

**EDUCATION: ART AS ART OF BREAKING OR DECONSTRUCTION**

**EDUCAÇÃO: ARTE COMO ARTE DO ROMPIMENTO OU DA DESCONSTRUÇÃO**

**EDUCACIÓN: EL ARTE COMO ARTE DE ROMPIMIENTO O DESCONSTRUCCIÓN**

Pedro DEMO<sup>1</sup>

Maria Cecília de Souza MINAYO<sup>2</sup>

Renan Antônio da SILVA<sup>3</sup>

**ABSTRACT:** Formal education is mainly school education, carried out in an *ad hoc* institution, partly compulsory (constitutional), with its own legislation, generally rigid, with blatant domesticating tones and offered by exclusive professionals. This analytical view may lean towards an acid criticism, but, first of all, it makes a natural observation in the world of life: institutions are ambiguous in nature, just like life itself and its species. Family, one of the most fundamental and foundational biological institutions in society, is also ambiguous: many are the ideal place for someone to create themselves; not all, however, and perhaps without guilt, due to insufficient conditions for survival. Some families fall apart, crumble, making preferable its dismissal to maintaining an impossible living hell. So it seems to be: the “normality” of life is ambiguous, either because politics always reappears as a crucial component, even in the background, or because social and historical validities are relative, even if not relativistic, or because humans are malleable enough creatures to change position, condition, belief etc. Hence it follows that educating strictly is counterproductive because the rigidity of life is invented. Biological life is plastic.

**KEYWORDS:** Education. Art in education. School. Society.

**RESUMO:** *Educação formal é, mormente, a escolar, feita numa instituição ad hoc, em parte compulsória (constitucional), com legislação própria, em geral rígida, com tonalidades domesticadoras flagrantes e oferecida por profissionais exclusivos. Esta visão analítica pode pender para uma crítica ácida, mas, antes de mais nada, faz uma constatação natural no mundo da vida: as instituições são ambíguas por natureza, tal qual a própria vida e suas espécies. Família, uma das instituições biológicas mais fundamentais e fundantes da sociedade também é ambígua: muitas são o lugar ideal para alguém se criar; nem todas, porém, e sem culpa quiçá, por conta de condições insuficientes de sobrevivência. Algumas famílias degradingolam, se desfazem, tornando-se sua destituição preferível a manter um inferno de convivência impossível. Assim parece ser: a “normalidade” da vida é ambígua, seja porque a politicidade sempre ressurge como componente crucial, mesmo no pano de fundo, ou porque as validades*

<sup>1</sup> University of Brasília (UnB), Brasília – DF – Brazil. Professor Emeritus. PhD in Sociology from the University of Saarland (Universität des Saarlandes) - Germany. Productivity Scholarship 1B CNPq. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5514-2781>. E-mail: [lepp@rc.unesp.br](mailto:lepp@rc.unesp.br)

<sup>2</sup> Oswaldo Cruz Foundation (FIOCRUZ), Rio de Janeiro – RJ – Brazil. Professor Emeritus. PhD in Health (FIOCRUZ). Productivity Scholarship 1A CNPq. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6187-9301>. E-mail: [lepp@rc.unesp.br](mailto:lepp@rc.unesp.br)

<sup>3</sup> South of Minas University Center (UNIS), Varginha – MG – Brazil. Full Researcher in the Research Department. PhD in School Education (UNESP). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1171-217X>. E-mail: [r.silva@unesp.br](mailto:r.silva@unesp.br)

*sociais e históricas são relativas, ainda que não relativistas, ou porque humanos são criaturas maleáveis o suficiente para mudar de posição, de condição, de crença etc. Daí segue que educar rigidamente é contraproducente, porque a rigidez da vida é inventada. A vida biológica é plástica.*

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** Educação. Arte na educação. Escola. Sociedade.

**RESUMEN:** *La educación formal es principalmente educación escolar, realizada en una institución ad hoc, en parte obligatoria (constitucional), con una legislación propia, generalmente rígida, con tonos flagrantes domesticadores y ofrecida por profesionales exclusivos. Esta mirada analítica puede inclinarse hacia una crítica ácida, pero, ante todo, hace una observación natural en el mundo de la vida: las instituciones son de naturaleza ambigua, como la vida misma y sus especies. La familia, una de las instituciones biológicas más fundamentales y fundamentales de la sociedad, también es ambigua: muchas son el lugar ideal para que alguien se cree a sí mismo; no todos, sin embargo, y quizás sin culpa, debido a las insuficientes condiciones de supervivencia. Algunas familias se desmoronan, se desmoronan, por lo que es preferible el despido a mantener un infierno viviente imposible. Así parece ser: la “normalidad” de la vida es ambigua, ya sea porque la politicidad siempre reaparece como un componente crucial, incluso en un segundo plano, o porque las validez sociales e históricas son relativas, aunque no relativistas, o porque los humanos somos criaturas maleables lo suficiente para cambiar de posición, condición, creencia, etc. De ahí se sigue que educar estrictamente es contraproducente, porque la rigidez de la vida está inventada. La vida biológica es plástica.*

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** Educación. El arte en la educación. La escuela. La sociedad.

## Introduction

The topic of education as art, not only as science or technology, is of great interest because art is the most common entry point for innovative, critical, deconstructive rebellion. Steiner's proposal for “education as art” (STEINER *et al.*, 1988) is an eloquent testimony, also because Steiner was a huge artist in education (1995; 1996). Zimmermann's (2001) position on Waldorf pedagogy, as an art of education, also highlights this dimension, which contains, in addition, the superlative sense of caring for children, taken as the protagonist of their history and full subject of rights. Remember that Huxley (1882), in the second half of the 19th century, spoke of education as science and art; at the beginning of the second half of the 20th century, Ziegfeld, within UNESCO, made the intimate connection between education and art (1954). Black, at the end of the first part of the 20th century (1944), worked on the concept of education as art and discipline. Interest in the theme remains. Let us remember that in the famous and

alarmist text *A Nation at Risk*<sup>4</sup> (1983), by the American government, mentioned in a previous text, extremely linked to American economic supremacy, art was an important formative reference. “Art cannot be taught; can be learned; it is discovered” (RACHELLE, 2014). There we have a clairvoyant perception: education because of teaching is training; art does not match training, because it comes from within; it cannot be deposited there by anyone outside. But it can be learned, because learning is authorship (DAVIS, 2005; GUNVE, 2017; KISIDA; BOWEN, 2019; KRISTIANSSEN *et al.*, 2017; BICKEL; CARTER, 2020). Rovelli (2014), without mincing words, states that “**science is rebellion**”, since “knowledge depends on throwing away what we think”. Natale (2012) stands up: “education is art - not science”. This assertion is too strenuous, because education can be both art and science, even though many see the art side as more consistent. Most teachers who like to take care of children's learning clearly perceive that their profession, having necessarily a scientific basis, is based more on the dimension of art, just as mothers would tend to see their maternal *métier* as technical and practical competence, but erecting a child who is useful for society and well done is fine art. This is also seen by academic advisors, especially of masters and doctorates: their function is seen as a professional technique, but their most profound achievement is to generate a new master who flies alone, and this is mainly a work of art (MINAYO, 2019).

### **Art as art of disruption or deconstruction**

Perhaps it is not fruitful to simply oppose art and science, but with a (positivist, deterministic) type of science. Remember that Dyson (2006) proposed “**the scientist as a rebel**”, not because of political ideology always possible, but because of the very deconstructive position of science: it challenges reality and the current discourse about reality, claiming that it is feasible to observe in a non-canonical way, in order to reveal a reality that is never what it seems. Galilei showed this rebellion to the Pope, not because he wanted to “do politics”, but to deconstruct the canonical view of reality, without a logical-experimental basis. Rasmussen (2018), comparing Smith and Hume, saw the former as “the teacher” and the latter as “the infidel” (thus they were labeled at the time by the *status quo*); the two were superlative friends, even with notable differences in point of view, which only further dignifies friendship; while Smith soon became a professor and was acclaimed by the establishment, Hume never made it to the chair because he would be too iconoclastic. In practice, Smith's work today is seen as

<sup>4</sup> Available: <https://www2.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/intro.html>. Access: 5 July 2020.

conservative or superconservative, feeding speeches from the extreme right too, while Hume persists as an epistemological rebel, even in the liberal context, because he denied science the status of final truth (empiricism does not allow unquestionable assertions) and no speech is conclusive, however logical it may be) (HUME, 2007). What drives science to self-renew without end are its *infidel children*, those who refuse to say amen. Amen fits in the church, not in science. In this sense, there is a type of science that is not the opposite of art, but one of its most powerful versions. This is what appears in Rovelli's (2014) so ostensible position: “science is rebellion - knowledge depends on throwing away what we think”. This is what Harari stresses in *Sapiens* (2015): scientific knowledge is a self-renewal device because it measures itself against what it has not yet done; what you did, is past. It is like the past football game: if it was won or lost, it is gone; what matters now is the next game, as it is foolish to want to live by victory or defeat. *Homo deus*, however (HARARI, 2017), praises his laurels, especially his scientific empathy, tripping over his own legs. Breaking science is the science that knows how to discard itself or question itself. Theories, as much as they may be masterpieces, are reconstructions that imply deconstructions (these are fundamental; the others are derived), in an inexhaustible mill of provisional renovations or in an infinite shuttle of retaken passages. What is best in theorizing, alongside methodical rigor or insightful formulation, is the lightness of its insignificance when it intends to account for reality, as they are only reductionist, approximate expressions of something much larger than we have covered. What is left out is what moves science; what has already entered is commonplace.

Epistemologically speaking, science is born in **deconstruction**: i) first, it deconstructs reality, because reality is never what it seems; if it were, there would be nothing to explain; ii) second, it deconstructs the current discourses about reality, because they are out of date, they are eyes of the past, and life continues, especially learning. The school is impervious to this epistemological dynamic, because, attached to a sacred curriculum as a foolish amulet, it is not able to assume that, in view of the curriculum, what matters is to deconstruct, to later reconstruct, not to pass on what is already dead. For this reason, the most accurate image of the curriculum is that of the cemetery: bodies of the past. To return to the present and have future significance, it is necessary to deconstruct and reconstruct. **Reconstruction** is crucial, but it is ongoing; fundamental is deconstruction. That is why “**knowing how to think is to question**” (DEMO, 2010, our translation). There is the proximity to art: no knowledge is more disruptive than art, because art, first, denies reality (it is too small to be taken seriously, it covers more than it reveals, it is only less and less usable repetition); second, it denies itself as something definitive: once done, it is gone, it is past; we need new art; it may still be worth millions of

dollars (a painting by Picasso, for example), but it is a work of the past. What matters most is a new Picasso, against Picasso, in addition to Picasso.

Art is difficult to define, perhaps it cannot even be defined, because it depends on the subjective experience of each one, just as it itself is a mixture of emotion and rationality, where the author's emotion prevails by far. But we can discern some more or less common traits, in particular the function of rebellion before reality and the discourse about reality. In the epistemologies of life, the most radical is art, because it takes reality as an object of unforgiving deconstruction. Although “still life”<sup>5</sup> can be art and so many take it, especially in photography (because it uses portraits of inanimate landscapes or living beings, animals, humans to revitalize questionings, especially to shock [deconstruct] the viewer), the most dynamic and disruptive art it is the one that “deforms” reality (pictured next to Picasso's *Guernica*), leaving the frontal message that to understand reality, it must be deconstructed, even violently. Reality is camouflage, a lying surface, a quibbling appearance, like makeup: it serves to cover up reality, embellishing what one would not like to reveal and see underneath. It is also a way of drawing attention, for the unusual, shocking, inside out, since the right side of reality is makeup; it is, at heart, crooked, convulsive, chaotic, ugly, unrecognizable. The artist does not interpret his art, he leaves, when it is a painting, just a title. He does this because, being a subjective expression, he himself has no final interpretation. If he were to make another painting with the same title now, he would not do this again, because this painting is passed. Even in plagiarized painting, plagiarized adrede, we have another painting with another “author” (same contraventor). According to Minayo, Demo and Silva (2020), it is understood that education can contribute to a change in any scenario; in particular, quality education.

Art covers an infinite spectrum of manifestations, in addition to painting (above), including performing arts, music, architecture, sculpture, interiors/exterior, etc. In all of them, the most brilliant feature is the divergence with reality and the discourse about reality. The ancient Greeks, in the theater, sought to question life, the meaning of life, society, hypocrisies, fake news... The public was invited to shock, sensitize, to change the understanding of things and themselves. Some arts are more accommodating, specializing in emotion, such as classical and Gregorian music, but, in their own way, they also leave the routine, bringing dimensions of beauty in surprising circumstances. Preferring the sonority, the perfect chord, the music is only repeated, and for this reason modern or popular music, or divergent (heavy rock, for example), resort to other expedients (tunings, screams, loud drums, frantic dances,

<sup>5</sup> Available: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Still\\_life](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Still_life). Access: 5 July 2020.

hallucinations) to connect with its audience. Nothing is more foolish than being serious: it does not change the face, the behavior, it is predictable, manipulated inside and out. Perhaps the most opposite to art is *routine*, life as a lie. Poetry, on the other hand, implies rebellion in front of grammar, to the established meanings, although it does not dispense grammar (this is not the opposite of poetry, it is the ordered background that emphasizes the divergence of meaning), as well as life it does not dispense with DNA - it seems fixed, repetitive, but life itself never repeats itself. When Vinicius says “*love is eternal while it lasts*” (our translation), it hurts common sense, logic, the routine expectation of meanings; in itself, it would be a contradictory statement, not worth taking seriously. In practice, it is serious, because it formulates something fundamental in love: the rebellious dynamics of something that wants to be lasting, but is naturally fleeting. Nothing is more liar than vows of eternal love - half of marriages separate, many couples live together out of stubbornness... - because passion is not love; while the former is typically impulsive and fleeting, love can leave longer strokes, but it also dilutes, because everything is diluted, so is life (DEMO, 2020a).

Art insistently recalls that life, in order to have any more authentic interest, needs to change every day - it is not a way of being, it is of becoming, of opposing, contesting, as is life itself: a dynamic that, being physical, does not accept to be just that (KAUFMAN, 2019; DAVIES, 2019; LASZLO *et al.*, 2016; GOBER, 2018), is material and immaterial, it is natural and transcendent, it is and it is not! Art does not refer only to the “beautiful”, because the beautiful, in general, is futile, as is a beautiful face; soon the wrinkles come!... The fundamental and founding “beautiful” is the one who messes up the right, confuses everything, turns it inside out, prefers disorder: while science searches for order in patterns, art searches for disorder in order, because it is generative; the order is killed. For art, we die, not because life ends, but because we no longer support ourselves, nor do others support us, because mold dominates stretching. What kills life is mold. When we allow ourselves to be taken by a work of art, we value divergence, which appears, like a ray of light, in the darkness of sameness. Art is terrified of reproduction, of class.

Today, the extremist right calls for a return to the “sacred values” of a retrograde reproductive identity, because it postulates immutable structures, unquestionable beliefs, divine positions (the evangelical truth that liberates, John 8:32, is cited to entangle the devotees who, manipulated by the perverse hierarchy, confuse grace with tithing), having in the background only the pretension of coming to power and never leaving. All Christian religions have this gut addiction (BELLAH, 2011), because they forged a god more human than humans, especially the Old Testament, who accepts all political mischief (kingdoms, prosperity, enrichment,

supremacy, elimination of rivals, blows etc.). Christ was never “prosperous”: his capital was always R\$ Nothing, or R\$ 0! Absolutely nothing. He said that his kingdom was not of this world; but that of the Pope, Edir Macedo, Malafaia is only of this world - they do not believe in God, because they are not representatives of God; God is their representative, say what they want, like when John 8:32 is mentioned: God is a puppet of Edir Macedo, as he is of fundamentalist rulers of the extreme right (DEMO, 2017). But there are saints, really, not as holy as the Catholic Church assumes, people who totally diverge from mercantilist materialism and seek other transcendental values, and possibly Pope Francis could be included there, or Saint Francisco (BOFF, 2006; 2007; HARRIS, 2014). Religion can be art, when it focuses on incredibly radical changes in life, in the name of sublime alternatives. Religion cannot be art that revolves around tithing or bank accounts.

Although it is a type of interpretation that I here make of art - essentially as a rebellion (KIPLING, 1901; RADCLIFFE, 2009; PARKER; WELCH, 2017) - I am betting that it is the most interesting and pertinent, because it rhymes with life: restless, exuberant, alternative, handy, provocative... Everything deconstructs, because nothing that is real is worth it - only the unreal is worth it, utopia (CLARK *et al.*, 2009; MERZ; KNORR CETINA, 1997; KAU, 2001) - because the parameter of reality is not what exists, but what does not yet exist, the potential, what can become, as proposed by Bloch in his “hope” principle and in his “not-yet-being” ontology (1959; 1961). Whoever is satisfied with the reality he has, has passed away. Science can be a dull, reproductive, even imbecilizing positivist routine, but it can also be rebellion (CONSTANTIN, 2020; BHASKAR, 2003), creative divergence, the search for other dimensions of a reality that cannot be a parameter for life; life must be a parameter of reality (DAVIES, 2019).

## School and art

First, we will recognize that the school still maintains art in the curriculum (BNCC, 2018, p. 193), although with varied treatment, which is not coherent. In FE, it appears in languages and is taken as a specific curricular reference (specific contents: visual arts, dance, music, theater). In HS, art is a general principle of approaching reality, perhaps more consistent with the importance of art as a formative component, but it is “lost” in the curriculum crowd. The tone is to know how to appreciate the phenomenon of art, its formative relevance not appearing properly, as a capacity for alternative authorship, although its multiplicity, multiculturalism, complexity are accentuated (2018, p. 193). The indication that students are

challenged to be protagonists and creators is very pertinent, sharing knowledge and productions, also performances and exhibitions. “Investigative practice constitutes the mode of production and organization of knowledge in Art”, suggesting learning activities aimed at the student, not just teaching (Ib.). Then, six dimensions of knowledge are defined that mark the uniqueness of artistic experience: i) *creation*: reference to the indispensable authorship; ii) *criticism*: includes new understandings of relationships with reality; iii) *esthesia*: reference to sensitive experience with alternative perceptions; iv) *expression*: ability to externalize and manifest subjective creations; v) *enjoyment*: delight in art; vi) *reflection*: building arguments and considerations about fruition, experiences and creative, artistic and cultural processes (Idem, p. 195).

The proposal is relevant, aware of the alternative condition of artistic formation; the general context of BNCC disrupts this view, as it is a proposal that camouflages under “essential learning” instead of old-fashioned “teaching” (DEMO, 2019; 2019a), rigidly codified piece by piece, disciplinarily. Recognizes that “**the recreation of the school**” is essential (BNCC, 2018, p. 462), but the environment remains instrumentalist as always, also because it depends totally on the teaching performance, which persists. The art educators who participated in the formulation of the BNCC included “specific competences” for FE in general pertinent:

**Chart 01** – Competences and observations

| Competences   | Observations  |
|---|---|
| 1. Explore, discover, enjoy and critically analyze artistic and cultural practices and productions of their social environment, of indigenous peoples, of traditional Brazilian communities and of different societies, in different times and spaces, to recognize art as a cultural, historical phenomenon, social and sensitive to different contexts and dialogue with diversities. | Formulation relevant in many senses, especially in the cultural and artistic diversity; the challenge of participating in this production, as a formative project, is less explicit; the pedagogical (formative) relationship would need to be more developed, because that's what matters after all. |
| 2. Understand the relationships between the languages of Art and their integrated practices, including those made possible by the use of new information and communication technologies, cinema and audiovisual, in the particular conditions of production, in the practice of each language and in its articulations.   | Relevant formulation, in particular as it includes new technologies, mainly digital; it is little, however, to “understand”, because the analytical posture is instrumental to the expected formative process, which remains obscured in an obscure background.                                       |
| 3. Research and discover different aesthetic and cultural matrices - especially those manifested in art and in the cultures that constitute the Brazilian identity -, its tradition and contemporary  | Relevant as content, but pale because it only requires “to research and to know”, when it is essential to   |



|  |   |
|--|---|
| manifestations, re-elaborating them in the creations in Art.   | deconstruct and reconstruct as an authorial formative process.  |
| 4. Experiencing playfulness, perception, expressiveness and imagination, giving new meaning to school spaces and outside it in the realm of Art.                               | Enjoyment is an important part, but the most relevant is to "reframe" school and non-school spaces, an objective only outlined. |
| 5. Mobilize technological resources as forms of registration, research, and artistic creation.   | Laconic text, for the record. It would be relevant to know how to recreate the digital world as a space for art.                |
| 6. Establish relationships between art, media, market, and consumption, understanding, in a critical and problematic manner, ways of producing and circulating art in society. | Very pertinent formulation but misses the chance to highlight especially the insertion of the student in such art spaces.       |
| 7. Discussing political, social, economic, scientific, technological and cultural issues, through exercises, productions, interventions and artistic presentations.            | Very appropriate proposition, which dignifies the insertion of art in the formation of students.                                |
| 8. Develop autonomy, criticism, authorship and collective and collaborative work in the arts.  | Very good formulation, being able to add to the critical activity, the self-criticism.  |
| 9. Analyze and value the national and international artistic heritage, material and immaterial, with their stories and different worldviews.                                   | Interesting indeed, but it could contain care for colonialisms as artistic exchanges.   |

Source: Devised by the authors

In terms of theoretical formulation, the text is relevant, also interesting, sometimes innovative and in tune with critical and self-critical, or alternative, formative expectations. Being Art in the Language chapter there seems to have been no more visible damage, except for the instructional context of BNCC. Remember that the BNCC still retains the term "reproduce" (it appears 15 times in the skills of the early years: 3 times, on page 105; 2 times on page 107; 2 times on page 111; 4 times on p. 123; 1 time to p. 127; 3 times to p. 131), as if reproducing could be a skill. It is precisely the inside out. This remnant of raw instructionalism only confirms that "essential learnings" are instructional "teachings". Skills, of course, are formulated as "verbs", which would indicate some "active methodology"; but this tactic hides the transfer of content, camouflaged under apparently suggestive verbs (DEMO, 2019, p. 38).

In the scope of the HS, the structure changes its figure, opting for interdisciplinary management: art is spread in the varied contents, as a *formative principle*.

Art, as an area of human knowledge, contributes to the development of students' reflective, creative, and expressive autonomy, through the connection between thought, sensitivity, intuition and playfulness. It is also a

driver for the expansion of the subject's knowledge about himself, the other and the shared world. It is in learning, research and artistic practice that the perceptions and understandings of the world expand and interconnect, in a critical, sensitive and poetic perspective in relation to life, which allows subjects to be open to perceptions and experiences, through the ability to imagine and reframe daily life and routines (BNCC, 2018, p. 482).

The formulation gets to be charming, but the school context is in another direction, completely opposite, right in the HS, where learning is totally pilgrim (DEMO, 2020). One thing is theorization, relatively advanced, another is practice, lost in the most debased instruction. It is even cynical to postulate that the HS is inspired by the rebellion of art, that penetrates mathematics (the greatest school pedagogical disaster), the Portuguese language (falling apart, regressing in performance), that is anchored in learning, research and artistic making: the tree is known for its fruits! The text corresponds, theoretically, to the expectation of the “recreation of the school” (BNCC, 2018, p. 462), exemplified in the formative itinerary, life project, student protagonism, very important expressions, but removed from motivationalist neo-liberal environments, which practice shamelessly instructionism which is the only way of “learning”. They did not introduce any relevant innovation in the private school, which remains stagnantly stagnant, because the pretensions of change in favor of the student's authorial learning come up against - and there they succumb - in reproductive practices of the arch of the old woman, the result of which is easy to observe in *Enem*: almost nobody knows how to write, just find the right answer to questions that, as a rule, do not mobilize authorship - out of 4 million candidates, circa de 50 write well, because student authorship has no importance at school.

In itself, the formulation is better than that of FE, because Art is taken as a formative principle common to all contents, but it is not credible, because BNCC persists in the end, especially because the school environment does not change by law, top: the teacher being the same, the class the same, the test the same, the school organization the same, everything should remain the same. For example, in order to recreate the school, it is essential to change the teacher. It is certain that the university will not accept any change in this sense, because it has no self-criticism. Formative itinerary calls for another school organization, mainly to overcome the 45 minutes of class, which do not serve any minimally decent learning activity. We do not have more concrete data on the results of Art at school, but we can use an indirect evaluation device (only approximate and suggestive), observing the performance in Portuguese, considering that Art is in the space of Language. In Table 1, we can observe the appropriate learning in HS, in the national average (Brazil) and in the states. On average (Brazil), proper

learning started at 45.4% in 1995, came to stagger to 22.6% in 2005 and stood at 29.1% in 2017, marking a 16.3% drop in 22 years, a very catastrophic result, which fully justifies BNCC's request to “recreate the school”: in fact, the school we have does not only produce learning, it is going backwards.

**Table 1** – Appropriate learning in PORTUGUESE LANGUAGE at HS - IDEB - BRAZIL and States (1995-2017) (%)

| Years            | 1995        | 1997        | 1999        | 2001        | 2003        | 2005        | 2007        | 2009        | 2011        | 2013        | 2015        | 2017        |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>Brazil</b>    | <b>45.4</b> | <b>39.7</b> | <b>27.6</b> | <b>25.8</b> | <b>26.9</b> | <b>22.6</b> | <b>24.5</b> | <b>28.9</b> | <b>29.2</b> | <b>27.2</b> | <b>27.5</b> | <b>29.1</b> |
| Pará             | 32.4        | 37.9        | 12.9        | 19.3        | 16.0        | 14.2        | 13.3        | -           | 26.1        | 14.8        | 19.0        | 15.6        |
| Maranhão         | 19.2        | 24.9        | 14.7        | 15.4        | 26.3        | 09.6        | 13.3        | 16.1        | 15.3        | 12.2        | 15.1        | 16.4        |
| Amazonas         | 36.6        | 23.8        | 12.5        | 13.0        | 14.8        | 06.4        | 09.9        | -           | 20.3        | 14.6        | 23.7        | 16.6        |
| Amapá            | 37.5        | 14.2        | 15.1        | 18.5        | 21.2        | 19.8        | 15.1        | -           | 20.0        | 17.4        | 18.2        | 17.0        |
| Roraima          | 27.9        | 19.8        | 6.8         | 12.1        | 14.4        | 19.1        | 15.0        | -           | 20.2        | 18.8        | 22.2        | 18.2        |
| Bahia            | 30.4        | 48.5        | 18.9        | 17.9        | 21.5        | 14.8        | 17.2        | 26.1        | 21.6        | 16.2        | 17.5        | 18.4        |
| Alagoas          | 35.6        | 25.9        | 15.9        | 17.7        | 21.8        | 15.5        | 13.5        | 16.8        | 15.4        | 12.6        | 15.9        | 19.1        |
| Rio Gr. Norte    | 27.5        | 35.6        | 14.7        | 17.8        | 18.8        | 15.2        | 17.0        | 19.6        | 18.2        | 15.6        | 18.5        | 20.6        |
| Piauí            | 21.7        | 41.0        | 20.3        | 23.9        | 24.3        | 16.7        | 15.1        | 16.2        | 18.8        | 18.9        | 20.7        | 21.3        |
| Tocantins        | 26.0        | 29.4        | 06.3        | 13.7        | 13.1        | 13.3        | 13.0        | -           | 20.2        | 16.9        | 17.5        | 22.1        |
| Acre             | 23.9        | 18.5        | 11.4        | 17.1        | 23.6        | 17.5        | 21.4        | -           | 19.2        | 21.7        | 21.7        | 22.9        |
| Mato Grosso      | 36.4        | 37.8        | 24.0        | 25.8        | 22.5        | 21.4        | 18.3        | 21.0        | 24.4        | 20.3        | 23.7        | 23.7        |
| Paraíba          | 28.6        | 28.5        | 22.5        | 16.9        | 18.1        | 12.6        | 18.8        | 23.4        | 21.5        | 22.6        | 22.0        | 23.8        |
| Rondônia         | 49.0        | 32.9        | 20.6        | 19.9        | 19.9        | 20.4        | 17.7        | -           | 24.2        | 24.2        | 24.2        | 26.3        |
| Sergipe          | 44.2        | 45.1        | 20.1        | 18.8        | 21.1        | 21.2        | 14.5        | 25.3        | 20.4        | 19.2        | 23.0        | 27.2        |
| Ceará            | 29.0        | 37.5        | 22.1        | 18.8        | 24.9        | 20.1        | 20.4        | 25.2        | 24.0        | 21.2        | 21.5        | 27.4        |
| Pernambuco       | 22.3        | 35.0        | 17.5        | 15.6        | 19.0        | 16.6        | 19.1        | 20.7        | 20.1        | 25.0        | 27.7        | 28.6        |
| Mt. Grosso Sul   | 42.4        | 42.0        | 26.1        | 31.4        | 30.5        | 29.6        | 28.4        | 42.4        | 37.6        | 32.5        | 34.1        | 30.4        |
| Paraná           | 49.1        | 46.9        | 30.8        | 22.4        | 28.6        | 25.6        | 29.9        | 37.4        | 31.9        | 27.3        | 33.2        | 32.8        |
| São Paulo        | 57.6        | 33.9        | 29.9        | 29.7        | 26.4        | 25.5        | 28.3        | 33.6        | 35.9        | 35.9        | 32.3        | 33.3        |
| Santa Catarina   | 49.2        | 41.9        | 31.4        | 30.9        | 63.6        | 25.7        | 27.1        | 31.8        | 35.5        | 31.5        | 32.8        | 33.9        |
| Goiás            | 49.6        | 43.7        | 26.7        | 25.0        | 25.9        | 17.6        | 18.3        | 27.0        | 26.3        | 28.6        | 28.9        | 33.9        |
| Minas Gerais     | 48.5        | 65.2        | 32.4        | 25.9        | 29.5        | 28.1        | 31.6        | 32.0        | 35.6        | 30.2        | 30.0        | 34.7        |
| Rio de Janeiro   | 38.8        | 31.5        | 38.9        | 31.6        | 37.5        | 23.6        | 26.9        | 30.3        | 38.1        | 36.0        | 34.4        | 35.0        |
| Rio Gr. Sul      | 57.5        | 60.2        | 34.9        | 42.8        | 39.5        | 33.6        | 34.8        | 45.1        | 36.3        | 37.9        | 32.4        | 36.5        |
| Distrito Federal | 65.5        | 55.8        | 42.8        | 40.9        | 39.4        | 40.6        | 43.3        | 38.4        | 40.3        | 40.2        | 41.1        | 39.3        |
| Espírito Santo   | 33.0        | 45.9        | 29.4        | 26.4        | 31.2        | 25.7        | 23.7        | 36.0        | 29.4        | 28.6        | 35.9        | 40.7        |

Source: MEC, Inep. Ranking by the last column – devised by the authors

The best placed state was Espírito Santo, with 40.7% of adequate learning in Portuguese in 2017, a rare example of progress since 1995, when it had 33% (the other example is Pernambuco: it starts with 22.3% and reaches 28.6%). The figure of 40.7% (the only one that reaches 40%) is still minuscule, totally unsatisfactory, and exceptional in general. All other states fell in performance, some impressively, like São Paulo: it started in 1995 with 57.6%, but

reaches 2017 with only 33.3% (24.3% lost). Distrito Federal started with 65.5% and went down to 39.3% (loss of 26.2%). There are seven states that performed below 20% in 2017: Pará, the most poorly positioned, with 15.6%; Maranhão with 16.4%; Amazonas, with 16.6%; Amapá, with 17%; Roraima, with 18.2%; Bahia, with 18.4%; Alagoas, with 19.1%. All also fell back in the period. It is an absurdly insufficient performance, indicating complete ineptitude to get the job done.

The Portuguese language is, as a rule, in tatters and decaying before the eyes, with rare exceptions. Judging by such performance, Art would hardly have any other result, which would lead us to assume that Art is what it is in general at school: occasional decoration, time-filling, inconsequential making. As a fundamental principle of authorial learning, it does not exist, because instructionism devours everything. To imagine that in the school we have Art as creation, rebellion, alternative, as a practical reference in schoolwork, it is an achievement.

### The “art” inside out of instructionism

In the eyes of PISA, Asian performance, reaching the top places, sounds like “art”, in the immediate sense of superior results. As Zhao (2014; 2018; ZHAO *et al.*, 2019) analyzes, however, the instructional proposal can garner superior results, but pedagogically it is infamous, because it is oppressive, unhealthy, suffocating (school suicide has increased), imposing on students training similar to forced labor that is not possible to accept as “pedagogical” and in this they are the reverse of art. As Zhao points out, there are no rebels, innovators, breakers, but an army aligned to shout amen. It serves such a teaching system to competitiveness and productivity, linked to the productive system subserviently, which is also the reverse of art. In part, we can interpret, at least tentatively, that the adoption of wildly competitive radical economic liberalism (MILANOVIC, 2019; PIKETTY, 2020) has the effect of “unclogging” the Chinese, as they can frantically indulge in disruptive economic activities, allowed, encouraged, when in other sectors of life they are restrained. This “unclogging” is evident in Lee's provocative work (2018), which bets on the soon taking of global economic and technological leadership, along with the educational one, of China in the world. One of the arguments is the taste for hard work, above all for competition without bounds, without truce, without concession, breaking everything all the time, to overthrow rivals and to place themselves at the top of the market. He recalls Schumpeter's famous work on “**creative destruction**” (2009), which he saw as “the art” of capitalism, and which ended up becoming the *modus procedendi* of this productive system, especially in the digital age. The disruption capacity is seen, in a

stupendous way, in disruptive technological companies such as Microsoft, Google, Facebook, Amazon etc. that turned the global economy inside out, placing creative invention as a fundamental lever.

From this pragmatic pressure emerged the imposition of employability, the fundamental change of preparation for work based on the creative potential of the worker, requiring even a critical spirit, philosophy, team work, initiative, own communication etc., a list of virtues that combines with the creative destruction of the productive system. The country that today corresponds most to this frenzy is China, in a very contradictory context, however. First, the major motivation for innovation is not formative, authorial learning, but wild, aggressive, predatory competition, which is also expressed in the destruction of the environment (cities that are not habitable by pollution, for example). It is not about art as the ability to break with reality in the name of life, liberation, emancipation, but in the name of capital. Second, the results are not pedagogical, they are internally instructional, forced down their throats, especially in the sphere of mathematics (ZHAO, 2018). A small number of students are freed from the suffocation, because, with high performance, they gain their own movement, especially in the digital field (hackers, software engineers, digital analytics etc.). The mass of students crawls, suffocated by oppression and fits into the jobs of the productive system subserviently, completely devoid of the virtues of Art as a human, humanizing, formative expression. In practice, a proposal from Art as a pedagogical formation that can lead to ridicule, because it would take time from what matters: mathematics, especially. Hence the bad reputation of the “humanities” because it is foolish to fill the spirit, while the material domination of the world economy is lacking. In the end, there remains the docilization of bodies and minds, not necessarily productive and competitive - docile people are accommodated! - but still very useful to the system because it allows for a sufficient combination of technical expertise and productivity.

For Zhao's interpretation, the art that appears there is inside out: the art of imbecilization, manipulation, alienation. There is no time and space to discuss life alternatives, new dimensions of reality, other collective cooperation projects, because everyone, like a suicidal army, is aligned for a battle without subjects against a faceless enemy, reverberating the same colonizing Eurocentric emancipatory project 500 years ago. Technology, industrial competence, cutting-edge education are used to colonize minds and bodies, because society does not revolve around its cooperative values of quality of life, but of insane competitiveness. More than ever, Foucault's analysis becomes prophecy: education is a prison activity. Children do forced labor (RIPLEY, 2013), grating close to 20 hours a day, so they can swallow mathematics, train correct

answers, master content at any price, quantitatively, with a view to occupying the top. Pedagogically it is an empty top. In terms of art, its inside out.

However, it is worth recognizing that among us, art at school has always been farcical, with the exception of gifted and dedicated teachers who make the effort to offer students a chance to understand the possible formative rebellion. As a rule, we all agree that art as a rebellious break is one of the most notable human expressions, which puts the species on an extremely more complex and refined (not “supremacist”) evolutionary route. Klein (2002), analyzing the dawn of human culture, instead of qualifying for the production of instruments and weapons, prefers to emphasize as a cultural and civilizing advance the production of handicrafts to give to others: making a bead necklace, an artistic adornment, a artifact invented in a good way indicates the most profound and promising human sensibility, whose disruptive symbology lies in pointing to alternative dimensions of life that enliven, edify, sublimate, not for competitiveness and productivity. It is not by chance that art is "useless" in raw economic terms, because we understand utility as advantageous, even vile, exploration. A painting by Picasso is worth millions of dollars today, but as such it is of no use other than hanging on the wall for visitation. What is the picture for, in social terms? It has no material use, exactly, but sociocultural - Guernica suggests the horrors of the Spanish civil war, calls for the deformation of bodies to indicate that routine reality prevents us from appreciating / perceiving other realities, which we can see on the screen many interpretations under the alternative shock, that the real world we live in is a horror. We can always claim that this message, as important as it may seem, does not produce anything concrete, does not lower inflation, does not improve the minimum wage... In terms of immediate utilitarianism, art is dispensable, since it is common to live without art , a tasteless routine life. The strong side of art is to challenge the meaning of things, of life, of humanity. For what? For nothing!

This nothing, however, is what is worth everything, because from it we can take away alternative senses to what seems to be meaningless, worlds other than those that emerge as a routine, shocking and new dimensions that only reproduce to age us as disposable pieces. The school we have has no way of appreciating this way, because, although there are clear, very coherent teachers, the system is a sarcastic laugh against the art rebellion.

## **Final considerations**

What are Beethoven's symphonies for? Would it be the case to work them at school? Although there is a market for music, music was never really a commodity, because it is a disruptive creation of the human mind, which is neither bought nor sold. Taking this type of formation to school seems like an infantile tendency, because it does not fill the belly. Most parents would think so too: the child loses time with symphonies, while he needs to speak English, know mathematics, skillfully handle a computer. However, since human history, the most important for the meaning of life has also been the most useless. Religion speaks for itself: searching for the meaning of life in another world of which we have no concrete notion, seems like a casual game. A closed monk in his monastery, dedicated to prayer and meditation, supported by others, is a flagrant idler. The normal is the common man, overwhelmed by immediate material concerns, with no time to think “other things” than immediate survival. What does a Beethoven symphony mean for those who earn minimum wages? The only question that would matter is how does the symphony improve the minimum wage?... It won't! So, it doesn't fit!

Art serves to deconstruct the immediate uselessness that defines routine life, indicating that the most authentic return is not material, pecuniary, but creative, alternative. It is an unacceptable addiction to arrest people for immediate survival, because this condition stupefies the spirit, exasperates aggression, lowers feelings. At school, even though it is a small, lost, artificial world, children could have this experience of rapture, sublimation, when they realize that the most important reality is not the one we have in hand, but that escapes us. The meaning of life is not in the immediate rudeness of a society drowning in shallow survival, but in the capacity to enjoy activities that yield nothing, besides the delight of experiencing them and extracting alternative life indications. Chinese children could have a more authentic sense of happiness if they saw education as a non-immediate, competitive, productive, but formative activity, where what matters most is always free.

## REFERENCES

- BASE NACIONAL COMUM CURRICULAR (BNCC). **Educação é a Base**. Brasília: Ministério da Educação, 2018. Available: [http://basenacionalcomum.mec.gov.br/images/BNCC\\_EI\\_EF\\_110518\\_-versaofinal\\_site.pdf](http://basenacionalcomum.mec.gov.br/images/BNCC_EI_EF_110518_-versaofinal_site.pdf). Access: 20 Sep. 2020.
- BELLAH, R. N. **Religion in Human Evolution**: from the Paleolithic to the axial age. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge. 2011.
- BHASKAR, R. **From science to emancipation**: alienation and the actuality of Enlightenment. Sage. 2003.
- BICKEL, B. A.; CARTER, M. (Eds.). **Studies in arts-based educational research**. Springer, 2020
- BLACK, M. Education as art and discipline. **Ethics**, v. 54, n. 4, p. 290-294, 1944
- BLOCH, E. **Das prinzip hoffnung**. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1959. v. 2
- BLOCH, E. **Zur ontologie des noch-nicht-seins**. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1961.
- BOFF, L. **Espiritualidade**: um caminho de transformação. São Paulo: GMT, 2006.
- BOFF, L. **São Francisco de Assis**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2007.
- CLARK, I. E. *et al.* “Deconstructing” scientific research: A practical and scalable pedagogical tool to provide evidence-based science instruction. **PLOS Biology**, San Francisco, v. 7, n. 12, dez. 2009.
- CONSTANTIN, A. Ciência e rebeldia. **Opinião**, 3 set. 2020. Available: <http://pioneiro.clicrbs.com.br/rs/cultura-e-tendencias/noticia/2020/09/andre-costantin-ciencia-e-rebeldia-13044929.html>. Access: 20 Sep. 2020.
- DAVIES, P. **The demon in the machine**. Penguin, 2019.
- DAVIS, J. H. Framing education as art: the octopus has a good day. **International Journal of Education & the Arts**, Pennsylvania State University, v. 6, n. 3, p. 1-16, 2005.
- DEMO, P. **Saber pensar é questionar**. LiberLivro, 2010.
- DEMO, P. **Teologia da prosperidade**. 2017. Available: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1aRWvy4PSBUQDeKg2iKLoug56Zye0tI1AsVjEVXw316o/pub>. Access: 20 Sep. 2020.
- DEMO, P. **BNCC: ranços e avanços**. 2019. Available: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1iNN-LQuf-9rJe6wFQoHI9kQzUKqjzDBj/view>. Access: 20 Sep. 2020.
- DEMO, P. **Escola e cuidado**. 2019a. Available: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XKQDqJHfNMFEEnN2gVF1n6yZmEmoYkS34/view>. Access: 20 Sep. 2020.



DEMO, P. **Educação à Deriva: à direita e à esquerda: instrucionismo como patrimônio nacional.** 2020. Available: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/10nMlgL8N9GKFgwtbL-bIn7GQf0HdyA4/view>. Access: 20 Sep. 2020.

DEMO, P. **Por que tristeza não tem fim, felicidade sim?** 2020a. Available: [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ad-U9Jw8yPf48sQrTU8HHTUm3k2dWAn\\_/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ad-U9Jw8yPf48sQrTU8HHTUm3k2dWAn_/view). Access: 20 Sep. 2020.

DYSON, F. **The scientist as rebel.** New York: New York Review Books, 2006.

GOBER, M. **An end to upside down thinking: dispelling the myth that the brain produces consciousness, and the implications for everyday life.** New York: Waterside Press: 2018.

GUNVE, F. Doing (art) education as art (education). *In: KNIGHT, L; CUTCHER, A. L. (Eds.). Arts-Research-Education. Studies in Arts-based Educational Research.* Springer. 2017. v. 1.

HARARI, Y.N. **Sapiens: a brief history of humankind.** London: Harper, 2015.

HARARI, Y.N. **Homo Deus: a brief history of tomorrow.** London: Harper, 2017.

HARRIS, S. **Waking up: a guide to spirituality without religion.** New York: Amazon, 2014.

HUME, D. **An Enquiry concerning human Understanding: and other writings.** Cambridge University Press, 2007.

HUXLEY, A. **On science and art in relation to education.** Collected Essays. 1882. Available: <https://mathcs.clarku.edu/huxley/CE3/ScRe.html>. Access: 20 Sep. 2020.

KAU, A. **Deconstruction and science: how post-secondary literary theory applies to scientific understanding.** 2001. Available: <http://sites.science.oregonstate.edu/~stetza/ph407H/Deconstruction.pdf>. Access 20 Sep. 2020.

KAUFFMAN. S. A. **A world beyond physics: the emergence and evolution of life.** Oxford U. Press, 2019.

KIPLING, R. **The science of rebellion: a tract for the times (The Imperial South Africa Association).** The Kipling Society. 1901. Available: <http://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/rebellion.htm>. Access: 20 Sep. 2020.

KLEIN, R.G. **The Dawn of Human Culture.** New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2002.

KISIDA, B.; BOWEN, D. H. **New evidence of the benefits of arts education.** Brookings, 2019. Available: <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2019/02/12/new-evidence-of-the-benefits-of-arts-education/>. Access: 20 Sep. 2020.

KRISTIANSEN, C.; LUND, K.; DAMIAN, B. L. **Reflections on the project “Art as Education, Education as Art”.** 2017. Available: <https://www.uia.no/studententer-i->

forskningsprosjekt/reflections-on-the-project-art-as-education-education-as-art. Access: 20 Sep. 2020.

LASZLO, E. *et al.* **What is reality?** The new map of cosmos, consciousness, and existence. New York: SelectBooks, 2016.

LEE, K. F **AI Superpowers:** China, Silicon Valley, and the new world order. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2018.

MERZ, M.; KNORR CETINA, K. Deconstruction in a “thinking” science: Theoretical physicists at work. **Social Studies of Science**, v. 27, n. 1, p. 73-111, 1997.

MILANOVIC, B. **Capitalism, alone:** the future of the system that rules the world. Harvard U. Press, 2019.

MINAYO, M. C. S. Orientação de mestrandos e doutorandos como atividade profissional. **Cadernos de Saúde Pública**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 35, n. 10, 2019. Available: [https://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci\\_arttext&pid=S0102-311X2019001200301&lng=pt&nrm=iso](https://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0102-311X2019001200301&lng=pt&nrm=iso). Access: 20 Sep. 2020.

MINAYO, M. C. S.; DEMO, P.; SILVA, R. A. Pessoas com Deficiência (PcD) egressas de uma formação profissional: trabalho e educação. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 15, n. 4, p. 1703-1729, jun. 2020. ISSN 1982-5587. Available: <https://periodicos.fclar.unesp.br/iberoamericana/article/view/13816>. Access: 21 Sep. 2020.

NATALE, C. 2012. **Education is an art:** not a science. **The Wonder of Childhood**, 2012. Available: <http://thewonderofchildhood.com/2012/03/education-is-an-art-not-a-science/>. Access 20 Sep. 2020.

PARKER, L.; WELCH, C. 3 things you need to know about the science rebellion against Trump. **National Geographic**, 2017. Available: <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/news/2017/01/scientists-march-on-washington-national-parks-twitter-war-climate-science-donald-trump/>. Access: 20 Sep. 2020.

PIKETTY, T. **Capital and ideology**. Harvard U. Press, 2020.

RACHELLE. What does art education mean to you? **TinkerLab**, 2014. Available: <https://tinkerlab.com/art-education-mean/>. Access: 20 Sep. 2020.

RADCLIFFE, J. **The science of rebellion** (Notes). 2009. Available: [http://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/rg\\_rebellion1.htm](http://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/rg_rebellion1.htm). Access: 20 Sep. 2020.

RASMUSSEN, D. C. **The infidel and the professor:** David Hume, Adam Smith, and the friendship that shaped modern thought. Princeton U. Press, 2018.

RIPLEY, A. **The Smartest Kids in the World:** And How They Got That Way. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2013.

ROVELLI, C. **Science is rebellion**: knowledge relies on throwing out what we think. IAI News – Changing how the world thinks. 2014. Available: <https://iai.tv/articles/science-is-rebellion-auid-455>. Access: 20 Sep. 2020.

SCHUMPETER, J. A. **Can capitalism survive?** Creative destruction and the future of the global economy. Harper Perennial Modern Classics, 2009.

STEINER, R. **The Kingdom of childhood**: introductory talks on Waldorf education. Foundations of Waldorf Education, SteinerBooks, 1995.

STEINER, R. **The education of the child**. Foundations of Waldorf Education, SteinerBooks, 1996.

STEINER, R. *et al.* **Education as an Art**. SteinerBooks, 1988.

ZHAO, Y. **Who is afraid of the big bad dragon**: why China has the best (and the worst) education system in the world. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2014.

ZHAO, Y. **What works may hurt**: side effects in education. Teachers College Press, 2018.

ZHAO, Y.; EMLER, T. E.; SNETHEN, A.; YIN, D. **An education crisis is a terrible thing to waste**: how radical changes can spark student excitement and success. Teachers College Press, 2019.

ZIEGFELD, E. **Education and art**: a symposium. UNESCO, 1954. Available: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000000457>. Access 20 Sep. 2020.

ZIMMERMANN, H. **Waldorf-Pädagogik weltweit**. Freunde der Erziehungskunst, 2001.

## How to reference this article

DEMO, P.; MINAYO, M. C. S.; SILVA, R. A. Education: art as art of breaking or deconstruction. **Rev. Sem Aspás**, Araraquara, v. 9, n. 1, p. 120-139, jan./jun., 2020. e-ISSN: 2358-4238. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29373/sas.v9i1.14213>

**Submitted:** 10/05/2020

**Required revisions:** 20/07/2020

**Approved:** 25/08/2020

**Published:** 30/09/2020