


EMANCIPATION THROUGH ART IN JACQUES RANCIÈRE <https://doi.org/10.56238/sevened2024.037-013>**José Soares das Chagas¹****ABSTRACT**

This article has as its scope the question of emancipation through art from the philosophy of Jacques Rancière. In his work *The Ignorant Master*, emancipation is seen as an affirmation of the equality of intelligences that occurs from the beginning of the formative process as opposed to the explanatory order in which there is a need for the submission of the intelligence of the apprentices to the master, who attests to their cognitive superiority through explanations. To address this problem, we developed the theme in three moments. In the first part, we discussed what an aesthetic education would be based on the definition of education and art. In the second, we approach the concept of emancipation as the starting point of a practice in which the teacher is an agent who organizes the teaching-learning process, but does not dominate intelligence because it presupposes an equality of cognitive capacity. In the last part, we dealt with what this emancipatory practice of the student would be within the universe of art. In this sense, learning and artistic practice are understood as paths of autonomy and freedom by leading the human being to the recognition of the equal capacity to feel, understand and express the poetry of the world.

Keywords: Emancipation. Education. Art. Philosophy.

¹ Prof. Dr.
(UFT)



INTRODUCTION

AESTHETIC EDUCATION

Before thinking about emancipation, it is very salutary to ask ourselves about the relationship between Education and Art, because it is in the configuration that we give to the reach of these practices and their exchanges, that we find the transformative and liberating meaning expected when dealing with this issue. Let's start with education. By this term we understand, in line with the first article of the Laws of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (LDB\96), all the "formative processes" that take place in different environments, groups and even in the School. Although it does not define it peremptorily, the legal text provides the criterion for recognizing this human phenomenon, which brings within itself two core ideas (process and formative), which inform us about the dynamics and objective of this reality.

Education is a *process*. Now, our biological being brings a genetic programming that configures our physical being and our tendency towards affective life; but it is not capable of answering what we will do with what Nature has done to us. We are born ignorant of everything and fragile (the weakest among mammals); and, along with milk, we drink values and behaviors built up generations ago, through which, from males and females, we build ourselves men and women. There is no static essence of woman and man; what there are are historically circumscribed patterns and roles through which we are provoked to conform and configure our individuality. We become what we are through a teaching-learning process that, as a rule, is spontaneous, experiential and systematic. We learn to walk on two feet, to speak, to contain our desires and impulses, and we enter the world of culture, through our paternal and maternal references. Then, we are challenged to adult life, which, depending on the degree of complexity of the society in which we are inserted, may require us to study the socially constructed knowledge required for insertion in the world of work and social decisions.

Education is processual and *formative*. The word formation in recent times has been used in a pejorative way. Generally, it is used as a synonym for "form" or an *a priori framework* that the official educational system imposes and conforms to everyone, under penalty of sanctions. However, Education does not necessarily represent this reproducing machine of cultural hegemony. The word formation in its broadest sense (and without necessarily negative denotation) can be associated with the meaning given by Aristotle (2001) to *Entelechy*, or reality towards which something or someone tends dynamically. A marble stone, for example, in the vision and in the shrewd and skillful hands of an artist has the "form" of a work. If we remove the metaphysical-naturalist tendency of the reading of



the Stagirite, we can say that education is the passage of something from one state to another through an intersubjective action, known as educational practice.

For Wener Jaeger, educational practice concerns the existence, maintenance and reproduction of any society. "[...] every society, when it reaches a certain degree and development, becomes accustomed to the educational practice [which is the] principle through which human communities preserve their physical and spiritual peculiarities" (Jaeger, 1995, p. 03). Thus, we can assert that education goes through two complementary poles: the subjective, development of individual potentialities; and social, reproduction of existing models of societies. In this second case, we have the etymological root "educare", from the Latin: *ex* (of, outside) and *ducare* (to transmit, to teach).

Education would then be a way of reproducing the *status quo ante* of the moral and artistic values and standards of any human organization. In the first (subjective) case, the etymological root is "educere", from the Latin: *ex* (out); and *ducere* (to guide, lead, take). The idea embedded here is that education would be a process that would awaken an attitude that starts from the inside of the person and projects itself outwards. The example of this type of formation, presented in pedagogical reflections, is that of Socrates, because of his maieutics or art of leading the interlocutor to give birth to ideas.

If education is defined by what it does (or do) with nature, Art, originally, is also understood in opposition to what is merely natural. In its etymological sense, *téchne* (from the Greek) presents the same root as *technique* or "set of rules capable of directing any human activity" (Abbagnano, 2007, p. 92). Thus, any action on the world or on man himself aiming to bring about changes, by means of more or less solidified productive processes, could in a *broad sense* receive the qualification of artistic! This is how, throughout the Middle Ages, the distinction was made between manual (or productive) arts and liberal (or spirit) arts. Today, we speak of art ²in a *stricto sensu* way to designate affective and concrete construction processes that materialize in pieces and representations (paintings, stagings, sculptures, music, etc.).

² From a contemporary point of view, art is an affective-productive process that presupposes and is constructed in its entirety through its hermeneutic fusion between the artist and the public, in the "artistic coefficient" or in what is discovered through the active participation of the public's interpretation of the artist's work: "Consequently, when I refer to the "artistic coefficient", It should be understood that I am not referring only to great art, but that I am trying to describe the subjective mechanism that produces art in its raw state – *l'état brut* – bad, good or indifferent. In the creative act, the artist passes from intention to realization, through a chain of totally subjective reactions. Their struggle for fulfillment is a series of efforts, sufferings, satisfactions, refusals, decisions that cannot and should not be fully conscious, at least on the aesthetic level. [...] consequently, in the chain of reactions that accompanies the creative act there is a missing link [...]; this difference between what he wanted to accomplish and what he actually accomplished is the personal "artistic coefficient" contained in his work of art": DUCHAMP, Marcel. "The creative act". In: BATTCKOCK, Gregory. *The new art*. Trad. Cecilia Prada and Vera de Campos. 2nd ed. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 1986, p. 73.



In this strict sense, we can understand art as a form of education. Now, since woman and man are not only, as one interpretation of Aristotle states, "a rational animal",³ but are also constituted of emotion, sensibility and passion, education would not be integral if it left aside the aesthetic aspect of the experiences of life and of the world, so that what it would aim to form would end up deforming, reducing people to simple beings of discursive-logical reason, close to mere calculators; or to operating systems provided, throughout their years of study, with efficient applications.

However, when we talk about aesthetic education, we are not referring only to the production and enjoyment of artistic products, as if we were separating the creative subject and his inner expression from the created object and his standardized knowledge. We allude, in fact, to the aspects that we consider central in this type of experience: expression of feelings; language; and culture. In fact, art is a form of expression of the inner world and feelings, a way of talking about the world as it affects us and makes us affect others by analogies and symbols. It is language, which can learn its codes and schemes and, thus, transmit feelings, convictions and ideas. It is culture, since it concerns the most varied ways of cultivating oneself and the world, in the process of reproduction and reproduction of symbolic life, as well as contacts and hybridizations, which occur over time.⁴ Thus, art is a form of knowledge that we can call aesthetics or understanding by feeling.⁵

We are used to reasoning that names things, organizes them into judgments and proceeds through argumentative stages until they reach deductive conclusions (by subtracting smaller propositions from larger propositions); or to inductive conclusions (of a larger proposition, resulting from the sum of smaller propositions). However, we perceive

³ Based on a naturalistic and essentialist idea of man and society, Aristotle conceives that the city is proper to the essence of man, who only needs to actualize this deeper reality through Education: "It is evident, therefore, that the city is part of the things of nature, that *man is naturally a political* animal, destined to live in society, and that he who, by instinct, and not by any circumstance inhibits him, ceases to be part of a city, is a vile being or superior to a man. Such an individual deserves, as Homer said, the cruel reproach of being a being without family, without laws, without a home. For he is greedy for combat, and, like birds of prey, unable to submit to any obedience": ARISTOTLE. *Politics*. Trad. Nestor Silveira Chaves. 2 ed. Bauru, São Paulo: EDIPRO, 2009, p. 16 (emphasis added).

⁴ Art, throughout history, has taken on different facets in the school world. Thus, in the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, it was treated as *technical knowledge*, in the twentieth century, as *an expression* or as an activity (in the case of the dictatorship period); and, currently, it is seen within a scope that involves all human life in society, namely: as *culture*. Within this context, art stands out as a transdisciplinary and transmethodological place, which affects the human being as a whole, as well as all its symbolic expressions: Cf. COUTINHO, Rejane; SCHLÜNZEN JUNIOR, Klaus; SCHÜLUZEN, Elisa Tomoe (Org.). *Arts*. São Paulo: NED, 2013. (Training Themes).

⁵ The term Aesthetics was coined by BAUMGARTEN, A. G. (*Aesthetics: the logic of art and poem*. São Paulo: Vozes, 1993), meaning a sensorial knowledge, through which the Beautiful is accessed and art is produced. The science that would take care of this knowledge would be precisely aesthetics. However, SUASSUNA, Ariano (*Iniciação à estética*. 11th ed. Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio, 2011, p. 22) draws attention to the fact that in modernity, especially under the influence of Kantian philosophy, beauty no longer has exclusivity in this type of reflection and other categories and other categories began to be valued and worked on, in view of the *sublime*. And even what was completely discarded, also began to appear, such as the *ugly*, etc.



and understand the world also through sensitivity, especially when it comes to realities for which words are always lacking or surplus. How to represent the feeling of horror in the face of injustice or gratuitous violence? How to explain how you feel about a person? How to understand jealousy or hatred? Certainly, we can make psychological or sociological approaches to these phenomena, but they will never be sufficient or adequate to what we best understand when we feel, imagine or intuit.

Feeling is, therefore, the cognitive reaction that unveils structures of the world, opening it to its virtualities. The artist, when creating a work, configures a web of cognitive reactions, which represents a reality of human life. This symbolic production affects individuals who react spontaneously to affective provocation. The emotion that follows this experience comes from an understanding that was not mediated by logical reasoning, but by the feeling that elucidates what happened inside the subject marked by a psychological state of agitation. Take into account laughter, which is an emotion provoked by the feeling of the comic; or the horror-admiration coming from the sublime; in short, art, in its most varied forms, is configured as a "form of [aesthetic] knowledge that [apprehends] and organizes the world through feeling, intuition and imagination" (Aranha, 2006, p.18).

Aesthetic education thus has the power to become a short circuit in the mechanical life⁶ of moral systems, which sclerose experiences and close horizons of meanings and expressions. Instead of conditioning behavior by what is socially approved or disapproved, art has the possibility of promoting dissent through a subversive attitude to the frameworks of values arising from ideologies or certain reductive worldviews. At the same time, it can empathize with other forms of culture and awaken creativity and more dynamic, joyful and lighter ways of learning and dealing with life. In this sense, there would be a greater appreciation of the individual to the detriment of traditional explanatory logic. But will any aesthetic education be able to promote this? Before answering this question, it is necessary to ask ourselves how emancipation takes place.

⁶ Art breaks the doing for the sake of doing, the rigidity of ready-made formulas and the moral fossilization, which restores for us the meaning of what we do and choose, including whether to continue living or not: "One fine day the 'why' arises and everything begins to enter into a lassitude tinged with astonishment." Start", this is the important thing. Lassitude is at the end of a *mechanical life*, but at the same time it inaugurates a movement of consciousness. It awakens him and provokes his continuation. The continuation is the unconscious return to the shackles, or it is the definitive awakening": CAMUS, Albert. *The myth of Sisyphus*. 11th ed. Ari Roitman and Paulina Watch. Rio de Janeiro: Record, 2014, p. 27. However, the conclusion to be coherent with the life that is built as a work of art, cannot end suicide: "For the absurdist analysis, after having shown that killing is a matter of indifference, eventually, in its most important deduction, condemns killing. The final conclusion of the absurdist process is, in fact, the rejection of suicide and persistence in that hopeless encounter between human questioning and the silence of the universe. Suicide would mean the end of this encounter, and the absurdist position realizes that it could not endorse suicide without abolishing its own foundations": CAMUS, Albert. *The Rebel*. Translated by Anthony Bower. London: Penguin Books, 2000, p. 14.



THE EMANCIPATION AND BRUTALIZATION OF THE EXPLANATORY ORDER

Emancipation presupposes an appreciation of the individual as a capable being and also presumes equality among all. The big question that arises, however, is whether the denial of inequality does not itself become the sedimentation of an asymmetric state of affairs. The belief in the School places all the possibility of creating autonomous beings in the capacity of an educational system to present paths in which a ritual of initiation to intellectual, affective and political life could be offered. All the pedagogical emphasis would fall on the sciences and knowledge that should describe the failures in learning; to create means of better teaching; and ways to verify whether this learning was effective. In short, everything would happen through scientific knowledge and who can explain it.

The issue of education, and also of art, would be within a system called by Rancière the "explanatory order", which works like a machine (Rancière, 2002, pp. 17/138) reproducing enlightened people through master explainers, who would have the authority to distinguish knowledge from non-knowledge; and to confer *status* of understanding to those who agree with the criteria, to which they themselves were submitted. In a pedagogized society, it is necessary to submit to those enlightened in search of light, becoming a student in the restricted and pejorative sense of the word, namely, without light. Hence the School becomes the nucleus of a world that intends to save itself from barbarism and inequality through the transmission of knowledge essential to the ascension to the degree of woman/man, educated/educated, citizen/citizen.

[...] Explanation is not necessary to help an inability to understand. It is, on the contrary, this *incapacity*, the structuring fiction of the explanatory conception of the world. It is the explainer who needs the incapable, and not the other way around, it is he who constitutes the incapable as such. To explain something to someone is, first of all, to demonstrate to him that he cannot understand it by himself. Before being the act of the pedagogue, the explanation is the myth of pedagogy, the parable of a world divided into wise spirits and ignorant spirits, mature and immature spirits, capable and incapable, intelligent and foolish. The explainer's own procedure consists of this double inaugural gesture: on the one hand, he decrees the absolute beginning [...]; on the other hand, it covers all the things to be apprehended from this veil of ignorance that it itself is responsible for removing (Rancière, 2002, p. 20).

Within the context of a society based on the principles of the Enlightenment, Rancière draws attention to the belief we have inherited that the world will become better, fairer and equal, through the action of the State through school education. Forming citizens is the great goal of our enlightened society. However, this means conforming people's lives to a pre-established curriculum, which rewards those who succeed in achieving the proposed stages, which will lead them to be considered enlightened. The School becomes,



within this universe, a machine for forming citizens, good men and "explained explainers" capable of also remedying the incapacity of those who have not yet learned.

Hence the epistemological assumption of our pedagogized society is that of the superiority of the intelligence of some in relation to that of others. And the evidence demonstrated for this starting point is the abyss between scientific knowledge and common sense; or adult and child knowledge. One way of learning the world (called by Rancière the "little gentleman") is through a rigorous method, starting from the simplest to the most complex; and from hypotheses and verification tests to conclusions. The other way continues as an "animal that gropes", through non-systematic experiments and attempts, which are independent of rigorous procedural methods or guidelines.

The obvious superiority of the little gentleman's knowledge (or adult scientific knowledge) is due to the fact that much of this knowledge is found under the veil of the technical explanations of its bearers, who can explain to whom to submit to their curriculum, recognizing their inability to learn alone. The institutionalization of knowledge is, at the same time, the affirmation of the incapacity of some who must submit to the capacity of others: those who already have the explanation or scientific knowledge. How can we deny this? How can we not say that in fact to the intelligence of the teacher, doctor, psychologist or philosopher, we should not submit? Who will doubt the diet and treatment prescribed by the "doctor"? Or who will not feel comfortable opening their intimacy and awareness to a scientist of the soul and human behaviors? Who will question the pedagogue/teacher's ability to describe the best path for learning? It seems that, within the beliefs of scientificity that we bring, the affirmative answer to these questions will be received as madness, foolishness or a youthful rebellion. However, if we look closely, it is these same beliefs that, by aiming at equality and emancipation, paradoxically *brutalize*.

It is not enough for inequality to be respected: it wants to be the object of belief and love. It wants to be *explained*. Every institution is an *explanation* in action of society, a staging of inequality. Its principle is and always will be antithetical to that of the method founded on the opinion of equality and the refusal of explanations. Universal Education can only be addressed to individuals, never to societies. Societies of men [need] for their stability, some kind of order. Those who are charged with the maintenance of this necessary order must explain and cause to be explained that it is the best possible, and prevent any explanation to the contrary. This is the object of institutions and laws (Rancière, 2002, p. 111).

In the end, *emancipation* is an announcement, not an explanation, that there is no intelligence better and more apt to know the world than others. It is to place equality as a founding principle and not as the end of a process to be achieved. It is to deny the hierarchy of knowledge and its knowers. It is to discover that Universal or Natural Education is the one that does not depend on explainers. It is to be enthusiastic about the capacity of



each individual to emancipate himself and also to be a herald of the courage to be free and not to submit to his own intelligence to the intelligence of anyone. At the same time, it is refusing to be patronizing towards others, not allowing them not to submit or become his disciples. The opposite of this emancipatory attitude is the *brutalization* or affirmation of the structuring fiction of inequality, which is given by the fear of being free, of assuming by oneself the risks of making use of one's own understanding,⁷ and the dangers and emotions of chance.

Stultification is not an inveterate superstition, but fear of freedom; routine is not ignorance, but cowardice and pride of people who renounce their own power, for the simple pleasure of seeing the impotence of their neighbor. It is enough to *emancipate*. Do not ruin yourselves with publications to flood lawyers, notaries, and pharmacists of sub-prefectures with encyclopedias designed to teach the inhabitants of the countryside [...] (Rancière, 2002, p. 113).

The order of explanation is a stultifying machine, which seeks to escape the influences of chance and the unexpected. At the same time, it divides and hierarchizes knowledge between science and ignorance. Only those who were in possession of this first would be able to prescribe the truth, the best means of attaining it and verifying its understanding. The *wise master* teaches from his own science through explanations and scientific and technical knowledge. Our pedagogized society teaches us to submit to this vertical disparity of knowledge and to obey a so-called superior intelligence. Believing in the superiority of intelligence of an intellectual caste, we always refer to it to enlighten ourselves and decide on our steps and objectives. There is here in this presupposition and attitude a double submission: from the will to the will of another; and, the worst, from the intelligence of one to the intelligence of another.

The *ignorant master* is the one who teaches nothing of his knowledge and, therefore, is emancipated and emancipating. He does not need (and does not want!) to teach anything of his science, because he knows that it is vain and disrespectful to the freedom of the other. Their ignorance, far from being (as it might sound to our ears) a manifestation of harshness or arrogance, is respect for the intelligence and humanity of the other. It is not like a Socrates, because he was arrogant in saying that *he knew more* than others simply because he knew nothing. It is rather like someone who has clothed himself in the lightness

⁷ Paradoxically to what Rancière defends, the idea of equality and enlightenment are themes and flags of the Enlightenment and of our entire society built on the values of this movement, but denying equality as a starting point: "Enlightenment (Aufklärung) is man's exit from his minority, of which he himself is guilty. Minority is the inability to make use of one's understanding without the direction of another individual. Man is himself guilty of this minority if the cause of it is not to be found in the lack of understanding, but in the lack of decision and courage to use himself, without the direction of others. *Sapere aude!* Have the courage to make use of your own understanding, such is the motto of enlightenment [Aufklärung]: KANT, Immanuel. Which is Enlightenment (Aufklärung). 6th ed. Raimundo Vier and Floriano Fernandes. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 2010.



and simplicity of life and nature and announces to everyone that anyone is capable of learning for himself; and, also, that between any individual, lost in a corner of the world, and a mind like that of a Leonardo da Vinci, Bach, Spinoza, Kant, Freud, Einstein or a Stephen Hawking, there is no qualitative or significant difference.

There is no reason to refer to geniuses or geniuses, because to affirm education as a means that aims at equality as a goal is the same as to put it to an end without end. On the contrary, emancipation occurs when it is understood that in a teaching-learning relationship, equality must be affirmed from the beginning, so that, even if there is a hierarchy of will, there is never a submission of one intelligence to another. The ignorant master is thus capable of teaching anything, including the arts, because he, first of all, provokes a fundamental experience, namely: self-emancipation.

EMANCIPATION THROUGH ART

The question we asked ourselves about art as an emancipatory activity receives a positive answer. However, not just any aesthetic education can promote the autonomy and freedom of individuals. There is a conception of art as the exclusive work of geniuses, who master techniques and languages to dazzle and provoke emotions. A teacher who assumes such an assumption will be brutalizing the creativity of his students, in addition to sedimenting in their minds the inequality and the feeling of inferiority in relation to certain personalities endowed with privileged talents or gifts, which make them superior, genius and unequalled. Plato called this, according to Rancière's interpretation, the *golden race*, or the race whose spirits were sown with the gold of intellectual superiority.

In Plato's conception of justice, each one must occupy in society what he has been called by nature. The education of the *polis* would be the judge of the vocation of all, distinguishing spirits for crafts and manual work, and for the armed forces and for command; the latter being the ones who would have the duty of governing and educating. That is to say: there would be no founding equality, even though among the children of the artisans could come spirits from the elite, who should be led to the rightful social post: the command and education of the entire city. This, however, would only happen by pure natural determination, and not because manual workers are men as warriors and philosophers are. Here, we do not even mention the painters, poets, sculptors and playwrights, because their knowledge represented an inferior way of understanding the world, three degrees away from the truth, according to book X of the Republic.⁸

⁸ "So this kind of imitation [art] concerns something that is the *third* from the truth [...]": Plato. The Republic. Trad. Edson Bini. Bauru, SP: EDIPRO, 2006, p. 430 (emphasis added).



Although rooted in Antiquity, the distinction between scientific knowledge (episteme) and opinion (doxa), presupposed in the Platonic aesthetic approach, explains many stultifying practices today. In different pedagogical conceptions, from the traditional to the New School and to the technician and historical-critical approaches, the hierarchical difference between knowledges is established. The student is seen as a being of common sense, bearer of naïve and necessarily inferior knowledge; therefore, a method and a curriculum must be established to instill true knowledge in them (Traditional School) or so that they themselves can overcome this stage of inferior inequality and reach the maturity of scientific knowledge (New School; constructivists; interactionists, etc.).

Finally, to a greater or lesser extent, art enters this educational process as a knowledge that helps or leads to another, superior and more important in itself: scientific knowledge! In addition, it is based on the assumption that there are geniuses or talents (divinely or genetically prone) to affective and aesthetic raptures capable of producing works relevant to humanity. Poor mortals, who have not been identified as having these golden germs, can only have fun, be distracted and learn to enjoy the symbolic products. And, in the best case, to be sensitized to some topic in order to be able to subsequently get in touch with scientific knowledge; like a teacher who shows a film to the students with the intention of "facilitating" the introduction of concepts and theories that are supposedly more apt to explain reality.

Aesthetic education is emancipatory when it breaks with the vertical separation of knowledge and starts to see it as languages capable of speaking about the world.⁹ When it leads the student to say "I am also a painter", this experience is liberating, because it makes the individual understand affectively and rationally that he is as human a being as anyone else; that is, equality has been verified and not postponed to the end of a process of technical training and expressions, by which he will be able to equate himself in the future with the great geniuses of painting such as Da Vinci, El Greco, Vermeer or other. In the case of the work of the ignorant master, it is a matter of placing the student in the midst of exercises that lead him to understand that art (such as painting, for example) is a

⁹ Society and the models of education that we have are the fruit of the Enlightenment ideal of a "redemption" of humanity through the progress of rational knowledge. The problem is that, as the Frankfurt school showed, in every conquest of reason, there is the germ of distrust and rational autophagy: "the Enlightenment – the work of reason – is the process of unmasking ideology. The Enlightenment philosopher, using reason, sets up a concept – truth – and affronts power by showing that power says things that differ from the concept. Power is, therefore, ideological and, in this sense, illegitimate; however, at this very moment of denunciation, the Enlightenment philosopher cannot prevent himself from acquiring *power* over his listener to the extent that he denounced power: GUIRALDELLI JR. Philosophy of education. Rio de Janeiro: DPeA, 2000, p. 31. In another book, this same author works on the issue of the equality of the various narratives from the pragmatic contribution of Anglo-Saxon philosophy: _____. Philosophy of education and teaching: neopragmatic perspectives. Rio Grande do Sul: UNJUÍ, 2000.



language. Make him draw, without initially caring about measurements and proportions, so that he does not feel incapable; and to show paintings to verify the "unity of feeling" or what the artist meant by that work. Now, if he used those signs and images, anyone, after careful research and in his own way, can also express his thought by means of canvas and paint. In this case, "there is no pride in saying, out loud: I am a painter! Pride consists in saying quietly: you are not painters either" (Rancière, 2002, p. 76).

The poet also demonstrates equality as a presupposition of his art. When it expresses the suffering, pleasure, fury of a jealous lover or the emotion of a mother at the death of her child, it is not translating pain and joy into a third gender (*tertius*) between the subjective experience of an individual's soul and ordinary language. What he does, in fact, is, through words, to produce a poem that needs to be deciphered, since linguistic signs are not able to accurately enunciate the internal movements of a person and the nuances of an emotion. The written verses then refer to other verses, "the poem of the world", which is the ability of each one to "guess" what was subtly insinuated, for the simple fact that we all have feelings, emotions and participate in experiences similar to that of the writer and the one who is referenced. Rancière cites the French playwright Jean Racine as an example.

Our "equality" with Racine, we know as the fruit of Racine's labor. His genius is to have carried out his work on the basis of the principle of the equality of intelligences, not to believe himself superior to those to whom he spoke [...]. It remains for us to verify this equality, to conquer our power through our work. This does not mean making tragedies like those of Racine, but employing so much attention, so much research in art to report what we feel and give it to others to experience, through the arbitrariness of language or the resistance of all matter to the work of our hands. The emancipatory lesson of the artist, opposed term by term to the stultifying lesson of the teacher, is that each one of us is an artist, insofar as he adopts two procedures: not to be content with being a man of a trade, but to pretend to make every work a means of expression; not to be content with feeling, but to seek to share it. The artist needs equality, just as the explainer needs inequality (Rancière, 2002, p. 79).

Art, therefore, emancipates the student when it accomplishes what is peculiar to it, namely, to provide an aesthetic experience. Through this, emancipation occurs to the extent that it opens space for the person to constitute himself as an individual, aware of being endowed with an affectivity and intellectuality capable of expressing himself and understanding what is expressed by others. When he understands that the artistic work is not of geniuses, but of souls equally capable of feeling pain and suffering, anger or indignation... and to share that with the world. He discovers that we can understand, because we are reasonable, but that in order to enunciate well it is necessary to learn the appropriate language for the intended narrative. "[...] he must learn the language proper to each of the things he wants to do: shoe, machine or poem" (Rancière, 2002, p. 77). The



aesthetic experience is, therefore, intrinsically emancipatory because it provides an understanding of the equality of individual geniuses in their ability to understand the common soul of the world: the pains, sufferings, joys, commotions, enjoyment, exaltation, in short, everything that moves us and transforms us infinitely into what we always are.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The lessons of Rancière's ignorant master lead us to realize that art needs equality to exist. In fact, all those considered great artists worked assuming that they translated joys or pains for others similar to them, capable of understanding reality that was reduced to the characters and meanings of language, to canvases and paints, to sounds, to worked stones; in short, to any matter whose relevance is to be a symbolic product, which continues to be under constant construction by those who come into contact with it. The student, more than knowing artistic works, is encouraged to research, in the sense of reading, repeating, decomposing and composing in his own way the various exemplary artistic works, to understand that he can learn the language of production of any artistic artifact; in order to discover and translate the unity of feeling of the researched work and, at the same time, also to know that he can express his feelings and emotions in a meaningful way. When this type of aesthetic experience is made, emancipation has been effected and individuality preserved.



REFERENCES

1. ABBAGNANO, N. (2007). *Dicionário de Filosofia* (5th ed.; A. Bossi, Trans.). São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
2. ARANHA, M. L. A. (2006). *Filosofia da Educação* (3rd ed.). São Paulo: Moderna.
3. ARISTÓTELES. (2009). *A política* (N. S. Chaves, Trans.; 2nd ed.). Bauru, SP: EDIPRO.
4. ARISTÓTELES. (2001). *Metafísica* (G. Reale, Trans.). São Paulo: Loyola.
5. BAUMGARTEN, A. G. (1993). *Estética: a lógica da arte e do poema*. São Paulo: Vozes.
6. CAMUS, A. (2014). *O mito de Sísifo* (11th ed.; A. Roitman & P. Watch, Trans.). Rio de Janeiro: Record.
7. CAMUS, A. (2000). *The Rebel* (A. Bower, Trans.). London: Penguin Books.
8. COUTINHO, R., SCHLÜNZEN JUNIOR, K., & SCHÜLUZEN, E. T. (Eds.). (2013). *Artes*. São Paulo: NED. (Temas de Formação).
9. DUCHAMP, M. (1986). "O ato criador." In G. Battcock (Ed.), *A nova arte* (C. Prada & V. de Campos, Trans.; 2nd ed.). São Paulo: Perspectiva.
10. DUTRA, C. E. G. (2007). *Guia de Referência da LDB/96* (2nd ed.). São Paulo: Avercamp.
11. GUIRALDELLI JR., (2000). *Filosofia da educação*. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A.
12. GUIRALDELLI JR., (2000). *Filosofia da educação e ensino: perspectivas neopragmáticas*. Rio Grande do Sul: UNJUÍ.
13. JAEGER, W. (1995). *Paidéia: a formação do homem grego* (A. M. Parreira, Trans.). São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
14. KANT, I. (2010). *Que é Esclarecimento* (R. Vier & F. Fernandes, Trans.; 6th ed.). Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.
15. PLATÃO. (2006). *A República* (E. Bini, Trans.). Bauru, SP: EDIPRO.
16. RANCIÈRE, J. (2002). *O mestre ignorante: cinco lições sobre a emancipação intelectual* (L. do Valle, Trans.). Belo Horizonte: Autêntica.
17. SUASSUNA, A. (2011). *Iniciação à estética* (11th ed.). Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio.