

Art-Education and Cyberspace: Consideration on the Post-Modern Context

Arte-Educação e Ciberespaço: Ponderações sobre o Contexto Pós-Moderno

ISSN 2177-8310
DOI: 10.18264/eadf.v12i2.1651

Roney Gusmão

¹ Universidade Federal do Recôncavo da Bahia - R. Rui Barbosa, Cruz das Almas, BA, Brasil

roney@ufrb.edu.br

Abstract

We understand cyberspace as an archetype of postmodern life, both because it reveals specificities of the behavior of contemporary subjects, as well as because it maximizes the destabilization of monolithic references bequeathed by modernity. For art education, cyberculture becomes fundamental because it highlights contextual characteristics of this spectacularization of images and their sensory appeals, in addition to contributing with discursive shifts relevant to the de-essentialization of aesthetic codes. We are interested in interpreting art teachers' discourses on the possible uses of virtual spaces, with the purpose of reflecting on the recent pandemic scenario and the dilemmas posed to educational practice in a post-modern perspective. To this end, we are conducting interviews with high school art teachers, with a view to understanding the effects of remote reality on the approach to art educational

Keywords: Postmodernity. Art-education. Cyberspace.



Received 03/11/2021
Accepted 26/06/2022
Published 29/06/2022

COMO CITAR ESTE ARTIGO

ABNT: GUSMÃO, R. Arte-Educação e Ciberespaço: Ponderações sobre o Contexto Pós-Moderno. **EaD em Foco**, v. 12, n. 2, e1651, 2022. doi: <https://doi.org/10.18264/eadf.v12i2.1651>

Arte-Educação e Ciberespaço: Ponderações sobre o Contexto Pós-Moderno

Resumo

Entendemos o ciberespaço como arquétipo da vida pós-moderna, tanto porque revela especificidades do comportamento dos sujeitos contemporâneos, como também porque maximiza a desestabilização de referenciais monolíticos legados pela modernidade. Para a arte-educação, a cibercultura se torna fundamental porque evidencia características contextuais desta espetacularização de imagens e seus apelos sensoriais, além de contribuir com deslocamentos discursivos pertinentes à desessencialização de códigos estéticos. Interessa-nos interpretar discursos de professores de artes sobre os usos possíveis dos espaços virtuais, tendo como propósito refletir sobre o cenário pandêmico recente e os dilemas postos à prática educativa numa perspectiva pós-moderna. Para tanto, estamos realizando entrevistas com professores de artes do Ensino Médio, tendo em vista compreender os efeitos da realidade remota na abordagem da arte-educação.

Palavras-chave: Pós-modernidade. Arte-educação. Ciberespaço

1. Introduction

The research that gave rise to this article began in 2020, shortly before the physical isolation imposed by the pandemic. At that time, our effort was to problematize art education from a postmodern perspective, focusing on the pedagogical practice in public schools in the city of Santo Amaro (Bahia). However, the remote reality that education provided in the following months required us to broaden the investigative horizon by including other research variables. If before we did not have virtuality as a substantial research concept, the scenario of 2020 made it imperative to take cyberspace into account, not only as a portrait of postmodern sociocultural dynamics, but also as an important mediator of educational practice. For us, the profusion of images and the wide circulation of ideas were already presented as an essential part of the discursive shifts typical of postmodern becoming (MAFFESOLI, 2014), but it was only through the remote condition that we saw ourselves attentive to the ambiguities that permeate the subjects' imaginary about the uses of educational technologies.

Although our focus on technologies is not so incisive, we are interested in understanding them as the reification of social contexts and the result of the materialization of historically situated power relations. Through this approach, we intend to deal with art education through the postmodern reality, whose specificities of this time, combined with the contemporary challenges that the school brings, insert cyber culture as an inexorable condition of social life at the beginning of the 21st century. Furthermore, it has become fundamental to bear in mind the fact that new technologies are open to many uses and, for this very reason, can slip between conservative purposes and multiple ways of highlighting resistance.

The empirical stage of the research referred to is still being carried out through virtual communication channels, a fact that has created some resistance on the part of respondents regarding the purposes of this investigation. This fact is justified both by the exhaustion of teachers who have experienced an enormous accumulation of work in these years (GUSMÃO *et al.*, 2021), and also because of all the uncertainties that hover in the imagination of these subjects about an alleged patrolling made possible by technologies about teaching performance. The nebulous political reality of Brazil in this time of neo-

conservatism, as well as the anxieties of living in times of a pandemic, have produced distrust on the part of education actors about the interests of research linked to Federal Education Institutions. This fact made it difficult to carry out the empirical stage of this research, which justifies the fact that, to date, in addition to the students interviewed, we have managed to return ten art teachers in basic education. The research subjects have been interviewed remotely, using WhatsApp or E-mail, and we have a research script to guide the dialogue.

Exactly because of this configuration and through all the need to rethink the pedagogical practice from the remote system that was interposed by the COVID-19 pandemic, we were impelled to observe that the speeches of the interviewed subjects are permeated with the tensions and anxieties situated in these years of isolation Social. For this reason, it would be very incongruous if we expected that teachers and students interviewed mentioned their trajectories in art education in postmodern times outside the social confinement that directly impacted experiences with educational technologies. Far from school environments so conducive to sociability and the sharing of aesthetic references, students find themselves in front of the screen for exhausting hours; teachers, on the other hand, inevitably started to associate technologies with the pain resulting from a cruel process of precariousness that has accompanied them for some decades now.

Being sensitive to this reality, we chose to seek to understand the discourses on art education in post-modernity, taking into account virtual spaces as a contextual ingredient of pedagogical practice. When the pandemic began, we did not foresee the relevance that virtuality would acquire in the following months, much less did we suspect how much online interfaces would produce dissent in the academic community about their uses. It was only in contact with the research subjects that we were alerted that we could not despise the virtuality that was imposed in the discourse.

With good reason, many of the interviewees were concerned about the limitations imposed by virtual distancing, given that physical presence is a fundamental assumption of their approach to the arts. This anguish was even clearer when we interviewed professors with a degree in Drawing, Performing Arts and Plastic Arts, who demonstrate greater forcefulness in refusing virtual activities. However, even finding it difficult to admit remote education, these professionals show commitment to stimulating the affective power of art. Through the interviews, we were alerted that virtuality, despite all the distance implicit in its semantics, perpetuates and amplifies aesthetic synergies through the power of joy, in a Spinozian perspective. Thus, even though they prefer face-to-face interaction, professors seek to overcome the limitations of remoteness, fostering the aesthetic experience as a vector of sensitivity.

It is worth noting that our greater interest in the visual arts does not allow us to ignore the limitations found in virtual activities, as well as all the involuntary associations of virtuality with the stigmas surrounding remote teaching in the pandemic period. It is in the midst of the game of forces that enters education, added to the anxieties of a scenario of uncertainties, that, in this text, we seek to insist on virtual spaces as potential producers of resistance in postmodernity (LÉVY, 1999), not in the sense of do without face-to-face presence, but envisioning new cognitive processes and new forms of existence.

2. Virtuality in a postmodern education

As already widely discussed in the pedagogical literature, education cannot be well understood outside its historical context. It is also very common to observe that well-intentioned research in defense of education ends up isolating it from socio-historical conditions and assigning it a role beyond its effective possibilities (LUCKESI, 1990). The same occurs in studies that start in the opposite direction, that is, that intend to criticize education, disregarding the context that surrounds it. The result is a paralyzing and not proposed reproductive criticism of pedagogical practice.

We observed a similar situation in the debate on technologies. As Lemos (1997) reminds us, radical defenses or attacks tend to guide technologies as an independent entity, disregarding the historical context that articulates them. This form of reductive perception has a Manichaeian tendency, resulting in simplistic conclusions: either technophilic or technophobic. The situation gets worse when we cross the concepts of technologies with education, whose lack of a contextual approach disrupts the interpenetration of concepts. Otherwise, we understand that interpreting the context is a crucial element to mediate the approach around technologies and education, so that one is not demonized to the detriment of the other, but the social, cultural, political and economic factors that cross.

It is precisely because of the concern to guide the theme in a contextual perspective, that in this item of the text we strive to understand the contemporary historical scenario in order to better interpret recent technologies. This theoretical effort aims to escape essentialist reductionisms that stagnate the roles of education, as well as technologies, making it impossible to take into account their interpenetrations. We also seek to escape the critical-reproductive pessimism of education, which we believe is not very productive in facing the challenges posed to education in the recent scenario.

It is interesting to add that, as Saviani (2010) reminds us, the critical-reproductive view of education gained privileged circulation in the graduate programs installed in Brazil by the military regime in Brazil in the 1970s. According to the author, these studies served as a counterpoint to the presence of analytical conception and the predominance of the technicity tendency, helping to unfold in conscious studies about the role of education beyond the borders of utilitarian finalism. However, despite the important reflexive contribution, the critic-reproduction of Althusserian influence, became, in the words of Saviani (2010), theory about education and not theory of education.

By placing these ideas in the scenario of predominance of technical pedagogy in Brazil in the mid-twentieth century, we find some reasons that stimulated such pessimism about education. The technicism of education in that period aimed only to meet the emergency demands of manpower in the motto of the national-developmental policy. As Saviani (2010) points out, in this curriculum format, teachers and students have no voice over what is done in education, they are, otherwise, understood as ordinary parts of a complex of gears at the service of production. Thus, the technologies were framed by the immediate need for production, operating by subsuming the worker to the rhythm of work and equalizing his subjectivity to the rationalist ideals of capital. The technician pedagogy became fundamental for adapting the body and subjectivity of the subjects to the project of society in full realization in Brazil.

It is also worth noting that technical education was inspired by the principle of neutrality bequeathed by positivism, whose assumption of efficiency and productivity made it objective and operational, committed to minimizing any subjective influences. With teachers and students silenced from a vertically created and imposed system, the school then incorporated technologies solely for the purpose of alienating subjects and replicating a socially and economically unequal system. Technologies and, in effect, technical education did not provide dialogic conditions that would make subjects co-authors of an open process (SAVIANI, 2010). Quite the contrary, school actors became secondary subjects, focused on filling peripheral roles in a system, whose functioning was already formatted for production purposes.

As is well known, this model of education was the target of wide criticism, even encouraged by resistance movements against the dictatorial regime. Therefore, we recognize that the consolidation of the hegemonic ideology in education was far from nullifying the effervescence of the subversive debate that crossed the end of the 20th century. In this sense, we understand that libertarian educational perspectives fermented in the 1970s and 1980s produced reflections relevant to education until the present day, however, the permanence of these ideas coexists with reminiscences of critical-reproductive theories and with a pessimism motivated by the electromechanical technology that founded the technical pedagogy.

Now, for the purpose of this article, we do not have enough space to discuss the way in which memory is articulated to the crossing of ideas in the course of time. What is, for now, possible to mention is the fact that we conceive memory as a representation of the past (RICOEUR, 2007) and that this memory often manifests itself in the way in which subjects give meaning to their lives and their practices through the mixture of references inherited in conjunction with reframed references. In this sense, memory transits through representations constructed in certain historical contexts that, as such, infiltrate common sense periodically legitimized by codes of power. Furthermore, what calls our attention is the fact that the representations conveyed by memory do not depend on the direct experience with the memorized object. Pollak (1992) draws attention to the concept of “memory by table” which, for him, consists of the possibility of inheriting representations constructed by previous generations, in previous historical contexts. Thus, if mnemonic files are part of the identity senses that link the subject to the collective, then, past representations can also serve as adherence to the collective, helping to chaotically perpetuate what was represented. This idea will be important to interpret the discourses of the subjects of this research at a time when teaching practice is, in part, validated by these meanings precariously conveyed by memory and, at the same time, re-signified in social practice.

Well, the debate about memory becomes fundamental for us to understand how pessimism about educational technologies today is strengthened by the imaginary about the technical curriculum inherited from the developmental context. In this way, subjects can perpetuate representations of the past and, moreover, can even find literature that supports the idea that technologies are nothing more than a gag to liberating education. With this, we do not agree that memory safeguards the past in the imaginary to the point of making it immutable, on the contrary, in agreement with Bergson (2019), memory transports representations, but rather confronts them with different modes of reiteration. Therefore, memory can even say about the past, but it is triggered from present intentions, making it open to new inferences and new intentions.

In teaching practice, this reality will be perceptible because, at the same time that subjects find meaning for their practices in the sense of belonging to the collective and in the sense of continuity of these affiliations, simultaneously, teachers and students confront what had been inherited with the intricacies of practice social in the present. For pedagogical practice, the dilemma between what is inherited and what is re-signified will even become part of a recurrent refusal to incorporate technologies in education, in coexistence with a desire to reorient practice based on new teaching alternatives. In the teachers' imagination, technologies stagger as a pedagogical power and, at the same time, as a reification of neo-conservatism in education. However, as in the Bergsonian memory, the subjects find their own ways of representing technologies, even though the pandemic reality of COVID-19 has brought to the fore fears of the return of a linear and uncritical system of technicity inspiration.

In this sense, it is important to underline how electromechanical technologies were placed in a context different from what is observed today. While the electromechanical technology bequeathed by Fordism and endorsed in education by military governments, were based on the radicalization of technical ideology and the silencing of subjectivities; otherwise, cyber culture in the 21st century can sharply reorient the use of technologies as an educational strategy. Assuming the risk of being redundant, it is worth repeating that it is not a question of celebrating new technologies as an independent automaton, but rather of understanding them as the archetype of a postmodern time, as a symptom of sociocultural resignifications that, inevitably, enter the education and upset their signs of power. Indeed, we understand that electromechanical technologies are for modernity, as cyberspace is for postmodernity; and this because, as said, technologies reify the social ethos and contextually translate the power relations of a time. While in modernity, characterized by the supremacy of Cartesian monolithic reason, technologies aimed at productivity training in the face of an explicitly hierarchical system; cyberspace, on the other hand, reveals the ambiguities of postmodern time, especially with regard to the collapse of the modernist subject, the outbreak of non-hegemonic movements (and, consequently, the notoriety of the body and

its discourses), the discredit of knowledge legitimation metanarratives and the loss of references (mono-referential imbalance).

The characteristics of postmodernity that, very briefly, we listed in the previous paragraph unfold in many other details that are closely associated with society after the 1960s. The loss of solid references, added to the wide dissemination of texts and images by informational technologies, enabled what Bauman (2001) deals with when referring to post-modernity. Thus, the vast flow of signs and the ephemeral visibility of multiple discourses help to identify transience as a very specific predicative of postmodern life. This tangle of texts and images contributes to displacing meanings and not making concepts essential, deepening fissures in universalisms and transitioning meanings from more mobile references.

Santos (2019) reminds us that cyber culture has the power to de-essentialize because interactivity replaces unidirectionality. Let us observe how this statement is well situated in post-modernity: the death of the Cartesian subject (in post-structuralist language) is associated with the very decline of modern reason which, strengthened by the loss of solid references and the decline of the macrostructures of knowledge, produced a multiplicity of small and unstable more open references. Thus, post-modern subjects watched infinite unfolding of identity movements under the agency of countless not possible to label combinations. The proletarian movement of the 19th century or the feminist movement of the 20th century is today fragmented into infinitesimal other forms of social identities that claim the body as an important marker of otherness in a de colonial perspective.

Lévy (1999) adds that, at the beginning of the 21st century, there is a preference for emerging, open, discontinuous, evolutionary and non-linear virtual spaces. The co-evolutionary property of the platform in interaction with the user has shown promise in postmodernity, revealing the obsolescence of monodirectional systems of the industrial era. As an illustration of what we say, it is worth noting the content of the article published by Revista Exame about four years ago. By listing the fifty most visited websites in Brazil and in the world, the data explained in the article signed by Agrela (2017) show us how interaction is a privileged attribute of the platforms that dominate the visitation ranking. Sites such as Facebook, Instagram, Wikipedia, YouTube attest to the desire for interactivity and content co-authorship, uniting the desire for individualization and sociability as coextensive in postmodern social life.

This desire for interaction and immersion in the collective helps us to situate cyberspace as a technological structure historically situated in postmodern times. Maffesoli (2003), when arguing about a return of the Dionysian in postmodernity, brings very opportune observations to the theme, helping to understand pleasures as an important mediation of postmodern sociability. It is not, however, a hedonism of an isolationist nature, but, on the contrary, it is a desire to lose oneself in the collective, to express hedonic references through the body that strengthen the synergies of sociability. In "O Tempo das Tribos" (1998), the author refutes the ideas that suspect a generalized isolation due to the use of technologies in post-modernity, defending the fact that we currently experience new forms of sociability that are much more mediated by two assumptions: transience (ethics of the instant) and the aesthetic paradigm (ethics of aesthetics). Transience occurs because, due to presentist behavior, subjects find themselves in a constant search for elusive pleasures. Featherstone (1995) had already noted this fact, highlighting how this tracking of new tasting objects ends up resulting in a profusion of signs of transitory identities, both for consumption purposes and for the fleeting satisfaction of the social self. The aesthetic paradigm, of which Maffesoli speaks, presents itself as an amalgamation of postmodern social life, mainly because, in the pantheon of images, subjects find the opportunity to highlight fragments of themselves and virtually negotiate the collectively shared intelligibility criteria.

The prevalence of the Apollonian, of which Nietzsche (1992) spoke well when referring to modernist rationalism, serves as an allegory to understand the institutional supremacy of monolithic reason bequeathed by the 17th century. Based on this set of ideas, a universalist parameter was created for the legibility of bodies and their subjectivities, within the ethnocentric orbit of modernist Europe. But,

as Maffesoli (2003) reminds us, it was in contrast to the hegemony of modernity's static reason that the effervescent scenario after the 1960s witnessed the collapse of the apparent solidity of modern paradigms, creating opportunities for the Dionysian return, which translates into the renewal of references for progressively polysemous spaces. The shadow of the Dionysian in postmodern life is revealed in the propulsion of pleasures that make the body notable, to the detriment of obsolete Cartesian dichotomies. Furthermore, this Dionysian drive is also perceived in the hedonic superficiality of the images, in the changing fluency of the discourses and in the ethics of the eternal present moment. They are unstable references and ephemeral desires symptomatic of this orgiastic propulsion of the postmodern Dionysian. As an archetype of this recent historical time, cyber culture consists of a reification of the Dionysian shadow that, enhanced by technological devices, creates new forms of sociability and, at the same time, vectorizes polysemic discourses immanent to the body.

The strength of the Dionysian, at the same time that the dimension of the body has been seething as a vector of empowerment and representativeness of de colonial movements, can also be seen in the more nebulous side of this desire for massification through aesthetics and outside the solid references of yesteryear. With this, it is useful to remember that, in the midst of the orphanity of references and through the breadth of discursive spaces, the more pulsional side of the Dionysian is also shown to be subject to agency by power regimes. Added to this is the way algorithms have recently integrated the orchestration of reactionary ideas outside any commitment to knowledge. Denialism, neo-conservatism, fake news is some of the darkest examples of a society exposed to schizophrenia due to the loss of convictions. Becoming, as an attribute of postmodern thought, shows the non-conclusion of identities, reveals the malleability of signs of value, but also demonstrates that the gaps left by the loss of references are likely to be filled by so many opportunistic thought systems. The hypertrophy of the present and the very solid cooling of references point to the fact that the return of the Dionysian needs to be taken care of in a balance with the Apollonian, not for modernist rationalism to return to its institutional place, but for us to replace reason monolith of positivism for a polysemic reason, which accommodates as many diversities as they exist, which takes the force of becoming as the creative force of a contextual reason.

It is precisely in this dichotomous scenario between the Apollonian and the Dionysian, that education emerges as a fundamental sphere to reconcile reason with diversity, as a means of supplementing a reflective posture on and through technologies. Taylorist/Fordist rationality, reified in industrial technologies and technical education, took into account the need to make workers "trained gorillas". These uses of technology only endorsed the inequality of the system and, as a result, proved incapable of guiding education beyond the productivist lens. Therefore, through the new paradigms that emerge in post-modernity, through the new modes of sociability brought by the ethics of aesthetics, in this stage of the text we focus on art education through the virtual reality of recent times.

3. Art education in virtuality

At the same time that we are considering the methodological potentials pointed out by technologies for pedagogical practice, it is necessary to take care that historically, hegemonic capitalist forces claim technologies as strategies to overcome the limits imposed on accumulation. Thus, as soon as workers articulate for the purposes of claiming, capitalists invest in the tools to overcome any obstacles to capital accumulation. Whether to dismiss the worker by replacing his labor force, whether to supplement his body and intellect in production or to violate his rest time, big capital ends up using technologies as a strategy to make work precarious and maximize of profit.

With that, when we think about the uses of educational technologies in the period of isolation imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic, we are inevitably led to realize how the remote system served to reduce costs in education. WhatsApp, e-mail or social networks invaded teachers' rest hours, in addition to the

accumulation of notebooks and forms imposed by the old systems, now replicated in virtual environments. The very fact that the workspace has become confused with the domestic space has helped sabotage teachers' leisure time and make work an almost invisible intruder in ordinary life. At the same time, private educational institutions carried out extensive staff cuts and basic education students began to find themselves trapped in an educational system transplanted from face-to-face, without significant adjustments to the emergency remote model. As observed in another research that we developed (Gusmão *et al.* 2021), the balance of this technology/education/pandemic triangulation was tragic in the imagination of education professionals and students, both victimized by the imposition of an exhaustive and cognitively unattractive mechanism.

Despite the dialogicality present in contemporary virtual spaces creating fissures in monolithic reason and intensifying the visibility of counter-hegemonic ideas, the neoliberal structure persists in institutionalizing technologies and domesticating their uses to fulfill the purposes of accumulation. In this way, in the same way that education has been revealed as an object of dispute, technologies also reveal the confrontation of antagonistic interests that aim to perpetuate social meanings. The objectives of the instituted forces are not only to make use of technologies to exacerbate the precariousness of work, but also to use them as a strategy of ideological equalization. However, even so, it is worth mentioning that, despite the fact that the mechanisms of exploitation have been sophisticated by the neoliberal rhetoric, we agree with Foucault (2021) on the fact that the action of power necessarily implies the recognition of its inverse force, that is, the exercise of power presupposes the resistance that confronts it. For this reason, we insist on defending education as the only way to guarantee democratic channels of dialogue in postmodern society, precisely because the disputes around the binomial technology/education have not yet been won, in fact, they are still in full swing.

Although this intensification of antagonistic forces in education sometimes proves unfavorable to the popular classes, especially in pandemic times, we still believe that virtual spaces are fruitful channels for the dynamization of resistance movements and the emancipatory re appropriation of technologies. We still understand that post-modernity is prone to the instability of references and, by effect, to the misalignment of very closed and supposedly static systems. In the reasoning of Lemos (1997), interaction and non-linearity, therefore, are intrinsic parts of this Dionysian movement that capillarizes in cyber culture, in a search for new balances that recreate the cognitive processes.

It is also Lévy (2003) who, interested in problematizing the virtual, observes that the etymology of the concept refers to *virtus* which, in Greek, means "power". For this reason, the author deduces that the virtual is not opposed to the real, even because the virtual is also real. It is actually opposed to the actual, since, for human relations, the virtual minimizes the inertia of social relations by transgressing the time/place unit. Thus, the virtual reinvents the body, multiplying its discourses beyond the limits of the here and now. Indeed, like any tool that supplements the body, becoming its virtual action, cyberspace also works as a supplement to the body, as a vector of its discourses and as a fermenter of sign displacements.

It is undeniable the fact that nowadays virtual spaces are getting closer to everyday life. And this concerns both the ergonomics of devices increasingly adhered to the body, as well as the relevance of virtuality as hyper reality. A company becomes even more real when present on Google Maps, for example, or even social life can be endorsed in a selfie, because, through it, space/time limits are infringed by the eternalization and hyper-realization of what it would be a frivolous moment. Virtual space works as the guiding thread of Baudrillard's simulacrum (1991) because it simulates reality by hyperbolizing its signs and, therefore, making it hyperreal. This hyper-reality ends up functioning as part of the circuits of power that Foucault (2021) spoke about and, for this very reason, they conduct discourses and suggest behaviors. Thus, the selfie, the podcast or the meme that circulate virtually exert a performative force, insofar as they point to modes of meaning circumscribed in power schemes.

It is precisely by recognizing this situation that we are impelled to realize how much the school curriculum cannot neglect the relevance of cyber culture in contemporary society. First, it is important to recognize the relevance of cyber culture because it is characteristic of postmodern society, proving to be intrinsic to the technologies that abound in the daily lives of the subjects who are now at school (SANTOS, 2019). Therefore, we cannot say that we start from the students' everyday reality if we ignore the amplitude of imagery flows in virtual spaces that reverberate in their social practices. The second reason concerns the fact that, if the circulation of discourses through virtual interfaces externalizes and maximizes human cognitive functions, and if such articulations function as conductors of power discourses, then it is necessary to recognize the imminent need for an education able to mediate this process.

In 2019, *Folha de São Paulo* published an article with the following title: "Brazil is 'vice' in time spent on networks in a ranking dominated by 'emerging'". The article showed Brazil in second place in the world in time spent on social networks (average of 225 minutes per day in 2018), second only to the Philippines. The aggravating factor is that in the ranking of the 25 countries that most access social networks, 24 are "emerging" countries, marked, by the way, by a history of precarious investments in education. The article helps us reflect on the likely effects that social networks can have on subjects exposed to content traffic, surely orchestrated by algorithms. The association between the long time spent on social networks, as the article pointed out, and the historical neglect of education in emerging countries is not the central theme of this text – which would require more systematic debates on this topic, but what is possible to problematize here this is how art education gains prominence through the imagery nature of social networks. We start in defense of approximations of educational practice with images that make ordinary life spectacular, aiming to promote otherness and autonomy in the face of this dual desire singularization/massification.

Certainly, it would be counterintuitive to deprive educational spaces of reflections around the theme, even because this search for interactivity in social networks can also be explored in educational technologies that are open to contextualization and dialogicity. In contrast to educational systems hardened by industrial technologies, what appears in postmodernity is the need to value the dialogic construction of knowledge within a multi referential perspective, that is, outside the pretentious static universalisms (SANTOS, 2019). The spectacularized body and aestheticized discourses are parts of the postmodern ethos laden with meanings that need to be problematized. Examining their sayings and revealing the socially constructed character of their meanings are some of the challenges that can be more easily faced with the help of the dialogic nature of recent educational technologies.

Lemos (1997) helps us understand that, unlike modernity, in postmodernity, a non-institutional sociability invested in the chaotic and polytheistic present stands out. The author relies on Maffesoli to take into account the aesthetic dimension for understanding postmodern sociability and, therefore, observes cyber culture as a synergy of the triad of sociability, aesthetics and technologies. In this reality, aesthetic education becomes a fundamental element, in order to provide a critical pedagogical approach that opposes the voracious and uncritical consumption of images. The idea is not the pure decontextualized blaming of technologies, nor the conversion of the educational experience into pure entertainment – which, in Freire's (2001) perspective, diminishes the formative character of the human being – but, otherwise, it is about understanding that the uses of social networks must be accompanied by critical evaluation in an emancipatory perspective, in such a way that the desire for sociability and belonging do not overlap with the force of otherness.

In the same direction, Cunha (2008) defends thesis on what he calls "e-art/education". Although we do not agree with some of the author's reductionisms, especially when she vilifies what she herself calls the "massive ideological industry", we draw attention to the contributions of her thesis on the contemporary potential of e-art/education. By striving to consolidate this concept, Cunha overcomes the orthodox pessimism that characterizes part of his text and starts to guide art education more assertively, admitting

the fact that technologies are open to uses outside the institutional regimes of power. To do so, according to the researcher, it is necessary to take into account non-linear virtual systems permeated by fluidity that confront the unique truth of classic linear systems of education. In addition to being inappropriate for training from a libertarian perspective, the linearity of the old education manuals is incapable of dealing with recent challenges, not least because “individuals are less and less tolerant of following uniform or rigid courses that do not correspond to their real needs and the specificity of their life trajectory” (LÉVY, 1999, p. 169).

Therefore, it is pertinent that the curriculum, more specifically in art education, be willing to take into account the local reality, with a view to problematizing the way in which life trajectories are permeated today by virtuality and the aesthetic codes that surround life. postmodern. In defense of art education from a constructivist perspective, Barbosa (1998) recalls that, in our everyday life, we are surrounded by images imposed by the media. This pantheon of images surrounds itself with discourses that eclipse its power schemes and, in this process, acquire great strength of penetration of the ordinary life of the subjects. In the work “The aestheticization of the world”, Lipovetsky and Serroy (2005) invite us to observe how the aestheticization of everyday life has gained prominence in the postmodern scenario, to the point that it is unlikely to think about professional or educational performance without image feedback. In this same direction, we find in Barbosa (1998) the idea that education needs to pay attention to visual discourse, even because images teach consciously or unconsciously, and should serve as a problematizing substance in teaching practice.

The same can be said about the emotions these images evoke. If post-modern behavior is so marked by the obsession with ephemeral sensorial stimuli, if the affections intertwined in the imagery profusion of cyber culture put tension in the daily lives of young people; therefore, it is necessary to review the old habit of underestimating the power of the image in arts teaching. We also turn to Barbosa (2014) here to remember that it is not enough to defend the teaching of arts at school as an outlet for emotions, if they do not also become objects of reflection. We cannot say that we practice aesthetic education if emotions are merely aroused in subjects without them knowing how to elaborate and contextualize them.

This debate becomes vital for the interpretation of the discourses extracted from the empirical stage of this research, also because, even in the recent remote reality, the professors interviewed recognize the need to take into account the aesthetic codes commonly shared in cyber culture. It is necessary to emphasize that the incorporation of cyberspace elements in the educational practice coexists with an inherited memory that also gives meaning to the daily pedagogical practice. The memory that integrates the interviewees’ speeches serves both to substantiate some speeches of resistance to innovation, in a kind of friction against technologies, and also to recognize the promising force of transformations within libertarian references still alive in memory. Now, if we think that memory is open to resignifications from the present, then the importance of understanding the current context in which teachers experience the use of technologies becomes clear. These experiences of the present are concatenated with other references, either mobilized by memory or reconstructed by it within new references.

The present we are talking about is the one that is set in the moment of a pandemic, for which so many concerns have infiltrated the speeches and the (dis)enchantments with education in the remote format. However, it is in the midst of so many uncertainties that teachers still persist in exploring the most promising side of technologies applied to education. For the interviewees, online teaching:

It made it possible for us teachers to bring other possibilities of working with art to the classroom, they are new tools for interaction and socialization of the student’s creative process, in addition to allowing them to get to know virtual museums, present more images (Teacher 2).

[Promoted] the use of digital platforms for image production, image sharing and synchronous interactions with students (Teacher 5).

I'm kind of tired after a year and a half of so many remote classes and everything, but I can see positive aspects. [...] The main positive aspect is allowing this openness for people in different places to connect, talk and learn together (Teacher 6).

This recognition of the potential of remote education ends up being accompanied by reflections on the pandemic reality. As we mentioned at the beginning of the text, the tensions related to social isolation coalesce with discourses about the role of technologies in education, since they inevitably penetrate the body, sociability, home environment and teachers' rest time. Therefore, it is inevitable not to expose all the frustrations and uncertainties of the moment, considering that the perverse uses of technologies in a scenario ended up deepening inequalities.

The negative aspects I think are many. First, because we work with people who do not have the same access conditions. If I can have a nice internet connection, a laptop, a comfortable place at home to teach/attend classes, many of my students don't have it. Another thing is that we don't have this bodily proximity (Teacher 2).

It is the only positive thing that I can consider [in remote teaching is] preventing the population from being contaminated, as we are in a country of extreme social inequality in relation to having remote teaching itself. Many are out of this reality. What there is is a simple attempt. It is not our reality (Teacher 8).

The practice of art, the coexistence with the other that the study of art provides is compromised. Experimentation is also more limited, firstly due to the lack of the closest meeting, secondly due to the lack of available technological resources and thirdly, due to the lack of experience of us teachers with this modality (Teacher 1).

The speeches demonstrate how the recognition of the potential of the technologies pointed out in education began to coexist in the time of the pandemic with a disillusionment about education by remote reality. Therefore, we understand that teachers understand that there are potentials in technologies, but, for the time being, they dedicate efforts to problematize the way in which educational interfaces were transplanted to face-to-face teaching in a light and inappropriate way.

Another element also implicit in the speeches is the fact that technologies and cyberspace cannot be understood as substitutes for presence. On the contrary, the interviewees insist on the face-to-face dimension as a fundamental complementarity for art education, after all, the remote teaching model, through speeches, hinders the sharing of some artistic languages. It is worth remembering that the record on the importance of presence was less incisive in graduates in the visual arts, and more forceful in graduates in performing arts, design and plastic arts. This fact demonstrates how teaching in visual arts needs to rely on cyber culture even in face-to-face teaching. It also reveals that, in the eyes of the teachers interviewed, some artistic languages can be severely affected by the remote condition imposed on education.

There are many losses. In the reality of the public schools where I work, the student is distant, it was not possible to establish a complete bond (preponderant element in the educational process), the necessary attention to mediation is compromised (Teacher 4).

[The negative aspect of online teaching is the absence of] physical interaction with the student, eye to eye, following the creative process (Teacher 9).

Being side by side is necessary so that each one and their needs can feel better. In addition to the difficulty of many not having access to the internet, not being able to follow the classes as they would like (Teacher 8).

Finally, together with the problems mentioned, the teachers interviewed feel extremely discredited due to the lack of training. Due to the emergency situation that imposed remote teaching, education professionals end up subtly associating educational technologies with the linear format bequeathed by industrial societies. As we have already discussed, that education format was grossly imposed against critical reflection, becoming a system of oppression and alienation of students towards a productivist finalism. When they find themselves unprepared to deal with remote teaching, teachers end up transporting discourses that are averse to technologies in education, as they understand them as an excluding substrate of a verticalized system.

Not all professionals involved in this process are prepared to work in remote teaching with the necessary knowledge and expertise. Unfortunately, those responsible for putting these professionals in the hot seat do not offer adequate training or support for this. In addition to the reality of the majority of the population, especially students, they do not have access to equipment or the internet (Teacher 1).

Thus, although the teachers surveyed already made use of online platforms (EMLtec, Virtual Museums and podcast platforms were cited) and virtual networks for sharing educational content with students (such as Facebook and Instagram), criticism gravitated towards around the mistaken way in which technologies were transplanted to face-to-face education. There was no care on the part of the instituted power with the necessary adjustments to an inclusive, problematizing and liberating educational practice. Overall, what we observed was that the pandemic worked as a kind of memory device, that is, it served to activate an inherited memory about hierarchical uses of technology within the asphyxiating context of developmentalist Brazil.

Converging with the neoliberal interference in education, which has been around in the imagination of professionals since the early 1990s, what the pandemic brought was a deepening of inequalities and the intensification of exclusion (GUSMÃO *et al.*, 2021). All of this does not nullify the Dionysian force in cyberspace, but ends up serving to deform the transformative power that postmodern cyber culture has for a problematizing education. Art educators interviewed bet on technologies as allies of critical knowledge about the convulsion of images in postmodern times, however, they are cautious about the productive paradigm inherited from industrial societies.

4. Considerations

Computers were born at the height of the Second World War for military purposes and, for this very reason, according to Lemos (1997), they emerged as Apollonian machines. The same can be said about the origin of the internet under geostrategic institutional purposes, but which, from the 1990s onwards, broke with the originally instituted intentions to become the arteries of the Dionysian in postmodern societies. The impetus of this Dionysian orgiastic capillarizes in the networks, both for the acclamation of the body, the discourses of dissent and transitory sociability, as well as for the pulsional force that produces this

desire to lose oneself in the other and dive into the masses. Due to this ambiguous condition, the Dionysian requires caution, after all, getting lost in the other cannot paralyze criticality and alterity. It is precisely here that the importance of education resides, as a formative space for the purpose of emancipating subjects from the exceptional traffic of images and sensory appeals in post-modernity.

Art, in this reality, presents itself as a fundamental ingredient to postmodern education, since the aesthetic experiences here cross the historical context and offer possibilities for critical analysis, including on contemporary imagery culture. What our empirical field showed us was that, even understanding the importance of cyberspace for understanding the contemporary ethos, teachers do not renounce presence and envision the virtual only as a complementary pedagogical strategy for teaching arts. Memory also played a leading role in the imaginaries about the role of virtuality, serving both to warn about its uses and also to contest for a preparatory support that enhances the pedagogical use of cyber culture in a critical perspective.

References

- AGRELA, L. Os 50 sites mais acessados do Brasil e do mundo. **Revista Exame**, 20 jun. 2017, Seção Tecnologia. Available at: <https://exame.com/tecnologia/os-50-sites-mais-acessados-do-brasil-e-do-mundo/>. Access in sep 2021.
- BARBOSA, A. M. **A imagem no ensino da arte**. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2014.
- BARBOSA, A. M. **Tópicos utópicos**. Belo Horizonte: C/ Arte, 1998.
- BAUDRILLARD, J. **Simulacros e simulação**. Lisboa: Antropos, 1991.
- BAUMAN, Z. **Modernidade líquida**. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2001.
- BERGSON, H. **Memória e vida**. São Paulo: WMF Martins fontes, 2019.
- CUNHA, F. P. **Cultura digital na e-arte/educação: educação digital crítica**. Tese (Doutorado em Comunicação) – Escola de Comunicação e Artes da Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, p. 278, 2008.
- DUARTE, F. Brasil é ‘vice’ em tempo gasto em redes em ranking dominado por ‘emergentes’. **Folha de São Paulo**, São Paulo, 06 set. 2019. Available at: <https://f5.folha.uol.com.br/nerdices/2019/09/brasil-e-2o-em-ranking-de-paises-que-passam-mais-tempo-em-redes-sociais.shtml>. Access in sep 2021.
- FEATHERSTONE, M. **Cultura de consumo e pós-modernismo**. São Paulo: Studio Nobel, 1995.
- FOUCAULT, M. **Microfísica do poder**. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2021.
- FREIRE, P. **Pedagogia da autonomia: saberes necessários à prática educativa**. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 2001.
- GUSMÃO, R. *et al.* Desenho didático online na pós-modernidade: percepções da formação continuada em tempos de pandemia. **Revista Edapeci**, São Cristóvão, vol. 21, num. 3, p. 16-28, 2021. Available at: <https://seer.ufs.br/index.php/edapeci/article/view/15806/12354>. Access in feb 2022.
- LEMOS, A. Ciber-socialidade: tecnologia e vida social na cultura contemporânea. **Logos: Comunicação e Universidade**, vol. 4, num. 1, 1997. Available at: <https://www.e-publicacoes.uerj.br/index.php/logos/article/download/14575/11038>. Access in aug 2021.
- LÉVY, P. **Cibercultura**. São Paulo: Editora 34, 1999.
- LÉVY, P. **O que é o virtual?** São Paulo: Editora 34, 2003.

- LIPOVETSKY, G.; SERROY, J. **A estetização do mundo**: viver na era do capitalismo artista. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2005.
- LUCKESI, C. C. **Filosofia da educação**. São Paulo: Cortez, 1990.
- MAFFESOLI, M. **O instante eterno**: o retorno do trágico nas sociedades pós-modernas. São Paulo: Zouk, 2003.
- MAFFESOLI, M. **Homo eroticus**: comunhões emocionais. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2014.
- MAFFESOLI, M. **O tempo das tribos**: o declínio do individualismo nas sociedades de massa. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 1998.
- NIETZSCHE, F. W. **O nascimento da tragédia, ou hedonismo e pessimismo**. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1992.
- POLLAK, M. Memória e identidade social. **Estudos Históricos**, Rio de Janeiro, vol. 5, num. 10, p. 200-212, 1992. Available at: <http://www.pgedf.ufpr.br/memoria%20e%20identidadesocial%20A%20capraro%202.pdf>. Access in set. 2020.
- RICOEUR, P. **A memória, a história, o esquecimento**. Campinas: Editora Unicamp, 2007.
- SANTOS, E. **Pesquisa-formação na cibercultura**. Teresina: EDUFPI, 2019.