

derivas

INVESTIGAÇÃO EM EDUCAÇÃO ARTÍSTICA
Research in Arts Education

ESCALA / SCALE
P
C



P. 05

Des'Editorial

ANA PAZ

P. 09

O Atlas: Indisciplinar a História da Arte

ANA SOFIA REIS

P. 21

O desejo da Escola de Arte que há-de vir

ANA CATARINA ALMEIDA

P. 41

Ensino de Artes Visuais específico, diferenciado e intercultural na Comunidade Quilombola de Conceição das Crioulas

DENILSON PEREIRA ROSA

P. 55

Com os pés descalços no caos

LARA SOARES

P. 69

Outros tempos, outros espaços

FABIANO RAMOS TORRES

P. 81

O que é a (uma) escola contemporânea?

JOÃO MARQUES FRANCO

P. 93

Pensar a Educação Artística a partir de Cabo Verde, na condição de implicados na acção artística e na economia solidária

JOSÉ CARLOS DE PAIVA / RITA RAINHO

P. 107

The fabrication of the chameleonic citizen of the future: Arts education in the advanced liberal society

CATARINA S. MARTINS

P. 119

Algunas ideas sobre la enseñanza de las prácticas artísticas

NEUS LOZANO SANFÈLIX

Today, education, in terms of the international agendas that define, in a great extent, the national policies, is often analogous with learning, competences, outcomes and testing aimed at producing a subject capable of integrating, in a successful manner, the world of work and society (Biesta, 2005). This subject must be chameleonic: flexible enough to adapt to the contexts and challenges that the market and society poses to him; creative to solve problems; autonomous so that he/she can face precarity; entrepreneur to avoid insecurity; and a lifelong learner, in order to be able to sketch a smile at every new requirement that the world of work presents.

We are living a catering regime in education: one in which knowledge is delivered made to measure, to meet the needs of the students, seen as clients with the capacity to choose and being responsible by their choices (Gielen & Bruyne, 2012). In the market of education, families are given the possibility to choose which school and program is more adequate for their children. Freedom is being used as a weapon that is masked with equality and objectivity.

The modules, competencies, hours of contact, all the Bologna jargon, is part of this catering regime in which everything must be in the right size, measure, delivered on time, known in advance; the jargon of European educational policies: testing, creativity, well-being, lifelong learning, etc. is also part of the technologies through which each of us conducts his/her own conduct, to be more productive, open to measurability and accountability, and, desirably, flexible and alienated from social protection systems while, **free to be free!**

Simultaneously, the arts and the art schools are under attack, in need to justify their funding and their existence. The forces are hard to face as it is a matter of survival and, at the same time, the neoliberal politics uses some of the arts' world more welcome words: freedom and critique. Not surprisingly, the arts are being instrumentalized under the rethorics of creativity and entrepreneurship (Kalin, 2018). It is, precisely, within this rethorics that the citizen of the future is being fabricated.

^x This text is the oral version of a conference presented at International Conference Aesthetics of Transformation, Arts Education Research and the Challenge of Cultural Sustainability, Nuremberg, 2-4 May 2018.

What I will be arguing here is that in advanced liberal societies (ROSE, 1996) everything turns more difficult to be questioned because the idea of an autonomous, responsible and free subject is the basis of neoliberal rationality. This neoliberal rationality produces and uses freedom as a technology of government: the students, the families, as consumers, get the “impression that they can choose anything they like, made to their own measure, while in fact it delivers mass produced, standardized products” (Gielen & Bruyne, 2012, p. 5). If the curricular discourses on the arts appeal to the formation of a critical, autonomous and responsible subject, and conform him through the devices of pedagogy, generating thus the curricular alchemies that fabricate certain types of desired subjects, the discourses that circulate today on education, namely referring to the basic competences of the 21st Century citizen, instrumentalize the imaginary of the arts as a space of freedom, for the fabrication of the entrepreneurial and lifelong learner. As von Osten (2011, p. 137) argues, “the ‘artist’ whose way of working is based on self-responsibility, creativity and spontaneity,[...] grounds the slogans of today’s discourse on labor”, becoming the economic model of the citizen of the future. A recent working document from OECD on key competences for lifelong learning states that

“It is important to equip current and future generations – regardless of social and cultural background – with the characteristics of successful innovators – including curiosity (or inquisitiveness), use of imagination, critical thinking, problem-solving, and perseverance (resilience or persistence) which includes positive risk-taking.”

(EUROPEAN COMMISSION, 2018, P.42)

These characteristics are typically associated with creativity and are presented here as being the solution for ‘all’, regardless their origin. The uncertainty of the future is governed through the perpetual investment one has to do in his/her own life, being resilient and persistent. The citizen of the future is always imagined as a critical, flexible, autonomous and creative subject. One of his/her main capacities is the capacity to learn, as a way of acquiring always new competences. The flexibility and autonomy appear as two qualities

associated to the critical and creative capacities and, thus, this is a subject not only capable of solving problems, but rather of choosing between situations that are presented to him/her. S/he is also able to change depending on the environment, like a chameleon.

S/he turns into a skills on-demand worker (Kalin, 2018).

Both critical and creative competences, as key competences of the citizen of the 21st Century, inscribe a moral agenda. Critique appears articulated with the idea of possibility of choice and decision making. Creativity articulates with problem solving and facing precariousness. During the second World War, Herbert Read stated that “the gigantic catastrophes that threaten us are not elemental happenings of a physical or biological kind, but [...] psychic events”. “The secret of all our collective ills,” he argued, “is to be traced to the suppression of spontaneous, creative ability in the individual” (Read, 1943, pp. 201, 202).

If creativity, then, emerged as a narrative of salvation against the human atrocities, today it emerges as the salvation narrative for the globalized and knowledge economies. It is not a matter, as Osborne (2003) argues, of a mere ideology that would respond to a capitalist society, but rather to a governmental practice that is supported in two zones of expertise: management and psychology.

The characteristics of this subject imagined in curricular terms, but especially in the documents that circulate internationally – in PISA, for example – make use of a set of categories that hardly find questioning. Neo-liberal forms of government incite specific behaviours using freedom and a seductive language that functions as a technology of government and self-government. Neo-liberal government operates, not through the activation of coercion mechanisms but rather through practices of self-regulation and self-formation of the subjects in face of particular truth games supported by knowledges and expertise that underpin the political, pedagogical and therapeutical discourses and the whole market, through forms of life and consumption that inscribe specific subjectivities.

Thus, educational discourses are invaded by a set of principles originated in the corporate and managerial world, now applied to the management of personal life and to the production of human capital. The highway to the future is traced through the accumulation and play of a kit of characteristics that make the desired student, and teacher, and citizen, as the one who is creative, responsible and

capable of making choices, firstly, in terms of his/her own life. Not only the life becomes an enterprise, but also its success is measured according to the amount of human capital one is able to reach. These universal inscriptions embody distinctions about different types of people. Not that these discourses talk about the 'barbarian' citizen as the non creative, irresponsible, or the individual that is not capable of choosing, but those differences are marked as zones of remediation and rescue.

The OECD's European Directorate, for example, defines education as "ways of thinking which involve creative and critical approaches to problem-solving and decision-making"¹. It is not only about who the teacher is and should be, but also who the student is and should be. Education is said to be, also, "about the capacity to live in a multi-faceted world as an active and engaged citizen". Democracy and freedom appear as redemption narratives. Teachers and students are the ones who have to be taught in ways that they can save not anymore the nation, but the society itself. Creativity is being instrumentalized as a competency in the workforce, essential to the global economy. However, in this salvation narrative, what is said is that are the rights of children to choose by themselves what to learn. As Andreas Schleicher puts it "These citizens influence what they want to learn and how they want to learn it, and it is this that shapes the role of educators". The neoliberal rationality makes an equivalence between freedom and choice, and it is a matter of each one to transform him/herself in a continuous architect of his/her own life. In fact, what gains relevance in this, is not knowledge, but rather the processes and methodologies that organize each one's way of relating to him/herself and organize life through the ordering of reason.

¹ This and the following quotations in the paragraph are part of Andreas Schleicher text "The case for 21st century learning", available at: <http://www.oecd.org/general/thecasefor21st-centurylearning.htm>

Who of us would say that she or he does not want to be flexible, creative, autonomous or a lifelong learner?

Who of us would say that insecurity is not a nightmare in the planning of everyday life?

However, to be creative, flexible, critical or entrepreneur corresponds to a way in which the subject constitutes him/herself, through and in relation with certain practices and truth games. Advanced liberal democracies, as Nikolas Rose puts it, govern “through the regulated choices of individual citizens, now construed as subjects of choices and aspirations to self-actualization and self-fulfilment” (1996, p. 41). This new regime of government seeks to govern at a distance, not exactly through disciplinary devices, but rather using instruments of control and audition for each citizen to configure him/her as a subject of choice, responsibility and autonomy.

The ideas of freedom and choice appear as the surface that impulsion the student to conduct him/her as client and consumer, investing and producing his/her own human capital, being able to compete inside and outside of the school. As Thomas Popkewitz puts it, “No one escapes being a lifelong learner”, having to be a creative citizen, and, if choice is presented as a matter of freedom, no one can escape the “choice of choosing” (Popkewitz, 2003, p. 48).

The future is mobilized as a way of governing the present. In a way, the fear of the uncertainty of the future is faced through prescriptive ways of being and behaving to face all the contingencies in a smooth way. Insecurity is, then, a strategy for government through which “the citizen is enjoined to bring the future into the present, and is educated in the ways of calculating the future consequences of actions as diverse as those of diet to those of home security” (Rose, 1996, p. 58).

The making of human capital

If today’s discourses on education and learning are about to be free and choose, these choices are presented as having direct impacts in the kind of person one is and should become. Advanced liberal democracies establish new types of relations of the subjects with themselves in terms of their own future. The student, as well as families, are placed in different conceptual zones according to their

actions and choices. To choose one or another school cannot be seen as a blind gesture, as performing well in PISA tests, for instance, is not only a matter of knowing.

These gestures produce effects and the choice of the school, as well as being in the top or at the bottom of rankings, means to be included in a safe and desirable territory or in a risky terrain. Those in risk are no more those that the 19th century social and educational sciences configured as the abnormal, but they still represent a certain 'barbarianism'. These barbarians are the ones that represent a threat for the progress and development of society, as they are not the citizens able to face and compete in the so called knowledge and globalized economies (Popkewitz, 2003). We see, then, how choice is being presented not free from certain 'happy' ends! It means that the entrepreneurial citizen that neoliberal rationality presents as the lifelong learner, creative, responsible, autonomous and problem solving subject is the one who self-improves his/her own life.

The *homo economicus* produced by neo-liberalism, according to Foucault (2008), brings a new relation of the subject with work. He is not the man of exchange, but rather the one who is his/her own business man, his/her own producer of human capital. In *The Birth of Biopolitics*, Foucault shows how neo-liberalism fine tunes the mechanisms of production of this subject, by making skills and competences inseparable from the one who is competent and can do something. S/he is a unit-enterprise. A consumption subject, but who produces his/her own satisfaction from his/her available capital. But this neo-liberal governmental art stems from freedom, deepening the principles of liberalism.

Liberalism presents itself "as the management of freedom, not in the sense of the imperative: 'be free,' with the immediate contradiction that this imperative may contain. The formula of liberalism is not 'be free.' Liberalism formulates simply the following: I am going to produce what you need to be free. I am going to see to and say that you are free to be free" (Michel Foucault, 2008, p. 63). Advanced liberalism uses freedom as a technology of production, of government and self-government of subjects, now businessmen of themselves, retaining their own capital, at the same time, investors and investment.

The arts appear today as a fertile ground for the production of the entrepreneurial subject. Historically, artistic practice, since the end of the 19th Century and with the avant-garde of the first half of the 20th Century, are seen as a space of creativity, freedom and of critique. In the school, the arts, via the lens of psychology, were also being built as spaces of creative and free expression. Until the 1950's, the term creativity was not yet in use, but some correlates as imagination, creative power, self-expression or spontaneity were already there. In the post-Cold War, the investment in the idea of creativity as pertaining to childhood and the desire to create a subject capable of social renovation, for example, intensified even more the idea of arts education as the space par excellence of the construction of subjectivity and freedom.

The explosion of creativity does not know, today, its own history, connected to military purposes and to the imagination of the impossible, that is, of atomic futures (Eekelen, 2017). However, the detection of creative citizens continues to be inscribed in this rationality that allows the fabrication of types of persons. Creativity as a technology of government operates a marking with specific social functions. In the tradition of the genius as the one who occupied the top of a cultural and symbolic activity, capable of functioning as the motor of a human selection that has been articulated historically with the idea of race in eugenics theories (Martins, 2015), and unlikely the other side of genius as being neurotic or with mental imbalance, today “the truly creative social actors, the designated elect who generate and release innovations, are marked apart – and marked up for symbolic ascension” (Raunig, Ray, & Wuggenig, 2011, p. 1).

The creative subject is, therefore, the one who, responsible for the formation of his/her own human capital, is responsible for his/her own survival in the neo-liberal jungle. It is here that I would like to bring forward again the idea of a chameleonic subject. Chameleons are lizards that are distinguishable from other lizards by their capacity to change colour, by their fast tongue for capturing prey, by moving their eyes independently of each other, potentiating a 360 degree sight and also by the prehensile capacity of their tail. The metaphor here established is merely illustrative of some of the characteristics imagined today for the 21st Century subject.

The advanced liberal government not only produces a subject of a certain kind, but also the relation that that subject is taken to

establish with him/herself according to the environment, be this environment statistical realities, school rankings, the images that circulate about a healthy or a beauty body, a nutrition table or the image of the citizen of the future as the creative and lifelong learner! These forms of government are supported in the binomial safety/unsafety, placing the fight for survival and safety as a goal based on the success with which the subject faces life's challenges. Butler argues that "populations are now defined by their need to be alleviated from insecurity, valuing forms of police and state control, promises of global investment, and institutions of global governance" (Butler, 2015, pp. viii, ix). It is in this scenario, of the mobilization of the uncertainty about a future as a form of government of the present, that the neo-liberal ways of government imply the sovereignty of a citizen that, being autonomous, responsible and capable of making choices, must be made sufficiently creative to face what is specific of that sovereignty of citizenship: that is, precariousness.

If we consider neo-liberalism as a form of governing subjects, then, the question that will be placed is how not to be governed in this way. At the core of the issue lies not, once we scrutinize the ways of government of advanced liberal societies, to imagine more freedom, but rather to imagine alternative forms of subjectivity and of life, of the relation of the subject with him/herself and of relation of the subject with the others.

"Neoliberalism tries to hide its tracks as it advances its voracious transformation of society through appropriating terms, sites, processes, and resources from more progressive and democratic movements of the past. In effect, we often experience how remnants of progressivism are being used to cover up neoliberal mandates".

(KALIN, 2018, P.3)

Thus, the arts should not be seen, in a naturalized way, as the field par excellence for the development of that neoliberal creativity and the formation of that autonomous and free-thinker subject. To defend the arts for their potential in the acquisition of knowledge in other disciplines or areas, for their economic applicability, for the intrinsic effects that these supposedly provide is to adhere to the neo-liberal

rationality. This gesture corresponds to an instrumentalization in which the bigger the potential for the application of the arts, be it to other knowledges, be it to the economy, the more they would be valued in the educational discourse. Even without thinking, educators encourage an enterprising self.

Creativity, today, is itself an investment in the formation of human capital applicable to the such recurrently called society of knowledge. The guarantee is that the creative subject will be an entrepreneur and this “is portrayed as a contemporary hero” (Dahlsted & Hertzberg, 2012, p. 243). However, just as Lazzarato argues, the model of homo economicus reconstructed by the neo-liberal government “has very little to do with either the artist or artistic ‘creativity’” (2011, p. 46). In fact, creativity is being placed away from art and aesthetics toward economic productivity and innovation. Innovation threatens to subsume and narrow creativity into processes that are market and product driven.

Therefore, I would like to rehabilitate the idea of critique as the possibility of not being governed in a certain way. In *What is Critique?*, Michel Foucault (2007) traces a genealogy of the very idea of critique, from the counter-Reform movements of the 16th Century, that were articulated around debates over particular forms of government. The question would not be how not to be governed, but rather: “how not to be governed like that, not for that, not by them?” (2007, p. 44). Going back to the ways in which education today articulates itself around the languages of business management and the ways in which the citizen of the future is imagined as the one who is, simultaneously, autonomous, free, responsible, lifelong learner, etc., such question would mean that one would need to question each of these principles that presents itself as inevitable.

It implies to ask which kinds of creativity are being disregarded, which contexts are being erased from the game, which persons are being fabricated as the desired ones and which persons and countries are being placed in risky zones.

If we consider that there is no power without the possibility of resistance, then, the critique presents itself as the possibility of resisting those languages and ways of being, to those ways of looking at the student and of imagining him always regarding a projected and calculatable future. It implies, therefore, to resist the representations and classifications that today dominate the discourse on education

and that, under the images of evaluations that supposedly produce quantitative portraits and states that are more egalitarian and fair, trace particular ways of being, thinking and acting.

It implies questioning: what competencies for the 21st Century and what gestures of inclusion and exclusion do those competencies activate?

It implies also to look at the subjects and at the school not as fields of investment (of time and of accumulation of capital) but, as Simons and Masschelein (2012) propose, as the possibility of a free time, separate from the world, from the daily political and economic occupations. As a time of suspension. It implies, concerning creativity and arts education, to start more complex discussions, resisting an economized creativity. May we be 'free' and disobedient enough to imagine it?

REFERÊNCIAS BIBLIOGRÁFICAS

- Biesta, G. (2005). Against Learning. Reclaiming a language for education in an age of learning. *Nordisk Pedagogik*, 25, 54-66.
- Butler, J. (2015). Foreword by Judith Butler. In I. Lorey (Ed.), *State of Insecurity* (pp. vii-xi). London and New York: Verso.
- Comission, E. (2018). *COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT Accompanying the document Proposal for a COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION on Key Competences for LifeLong Learning*. Retrieved from Brussels:
- Dahlsted, M., & Hertzberg, F. (2012). Schooling Entrepreneurs: Entrepreneurship, governmentality and education policy in Sweden at the turn of the millenium. *Journal of Pedagogy*, 3(2), 242-262.
- Eekelen, B. (2017). Creative Intelligence and the Cold War. US Military Investments in the Concept of Creativity, 1945-1965. *Conflict and Society: Advances in Research*, 3, 92-107.
- Foucault, M. (2007). What is Critique? In S. Lotringer (Ed.), *The Politics of Truth* (pp. 41-81). Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).
- Foucault, M. (2008). *The Birth of Biopolitics. Lectures at The Collège de France, 1978-79*. Hampshire and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gielen, P., & Bruyne, P. (2012). Introduction. The Catering Regime. In P. G. P. d. Bruyne (Ed.), *Teaching Art in the Neoliberal Realm. Realism versus Cynicism*. Amsterdam: Valiz Antennae.
- Kalin, N. (2018). *The Neoliberalization of Creativity Education. Democratizing, Destructing and Decreating*. Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lazzarato, M. (2011). The Misfortunes of the 'Artistic Critique' and Cultural Employment. In G. Raunig, G. Ray, & U. Wuggenig (Eds.), *Critique of Creativity. Precarity, Subjectivity and Resistance in the 'Creative Industries'* (pp. 41-56). London: MayFlyBooks.

- Martins, C. S. (2015). Genius as a Historical Event: Its Making as a Statistical Object and Instrument for Governing Schooling. In T. S. Popkewitz (Ed.), *The 'Reason' of Schooling. Historicizing Curriculum Studies, Pedagogy, and Teacher Education* (pp. 99-114). New York and London Routledge.
- Osborne, T. (2003). Against 'creativity': a philistine rant. *Economy and Society*, 32(4), 507-525.
- Popkewitz, T. S. (2003). Governing the Child and Pedagogicalization of the Parent. In T. S. P. Barry Franklin, and Marianne Bloch (Ed.), *Educational Partnerships and the State. The Paradoxes of Governing Schools, Children, and Families* (pp. 35 - 61). New York: Palgrave Macmillan US.
- Raunig, G., Ray, G., & Wuggenig, U. (2011). Introduction: On the Strange Case of 'Creativity' and its Troubled Resurrection. In G. Raunig, G. Ray, & U. Wuggenig (Eds.), *Critique of Creativity. Precarity, Subjectivity and Resistance in the 'Creative Industries'* (pp. 1-5). London: MayFlyBooks.
- Read, H. (1943). *Education through Art*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Rose, N. (1996). Governing 'advanced' liberal democracies. In A. Barry, T. Osborne, & N. Rose (Eds.), *Foucault and Political Reason. Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government* (pp. 37-64). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Simons, M., & Masschelein, J. (2012). School - A Matter of Form. In P. Gielen & P. D. Bruyne (Eds.), *Teaching Art in the Neoliberal Realm. Realism Versus Cynicism* (pp. 70-83). Amsterdam: Antennae.
- von Osten, M. (2011). Unpredictable Outcomes/ Unpredictable Outcasts: On Recent Debates over Creativity and the Creative Industries. In G. R. U. W. Gerald Raunig (Ed.), *Critique of Creativity. Precarity, Subjectivity and Resistance in the 'Creative Industries'* (pp. 133 - 145). London: MayFlyBooks.