaining protection against absolute certainties and surprises.

The traditional and archaic scheme, based on conceptions of ritual transformations of cycles in circles and original models, neutralizes the character of an open future, conceiving it as a continuation of the present (ELCHARDUS; SMITS, 2006). Here, reigns the kingdom of destiny already written and not known (ELIAS, 1989; HUBERT, 1992; SUE, 1995).

Here is - Marcus Aurelius writes in his Meditations - the properties of the reasonable soul, it travels throughout the world and through the emptiness that surrounds it; examines its configuration; its vision extends to eternity; it embraces and appreciates the periodic renewal of the universe; it believes that those who come after us will see nothing new, as those who came before us have seen nothing but what we see now, and that a man who lived forty years,

however little he understood, saw little more or less as much as preceded him and what will follow, since everything continues uniformly (MARCO AURÉLIO, 2004, Book XI, our translation).

It is, therefore, the past of tradition that guides and gives meaning to life, providing security for the present and the future, perceived in relation to an already known past. “Only those who have the tradition have the measure”, wrote the Greek poet Teognis (JAEGER, 1996, p. 191). A measure that gives depth to time. The origin of the city of Rome – *ab urbe condita* – meant precisely the connection to a foundational time, to a principle that unfolds the meaning of history, projecting it into the present and the future (REVAULT D'ALLONNES, 2008, p. 73).

The established context gave confidence to possibilities to discover the secret of destiny and to divine the beyond of the present: prophecies, divinations, predictions, oracles and visionaries. The future was latent, and the effort was directed towards discovering it, guessing it, to alter a destiny that could not be escaped. Plato referred to:

Have not you seen that when you practice for a long time and since childhood, imitation infiltrates the body, the voice, the way of being, and transforms the character by changing its nature? (PLATÃO, 2003, p. 187, our translation)

Contrary to Platonic time, contemporaneity claims for itself its own way of doing and building the future. It rebelled against the fate of an inexorable destiny without intervention. It wants to build a humanly configurable future, open and indeterminate by the individuality of each subject (BAUMAN, 2000; SENNET, 2007). Looking to the horizon allows you to do foresight, scientific forecasts, political planning and economic previsions.

The future thus becomes the subject of sketch, project, plan, management and regulation. Experts look to the present to produce the desired future. In a modern, mechanistic, linear world of causes and effects, the ability to project the future was a powerful metaphor for anticipating social and organizational processes, as well as physical realities (KOSELLECK, 1993; NOWOTNY, 1994). This metaphor became the palpable everyday reality for most of the population, when the development of the labor society, first, and that of consumption, later, opened to the new middle classes an unprecedented possibility of personal fulfillment (BURY, 2009; POMIAN, 1984).

Nowadays, evolution understands the future as a complex chain of events of various meanings and only with hypotheses of anticipation through inquiry into the possible and probable and, in this aspect, our knowledge becomes very weak.

Since the future is not the replacement of the present (LUHMANN, 1996), but something unknown, based on innovation, opening to the future inevitably means a faltering project. If you knew tomorrow, it would be a continual present and not the future. It happens as if the present extended its horizon to such an extent that it allowed us to glimpse the future as an imminent present (NOWOTNY, 1994).

Thus, synchronously, the field of projection of hopes and fears takes place, a scenario of battle. The social perspective is full of positive references, such as hope, and negative ones, such as fear (INNERARITY, 2011).

From decision making to the elaboration of meaning

The contemporary individual is overloaded with decisions, causing him to panic and have irrational ways of behaving. When this happens, there is no longer the necessary distancing to make good decisions, as the person loses his bases of stability and, naturally, becomes disoriented and insecure, as if losing the sense of his actions and, in the limit, the meaning of his life (ARIÈS, 1988; GIDDENS, 1991).

The negative effects of a society that requires urgent decision-making are visible in today's culture, seen in the way of governing and of organizations. As stated by Innerarity (2011), those who have great responsibilities to decide often have to do so in an unexpected way and not always with all the information or understanding of the phenomena for which they are deciding.

It could even be said that, given the costs of decision and responsibility, it would sometimes be more appropriate to have a range with fewer options than many opportunities. Of course, the risk of the option increases, but on the other hand it also implies greater freedom in action. Decision-making implies precisely the boldness of choice. Because, in fact, as the days of the coronavirus pandemic become evident, when society faces great risks, there is no longer any option to consider, it is only possible to act, to make decisions. But every action also opens the way for hope, for what to do, and certainly something can be done. All this requires the necessary trust. And that can only come from the world that we humans have in common. This is how we can promise that we will not go back to doing what we did or that we will do it and continue to do it (ARENDRT, 1998, p. 262). Confidence is thus born out of our temporal and worldly condition. It sends us from the present to the past, to deny or affirm it, and from there also to the future to decide whether we should continue or start again.

Modern society has, as a rule, been an optimistic society, with an openness to new possibilities of self-configuration, even though they are sometimes surprised to the contrary. As Innerarity (2011, p. 70, our translation) points out, “a democratic society is a society in which the scope of what has to be decided increases, but these decisions are not sovereign decisions, they are exercised in a fabric on which political authors depend, in turn, from the action of many authors”.

Social decision makers, in the urgency of decision, must consider the reason for taking decisions according to the criteria of rationality, social complexity, temporal and spatial configuration etc., aware that all these criteria are interdependent and justified because contemporary societies are all linked in the same web.

In traditional societies, a given decision-making, as a rule, did not interfere with the other, because all processes were too tight, but in complex societies, acts are not isolated, but socially interdependent (ADAM, 2003; 2004; URRY, 2002; VIRILIO, 1997). For this, the information that is available today greatly contributes.

The excess of information typical of functionally differentiated societies – which is often gaps and fake news –, instead of generating enlightened minds, produces ambiguous and uncertain societies. It is necessary to be aware of the information received, in order to know how to manage it.

It is not the information systems that originate a decrease in the information flow (THOMPSON, 1998), on the contrary, this is the result of a mature knowledge of selection. Therefore, our societies cannot ignore the elaboration of information, so that it possesses and conceives, even if implicitly, structures of meaning.

Thus, we can say that we are facing a game and, through the information that comes to us, we can win or lose.

Investing in the present to envision the future

Complex societies are involved in a system of interdependencies of linked facts that, at first glance, seem ungovernable, which conditions the issue of responsibility, for which no one likes to be accountable. In this sense, it is urgent to work on the ability to read and anticipate the consequences, which must consider the reading of current signs, to avoid acting only when the crisis becomes present. Whenever this happens, it means that societies are not properly prepared to face the winds of the future (RICOTTA, 2006) which, we know, will require a lot of wisdom, but also the humility to know how to accept that there are many elements that,

however of easy reading they are, they continue, in the eyes of the present time, very impenetrable: they are thick times, which require more time to enter.

The present times demand that we build a common responsibility. As Arendt (1973, p. 283, our translation) said in *The Origins of Totalitarianism*: “The case of one is the case of all”, which will happen more through the initiative and gift of each one than through a normative way. For this same reason, Innerarity (2011) tells us that financial or collective health crises are an example of how difficult it is to refer collective damage to identifiable causes or act with moral criteria amid these processes in a world where everyone is interdependent, which increases the number of irresponsibility and actions that are not easily imputable. For Innerarity (2011, p. 90, our translation):

[...] the problem is how to represent this responsibility at a time when the relationship between my individual behavior and global results has lost evidence, so it becomes urgent to develop a concept of responsibility that meets the current social complexity and corresponds to our reasonable expectations of achieving a world that can be governed and for which we take responsibility.

The responsibility called for here will then be much broader; which contemplates unwanted, unpredictable and unknown effects that cannot be imputed to the authors, which means that the limits of imputation will have to be extended beyond the horizon of knowledge and experience, the traditional model of control over trivial forms of action, for the responsibility that comes from complex processes, in which there is self-organization and hierarchical interactions.

In this same sense, in complex societies, those that are prepared to let the future in, that is, those who have the power, will have to reorient it by facilitating creative dynamics, open and transparent processes, will have to be able to manage individual and collective risks and attend to security as a precious commodity.

In this way, it is necessary to work in the present time the responsibility of the future time. It is not possible to continue acting as if there were only present, it is necessary to be bolder and take a step, sharing the responsibility of today with that of tomorrow.

It is necessary – in the words of Arendt (1999, p. 106-107, our translation) – “to establish islands of security in the ocean of insecurity of the future”. And for that, we must count not only on the possibility of promising, with confidence, what one intends to do in the future, but also on the possibility of forgiving what was done in the past. So, far from severing ties with the past time, what we do, in this way, is to free ourselves from its moorings, making possible a new beginning that allows us to face the present and the future with confidence.

The human being thus becomes a better person and lives the present time not as someone who is always paying the obligations of the past time, but as someone who wants to earn the future time. Therefore, it is necessary to assume a prospective responsibility that foresees, prevents and configures more intelligent responses capable of responding to new challenges.

Finally, in this present with an eye to the future, it would be good if the awareness of the limitation of our knowledge in the face of the unpredictability of the future becomes a weapon in the fight against the imperialist policies and the arrogance that prevail in our societies.

Distrust in face of political action

Political action plunged into a phase of great limitations, since the figure of the hero was annihilated and the epic speeches that herald the crises stopped attracting citizens. In this sense, we are facing an ecstatic present of mediocrity, where heroic discourses no longer mobilize or displace and, even on the contrary, are turned to indifference and ostracism.

Given this scenario, there is a need for new paradigms that are capable of responding to new circumstances. Paradigms that mobilize people, that make them get up for new causes, that motivate them to leave their homes, homes that leave them confined to comfort.

Comfort, typical of our society, does not help to transform the community. Rather, it helps to feed egos, encourages individualism and absolutizes very solipsistic ways of thinking. Therefore, policies are proposed that eliminate absolute agreements and overcome absolute differences. What is urgent, in fact, are projects without predetermination, but always open to new formulations and alternatives, pilgrim projects of new knowledge, ready to welcome ideas from all sides.

In this context, the need arises for a Copernican revolution, capable of profoundly changing the way of conceiving politics. The classic framing that, as everyone noticed, no longer gives answers. The government has to govern and not govern itself. It has to invest in people, to look ahead, dropping populism. It has to establish strong ties with the future, which is not flattenable or the result of guesswork and, therefore, there is no time for amateurs, it is necessary to have people who are people. People who study, who respect the weight of the vote and who want to build bridges for those who come after us.

The future is something new, which meets the human being, hence the need to anticipate it with an open and transparent heart. It is an intelligent game, launched through human intelligence, without addiction, where all human beings play in relation and whose final result,

the result of the complexity of interactions, is not yet determined. It is determined on a day-to-day basis.

The way of operating in politics, which is often messed up, lacking transparency and verticality, is far removed from the demands of the new times. It is therefore necessary to create a new social paradigm in our societies! It is definitely necessary to overcome the general environment of crisis in which Western modernity was installed (ROSA, 2019). But it is also necessary to transcend both the diagnosis of the crisis and the response of continuous innovative reformism (LE GOFF, 2002). A reformism that only repairs the urgency of the moment, in the immediacy of the present, breaking all awareness of the past, without which there can be neither a project for the present nor for the future. Because, in fact, only from the perspective of the old, the new can give birth to another life, precisely because “it detaches itself from everything that existed” (ZAMBRANO, 1992, p. 14, our translation). Only then will we be able to get out of the uncertainty that surrounds us. As Bauman (2001, p. 170, our translation) refers:

The uncertainty of the present is a powerful individualizing force. It divides rather than unites, and since there is no way to tell who will wake up the next day in which division, the idea of “common interest” becomes increasingly nebulous and loses all practical value. [...] Contemporary fears, anxieties and anguishes are made to be suffered in solitude. They do not add up, they do not accumulate in a “common cause”, they do not have a specific address, let alone an obvious one.

This process is fed by the very logic of democratic systems which, on the one hand, have to make decisions with the speed required by the accelerated pace of post-industrial societies and, on the other hand, they themselves favor, with their performances, the same dynamic. Therefore, any sensation of deceleration of this movement is interpreted as a symptom of crisis, which is – it must be said – the only possible interpretation for the aforementioned slowdown, so that the frantic, delirious rhythm quickly resumes, at full speed, because it is at this rate that contemporary society has become used to solving its crises (HAN, 2016). For this very reason, democratic politics and management are directed to continue accelerating the pace, and this is repeatedly asserted by political leaders. “In post-modernity – writes Harmut Rosa – the possibility of politically conducting the development of society... has become questionable: politics no longer appears as the pacemaker of society, but as the fire department that remains behind and tries to get out of the problem” (ROSA, 2019, p. 287-288, our translation). This generates a spiral of continuous growth, which feeds back with its own energy, which never seems to be satisfied. The matter on which it feeds is none other than the desire to overcome the previous situation, which is quickly dominated by another, announced as threatening. All

of this generates an enormous restlessness that drives back the same dynamic, raised to the moral principle of post-modernity.

As Adorno and Horkheimer (1995, p. 126, our translation) warned us:

The machine rotates without moving out of place. While it determines consumption, it discards what has not yet been tried because it is a risk. [...] Nothing must stay as it was, everything must be in constant motion. For only the universal victory of the rhythm of mechanical production and reproduction is the guarantee that nothing will change, that nothing will emerge that does not adapt.

Disenchantment of the world

All projections and promises of politics have withered away, although the diversity of opinions is still preserved, manifested not so much between the right/left confrontations, but between these and those who occupy the radicalized places, whether they are on the right or on the left. Now, one might ask: what is the reason for the emergence of these extremisms? The answer could raise a new question: and what has politics been doing for citizens? Politics has offered scarce knowledge, lacking opportunities and alternatives; too much centered on her navel, unable to read the future and build bridges over the great priorities, not those of today, but those of the future. In this way, the political life of the present has been very arrogant, leaving the door open for arrogance, the value of extremists, gain expression. An arrogance that is also born from the disappointment experienced by the populations, who expect continuous movements that lead to improvements of all kinds, which, in truth, never end up being consummated. This is especially visible in times of crisis, when gurus emerge who, in order to attract the population, announce that they are going to end the previous situation, promising more movement in the form of growth. A growth that, however, no longer has the capacity to build the future, because the only thing it does is wear it out with the same logic of growth (ROSA, 2016; 2019, p. 547). The more it promises to grow to end unemployment, the more those who work also suffer, as they are repeatedly pulled out of their life contexts (SENNETT, 2001); the more calls are made to improve education rankings, the more teachers and students feel alienated from teaching and education (DURÁN; DUQUE, 2019); the more it is consumed, the more life is consumed, therefore, it must be renewed again and again making new consumptions (GONZÁLEZ-ANLEO, 2014). The more people talk about conserving the planet, the more it is destroyed with increased productivity and a pace of life that no one wants to leave, not even those who seem more sensitive to it all. In short, all this logic of constant accumulation increasingly pulls us from our worlds of life, from our security, to submit to the

only thing that counts, which is permanent change, according to which everything that was true yesterday will not be true today, and the same will happen tomorrow. And, worst of all, we are told that this is the only way we can build our identities, composing and recomposing them repeatedly, in a continuous process of creative destruction (BAUMAN, 2009, p 93; 2010, p. 21). Because, on the contrary, if we do not try to be more every day - that is, more capable than we were the day before, knowing that this capacity, far from being completed, is also emptying every day, so we must continue to fill it daily – if we do not look for all this, it is said, we will be old and useless to the world.

The political life of our society lacks the awareness that the present time is fragile and uncertain, but the uncertainty itself has to be constructed in another way, outside the logic of escalating growth (ROSA, 2019, p. 517). It is from this knowledge that we must build today and move on to the future.

Modernity placed great trust in science as something that would be right and that could structure society. This, in a way, is true. However, it is not the absolute truth. It was realized that there was and that there is a lot of science falling apart. Absolute certainties broke down, giving way to convictions without evidence. Confidence in this science could be compared to the future technocrat, who thought that, by acting and programming in a certain way, the future would be certain and constant. However, this was a failure, as the future, as we have already mentioned, is composed of latent variables and a very opaque tissue. Therefore, the great urgency is to assume that we have a fragile and limited knowledge.

Modernity, since its beginnings, has placed its trust in scientific and technological processes and, in doing so, has also restored their security. But when these processes, as now happening in the Coronavirus pandemic, show their fragility, they reveal to us, as never before, their weaknesses. Weaknesses that result from depositing all objective value in these processes, believing that in them lay the capacity to redeem us from all our ills. But this belief, if it is not driven by a greater one in the ends to which those should be directed, then it will be of little value and use. Furthermore, they will disappear with the objective truth that seemed to sustain them. “Even when they are constructed taking into account all the rules of science”, wrote Durkheim (1992, p. 407, our translation), “concepts do not only attain authority because of their objective value. To believe in them, it is not enough for them to be true. If they do not harmonize with other beliefs, with other opinions, in a word, with the set of collective representations, they will be denied”. Put another way, beliefs encourage us to act in a certain direction; they bind us to a goal to which we are committed. Only then will we be able to decide with certain security

and confidence, “disposing of the future as if it were the present” (ARENDR, 1998, p. 264, our translation).

The future in constant tension

Social life is like an orchestra, where no one cancels anyone out. For this, the constant concern must be to work on the principle of contradictory, which involves knowing how to manage different opinions and thoughts, because they can complement, rather than destroy they can deconstruct, and it is from here that the new is born, the future. In this sense, the great mission of complex societies would consist in managing disagreements in an orderly manner, as someone who providentially deconstructs to build wisely.

In fact, the intact capacity that the future holds to be built and its unpredictability is what draws us to it, generating a strong tension between the already and the not-yet, although the still is not very latent in the present (KOSENLECK, 1993). It is in this tension that one has to learn to live.

Today's society is a true public square, where the plurality of offers intersects and where the heterogeneity of attitudes, values and behaviors is not only possible but advisable. It is the social complexity in management.

Nowadays, we are witnessing great achievements that are not the result of the initiatives of a single person or institution. It is from the constant tension of sharing knowledge that great achievements come.

Politics, in part, has given way. How education, religion, family, and most institutions gave way. Power is now in the capacity for anticipation, for forecast. And whoever has it, has it very contingently.

Contingency is fundamentally related to the decisions that are taken and the way to take them in practice, as that is where the future comes from. This means that the tension that requires decision-making entails a risk, since it involves a great deal of contingency and, therefore, is based on not-knowing (INNERARITY, 2011). That is, one decides not about what is known, but about the uncertainty of the future, which sometimes requires a great deal of imagination.

In this context, it can be said that we live in a time of growing complexity, in which changes accelerate and change from one day to another the social, political, economic and cultural spheres, which destabilizes the social structure that we had as guaranteed. But we also need to know that any society that does not overcome this uncertainty of constant change will

be an uprooted society that, breaking all ties with the past and with no prospects for the future, will sail aimlessly in a constant crisis. All of this does not mean, as mentioned, tying oneself to the mast of the past, to repeat it, but perhaps starting something new, with a deep awareness of what it was, in order to face the future with hope. “When the past does not illuminate the future”, Tocqueville wrote, “the spirit walks through the darkness” (TOCQUEVILLE, 1994, p. 278, our translation). Happy are those who were blessed by their parents because they will also be able to bless their descendants.

Therefore, it is only possible to leave the complexity and reflexivity that characterize our societies with a certain amount of confidence. But this requires, as stated above, certain beliefs that feed it. We have already passed the time, which characterized full modernity, in which fears were different, arising from the feeling of not being able to live up to the integration necessary to face the future. Fears that multiplied because, having broken with the traditional world of the past, this was the only possible alternative that, however, offered a series of future opportunities, never seen before.

As Elias (1993) has well demonstrated, modern subjectivity was constructed in this apparently contradictory and paradoxical way. For, although it was a profound awakening of individual conscience, all this occurred through submission to the civilized socialization program. That is how this awareness developed throughout modernity, through the institutional universes of family, work and education. Only by overcoming these fears, linked to the institutional integration required by these universes, could the future be faced, which was open to multiple possibilities, thus hoping for a certain recognition of what could be achieved. Only by integrating within this institutional framework could the modern subject aspire to express themselves and develop a life project focused on the future.

Nevertheless, as these possibilities became less and less attractive and clear-cut, fears emerged stripped of all reward. This fact was denounced from the beginning as an undoubted sign of cultural malaise (FREUD, 1973), anticipating the exhaustion of the modern civilizing program. A denunciation that later became much more persistent, as a whole generation of young people, born from the 1950s onwards, openly came out against their parents, seeing in them and their past the example of a repressive society and, in its promises of liberation oriented towards a future of progress, the living display of an ideology that concealed that manifest repression. This fact was denounced, as is known, by the most distinguished intellectuals, helping to shape the spirit of an entire era (BOURDIEU; PASSERON, 2001; FOUCAULT, 1999).

Without the possibility of a return to the past, and with the images of progress increasingly blurred, it no longer makes sense to look to the future. “*No future*” was the title of one of the songs that famous British rock band *Sex Pistols* released in 1977, whose lyrics said “don't tell me what you want; don't tell me what you need, there is no future for you”.

Thus, a time was opened when fears would be different. Not only those related to the overwhelming disciplinary structure of institutions, but those related to the difficulty of integration. Not those derived from the necessary institutional recognition, without which it would be difficult to build a future life, but from others that derive from the lack of this recognition, which must be sought every day without being discouraged, without more guarantees than each one can demonstrate.

If the psychological disorders of modernity were related to the willingness to assume disciplinary institutional structures in order to gradually free themselves for the future, those of postmodernity have to do with the person's difficulty in assuming himself as a subject destined to be capable and self-sufficient, once detached from past cultural models and future institutional orientations. And yet, he finds himself unable to be that way when this was his destiny. The role of therapy is none other, in this context, than to seek the subject's re-encounter with himself; with its destiny (EHRENBERG, 1998, p. 147). For this meeting, so necessary, to materialize, a whole program of interiorization is proposed, with the aim that each individual assumes their present condition, free from the past and the future (ILLOUZ, 2010, p. 139). Recovered for a moment from his ills, the individual seems to emerge triumphant, but as soon as he straightens up, he feels helpless as before.

REFERENCES

ADAM, B. Reflexive modernization temporalized. **Theory Culture Society**, v. 20, n. 2, p. 59-78, 2003.

ADAM, B. **Time**. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2004.

ADORNO, T.; HORKHEIMER, M. **Dialética do esclarecimento**: fragmentos filosóficos. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 1985.

ARENDT, H. **The Origins of Totalitarianism**. New York: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1973.

ARENDT, H. **La condición humana**. Barcelona. Paidós, 1998.

ARENDT, H. Labor, trabajo, acción. In: ARENDT, H. **De la historia a la acción**. Barcelona: Paidós, 1999. p. 89-107.

- ARIÈS, P. **Sobre a História da Morte no Ocidente desde a Idade Média**. Lisboa: Teorema, 1988.
- BAUMAN, Z. **Liquid Modernity**. Cambridge: Polity, 2000.
- BAUMAN, Z. **El arte de la vida**. Barcelona: Paidós, 2009.
- BAUMAN, Z. **Tiempos líquidos**. Vivir en una época de incertidumbre. Barcelona: Tusquets, 2010.
- BAUMAN, Z.; TESTER, K. **Conversations with Zygmunt Bauman**. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001.
- BOURDIEU, P. **Meditações Pascalianas**. Oeiras: Celta Editora, 1998.
- BOURDIEU, P.; PASSERON, J.-C. **La reproducción**. Elementos para una teoría del sistema de enseñanza. Madrid: Editorial Popular, 2001.
- BURY, J. **La idea de progreso**. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 2009.
- DELORY-MOMBERGER, C. A pesquisa biográfica ou a construção compartilhada de um saber do singular. **Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa (Auto)Biográfica**, v. 1, n. 1, p. 133-147, 2016.
- DELORY-MOMBERGER, Christine. **De la recherche biographique en éducation**. Fondements, méthodes, pratiques. Paris: Téraèdre, 2014.
- DUQUE, E. É possível sair do presente? Uma teoria prospetiva. In: ARAÚJO, E. *et al.* (eds.). **Tempos sociais e o mundo contemporâneo**. As crises, as fases e as ruturas. Braga: Centro de Estudos de Comunicação e Sociedade/Centro de Investigação em Ciências Sociais, 2014. p. 154-169.
- DURÁN VÁZQUEZ, J.; DUQUE, E. **Las transformaciones de la educación**. De la tradición a la modernidad hasta la incertidumbre actual. Madrid: Dykinson, 2019.
- DURKHEIM, É. **Las formas elementales de la vida religiosa**. Madrid: Akal, 1992.
- EHRENBERG, A. **La fatigue d'être soi**. París: Edile Jacob, 1998.
- ELCHARDUS, M.; SMITS, W. The Persistence of the Standardized Life Cycle. **Time & Society**, v. 15, n. 2/3, p. 303-326, 2006.
- ELIAS, N. **El proceso de civilización**. Madrid: FCE, 1993.
- ELIAS, N. **Sobre el tiempo**. Madrid: FCE, 1989.
- FOUCAULT, M. **Vigilar y castigar**. Barcelona: Círculo de Lectores, 1999.
- FREUD, S. **El malestar en la cultura**. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1973.

GIDDENS, A. **Modernity and Self Identity**. Cambridge: Polity, 1991.

GONZÁLEZ-ANLEO SÁNCHEZ, J. M. **Consumidores consumidos**. Juventud y cultura consumista. Madrid: Khaf, 2014.

HAN, B.-C. **O aroma do tempo**. Um ensaio filosófico sobre a arte da demora. Lisboa: Relógio d'Água, 2016.

HUBERT, H. Estudio sumario sobre la representación del tiempo en la religión y la magia. *In*: RAMOS TORRE, R. **Tiempo y sociedad**. Madrid: CIS, 1992. p. 1-33.

ILLOUZ, E. **La salvación del alma moderna**. Terapia, emociones y la cultura de la autoayuda. Madrid: Katz, 2010.

INNERARITY, D. **O Futuro e os seus Inimigos**. Uma defesa da esperança política. Lisboa: Teorema, 2011.

JAEGER, W. **Paideia**. Madrid: FCE, 1996.

JANNER RAIMONDI, M. Empathie. *In*: DELORY-MOMBERGER, C. (coord.). **Vocabulaire des histoires de vie et de la recherche biographique**. Toulouse: Érès, 2019. p. 72-75.

KOSELLECK, R. **Futuro pasado**. Barcelona: Paidós, 1993.

LE GOFF, J.-P. **La démocratie post-totalitaire**. París: La Découverte, 2002.

LUHMANN, N. **Introducción a la teoría de sistemas**. México: Anthropos, 1996.

M'BIATONG, J. La recherche biographique en éducation pour l'éthique. *In*: DIZERBO, A.; M'BIATONG, J. (coord.). **Pour une éthique de l'accompagnement biographique**. Paris: Téraèdre, 2019. p. 129-152.

MARCO AURELIO. **Meditaciones**. Madrid. Cátedra, 2004.

NOWOTNY, H. **The modern and postmodern experience**. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994.

PLATÓN. **La república**. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 2003.

POMIAN, K. **L'ordre du temps**. París: Gallimard, 1984.

RAMOS, R. Time's social metaphors. An empirical research. **Time & Society**, v. 16, n. 2/3, p. 157-187, 2007.

REVAULT D'ALLONNES, M. **El poder de los comienzos**. Ensayo sobre la autoridad. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu, 2008.

RICOTTA, L. **Valores do educador: uma ponte para a sociedade do futuro**. São Paulo: Ágora, 2006.

ROSA, H. **Alienación y aceleración**. Hacia una teoría crítica de la temporalidad en la modernidad tardía. Madrid: Katz, 2016.

ROSA, H. **Resonancia**. Una sociología de la relación con el mundo. Buenos Aires: Katz, 2019.

ROUANET, S. Figuras do tempo. *In*: **Ciclo mutações**: o futuro não é mais o que era. Academia Brasileira de Letras: Rio de Janeiro, 2012.

SENNET, R. **A cultura do novo capitalismo**. Lisboa: Relógio d'Água, 2007.

SENNETT, R. **La corrosión del carácter**. Las consecuencias personales del trabajo en el nuevo capitalismo. Barcelona: Anagrama, 2001.

SOUZA, R.; CATANI, A. Educação escolar e educação social: uma interação a favor da cidadania. **Revista Trama Interdisciplinar**, São Paulo, v. 7, n. 3, p. 50-68, 2016.

SUE, R. **Temps et ordre social**. París: PUF, 1995.

THOMPSON, J. **A mídia e a modernidade**: uma teoria social da mídia. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes, 1998.

TOCQUEVILLE, A. **La democracia en América**. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1994. v. 2.

URRY, J. Sociologia do tempo e do espaço. *In*: TURNER, B. S. (org.). **Teoria social**. Lisboa: Difel, 2002. p. 377-403.

VIRILIO, P. **El ciber mundo, la política de lo peor**: entrevista con Philippe Petit. Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 1997.

ZAMBRANO, M. **Persona y democracia**. La historia sacrificial. Madrid: Taurus, 1992.

How to reference this article

DUQUE, E.; DURÁN VÁZQUEZ, J. F. The contradictions of post-modern temporality in the light of the new coronavirus pandemic. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 16, n. 3, p. 1713-1728, July/Sep. 2021. e-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v16i3.15417>

Submitted: 21/12/2020

Required revisions: 16/01/2021

Approved: 11/02/2021

Published: 01/07/2021