

## Year 2091 – silence within the philosophies of education: for a cartography of the school resistances\*

Davis Moreira Alvim<sup>1</sup>

ORCID: 0000-0002-9379-0587

Izabel Rizzi Mação<sup>2</sup>

ORCID: 0000-0001-5421-0837

Steferson Zanoni Roseiro<sup>3</sup>

ORCID: 0000-0003-1424-2281

### Abstract

Silence over the philosophies of education. Within the concept constellation that runs through concepts like ideology, disciplinary power, emancipation, deschooling, historical-criticism, defense of schooling and self-learning, the students' protests within and for the school are blurred in its contestant and inventive potential. We aim to question the philosophies of education regarding the role of the school protests in their processes of appropriation and transformation of the school, taking into consideration, especially, the high-school and college students' occupations, or *ocupas*, and the resistance and cooperation movements undertook by all the students. We propose a cartography of the school resistances from the philosophy statements within the school from the relationships of power and, on the other hand, the ones where the school rises as a possible place of emancipation and transformation. Among the philosophical approaches analyzed are the theory of Ideological State Apparatuses, Louis Althusser, the disciplinary power dispositifs of Michael Foucault, the concept of deschooling provided by Ivan Illich, the pedagogy of the oppressed by Paulo Freire, the historical-critical pedagogy by Dermeval Saviani, the defense of the school promoted by Jan Masschelein and Maarten Simons and, finally, the liberating self-learning as proposed by David Ribeiro Tavares. We can conclude that, unlikely the suggested by the high-school and college students' occupations, a long philosophical tradition about education is, consistently, denying students their role of active elements in the invention of school, investing little or no reflection on the students' fights.

### Keywords

Philosophy of education – Occupation – Autonomy – Power and education – Students' resistance

\* Translator: Débora Bylaardt Meira.

**1-** Instituto Federal do Espírito Santo. Serra, Espírito Santo, Brasil. Contact: davis.alvim@ifes.edu.br.

**2-** Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo. Serra, Espírito Santo, Brasil. Contact: lebazi.r@hotmail.com.

**3-** Rede Municipal de Ensino de Cariacica. Viana, Espírito Santo, Brasil. Contact: dinno\_sauro@hotmail.com.



<https://doi.org/10.1590/S1678-4634202046223171>

This content is licensed under a Creative Commons attribution-type BY-NC.

## What is a school?

During a period considered too long, it was stated that in the school dispositif there is a harmful set of forces: dominant ideologies, symbolic violence, disciplinary approaches, and imprisonment techniques besides a wide proliferation of daily prejudices. A warn to the incautious: be careful, school (HARPER *et al.*, 1987). Be careful because it is a world separated from life, a space that reproduces the social inequalities, a place to learn dependency and, finally, a part or a gear in a domination machine. Or else, according to the critical concepts of Masschelein and Simons (2014, p. 9), school would be “an invention of power down the very last detail”.

By emphasizing the multiple relationships of domination within schools, we intend, on the other hand, to find solutions or ways to deal with this mechanism of subjection. It was reported that the emancipation would be within the reach of students through dialogues with critical teachers and professors, contact with dialogical revolutionary leaderships or, still, through the socialization of the knowledge historically systematized by humanity. Meanwhile, others, not believing in the potential of the school, completely resigned from the school apparatus, and proposed to abolish it, stating clearly: we should deschool.

However, it is important to replace the question. Not: what is a school?, how to get emancipated at school?, how to suppress school? or how to defend the school? Perhaps, we should ask: *what can a school do?* Following the tips from Deleuze (2002), who asks “what can a body do?” in his book about Benedictus Espinoza, if asking about the potential of the school implies to admit some ignorance and, at the same time, issue a challenge. It is heard, for example, about reproduction, domination, emancipation and deschooling, although the fights of Brazilian students within and for school, rehearsed during the school occupations in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, compel us to understand what a school can do.

If we asked ourselves: *what can a school do?*, maybe we could understand the amount of resistances that frequently agitates the geography of the Brazilian school and makes us think that there are more in the school apparatus than inequality and domestication operations. They are girls protesting in the school sports field yelling “women’s power!”, claiming their right to play soccer. They are feminine collectives that refuse the regulations on their uniform saying, “we will wear shorts for sure!” or “make the leggings legal!”. They are students that organize protests wearing skirts (*saias*) against sexist practices. They are students that sing against racism. They are self-organized ways to promote debates, present theatre performances, recite poems, promote film clubs; compose and present songs. They are relations of friendship, confidence, care, affection, and love that are formed through the corridors, the patios and cell phone devices. They are secret techniques to exchange information during classes and ways to bypass the disciplinary bodies. Finally, they are high school and college occupations that give new meaning and reorganize radically the logic of schools and request the invention of another school within school.

School consistently runs away from itself.

Oddly enough, though, there is a silence over the students' resistances within the philosophies of education. Should we focus only on rethinking about the dominations reinstalled over schools, but, before, be part of the resistances operating within the school apparatus? It is time to start a cartography method within the school protests. Therefore, the question *what can a school do?* needs to be more precise. Maybe we could rearrange it, making it find the protests of the high school and college students in Argentina and Chile which, in 2012, published through the *Frente de Estudiantes Libertarios a manual named How to occupy a school?*, translated in Brazil by the Collective *O Mal-Educado*<sup>4</sup> and used in occupations throughout the country (CAMPOS; MEDEIROS; RIBEIRO, 2016). If the high school and college occupants showed that a school can be fully occupied, rearranged and horizontal, maybe it is also the time to face the theories about education and ask: *How to occupy the philosophies of education?*

### **Schools of power: do not become enamored of The Big Brother!**

In 1948 George Orwell finished writing one of his most acknowledged works, the classic *1984*. The projections of his narrative are frequent in our times, since the use of the name of one of his main characters, the Big Brother, in the famous reality show based on the continuous observation of people's personal lives, *Big Brother*, to the strange similarity between the definition of the crime to express dissident emotions, *facecrime*, and one of the most used social media networks nowadays, *Facebook*.

*1984* is a dystopia that describes with details a power that takes over and reorganizes all the instances of life. The novel is set in a space controlled by an enigmatic leader, called Big Brother, where war is endless, past is constantly manipulated and there is a governmental surveillance over everyone through multiple surveillance dispositifs. There is resistance, surely. The leading character, Winston Smith, catches himself, at a certain point, unconsciously scribbling in his notebook the sentence "DOWN THE BIG BROTHER" (ORWELL, 2005, p. 20) and imagines his death as a possible moment of freedom: "to die hating them, this was freedom" (ORWELL, 2005, p. 268). However, by the end of the novel, after experiencing the horrors of the torture room in the Ministry of Love, Smith beholds the black moustache of the leader, admires his smile and, finally, achieves what he calls a victory over himself. Now, he loves the Big Brother.

Orwell is certainly known as one of the fiction writers that best predicted our current times. His best current issue, though, is within his own production of a reality that works from the relationships of power. This is the very reason, for getting attached to the power diagrams, that the resistances appear as *countermovement* and act in a reactive way. For example, graffiti on the bathroom walls, writing in secret notebooks or even the desire for some seconds of freedom before extermination. Not surprisingly, the outcome of the resistant processes is, at least, sad. The antifascist suggestion announced by Michel Foucault (1993, p. 200), "do not become enamored of power", changes into its diametrical opposite: love by the Big Brother, that means, unconditional love for power.

---

**4 -** There is no translation into English of this work, but the title would be: "The impolite person".

There are plenty of Orwellian interpretations to understand our times. A comprehensive list of propositions understands the contemporaneous under the dominant view of the relationships of power. There are the ones that present the postmodern condition as a mutation of capitalism where the commercialization of life had advanced in such a way that concepts as *commodity fetishism*, by Karl Marx, or *cultural industry*, by Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer, became anachronistic and obsolete (JAMESON, 2004). The difference would be changed into exoticism for tourists while *the other* seems to have backed off to become more of the same in a burnout society (HAN, 2017). Or still, we live in a moment where the biochemistry of hormones and the pharmaceutical development of molecules create a pharmacopornographic era that combines sex, drugs and biopolitics (PRECIADO, 2018). Ultimately there would be the dominance of a sovereign power which makes the state of exception a rule, making the concentration field a political paradigm. We would live, then, in an indistinction area between absolutism and democracy, between Auschwitz and Guantánamo (AGAMBEN, 2004). Although they are very different interpretations, we can find some primacy, the same we found in Orwell, of the relationships of power over the resistances.

The tendency to seize the contemporaneous under certain determinism of the relationships of power and the corresponding secundarization of the resistances is repeated when the issue is school. The students' resistances consistently receive less attention than the relationships of power through school institutions. For example, from the 1960s, some Marxists became interested in the school field. In this context, Louis Althusser (1996) wrote a book that became a base masterpiece for the so-called critical readings at the time. In *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses* he states that, unlikely the previous production regimes, capitalism created its own space to train the workforce: school. By putting into operation a double objective, the first one, which would give school a direct use, as learning how to read, write and count, and a second one where learning lays on "good behavior" and "correct manners", school would undertake a vital class struggle for the survival of the dominant class. For Althusser (1996, p. 138), the ideological apparatuses (such as school, media, family and churches) assemble the bodies so that they execute, by themselves, "the gestures and acts of their submission" and record, in life, the "remarkable words of the prayer: 'Amen, so be it'". In this concert of ideological reproduction apparatuses, Althusser considers that the school has a dominant role, replacing the Church while the main ideological disseminator.

Four years after the publication of Althusser's article, Michel Foucault published *Discipline and Punish*, where he stated that discipline (school, prison, family, among others) make up a training for good behavior. Even though it conflicts with the theories about power from his time, Foucault (2004) states that disciplinary power lasts indefinitely, taming the bodies to multiply their own discipline, to strengthen it, connect it and use it easily. It is about a specific technique, "a power that takes individuals at the same time as its objects and instruments of its practice" (FOUCAULT, 2004, p. 143). It is not a triumphant, magnificent, and spectacular power. Before and above all, the disciplinary dispositif would show the presence of a modest and suspicious power that works through minor procedures besides simple and discreet instruments. In military schools, Foucault

(2004) has found pedagogical instruments that worked under the imperative of health (train vigorous bodies), qualification (get competent officers), politization (build obedient soldiers) and, finally, moralization (prevent the debauchery and homosexuality), but has also found a design that makes a constant communicative surveillance. Such simple and discreet aspect of the powers has the role to reduce the deviations and make disciplinary corrections in the bodies, besides soothing the resistances.

Althusser and Foucault use a few lines of their texts to talk directly about school education. While Althusser is concerned about unveiling how the dominant ideology works within the Ideological State Apparatuses, especially school, Foucault, in turn, investigates the disciplinary power dispositifs, watching attentively the prison institution, without giving it the importance Althusser gives the school. This means they are not researchers that sought to elaborate over school lengthy, but they were, undoubtedly, inspiration to produce a vast literature dedicated to the relationships of power that goes through schools. Both are theories that see school as a product or an outcome of the relationships of power whose role is to produce submission, while, at the same time, the resistances appear as mere reaction to the productive dynamics of power. Thus, they are opening works of those trends that will understand schools as *schools of power*.

It is not intended to suggest that such philosophies are following Orwell's ideas, but, before, that Orwell's work expresses clearly, somehow a bit symptomatic, of understanding the relationships of power (and the resistances). Such trend crosses great part of the attempts to understand the contemporaneous and its schools. From this perspective, terms such ideology, inequality, power, discipline, control, violence, and exclusion become important tools to think about school education.

However, the analytics of the school relationships of power raised some controversies. One of them is about its lack of pedagogical proposition. Saviani (2013), for example, uses the term "critical-reproductive" to name the educational theories that, coming from an alleged failure of the movement from May 1968 in France, would be suitable to explain the existing mechanisms of power, but they are limited to the acknowledgment and unable to propose a practical intervention<sup>5</sup>. Moreover, Saviani doesn't place the problem appropriately.

The difficulty is not that such education theories do not explain a proposal of pedagogical intervention, but, before, that they think about the dynamics of any school as a direct subproduct of the relationships of power, whether state, institutions, or microphysics. The school cartography is not about a pedagogical project, but of another school, underground and virtual, that lives *now*. Well, what the thinkers of the *schools of power* miss, as Saviani states, is not that the school can change itself or that it would be possible to propose other pedagogies, but that the dropouts, the affections, the resistances and inventions that flow and cross the school experience are *contemporarily relevant*.

Would it be possible to think the school education beyond the relationships of power?

---

**5** - The expression "critical-reproductive" in Saviani, directly mentions the works from Louis Althusser, Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron but it doesn't refer to Michel Foucault nor to the educational researchers that were inspired by its power genealogy. Still, we are considering that its criticism to the absence of pedagogical propositions could, in general, be extended to the microanalytic of the power in schools.

For Gilles Deleuze (1993), the power dispositifs are not an integral part once the lines of flight are the first. A society contradicts itself very little because, first, everything in it escapes, resists, runs away and overflows. The relationships of power are secondary, and they are the reactive part of the assemblage, making reterritorialization of the escaping forces which have the transformation potentials and creations that makes deterritorialization of the social fields. It is about an important understanding for the cartography of the school: power is reactive, in a way that its operation depends, directly, of the channeling and administration of the resistant potentials, or the escaping ones. Its productivity is the expression of a separate exercise regarding everything that is active, affirmative, and creative of worlds. That means, the resistant forces usually surpass the dominations, allowing the new creative forces to go beyond the simple opposition to power (HARDT; NEGRI, 2016).

School can, likewise, be framed by a cartography method that considers this other configuration: a cartography of the school resistances. Such procedure favors to follow the dynamics of school education for its combats, its escapes, its thresholds, its active forces, and its affirmative potentials. The resistant forces are mapped without any reference to an idyllic or apocalyptic future that chooses to compose with a multiplicity of sis and bros rather than adore the Big Brother (whoever may it be) because they are horizontally organized, refusing to worship great leaders and combining themselves virally in collectives, groups of affinity, protests and occupations. From this perspective, we can notice that the flood of relationships of power that overfill schools just do so in the attempt of, reactively, taming or managing the radical potentials that they comprise. Thus, the relationships of domination that connects the space at school are not ignored but it is preferred to investigate, preferably, its resistances, because only through them it is possible to understand the dynamic operation of the school apparatus.

Beyond the schools of power and emancipation, there is a school cartography that follows specific resistances and understands the school environment as trenches, or still, as holes where rats live (GALLO, 2002). It is interesting to find suggestions of the last Foucault (1995), especially the ones that teach us to be through what is at the side and prohibited in its creative role that the potentials of a social field are captured. Anyway, they are the ones that remind us not only to “defend ourselves, but also to assert ourselves and assert ourselves not only as identity, but as a creative force” (FOUCAULT, 2014, p. 252). Therefore, to understand the school dispositifs it is necessary to observe the forces that, one way or another, conflict with the powers and, continuously, escape and create against them.

Thus, from the experiences of high-school and college occupations, we have mapped a set of theories about education that are committed not only to the art of building and producing concepts, but also have searched, equally, to create them. We understand as philosophies of education those productions whose propositions resulted in some kind of conceptual proposal regarding school education, since the “philosophy, more strictly, is the discipline that consists in creating concepts” (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2005, p. 13). It is clear, though, that a wide set of these philosophies indicates negligence with the

potentials of the students' resistances in its elusive, creative, and affirmative aspect. It is this uncomfortable silence that moves the concerns presented in this paper.

Somehow, to a great part of the educational philosophies, it is still 1984.

## **Hey, teachers, leave the kids alone: the deserter and the fighter**

An alarmed child remembers the teacher: he wears a black overcoat, yells, and points the stick towards the child, suggesting a random fault. The classes start and there's no escape: students wearing uniforms, in line, enter the assembly line of a school which is very similar to a factory. The first modulation imposed to the children makes them sit in rows while they are dragged through an industrial conveyor belt. Then, separated into genders, masculine and feminine, students march under the command of the teacher. Suddenly, the school alarm rings, and the rebellion begins. Students start to destroy the school: broken desks, devastated walls, shattered glass and, finally, a great fire turns the building into ashes. Outside, students of all genders dance and jump around the fires, where tables and desks burn, and the flames are fed by the tests and exercises. Eventually, the teacher, expelled from the school by the students, disappeared.

Maybe the reader can recognize this plot. It is the famous videoclip from the British band Pink Floyd, called *Another Brick in the Wall*. First, the video expresses the analytical shade over school that we decided to call Orwellian, showing its factory, disciplinary and homogenizing aspects. However, the video also indicates a limit to the Orwellian concepts by questioning the collective rebellion. That means, at some mysterious point the machinery to produce modulated willingness has failed. But what happened?

The proliferation of theories that seize school as an instrument of production of submissive subjects brings out questions about possible resistances. What do we do with the school apparatus? Aren't there any ways out? Alternatives? Crossings? Ways to fight? Ivan Illich didn't hesitate in presenting a radical proposal to deal with the school apparatus: the complete deschooling. In the book *Deschooling Society*, Illich (2007, p. 26) suggests that the proliferation of schools through society "is as destructive as the army race, just less visible". In the middle of the Cold War, he points out that the process of institutional commercialization of knowledge promoted by the school, works not only in the capitalist countries but also in the socialist ones. In both sides of the world dispute, the main teaching in the school apparatus is to convince the children that they need an institution to learn, suppressing the autonomy and self-learning.

Deschooling is not about destroying it physically, but creating other forms of personal interaction, creative, independent, and able to create values that escape from the technocrat control. Illich (2007) suggests that institutions can be divided into convivial and manipulative. Among these are the military institutions that impose the law and war on the pretext of *peace-making*, whose business is none other than death. The manipulative institutions also adopt a therapeutic and charitable aspect such as prison, mental hospital, orphanage, and nursing home. Fundamentally, one of the manipulative institutions is the school because it hires teachers to force students to find time and energy to study once

it is, overall, unable to operate through self-motivated learning. Such institutions remain active through the artificial and fake production of the necessity of its existence.

Convivial institutions, in turn, respond to spontaneous necessities. They exist under precarious conditions, virtual or larval. They are the undersea cables, the postal services, the public markets, the drainage systems, the drinking water distribution system, the parks and sidewalks. They tend to form networks that help communication and cooperation and besides, to be searched at people's own initiative. Deschooling would go through a process of enhancement of the convivial institutions and, at the same time, the retraction of the manipulative ones. The convivial aspect is important to Illich because it seems that, even in schooled societies, most part of knowledge does not come from schools but from friendships, loves, communication devices and meetings on the street.

Illich (2007) considers the rebellion against and outside the schooling apparatus a powerful thing, and he sees in this space a possibility of revolution with less risk of bloodshed. The fight for deschooling then goes through the creation of educational networks and convivial spaces, that means, through the production of new learning networks promptly available to the public, providing equal opportunities of learning and teaching for everyone.

Going through a radically different way, although also believing in the possibility of fight beyond reproduction, Freire (2017) chooses to confront one of the cores of the school apparatus, pedagogy, suggesting a specific education to the oppressed ones. The question to Freire (2017) is another one: how can the oppressed ones take active part on the creation of a pedagogy that takes into account their freedom by being themselves species of double beings that host oppressive values within themselves? Or, still, how to face, within the educational process fields, the challenge to collectively carry out the human emancipation once the subjects to be emancipated continuously reproduce the oppressions that oppress them?

In the book *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire (2017) suggests that the education producer of subservient subjectivity is only one among other possible configurations. And he names it: banking model education. It is a process centered on the narration or dissertation produced by an active subject (narrator or teacher) aimed to the patient and listeners objects (students). Education becomes "an act of depositing, where the pupils are the depository and the educator, the depositor" (FREIRE, 2017, p. 80), producing human beings without being complete, once they are continuously tamed and seen as objects. On the other hand, Freire (2017) suggests a concept of education called problematizing or liberating. The liberating education seeks the overcoming of contradiction between educator and pupils, asserting the dialogical aspect as the essence of education. While the banking model education works in an anesthetic way, by inhibiting the creative potential, the problematizing education allows a reflexive aspect that involves a constant unveiling of reality. The objective of the liberating education is to make people fight for their emancipation, making themselves subjects of their educational process and preventing that the dehumanizing action promoted by the banking model education continues.



It remains, then, a second proposition by Freire: a revolutionary dialogical leadership, that means, a leader that “does not impose, does not manipulate, does not tame, does not make slogans” (FREIRE, 2017, p. 228), but who trusts the masses. However, this trust cannot be full because it is important to suspect the oppressed ones as far as we suppose an oppressor inside them, making them “dead in life” (FREIRE, 2017, p. 233). It is about a complex process that denies the authoritarianism *over* the masses while, at the same time, it rejects what is called licentiousness *of* the masses. The creation of an agenda for action, in this sense, can only happen through the simultaneous and well-balanced action between the people and the leadership. The people, usually crushed and oppressed, cannot prepare theories that promote their own freedom by themselves, as far as such procedure is only possible with the meeting of the revolutionary leaderships.

So, while Illich presents desertion as a way out, Freire proposes a dialogical combat. The deserting tendency of Illich lacks resistant bodies that can confront the powers of school. With a low fighting spirit, he seems to find comfort on the idea where school would be little prepared to a collective movement of deschooling. Illich seems to understand that self-learning could simply emerge from a physical distancing of the school apparatus, giving few clues about which resistant forces would, in fact, deschool. On the other hand, Freire shows up to the fight followed by forces too centralizing that, in turn, suspect from the capacity of self-organization and autonomy of the students. Thus, he settles in the search to reform the revolutionary leaderships, so they become less hierarchical and more dialogical. In this perspective, without proper contact with the enlightened leaderships, the pupils would remain eternal hosts of the oppressor.

### **School without fight: controllers, defenders, and accelerators**

The thought that emerged during the 1970s with Ivan Illich and Paulo Freire, undoubtedly comprised evidences of resistances to the *schools of power*. However, such encouragement has found reactions that have, early, blocked its potentials, biasing its attempts of production through three different fields: the controller, the defender and the accelerating one. The first came from the historical-critical pedagogy that tried to *refrain* the criticisms to the traditional education and combine, dialectically, the automated mechanisms of schooling with some of the criticism coming from the New School. The second one comes from the Belgium propositions to defend the school from the hate, criticisms and attacks driven to it to a kind of a protection of the school and its essential common. Finally, a third tendency, *the accelerating one*, has tried to advance the autonomy and the horizontality from a new evolution stage of learning.

In the beginning of the 1990s, Dermeval Saviani released a book of great repercussion called *Historical-critical pedagogy: first approaches*. His proposition is to track the historical paths of education having as a guideline the Marxist concept of production mode. Saviani (2013) understands that “mankind” is, in great part, made of through the educational work, process that has as reference the objective knowledge historically produced. Education would be a human historical production that, in turn, performs its own humankind production. That means, through the set of historical knowledge created

dialectically and collectively by humankind, educational work produces humanity in every individual.

In the historical-critical pedagogy, one of the most important points to trace any educational relationship is to identify the most developed forms of the objective knowledge, separating the essential from the accidental and the fundamental from the accessory, always recognizing the conditions of knowledge production, framing what Saviani (2013) calls *classic*. It is important to convert the objective knowledge into school knowledge, trying to discover the appropriate ways to develop the pedagogical work. At the end of the process, it begins to provide students with the necessary means to absorb such knowledge and learn its production process. The school knowledge depends on the knowledge that is essential to humankind and schools have to choose what is established as essential within the set of human history and after that, organize the contents, space, time, and teaching and learning procedures. Finally, it is under the humankind logic of production that the students from Saviani are manufactured.

The historical-critical pedagogy openly tries to differ from the perspective adopted by the ideological apparatuses' theory from Althusser as well as from the propositions of Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron about the symbolic violence. Saviani praises the capacity of these authors to criticize the existing one but disapproves of them for not having any practical proposal of intervention (SAVIANI, 2013, p. 57). Thus, the historical-critical pedagogy is a pedagogical approach that emerges as an attempt to embrace the contradictory aspect of school education, organizing popular proposals to transform society and valuing the technical competences. For it, socialization of the production means should be followed by the socialization of an elaborate knowledge that, in the capitalist societies, tends to be a monopoly of the dominant classes.

Thus, it seems necessary to defend schools. Sharing this objective, Masschelein and Simons (2014) seek the school quintessence. In this sense, the book *In defense of the school: a public issue* seeks a kind of original configuration of the school that, according to its authors, should be defended. The position of Masschelein and Simons (2014, p. 10) is clear: "We resolutely refuse to endorse the condemnation of the school".

According to Masschelein and Simons (2014), school is a powerful creation of the Hellenic polis, that comes in the form of appropriation of the aristocratic privileges. The school institution cancels criteria such as origin, race, or nature to the belonging to the class of the good and wise ones and, at the same time, makes the personal markers that determine the social roles ineffective. It is about a suspension of natural inequality that provides free time, seen as non-productive time, only to the ones that, due to its social position, do not have the right to claim it. Or rather, the Greek school creates a time and a space different from the social rules (*polis*) and from the family codes (*oikos*) allocating with bigger similarity the equal time and promoting the democratization of the free time.

The history of school is, though, a history of attempts to steal its essential aspect. The hatred of school continuously moves attempts to stop and capture the school free time by the logic of the family where the school should be an extension of the family, or by the social and governmental ruling, to whom the school should reinforce the job market and produce good citizens. Masschelein and Simons (2014) put themselves into a direction

completely opposed to the one that sees the school as an extension of the State apparatuses, that means, as a sponsor of inequalities or as an engine in the disciplinary dispositifs of the bodies, standing apart from the ones that think school, dialectally, as product and producer of production means. For the authors, school provides a specific composition of time, space, and subject, oriented to the free-done-time, offering possibilities to go beyond the social order and the unequal positions occupied by students. Thus, the school aspects such as suspension, profanity, attention to the world, technology, equality, love, preparation, and pedagogical responsibility, are not exactly historical, but rather, the thing that makes a school effectively a school.

Tavares (2014), on the other hand, proposes a dialogue about the current teaching and learning models in technological societies, suggesting an improvement of the autonomous processes among students and a radical interference on the vertical teaching. Tavares (2014) indicates that we are living the first evidences of an event that can trigger new learning processes, immersed in a type of liberating, technological and cybernetic self-learning. In *Autodidatismo libertário: evolução e ontogênese do homo ciberneticus*<sup>6</sup>, he explores the emergency of an uncertain evolution stage: the cybernetic man. Such event shows the need to review the educational models, which are mechanistic and reductionist, that use vertical procedures such as the performance measures previously standardized, the distribution of rewards to the best ones and punishment to the worst ones.

For Tavares (2014), the subjects don't need to be educated by the social models and patterns, but to live in a potential environment. We would be triggered by a way of curiosity to learn inherent to the genes, that, in turn, can be activated or deactivated from the relationship with the environment. However, instead of welcoming the *homo ciberneticus*, we consider him a threat. The self-learning tendency of the ones reborn through the sameness of the school production belts is seen as dangerous, once societies tend to appreciate morality, collectivism, and materialism. Thus, the potentially self-learning subjects are subjected to *diseases* like Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). The creation of such diseases makes pathological what, according to Tavares, can be only reactions to the rigid and subservient ways of learning that are imposed in schools.

Tavares (2014) hypothesis is: the processes of liberating self-learning are enhanced by the contact with the Internet networks. Full of computer bits, self-politicizing in the cybernetic network or becoming an immanent self-producer, a subject that wants to be the creator of its own existence is born. This way, the *homo ciberneticus* generates a new way of respecting the others, built from other ways of identification now formulated under the terms of non-comparable differences or, in other words, producing differences that are fully accepted and respected. Tavares (2014) proposes the pedagogeneses as a model to form the independent cognitive structure of moral and institutional impositions, allowing the subject to learn by himself. The new pedagogies would be focused on the potentials of the subjects to, from then on, release technological seeds of an era of cooperation, affection, solidarity, and reciprocity. Therefore, there should be an understanding at the

---

**6** - There is no translation into English of this work, but the title would be: "Liberating Self-Learning: evolution and ontogenesis."

same time simple and difficult: never “to forcefully impose anything to anyone but, be kind within the singularities” (TAVARES, 2014, p. 25).

By analyzing such projects, we stand before a triple strategy of ignorance in the combats: dialectical refrain, defense of the school or cybernetical acceleration. Now, in the view of the combative and deserter creations suggested by Freire and Illich, these theorists of education proposed the school interpretations less used to school fights in and by the school. Saviani’s proposal, for example, works not only from top to bottom, but also far from the desires of students and their resistances. The image of an inverted triangle might illustrate his method: it begins with an identification of relevant historical knowledge, passes through its conversion to an understandable form and, just then, results in the proper assimilation of the students who, in the last part of the triangle, absorb and learn the production of historical knowledge. The language used has clearly shown that: it is a process of “provisioning” (SAVIANI, 2013, p. 9). Saviani suspects of the students ability to express their needs, once that, not rarely, their: “wishes and aspirations do not essentially correspond to their real interests” or, still, that “not always what the child expresses at first sight as his/her interest is his/her interest as a concrete being” (SAVIANI, 2013, p. 71). In the end, the historical-critical pedagogy has a suspicion regarding students even bigger than the one expressed by Paulo Freire as germs of the oppressor that would inhabit the students. Here, the parents, teachers, school apparatus and Saviani’s pedagogy itself hold the necessary prerogatives to determine the concrete interests of the children and young students because students would hardly be suitable for this task.

Masschelein and Simons are committed to defend the essential existence of school. The defensive position of the authors wants to avoid external attempts to tame school, seeking to protect it from what corrupts its democratic and public dimension. For them, such external pressures are a Trojan horse that, once within school, promotes its destruction. It is suggested a change on focus on behalf of the defense of education. It is asked that all educators change into pedagogues guiding children and young students towards school and, thus, “all the pedagogues are called to raise” because teachers are “the only ones who unblock and cheer up a common world for our children” (MASSCHELEIN; SIMONS, 2014, p. 166-167). However, the authors put aside the possibility that new generations and their resistances can, actively, take part in the act of restructuring or renewing the school itself while *they live at the school* through *school fights*, not taking into consideration the childhoods and the youth as capable to produce idleness without being instructed to. Once more, it is about reserving the changing action to the teachers from their role as students’ conductor. Since they conduct so many children and young students inside the school cave and move around the educational hierarchies, it is not possible to imagine possibilities for teachers and students to defend school one next to the other, together.

Tavares also dismisses the school fights with the suggestion that a biological emergency can, quite spontaneously, force those changes in school. The new configuration of the cybernetic subject, accelerated, self-productive and self-learning, would not tend to accept so easily the old models of mass control that, once, fell over their fathers and/or mothers, as slow and heavy contents of institutionalized religions, television or press medias and, also, the ones coming from the old vertical pedagogy within schools.

Breaking up with the vertical, hierarchical and hard load preinstalled in the educational processes would be the condition for the dawn of a new era, human-technological, that means, a cognitive transhumanism where new brains, faster in processing, dance among epigenetic changed structures. The beginning of the end of our era comes from a kind of adaptation automatically necessary from the school to the *homo ciberneticus*.

The huge differences between controllers, defenders and accelerators get, this way, a concerning proximity: from all of them *schools without fight* rise. The historical-critical pedagogy lessens the fight against soothing oppressions, which Paulo Freire (2017) named banking model education and, at the same time, destroys, from the top, the resistances that work for deschooling, claiming for an answer settled for a dissidence that had barely started.

Masschelein and Simons (2014), in turn, suggest a defensive recovery of the school essence in order to protect its original core, seeking to establish a criterion that can categorize its authentic form, stating what is or is not a real school. Thus, Tavares (2014) seeks for ways out through self-learning as if it itself was enough to change us, providing the means to overcome, automatically or in an evolutionary way, the social conflicts. It is expected that this type of self-learning awakening might come from a peaceful process and without fights, that means, a passive wait until, finally, the vertical structures of education grow older and die, despite the secular evidences of its survival capacity.

## **2091 - For a cartography of school resistances**

The parade of educational theories we've relied on this paper is crossed by different aspects. Some of them trigger the concept of power as a constitutive part of school. They are *schools of power* precisely when they conceive it as its product, and understand, on the other hand, the resistances in and against the school body as reactive and secondary elements regarding the schooling machinery. Other areas of the parade, however, ask: what can we do with this machinery and its microparts that make, otherwise, powers circulate? Would it be possible to abandon it (Illich), emancipate through it (Freire), make it an apparatus of universal knowledge appropriation (Saviani), defend its quintessence (Masschelein and Simons) or turn to the liberating self-learning (Tavarez)? In all the cases, the resistant processes that make school a place of creative potential of a common educational are blurred. That means, the philosophy of education loses potential when ignoring the students' resistances, in general, and the high-school and college occupations particularly, and, still, abandons the students' fights by investing little or no thought in the contemporary school fight networks.

It is not excessive to state that there is, if not a silence, at least a strange lack of attention to the issue of the resistances in and to the contemporary school apparatus. The philosophies of education could basically answer the question: "how does the power in a school work?" If it is true that the post-critical theories could bring to their texts bodies so far forgotten (SILVA, 2013), it is also significant its little positivity regarding how these same bodies fight and create school. Such contexts understand the relationships of power as productive and inventive, blurring the resistances while combative, elusive, affirmative, and creative forces which, in turn, induce the power to constant reactive

movements that aim the management of differences. With no fundamental questions to investigate the microoperations of (re)production of subservience within the educational spaces, such contexts, though, do not stop stating that *we are in 2091*, in the same sense Orwell, by inverting the last two numbers of the publication year of his work, 1948, produced the year of 1984.

It is a long philosophical tradition about education where, curiously, the students' fights are not presented as active elements. Between the macro and micro powers that would build school, or among the concepts of emancipation, deschooling, universal teaching, self-learning and defense of the school, students within the fight look like zombies like waste produced by the school power machinery, hosts of oppressor germs waiting for the emancipating revolutionary leader, eternal spectators of an education that would provide them a humanist education or, finally, the genetic codes to be activated. Oddly enough, none of these perspectives understands the students' fights networks as a possible producer of school. Or, yet, they are basically school philosophies, without students or fights.

Nor 1984 or 2091, but year 1 in the school calendar: for a cartography of the school resistances.

Now, experiences as students' occupations bring down the parade of philosophies of education which we presented above. Its crash with the ground, however, do not necessarily imply in mistake or annihilation, but first, in a necessary meeting with the school fights and its creation networks. This movement leads us towards a cartography of school resistances written down within the intermittences of the high-school and college fights, the school corridors and patios and the ideas about education that also impose the affirmation of the occupations over the educational philosophies, putting on hold concepts like ideological apparatuses, disciplinary power, liberation, emancipation, deschooling and biological self-learning while, on the other side, it is arranged with the autonomous process of students' fights.

Despite the long silence of educational philosophies regarding the school resistances, the lines open by high-school and college occupations are not totally unnoticed. In "*Carta aberta aos secundaristas*"<sup>7</sup>, Pelbart (2016) suggests that the occupations have outlined a class thriving with ethics and politics, introducing a new choreography which is, at the same time, in parallel and against the drained dynamics that represent the national politics. In the letter, publicly read at the School Fernão Dias Pais, in São Paulo, Pelbart (2016) indicates that the "*ocupas*" have outlined an atmosphere mixed with the freshness of the fights, with unexpected collective affections and proliferation dynamics that made a cut in the continuity of the political time. Suddenly, "all the set of things becomes unbearable" (PELBART, 2016, p. 9). Among these things are the commercialization of education, the relationships of disciplinary power in force within the school spaces and the weak modes of teaching and learning used in schools. In contrast, unimaginable things have been built such as students ahead of the school property management and establishing a self-managing movement that was formed by the priority of students. Pelbart (2016) sees that

---

**7-** There is no translation into English of this work. The title would be: "Open letter to the high-school and college students".

the high-school and college students' strike has marked the emergency of a collective desire that experiences the pleasure of the effective occupation of public spaces which were full of police officers, the multitude drive, the production of collective intelligence and the perception of the common.

In a detailed description that comprehends the history of the high-school and college students occupations in São Paulo, the work *Escolas de luta*<sup>8</sup> (CAMPOS; MEDEIROS; RIBEIRO, 2016) shows significant clues for the understanding of the possibilities opened by the high-school and college students strike, indicating that the occupations helped students to see possibilities of a more democratic and pleasant school. The formats and modalities of different learning become generalized, such as workshops, debates, rounds of conversation, movie screenings and experiences that recognize students as subjects of the educational process. In the preface to the same book, Ortellado (2016) suggests that occupations outline new social relationships between students, teachers, and school management. There is a rupture of the individualist isolation specific to the school routine favoring the creation of new sociability based on “the co-responsibility, horizontality of the decision processes and care about the public property” (ORTELLADO, 2016, p. 13). Among the echoes of the high-school and college combats, Ortellado (2016) shows some changes like, for example, students groups more horizontal dissociated from political parties, changes in the dynamics of the classroom, fathers and mothers more empowered to demand and control the performance of the school managements besides the construction of a great political experience where thousands of activist students were forged.

Can high-school and college occupations become constitutional assemblies before the crisis? That's what Mendes (2018) asks in the book *Vertigens de junho: os levantes de 2013 e a insistência de uma nova percepção*<sup>9</sup>. By contextualizing the Brazilian high-school and college students' strike in a bigger circle of occupations, from 2010 to 2015, Mendes (2018) analyses the organization forms of the “*ocupas*” while crossed by the conundrum of the destitution / constitutional power. The author points out some instituting potentials within the context of the high-school and college occupations. Among them, for example, is the passage of the defense of the public welfare, as it was common in the *altermundi* in the decade of 1990, for the direct *constitution* of the common, stated in the democratic self-management that takes up the services to make them common, not state-owned or private. Besides, the occupations open a line of rupture “with the heavy disciplinary tradition that changes students into a passive, dull and obedient figure, holding back creativity and the willingness to participate and collaborate with the learning process” (MENDES, 2018, p. 209).

Mendes (2018) defines constituent power as an open and live procedure that creates a double movement, namely: on one side, the radical questioning of the power relationships in force and, on the other side, constitution of collective practices of resistance and inventiveness that aren't concluded in a project, state, institution or identity community. The “*ocupas*” make the autonomous sharing of knowledge proliferate and they organize,

---

**8-** There is no translation into English of this work. The title would be: “Schools of fight”

**9-** There is no translation into English of this work. The title would be: “June vertigo: uprisings of 2013 and the insistence to a new perception”.

in a democratic way, services directly related to life, such as power, water and technology, claiming full right to the production of our own life spaces and interaction with others. However, such institutive forces still have barriers regarding its destitution potential because they present, in different degrees, difficulties to promote refusal potentials, especially due to the influences of social movements connected to the most traditional and partisan of the left that endure the fights and limit their contagious power (MENDES, 2018).

Although they don't exactly produce a philosophy of education, the works above mentioned provide some evidences or lines that allow us to see some possibilities of a reorganization of the philosophical thought from the experiences of the high-school and college occupations, paving the way for a *cartography of the school resistance*. With Deleuze and Guattari (2006), such cartography reminds the philosophies of education that there are, in schools, at the same time, lines of flight and endurance to prevent such escapes. Thus, beside the repression, control, and connection points of power there are also "points fairly free or liberated, points of creativity, mutation, resistance" (PELLEJERO, 2008). The challenge to use the cartography method within the school combats is to produce philosophies of education alongside the students' molecule lines formed by flows, possibilities, and intensities. In this sense, students' combats are understood as deterritorialization and inventive flows regarding the practices of discipline and control used in schools and not only simple fragmented confrontations against the power mechanisms because, in a way, the power dispositifs are the ones to offer *resistance* to the deterritorialization movements of students.

Using the cartography method within the school fights is not an agenda, a manifesto, or a prophecy since it is not about offering a view of a world about to come or giving existence to a new subject. Following the lines of flight of the high-school and college resistances is, as suggested by Hardt and Negri (2014), to follow, critically and creatively, the agents of change that have come to the streets and, in this case, occupied schools. Such cartography comes from an outline and following of school resistances, understanding them as forces that produce school differences. Now, the "last word of power is that resistance is primacy" (DELEUZE, 2005, p. 96), so the school networks are frequently crossed by resistant points, focuses and circuits that make the change possible. Therefore, it is about watching the refuse and invention potentials of school fights, producing thoughts of resistance.

Occupations express what is that most powerful in the philosophies of education that were mentioned here. The school combats or "*ocupas*" make the school a common and counter-hegemonic space and take the disciplines to empower politicized bodies instead of politically docile ones. In a "*ocupa*", school is deschooled within itself with no need to abandon it and, there is also a liberating pedagogy that begins with the radically concrete questions brought by students, questions that only the battles in networks can offer (and not a dialogical leader). As a liberating self-learning, a "*ocupa*" produces free time, full profanation, and an educational common that are beyond the attack or defense of the school, creating democracy. Instead of asking "how democracies die?", as did Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018), the students' occupations ask: how can we create democracy from school? When entrenched in closed schools, without directors, coordinators, teachers or educators,



students in battles are able to show assembled, collaborative, self-organized, extremely powerful and creative educational practices. However, it seems that the philosophies of education refuse to put themselves into the students' shoes, refusing to produce thoughts with the “*ocupas*” and the students' battles.

We accepted the suggestion of Judith Butler (2015) where, before the tricks of power, our role is to discover the best ways to create problems, to conclude with a question: how can the high-school and college resistances guide us into the reinvention of the philosophies of education? Upon the silence about the students' battles, the only possible conclusion is the one Nietzsche (2007) wrote in 1888, a year impossible to be inverted according to Orwell's approach: the rest follows from this.

## References

AGAMBEN, Giorgio. **Estado de exceção**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2004.

ALTHUSSER, Louis. Ideologia e aparelhos ideológicos de Estado. *In*: ŽIŽEK, Slavoj (org.). **Um mapa da ideologia**. Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto, 1996. p. 105-142.

BUTLER, Judith P. **Problemas de gênero: feminismo e subversão da identidade**. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2015.

CAMPOS, Antonia Malta; MEDEIROS, Jonas; RIBEIRO, Marcio Moretto. **Escolas de luta**. São Paulo: Veneta, 2016.

DELEUZE, Gilles. Desejo e prazer. **Cadernos de Subjetividade**, São Paulo, v. 1, n. 1, p. 13-26, 1993.

DELEUZE, Gilles. **Espinosa: filosofia prática**. São Paulo: Escuta, 2002.

DELEUZE, Gilles. Sobre capitalismo e desejo. *In*: DELEUZE, Gilles. **A ilha deserta: e outros textos**. São Paulo: Iluminuras, 2006. p. 331-343.

DELEUZE, Gilles; GUATTARI, Félix. **O que é a filosofia?** Rio de Janeiro: Ed. 34, 2005.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **Ditos & escritos: genealogia da ética, subjetividade e sexualidade**. v. 9. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2014.

FOUCAULT, Michel. Introdução a uma vida não-fascista. **Cadernos de Subjetividade**, São Paulo, v. 1, n. 1, p. 197-200, 1993.

FOUCAULT, Michel. O sujeito e o poder. *In*: DREYFUS, Hubert L.; RABINOW, Paul. **Michel Foucault, uma trajetória filosófica: para além do estruturalismo e da hermenêutica**. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 1995. p. 231-255.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **Vigiar e punir**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2004.

FREIRE, Paulo. **Pedagogia do oprimido**. Rio de Janeiro: São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2017.

GALLO, Silvio. Em torno de uma educação menor. **Educação & Realidade**, Porto Alegre, v. 27, n. 2, p. 169-178, 2002.

HAN, Byung-Chul. **Sociedade do cansaço**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2017.

HARDT, Michael; NEGRI, Antonio. **Bem-estar comum**. Rio de Janeiro: Record, 2016.

HARDT, Michael; NEGRI, Antonio. **Declaração – Isto não é um manifesto**. São Paulo: n-1, 2014.

HARPER, Babette et al. **Cuidado, escola: desigualdade, domesticação e algumas saídas**. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1987.

ILLICH, Ivan. **Sociedade desescolarizada**. Porto Alegre: Deriva, 2007.

JAMESON, Fredric. **Pós-modernismo: a lógica cultural do capitalismo tardio**. São Paulo: Ática, 2004.

LEVITSKY, Steven; ZIBLATT, Daniel. **Como as democracias morrem**. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2018.

MASSCHELEIN, Jan; SIMONS, Maarten. **Em defesa da escola: uma questão pública**. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2014.

MENDES, Alexandre. **Vertigens de junho: os levantes de 2013 e a insistência de uma nova percepção**. Rio de Janeiro: Autografia, 2018.

NIETZSCHE, Friedrich. **O anticristo: maldição ao cristianismo**. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2007.

ORTELLADO, Pablo. Prefácio. *In*: CAMPOS, Antonia Malta; MEDEIROS, Jonas; RIBEIRO, Marcio Moretto. **Escolas de luta**. São Paulo: Veneta, 2016. p. 12-18.

ORWELL, George. **1984**. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2005.

PELBART, Peter Pál. **Carta aberta aos secundaristas**. São Paulo: n-1, 2016.

PELLEJERO, Eduardo. Dos dispositivos de poder ao agenciamento da resistência. **Com Ciência**, Campinas, n. 98, 2008. Disponível em: <http://www.comciencia.br/comciencia/handler.php?section=8&edicao=35&id=419&tipo=1>. Acesso em: 09 jun. 2020.

PRECIADO, Paul B. **Testo Junkie: sexo, drogas e biopolítica na era farmacopornográfica**. São Paulo: n.1, 2018.

SAVIANI, Dermeval. **Pedagogia histórico-crítica: primeiras aproximações**. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2013.

SILVA, Tomaz Tadeu da. **Documentos de identidade**: introdução às teorias de currículo. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2013.

TAVARES, David Ribeiro. **Autodidatismo libertário**: evolução e educação na ontogênese do homo ciberneticus. Curitiba: Itahala, 2014.

*Received on: 27.04.2019*

*Revised on: 04.06.2019*

*Approved on: 25.06.2019*

**Davis Moreira Alvim** holds a doctorate in Philosophy from the Pontifical Catholic University in São Paulo (PUC/SP), he is a teacher at the Federal Institute of Espírito Santo (IFES), professor at the Post-Graduation Program in Humanities Teaching (PPGEH/IFES) and at the Post-Graduation Program in Institutional Psychology at the Federal University of Espírito Santo (PPGpsi/UFES). He is a high school teacher at the Federal Institute of Espírito Santo (IFES), and is part of the Studies and Researches on Sexuality Groups (GEPSS) at the Federal University of Espírito Santo (UFES).

**Izabel Rizzi Mação** is a doctoral student by the Post-Graduation Program in History at the Federal University of Espírito Santo (PPGHis/UFES), scholar at the Research and Innovation Support Foundation of Espírito Santo (FAPES). She is part of the Studies and Researches on Sexuality Groups (GEPSS) and of the History Theory and Historiography History Laboratory (LETHIS) at the Federal University of Espírito Santo (UFES).

**Steferson Zanoni Roseiro** has a master's degree by the Post-Graduation Program in Education at the Federal University of Espírito Santo (PPGE/UFES) and is a teacher in primary education. He is part of the Studies and Researches on Sexuality Groups (GEPSS) at the Federal University of Espírito Santo (UFES).