

**DIFERENTES PERSPECTIVAS SOBRE UMA EDUCAÇÃO ESTÉTICA NA ATUALIDADE**

**DIFERENTES PERSPECTIVAS SOBRE LA EDUCACIÓN EN LA ACTUALIDAD**

**DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES ON AESTHETIC EDUCATION NOWADAYS**

Luiz Antonio CALMON NABUCO LASTÓRIA<sup>1</sup>

**RESUMO:** A remissão à sensibilidade humana, à dimensão do “sensível” como objeto da educação propriamente dito encontra a sua formulação mais longínqua na *República*, de Platão, no entanto essa tarefa permaneceu um problema carente de uma equação razoável até os dias atuais. No Brasil, sobretudo após a publicação dos Parâmetros Curriculares Nacionais a partir de 1997, as discussões e proposições para a efetivação de uma educação do sensível se intensificaram. Nosso propósito, nos limites deste artigo, consiste na exposição e na problematização de duas diferentes perspectivas teóricas situadas em diferentes paisagens históricas do século XX, e que embasam as discussões no âmbito nacional a propósito de uma pretensa educação sensível na atualidade. Esse é o caso do psicólogo e teórico soviético Lev S. Vygotsky (1896) e do filósofo francês Jacques Rancière (1940).

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** Educação estética. Civilização. Contemporâneo.

**RESUMEN:** La referencia a la sensibilidad humana, a la dimensión de lo "sensible" como el objeto de la educación misma, encuentra su formulación más distante en la *República de Platón*, sin embargo, esta tarea ha seguido siendo un problema que carece de una ecuación razonable hasta nuestros días. En Brasil, especialmente después de la publicación de los Parámetros Curriculares Nacionales desde 1997, las discusiones y propuestas para la realización de una educación de la sensibilidad se intensificaron. Nuestro propósito, considerando los límites de esta investigación, consiste en la exposición y problematización de dos perspectivas teóricas diferentes situadas en diferentes paisajes históricos del siglo XX, y que subyacen a las discusiones a nivel nacional sobre una educación supuestamente sensible en la actualidad. Es el caso del psicólogo y teórico soviético Lev S. Vygotsky (1896) y del filósofo francés Jacques Rancière (1940).

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** Educación estética. Civilización. Contemporâneo.

**ABSTRACT:** The reference to human sensibility, to the dimension of the “sensible” as the object of education itself, finds its most distant formulation in Plato's *Republic*. However, this task has remained a problem lacking a reasonable equation until now. In Brazil, especially after the publication of the National Curriculum Parameters in 1997, the discussions and propositions for an education of the sensibility have intensified. Our purpose, considering the

<sup>1</sup> Universidade Estadual Paulista (UNESP), Araraquara – SP - Brasil. Professor Doutor Livre-Docente vinculado ao Departamento de Psicologia da Educação. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9870-5687>. E-mail: [lacalmon@fclar.unesp.br](mailto:lacalmon@fclar.unesp.br)

limits of this paper consists in the exposition and reflection of two different theoretical perspectives. They are situated in different historical moments of the twentieth century and they are important reference for the national debate regarding a supposedly education of sensibility nowadays. This is the case of Soviet psychologist and theorist Lev S. Vygotsky (1896) and of the French philosopher Jacques Rancière (1940).

**KEYWORDS:** *Esthetics education. Civilization. Contemporary.*

## Introduction

The approach to sensibility as a focus in Education was cited in Plato's *Republic* in the ancient Greek society and also in the work of the modern romantic philosopher and dramatist Friedrich Schiller (1759-1805). For Schiller the beauty was a categorical imperative which should lead the human activities. The reason for this perspective was that the philosopher has considered both sides of human beings: the rational and the sensitive at the same time. In the empirical and ordinary experience on the human being the beauty shows itself as a task and not as something that exists. For him the beauty was an inevitable complement of the moral duty (*sollen*) which Immanuel Kant had mentioned in his *Critical of Practical Reason*.

However, that task never had a reasonable solution until today. Despite the educational paradoxes, like the programmed training as an educational praxis, something very common nowadays, it is necessary to consider that human affection comes before consciousness. That was the reason Sigmund Freud has considered the education as one of the three impossible professions.

Certainly, the history of the Nazi experience has showed us the most important example of failure of the sensitive Education expected by the Western civilization. We don't have any doubt that the case of "Friedrich Wilhelm Ruppert" is an emblematic real example of this problem. Rosa Sala Rose (2007) has mentioned him – as the good father who tortured people and played violin – to question about the link between moral inequity and culture. How is it possible to play Schubert at night, read Rilke in the morning and torture people at noon?

The historical presence of Ruppert and the others like him have thrown away the most important and beautiful ideal of modernity: culture doesn't necessarily make us better; neither qualitatively nor ethically. All of us who appreciate culture have cultivated this utopia but we have been forced to see a terrible reality: Ruppert more than justified a new interpretation of the famous Adorno's statement – "It is not possible to make poetry after Auschwitz". The reason is not because poetry is noble enough to exist after such horror, but instead, because poetry lost its universal impulse and became

such a useless entertainment for sensitive souls in their spare time (ROSE, p. 17, 2007).<sup>2</sup>

Unfortunately, Ruppert is not an isolate case. His character is similar to many others which actually have permeated society. Nevertheless, they differ in their levels of (in) sensibility and cruelty. Despite the crucial differences between the European fascism of the twentieth century and our actual democratic societies, the proposal for a sensitive Education remains as a western civilization dilemma. Dilemmas, which ask for thoughtful elaborations to prevent new barbarisms, particularly caused by the usual new media relationships which are a product of our merchandizing society.

Theodor W. Adorno has spoken about the necessity of conscious thoughts elaborations with the following words:

The faculty of judging refers to an ego consistence and to the dynamic of instincts which is responsible for the psych division between feelings and reason. [...] This psychic departmentalization does not work when the act of thinking is split. The same happens when someone juxtaposes reason and therapeutic ingredients. Only when self-reflecting on desire (as the basis of thinking) subsides into the objective thinking can we have a real impulse towards utopia (ADORNO, 1992, p. 174).<sup>3</sup>

After the Curriculum National Parameters publication in 1997 the debate about a sensitive Education became more intense. In general, the authors admit critically an Education centered exclusively on the reason and also in the knowledge specialization. Most of them discuss about the day by day life under the judge cultural industry impacts. The contributions of authors like Michel Maffesoli and Jacques Rancière greatly support some of theoretical positions about propositions of a sensitive Education in the country. So, the aesthetic dimension as a responsible to help the integrality of human beings came top for the intellectual scene.

---

<sup>2</sup> La existencia histórica de Ruppert y sus representantes ha dado definitivamente al traste con uno de los más grandes y bellos ideales de la modernidad: que la cultura nos hace mejores; no solo cualitativamente, en cuanto seres humanos, sino también en nuestra dimensión ética. Todos los que valoramos la cultura somos deudores de este sueño del que nos ha arrancado un amargo despertar: Ruppert justificaría una nueva interpretación del celeberrimo dicho de Adorno segun el cual no puede haber poesía después de Auschwitz, y es que, si no puede haberla, no es porque la poesía seja demasiado noble para seguir existiendo tras la comprobación pública del horror, sino porque, despojada del deseo universal que la impulsaba, se habría vuelto inútil, un mero entretenimiento para almas sensibles en los ratos de ocio (ROSE, 2007, p. 17).

<sup>3</sup> A faculdade de julgar se mede pela firmeza do Eu. Mas, com isso, também por aquela dinâmica das pulsões que é confiada ao sentimento pela divisão psíquica do trabalho. [...] Contra a cisão do pensamento não adianta a síntese dos departamentos psíquicos tornados estranhos uns aos outros, nem a mistura terapêutica da *ratio* com fermentos irracionais, mas a autorreflexão sobre o elemento do desejo que, de maneira antitética, constitui o pensamento enquanto pensamento. É quando esse elemento se dissolve de um modo puro, sem resíduo heterônimo, na objetividade do pensamento, que ele se constitui num impulso em direção à utopia (ADORNO, 1992, p. 174).

On the other hand, author as Lev S. Vygotsky, G. Lukács and also the authors who integrated the called Frankfurt School have being studied as a possible reference for thinking about a sensitive Education. In Brazil this current of thinking is critic of the mainstream Educational orientation which has tried to recover a possible aesthetic Education of the slogan “learning to learn”.

Our purpose, considering the limits of this paper, consists in the exposure and reflection of two different theoretical perspectives which were formulated in different historical moments of the twentieth century and are reference to actual discussion about this topic in that country. Those perspectives come from the Sovietic psychologist Lev S. Vygotsky (1896) and the Franch philosopher Jacques Rancière (1940).

The first author has written during the Soviet Union socialist revolution. His theoretical perspective considered art as a technique of the feelings and a specific ideological representation which is socially constructed. His work was written at the same time when a new society was being built – just after the October Socialist Revolution of 1917<sup>th</sup>. The second author, who was Althusser’s student and participated in the May 68<sup>th</sup> protest in France, emphasized the relations about education, aesthetic and politics after the 80s.

## I

During the construction of socialism (1917) Vygotsky recognized the aesthetical phenomena as a technique of feelings and the psychology of art as a mediator between the productive power and the different ideological representations. These ideological representations are within the scope of aesthetics: - “the sociological study will never immediately be able to show the ideology without psychological contributions (VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 12)<sup>4</sup>. Therefore, the psychological mediation inside the scope of aesthetics would be necessary to show the ideologies. For the Soviet psychologist, [...] “the art is able to organize a specific area of the psyche of the social men – specifically in the field of feelings” (VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 12).<sup>5</sup>

In his book, *Psychology of Art*, which was written between 1924 and 1926, Vygotsky dedicated one entire chapter to psychoanalytic theory. He did it considering the most important concept elements of Marxism (an appeal to a historical objectivity and an appeal to a systematic

<sup>4</sup> [...] nunca o estudo sociológico em si, sem o complemento do estudo psicológico, estará em condições de revelar a natureza imediata da ideologia (VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 12).

<sup>5</sup> [...] a arte sistematiza um campo inteiramente específico do psiquismo do homem social – precisamente o campo do seu sentimento (VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 12).

thought of synthesis). And he also did it because he considered that Marxism needed to transcend the restrictive frame of the Philosophies of consciousness. To understand the aesthetical phenomena the author argued that: “We never can precisely explain why we liked this or that work of art; we can almost never describe the minimal essential aspects of our emotions. And as Plato had said in *Íon*, the poets don’t know the reason for their creation (VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 81).<sup>6</sup> Despite that, it is important to highlight that this author categorically rejected the Freudian division between consciousness and unconsciousness.

Considering that the unconscious forces act on both, production and reception of art, which we can only recognize from clues. “All interpretation made from the artist or the reader must be [...] considered as a later rationalization [...]. Or better: as an illusion or as a justification in the face of reason – something like an unreal explanation *post factum*” (VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 82).<sup>7</sup> In fact the soviet author’s perspective of the aesthetic studies about art has always been based on psychological premises. Except for psychoanalysis, the other psychologies have explained the aesthetical phenomena just based on consciousness. So these psychologies drifted from that catharsis as a critical point in the emotional tensions of day by day life. Catharsis is responsible for the split of everyday life emotions and emotions produced by art.

According to Otto Rank and N. Sachs Vygotsky said:

All evidence shows us that the emotional effects are different when they are produced by art. And this aesthetical change in the emotional effect, which ranges between the opposite poles of anguish and pleasure, is the great problem to be answered. The solution to this problem could come from the analysis of the unconscious life of the spirit (*The importance of psychoanalysis in soul science – 1913 – apud*, VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 83).<sup>8</sup>

The contributions of the psychoanalytic theory were noticed again in Vygostky’s *Psychology of Art* (Chapter 9) that expresses his understanding of the Aristotelian concept of *kátharsis*. The intention of the soviet author was to establish a link between the dynamic of the emotion caused by art and the production of phantasies by the viewer.

---

<sup>6</sup> Nunca conseguiremos dizer com exatidão por que precisamente gostamos dessa ou daquela obra; quase não podemos externar em palavras aqueles mínimos aspectos essenciais importantes dessa emoção e, como já observava Platão no *Íon* (cf. 86) os próprios poetas são os que menos sabem por que meios criam (VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 81).

<sup>7</sup> [...] considerada como racionalização [...] tardia, isto é, como alguma impressão ilusória, alguma justificação diante da própria razão, como explicação *post factum* inventado (VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 82).

<sup>8</sup> Tudo indica que o efeito dessas emoções é inteiramente diverso quando produzido pelas obras de arte, e essa mudança estética do efeito da emoção, que vai da fonte do angustiante à fonte do prazer, é o problema cuja solução só pode ser obtida através da análise da vida inconsciente do espírito (*A importância da psicanálise nas ciências da alma – 1913 – apud*, VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 83).

The original Greek concept of *kátharsis* means purification, purgation, consolation of the soul by a moral obligation. According to N. Abbagnano (1982), this concept probably came from the Jonick medicine of Hypocrites. “According to Plato’s ontology *kátharsis* means “liberation, step by step, of the pleasures; something like a specific training to death” (ABBAGNANO *apud* LASTÓRIA, 2017, p. 170).<sup>9</sup> However Aristotle may have been the first philosopher who used this meaning of aesthetical concept in his *Poetic*. In fact, the concept of *kátharsis* had two meanings for Aristotle: in medicine and in moral. Or better: *kátharsis* is “a kind of treatment of affections of the soul or the body that can keep a balance between them, according to the requirements of reason” (LASTÓRIA, 2017, p. 170).<sup>10</sup>

In modern times that concept of *kátharsis* has been used in the aesthetical area, and also in psychoanalytic theory. Vygotsky, in turn, has reformulated this concept in aesthetics. He adopted the Aristotle’s concept in *Poetic* as his background: “Tragedy is a complete imitation of a great man’s character, using ornamental language to develop the drama. The imitation of a great man’s character occurs by the actor’s performance and not by the narrative. The main purpose of the imitation is to cause ‘terror and sorrow in the audience thus purifying the audience’s emotions’” (ARISTOTLE, 1993, p. 37).<sup>11</sup> Contradictory emotions caused by the tragic hero performance, as terror and sorrow, as stated by Aristotle, is the cathartic central element of aesthetics which Vygotsky intended to clarify. He does that through the materialistic social psychology.

Vygostky agrees with Pliekhánov, who had mentioned Darwin’s opinion on the principle of antithetical expressive movements:

In some conditions of the human soul, some habitual behaviors are integrated to the usual background; and we can be sure of the existence of a human involuntary tendency to show an opposite behavior when the human soul faces a contradictory condition, even though these behaviors may not have any usefulness (PLIEKHÁNOV *apud* VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 268).<sup>12</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Platão, em conformidade com sua ontologia do Bem, utilizou-o num sentido moral e metafísico para designar a libertação paulatina dos prazeres”; algo como “uma espécie de treino preparatório para a separação total que advém com a morte (ABBAGNANO *apud* LASTÓRIA, 2017, p. 170).

<sup>10</sup> uma espécie de tratamento das afecções (corpóreas ou espirituais) que não as anula; antes as reduz à medida compatível com as exigências próprias à razão (LASTÓRIA, 2017, p. 170).

<sup>11</sup> É pois a tragédia imitação de um caráter elevado, completa e de certa extensão, em linguagem ornamentada e com as várias espécies de ornamentos distribuídas pelas diversas partes (do drama), (imitação que se efetua) não por narrativa, mas mediante atores e que, suscitando o ‘terror e a piedade, tem por efeito a purificação das emoções’ (ARISTÓTELES, 1993, p. 37).

<sup>12</sup> Alguns estados d’alma suscitam certos movimentos habituais, que em sua primeira manifestação até agora fazem parte dos movimentos úteis; e vemos que em estado d’alma totalmente oposto existe uma tendência forte e involuntária a realizar movimentos de qualidade totalmente oposta, embora estes nunca possam trazer nenhum proveito (PLIEKHÁNOV *apud* VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 268).

However, if opposite movements mobilize opposite muscles of the organism, this phenomenon, which occurs under the impact of opposite impulses, is integrated in our repertory behavior – and the same occurs with primitive organisms – Darwin had concluded that there is a link between certain acts and certain sensations or feelings. It would be possible “to suppose that opposite acts do not occur arbitrarily as a result of the usual effect between the diametrical opposite sensations or feelings” (PLIEKHÁNOV *apud* VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 268/9).<sup>13</sup>

According to Vygotsky, catharsis is considered a consequence of the effect of a tragedy – and the soviet author still considered the fable, the novel and other artistic forms of objectification produced by the principle of antithesis, according to Darwin, thus being the result of the artists’ work. He thought that the specific form of tragedies would guide our behavior to opposite directions at the same time. The tensions always increase during a drama but they are not extinguished by the audience’s exterior acts. The emotional tensions still left within us will be connected to our capacity to imagine and they will produce opposite feelings, which are the secret of the aesthetical form. From the fable to the tragedy, Vygotsky believes that “there is only one law for an aesthetical reaction: this law refers to the emotion which is developed in an opposite poles thus resulting in its destruction at the highest level – like a shock. This is the definition of catharsis” (VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 270/1).<sup>14</sup>

Vygotsky’s perspective shows an antithesis between form and content inside of any art work. The form is responsible for the secret of the aesthetic reception as it contradicts the content of the art work causing its complete destruction.

One can say that the base of the emotions is the aesthetical reaction which is produced by art and felt intensively by people as if it were reality. But those emotions are the result of the phantasy that art causes on all of us. This motor aspect of the resulted emotion is extraordinarily repressed and it seems to us that we are experiencing only delusional feelings. The unity between feelings and phantasy is the base of all art. Its peculiarity is to produce opposite emotions. Only with the antithetic principle of art can art itself retain the motor expression of emotions thus making the contradictory impulses collide, destroying the emotions and the form of the content of the art and resulting in the explosion of nervous energy” (VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 272).<sup>15</sup>

<sup>13</sup> supor que as ações de qualidade inteiramente oposta passem a ser realizadas de forma não arbitrária, como resultado da associação habitual sob o efeito de sensações ou sentimentos diametralmente opostos (PLIEKHÁNOV *apud* VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 268/9).

<sup>14</sup> a lei da reação estética é uma só: encerra em si a emoção que se desenvolve em dois sentidos opostos e encontra sua destruição no ponto culminante, como uma espécie de curto-circuito. É esse processo que gostaríamos de definir com o termo catarse (VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 270/1).

<sup>15</sup> Poderíamos dizer que a base da reação estética são as emoções suscitadas pela arte e por nós vivenciadas com toda realidade e força, mas encontram a sua descarga naquela atividade da fantasia que requer de nós a percepção da arte. Graças a esta descarga central, retém-se e recalca-se extraordinariamente o aspecto motor da emoção, e começa a nos parecer que experimentamos apenas sentimentos ilusórios. É nessa unidade entre sentimento e fantasia que se baseia qualquer arte. Sua peculiaridade imediata consiste em que, ao nos suscitar emoções voltadas

In Greek Antiquity the cathartic aesthetics phenomena were ethical and political phenomena. The tragedies were sponsored by the polis and watched by the ancient citizens as a social and political ritual which linked aesthetics and politics. The goal of those rituals was to lead citizen to collectively reflect on human being dilemmas in the context of the Greek state. We said above that Vygotsky understood the aesthetical phenomena as a “social technique of feelings”. Now we can add that through this technique the human being (the artist or receptor of art – all of us) must learn how to control our anguish and our other feelings, which are engendered by the necessary effort to preserve our own existence.

Historically, art and labor were linked, reminds us the soviet author Vygotsky. That is the reason why the ancient people considered art as a complement of heavy labor. The goal of art was to manifest feelings of anguish. Later art and labor were separated, art, however, retained its function as a form of elaboration of feelings through catharsis. This argument allows us to understand that the conception that separates labor from art and aesthetics emotions from practical activities of day by day life is wrong.

The reason social psychology of art highlights catharsis as a central concept of the aesthetics phenomena is that “the art takes place where there are vibrant and intense feelings” (VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 314)<sup>16</sup>. Catharsis as a social technique allows the human being to elaborate his painful feelings creatively and critically. This is the reason why art requires creativity of the art admirer. It is not enough for the art admirer to feel the author’s feelings or understand the art work structure. It is necessary to overcome his own feelings through catharsis. Vygotsky mentions that Ovsianiko Kulikovski states that “the function of military music is not to promote warlike emotions but to balance human organic life and the dangerous moments of the human organic life. Thus, the function of art is to discipline human organic life and to allow the necessary release of emotions as well as to promote bravery” (VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 314).<sup>17</sup>

Contrary to the theory of contagion which states that the feelings of an individual can be spread out to a crowd by art, Vygotsky supports the thesis that states that human feelings are a social phenomenon:

---

para sentidos opostos, só pelo princípio de antítese retém a expressão motora das emoções e, ao pôr em choque impulsos contrários, destrói as emoções do conteúdo, as emoções da forma, acarretando a explosão e a descarga da energia nervosa (VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 272).

<sup>16</sup> a arte pode surgir onde existe simplesmente o sentimento vivo e intenso (VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 314).

<sup>17</sup> o papel da música militar não consiste em suscitar emoções bélicas, mas antes em estabelecer um equilíbrio entre o organismo e o meio em um momento crítico para o organismo, e assim disciplinar, ordenar o seu funcionamento e permitir a descarga necessária a sua emoção, afastar o medo e como que abrir caminho para a bravura (VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 314).



The binding of our outside emotions occurs by an objective emotional social power, produced outside us and materialized and fixed on the external objects of art which become tools of society. In general, art is a social technique of human feelings; an instrument by which society is able to incorporate art to the social cycle of life. On the other hand, the feelings resulting from art become personal when someone experiences an art work (VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 315).<sup>18</sup>

Thus, it would be up to society to dispose of art as the technique of control of human feelings to improve society itself in the ethical and political sense; after all, art is for life what wine is for grapes.

Finally, Vygotsky agrees with Tolstoy that music should be a matter of State. But he establishes precisely the limits of the pedagogical function of art to be exerted by the official State critique, and also the limits of the educational use of art in schools to educate students. For the soviet author, art represents “the most important concentration of all biological process of an individual in society” and “one way to keep a balance between man and his world in critical moments of his life” (VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 329)<sup>19</sup>. That is why art could not be ignored in the social process of building a new man in a society under construction.

## II

The French philosopher Jacques Rancière considered all aesthetical dimensions as the political base of the historical experience of the human being. According to Rancière the aesthetical dimension shows us the plurality of human sensibilities and the different forms of political power. Both are an element for the diagnosis of the contemporary subjectivity. However, the French philosopher doesn't agree with the post-modernism perspective which claims the avant-garde modern art as the redeeming or emancipating humanity factor that connects sensibility and aesthetic to innovations. Rancière reflected on the experimental contemporary art through the several interfaces produced by the *sharing of the sensitive*. According to the French philosopher, the *sharing of the sensitive* is really responsible for connecting the aesthetical human dimension with the everyday life. Rancière is controversial

---

<sup>18</sup> A refundição das emoções fora de nós realiza-se por força de um sentimento social que foi objetivado, levado para fora de nós, materializado e fixado nos objetos externos da arte, que se tornaram instrumentos da sociedade. De maneira igual, a arte é uma técnica social do sentimento, um instrumento da sociedade através do qual incorpora ao ciclo da vida social, mas, ao contrário, torna-se pessoal, quando cada um nós vivencia uma obra de arte, converte-se em pessoal sem com isso deixar de ser social (VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 315).

<sup>19</sup> a mais importante concentração de todos os processos biológicos do indivíduo na sociedade”, and “um meio de equilibrar o homem com o mundo nos momentos mais críticos e responsáveis da vida (VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 329).

in relation to the death of art or the decline of art. He also disagrees with the French Situationism of 60<sup>s</sup> which became a kind of regret after the end of the utopias.

This background defines many theoretical propositions of Rancière but not his main goal: - to reestablish the conditions of intelligibility on the aesthetical debate understood as a “specific regime of identification of art as it is perceived by man: “a form of articulation between ways of doing things, forms of the visibility of doing things and the way of thinking about these relationships, thus implying a certain idea of the effectiveness of thought” (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 13).<sup>20</sup>

What can we understand more precisely for “sharing the sensitive” as a concept which implies the relations between aesthetics and politics? A set of evidence revealing a common substrate unequally shared. The establishment of people’s places, time and their different kinds of activities defines how everyone participates in the common life in society. However, another division defines, first, how the citizens participate in the government of the polis, according to Aristotle. This division specifies who is able to participate in society. The *sharing of the sensitive* shows us who can participate in the public space according to what one does, according to the time one has and according to where each activity takes place. Rancière uses Plato’s example on the position of the artisans in the polis: “The occupation defines the competence or incompetence to participate in the public common space. It defines how one can be visible or invisible in this social space and if one can speak in public (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 16).<sup>21</sup>

The French philosopher understands that aesthetic, *sharing of the sensitive*, as the bases of political behavior. But it isn’t something like aestheticization of politics (as Walter Benjamin has mentioned) or politics perversion (as Wagner’s Gesamtkunstwerke). The aesthetic as a *sharing of the sensitive* is a set of the first forms that defines what someone feels: “It is a specific time and space, something visible or invisible, words and noise which define at the same time the place and what occurs in political experience” (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 16).<sup>22</sup>

We can say briefly: if politics is the art of moving oneself between appearances, as Hanna Arendt has mentioned, and moving oneself through images, as Vilém Flusser has showed us, the education of the sensitive takes into account the main sensitive competences:

---

<sup>20</sup> Regime específico de identificação e pensamento das artes: um modo de articulação entre maneiras de fazer, formas de visibilidade dessas maneiras de fazer e modo de pensabilidade de suas relações, implicando uma determinada ideia da efetividade do pensamento (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 13).

<sup>21</sup> Assim, ter esta ou aquela ‘ocupação’ define competências ou incompetências para o comum. Define o fato de ser ou não visível num espaço comum, dotado de uma palavra comum etc. (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 16).

<sup>22</sup> É um recorte dos tempos e dos espaços, do visível e do invisível, da palavra e do ruído que define ao mesmo tempo o lugar e o que está em jogo na política como forma de experiência (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 16).

see, hear, judge and say; it considers the proprieties of the space and the sharing of the human experiences in the public space. According to Rancière: “politics is concerned with what can be seen and what can be said about what has been seen; about who is competent to see and competent to say, about the space’s proprieties and about the sharing of the human experiences in the public space” (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 17).<sup>23</sup> For the French philosopher those educational goals are based on a previous aesthetic dimension from which we could discuss further practices on education. The aesthetic practices are artistic practices and these artistic practices “modify our practices in general thus permitting specific angles of visibility” (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 17).<sup>24</sup>

Plato’s idea on writing and on theatre illustrates Rancière’s thinking about the contemporary aesthetic, especially after internet. In the ancient Greece, theater as a public area and as a place reserved to stage the dimension of the social imaginary, the sharing of identities, spaces and activities were mixed. The same occurred with writing when this specific form of communication became usual and became able to spread words everywhere without any criteria. This fact was responsible for the corruption of the legitimacy of the words. However Plato’s veto was conservative, argued Rancière, because it just expressed a sharing of the sensitive through which the *polis* danced and sang its own static community.

Let’s exam Rancière’s argumentation about the two Plato’s paradigms of sharing of the sensitive into the Greek *polis*: the writing and the theater. Both paradigms according to Rancière would be “the main way for the structuration of arts in general” (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 18).<sup>25</sup> Plato opposes good art to theater and writing. He considered theater as a form of indetermination of identities and writing as a lack of legitimation of speakers. He also identifies the change in signs which were materialized through writing and painting, and the simulacrum of the movement of the bodies in a public stage (theater) as the

[...] three forms of sharing of the sensitive which has structured how the arts can be perceived and can be thought into the political community. These forms define how the arts or performances ‘make politics’ whatever their intentions, despite the social position of the artists or despite the artistic forms that reflect the social movements (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 18/19).

<sup>23</sup> A política ocupa-se do que se vê e do que se pode dizer sobre o que é visto, de quem tem a competência para ver e qualidade para dizer, das propriedades do espaço e dos possíveis do tempo (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 17).

<sup>24</sup> Intervém na distribuição geral das maneiras de fazer e nas suas relações com as maneiras de ser e formas de visibilidade (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 17).

<sup>25</sup> Formas de estruturação para o regime das artes em geral (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 18).

In terms of democratic politics, we must consider the legitimacy of the universal readers' community as judges: people that are able to understand and to have self-discernment. In this statement we quote Immanuel Kant, who was in favor of constructing a possible rational enlightened world. However we must consider that this argument has failed in Europe of the 20<sup>th</sup> century specifically in Nazi Germany: "a community which it was drawn based only on free circulation of words" (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 19).<sup>26</sup> As we noticed above, Rancière advocated the regime of the pre-sharing of the sensitive; that dimension that comes before any other social practices. Thus, the French philosopher observes how the Greek theater and writing as platonic models of the effective sensibility of the word that can be the paradigm of arts in general through History.

The *sharing of the sensitive* according to Rancière expresses that "the art never contributes to political emancipation or domination more than they can. The same occurs between art and politics, bodies' positions and movements, word functions, and the division between the visible and the invisible. (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 25).<sup>27</sup> And also: "the art autonomy and subversion rely on the same base of the *sharing of the sensitive* (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 26).<sup>28</sup>

For this French author all politics are certainly based on *the sharing of the sensible*: the theater and choir on one hand and page on the other hand as Plato thought. In the end of nineteenth century and in the beginning of twentieth century we can observe the extrapolation of the page's model exceeding the materiality of the written page. Rancière called it democracy as a novel. Democracy as a novel is a kind of democracy which is defined by certain indifference in the writing. This fact symbolizes the novel's form and the public that it is addressed to. *Madam Bovary* and *The sentimental education* were immediately identified as a democratic form of literature, according to Rancière. Flaubert had no intention of sending any message through the novel nor attributing any pedagogical meaning to it. He only "painted scenes" with the same indifference as the pages that can contain words that will be read by anyone. Flaubert understood that it was a legitimacy poetic option. This is the democratic meaning which Rancière attributes to the novels at that time.

---

<sup>26</sup> Comunidade desenhada tão somente pela circulação aleatória da letra (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 19).

<sup>27</sup> Artes nunca emprestam às manobras de dominação ou de emancipação mais do que lhes podem emprestar, ou seja, muito simplesmente, o que têm em comum com elas: posições e movimentos dos corpos, funções da palavra, repartições do visível e do invisível (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 26).

<sup>28</sup> A autonomia de que podem gozar e a subversão que podem se atribuir repousam sobre a mesma base (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 26).

The same occurs to the typography and iconography culture. Both forms of culture had demonstrated their subversive powers since Renaissance. Both forms of culture were also revitalized with the romanticism, and for Rancière, these facts exemplified the blind spot between esthetics and politics. The interlacing between image and letter mixed “the rules of correspondence between what can be said and what is visible, both proper aspects of the representative logic” (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 20).<sup>29</sup> The same interlacing between image and letter assorted the notions of “pure art” and “functional art” originating the movement *Arts and Crafts* and their ramifications (*Art Déco*, Bauhaus, constructivism).

The two-dimensional surfaces that emerged with the modernism opposed to the Renaissance perspective intended to give back to painting something that belonged to it if compared to architecture. Surfaces don't have inner proprieties, believes Rancière. All surfaces are the result of the *sharing of the sensitive*. According to Plato, writing and painting on surfaces were voiceless signs, signs with no breathing souls, and the optical of depth in Renaissance, instead, was an esthetic answer to painting in an era which had the privilege of understanding itself in a historical perspective. “Renaissance established a relation of correspondence at a distance between the word and the painting, between what can be said and what can be visible, placing imitation in its specific space” (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 22).<sup>30</sup>

The analysis of Rancière reveals that the dispute between Renaissance tridimensional perspective of paintings and the Modern bi-dimensional perspective of paintings are important political issues that originate from aesthetics.

The revolution in painting as non-representative art, partially began on paper surface, or on the changes of the function of the literature images. Also, the changes in the commentaries on paintings or on the interface between typography, posters and decorative arts have contributed to that revolution. The non-representative modern painting is part of an overall view about a new man, who lives in new buildings surrounded by many new different objects. The planarity of this man is connected to book pages, to posters or to tapestry. The planarity is something like an interface with them and the ‘purity’ of this non-representative art establishes the connection between pure art and functional art. This is certainly a political definition of art (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 22/23).<sup>31</sup>

<sup>29</sup> As regras de correspondência à distância entre dizível e o visível, próprias à lógica representativa (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 20).

<sup>30</sup> Ela instaurou entre a palavra e a pintura, entre o dizível e o visível uma relação de correspondência à distância, dando à ‘imitação’ seu espaço específico (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 22).

<sup>31</sup> É na superfície plana da página, na mudança de função das ‘imagens’ da literatura ou na mudança do discurso sobre o quadro, mas também nos entrelaces da tipografia, do cartaz e das artes decorativas, que se prepara uma boa parte da ‘revolução antirrepresentativa’ da pintura. Esta pintura [...] é parte de uma visão de conjunto de um novo homem, habitante de novos edifícios, cercado de objetos diferentes. Sua planaridade tem ligação com a da página, do cartaz ou da tapeçaria – é uma interface. E sua ‘pureza’ antirrepresentativa inscreve-se num contexto

Therefore, the revolutionary impulse couldn't promote a painter like Malevitch as a precursor of a new way of life, but the specific sharing of the sensitive could do it instead. Only through the specific *sharing of the sensitive* some new interfaces between different art features (poems and illustrations, theater and graphic designers, literature and decorative art) could be created. Rancière concludes about this new specific *sharing of the sensitive*:

This *sharing of the sensitive* is political because it revokes the double politics inherent in the representative logic: on one hand the logical of the representative art separates world imitation and human social and political interests. On the other hand, the hierarchical organization of the arts, which suppose the superiority of speaking and action and the inferiority of painting, is identical to the human social structure. When the novel surpassed the theater, the images and other signs on the surfaces, like paintings or typographic art, it defined another sensible experience. The same occurred when the artisan's handicrafts were promoted to a high-level art to decorate anywhere (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 23).<sup>32</sup>

The French philosopher understands the “representative regime of the art” as a regime between the ethical regime and the aesthetical regime, which is a strategy to establish art in social imagination as an exceptional experience. Art working is a technic to produce mimesis but not simulacrum according to Plato's perspective. The point of view of the regime of art representation blurs the act that both activities: work as a social activity and work of art are in the same level. Only in this kind of regime it is possible for the aesthetical discourse to operate its hierarchy in the divided liberal and mechanical arts.

In the aesthetical regime, that follows the previous one, the new *sharing of the sensitive* rearranges the places and the times and also the status of artistic activities. Rancière advocates that the new regime shows us the way to follow Schiller's program in his *Letters on the aesthetic education of man*. This is possible now because we can think of labor not like Aristotle – imposition of form on inert material thought by someone.

The romantic program of Schiller supposes a *sharing of the sensitive* which would extinguish the division between who decides something and who feels the consequences of that decision. Schiller's program would lead us to another level of humanity, eliminating the

---

de entrelaçamento de arte pura e da arte aplicada, que lhe confere de saída uma significação política (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 22/23).

<sup>32</sup> Essa é política porque revoga a dupla política inerente à lógica representativa. Esta, por um lado, separava o mundo das imitações da arte do mundo dos interesses vitais e das grandezas político-sociais. Por outro, sua organização hierárquica – e particularmente o primado da palavra/ação viva sobre a imagem pintada – era análoga à ordem social. Com a vitória da página romanesca sobre a cena teatral, o entrelaçamento igualitário das imagens e dos signos na superfície pictural ou tipográfica, a promoção da arte dos artesãos à grande arte e a pretensão da nova de inserir arte no cenário de cada vida em particular, trata-se de todo um recorte ordenado da experiência sensível que cai por terra (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 23).

opposition between understanding and passive sensitivity. Rancière's comments about this theme:

[...] in the 19 century the positive value of work became the common sense of the thinking community. This modification was possible because the influence of the aesthetical stage implied an aesthetical *volition*. The Romantic Movement declared that the act of thinking has one sensitive side and the materiality of the sensitive should be the main aim of the act of thinking in general. So, the art became the symbol of labor. It anticipates something that the work still cannot permit – the end of the social oppositions (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 66/67).<sup>33</sup>

Despite the author highlights there is a possibility of misunderstanding this theme: the value of work nowadays does not come only from the new aesthetical thought. The aesthetical thought is just a result of the *sharing of the sensitive* independently of the economic circumstances.

## Conclusion

Our start point in this article was “Sensitive Education as a task” which has never been reasonably solved until today. Then we have briefly exposed two different theoretical perspectives on this theme considered in two different moments of the XX century, which have been revisited by many authors in the educational field nowadays.

After 1917 in the URSS, Vygotsky has recognized the aesthetical phenomena as an important social technique of feelings. For him, art represents: “the most important concentration of all our biological processes in society” and “a way to balance men and the world in a critical moments of life” (VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 329)<sup>34</sup>. That was the main reason to consider art as a fundamental aspect for building a new man according to the socialist program. The difference between the artistic sphere and everyday life should be maintained so that the social and psychological experience of catharsis can take place. The educational function should provide the students with the systematical and historical knowledge about aesthetical phenomena to facilitate the experience of catharsis. Despite the profoundness of the

<sup>33</sup> [...] tornou-se, no século XIX, a afirmação de seu valor positivo como forma de efetividade comum do pensamento e da comunidade. Tal mutação passou pela transformação da suspensão, própria ao ‘estado estético’, em afirmação positiva da *vontade* estética. O romantismo proclama devir-sensível de todo pensamento e o devir-pensamento de toda materialidade sensível como objetivo mesmo da atividade do pensamento em geral. A arte, assim, torna-se um símbolo do trabalho. Ela antecipa o fim – a supressão das oposições – que o trabalho ainda não está em condições de conquistar por e para si mesmo (RANCIÈRE, 2005, p. 66/67).

<sup>34</sup> A mais importante concentração de todos os processos biológicos do indivíduo na sociedade”, and “um meio de equilibrar o homem com o mundo nos momentos mais críticos e responsáveis da vida (VYGOTSKY, 2001, p. 329).

soviet author's point of view, it was conceived in another historical moment. He was historically far from the intricate questions raised by an education of the sensible in the contemporary cultural industry.

The French philosopher J. Rancière also considered the aesthetical dimension as the basis of human being's experience in a historical and political meaning. However, this author identified a new sharing of the sensitive as the new aesthetical regime. This regime redefines spaces, times and also the status of art activity. Now we have the materialistic conditions to follow Schiller's program on the aesthetical education of man. This is possible because "work" is not considered anymore as an imposition of the form which has been thought over the inert material (ARISTOTLE, 1993).

Schiller's romantic program presupposed another sharing of the sensitive that would overcome the cultural experience of those who act and those who suffer the consequences of these actions. Finally, art would become a symbol of the power of work. However, it would anticipate what work has not been able to accomplish yet. Nevertheless, the author observes the possible misinterpretation of the present value of work deriving uniquely from the new aesthetical thinking. The actual aesthetical thinking is still a consequence of the new sharing of the sensitive, independently of economic conditions. This is the political aspect of the contemporary aesthetical conception that must be explored by the Education of the Sensitive that is aware of the new aesthetical contemporary interfaces.

## REFERENCES

ABBAGNANO, N. **Dicionário de filosofia**. São Paulo: Editora Mestre Jou, 1982.

ADORNO, T. W. **Mínima moralia**. São Paulo: Editora Ática, 1992.

ARENDT, H. **Entre o passado e o futuro**. São Paulo: Editora Perspectiva, 1988.

ARISTÓTELES. **Poética**. São Paulo: Editora Ars Poética, 1993.

BRASIL. **PCN**. Volume 1 e 6. Brasília: MEC/SEF, 1997.

DUARTE, N. Arte e Educação contra o fetichismo generalizado na sociabilidade contemporânea. **Perspectiva**, Florianópolis, SC, v. 27, n. 2, 461-479, 2009.

FABIANO, L. H. Adorno, Arte e Educação: Negócio da arte como negação. **Arte e Sociedade**, Campinas, SP, v. 24, n. 83, p. 495-505, 2003.



FREUD, S. Analisis terminable e interminable. *In: Obras completas de Sigmund Freud*. Tomo III. Madreed: Editora Biblioteca Nuova, 1981.

LASTÓRIA, L. C. N. **Ensaio de teoria crítica, ética e psicanálise**: a formação do sujeito contemporâneo em questão. São Paulo: Nankin editorial, 2017.

MAFFESOLI, M. **Elogio da razão sensível**. Petrópolis: Editora Vozes, 1998.

PLATÃO **República**. Porto: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 2001.

RANCIÈRE, J. **A partilha do sensível**. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2005.

ROSE, R. S. **El misterioso caso alemán**: un intento de comprender Alemania través de sus letras. Barcelona: Alba Editorial, 2007.

SCHILLER, F. **A educação estética do homem**. São Paulo: Editora Iluminuras, 1990.

VYGOTSKY, L. S. **Psicologia da arte**. São Paulo: Editora Martins Fontes, 2001.

### How to quote this article

LASTÓRIA, Luiz Antonio Calmon Nabuco. Diferentes perspectivas sobre uma educação estética na atualidade. **Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional**, Araraquara, v. 24, n. 2, p. 297-313, maio/ago., 2020. e-ISSN: 1519-9029. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v24i2.13163>

**Submitted:** 10/09/2019

**Required revisions:** 05/10/2019

**Approved:** 20/12/2019

**Published:** 09/04/2020