

ARTICLE

CURRICULA AND ART SIGNS AROUND A COUNTERCULTURAL EDUCATION

JANETE MAGALHÃES CARVALHO¹

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9906-2911>
 <janetemc@terra.com.br>

SANDRA KRETLI DA SILVA¹

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0107-8726>
 <sandra.kretli@hotmail.com>

¹ Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo. Vitória, Espírito Santo (ES), Brazil.

ABSTRACT: The article discusses how curricula that use art with its sensitive signs can enable a movement of thought around a countercultural education that affirms life in counterpoint to capitalist processes. It dialogues, with post-fundamentalist theoretical intercessors, the concepts of cultures, curricula, teachings, and images of artistic signs when forming people to come. Methodologically it is a training research carried out with teachers of a municipal school network, virtually via *Google Meet*, in the year 2021. Therefore, it aims to think about the strength of artistic signs in cultural and curricular inventions and compositions. In the results, the text points out some destabilizing points that teachers, during encounters with the signs of the arts, excavate, open fissures in dogmatic thinking —thought as representation — opening gaps for the passage of inventive nomadic thought, the one that escapes, which experiences and creates possibilities for power flows of forces. This process expands differentiation processes and thus invents new images for the curricula, cultures, and schools with the force of difference.

Keywords: counterculture, curricula, difference, art signs, teaching.

CURRÍCULOS E SIGNOS ARTÍSTICOS EM TORNO DE UMA EDUCAÇÃO CONTRACULTURAL

RESUMO: O artigo argumenta sobre o modo como os currículos que utilizam a arte com seus signos sensíveis podem possibilitar um movimento do pensamento em torno de uma educação contracultural que, afirma a vida em contraponto aos processos de sujeição capitalistas. Dialoga, com intercessores teóricos pós-fundamentalistas, acerca das conceituações de culturas, de currículos, de docências, das imagens de signos artísticos em sua relação com a formação de um povo por vir. Metodologicamente trata-se de uma pesquisa-formação realizada com professoras de uma rede municipal de ensino, de modo virtual via *Google Meet*, no ano de 2021. Objetiva, portanto, pensar a força dos signos artísticos nas invenções e composições culturais e curriculares. Exemplifica, nos resultados, alguns desestabilizadores que professoras, nos encontros com os signos das artes, escavam, abrem fissuras no pensamento dogmático — pensamento como representação —, abrindo frestas para a passagem de um pensamento nômade que escapa, que experimenta e cria aberturas para passagem dos fluxos de forças imagéticas e conversacionais de modo a expandir processos de diferenciação e assim inventar novas imagens para as escolas, para as culturas e para os currículos com a força da diferença.

Palavras-chave: contracultura, currículos, diferença, signos artísticos, docência.

CURRÍCULOS E SIGNOS DE LAS ARTES EN TORNO A UNA EDUCACIÓN CONTRACULTURAL

RESUMEN: El artículo argumenta cómo los currículos que utilizan los signos sensibles del arte pueden permitir un movimiento de pensamiento en torno de una educación contracultural que afirma la vida como contrapunto de los procesos de sujeción capitalista. Dialoga, con intereses teóricos postfundamentalistas, los conceptos de culturas, currículos, enseñanzas, imágenes de signos artísticos en su relación con la formación de un pueblo por venir. Metodológicamente se trata de una investigación formativa realizada con profesores de una red de escuelas municipales, de forma virtual a través de *Google Meet*, en el año 2021. Objetiva, por tanto, de pensar la fuerza de los signos artísticos en invenciones y composiciones culturales e curriculares. Ejemplifica algunos factores desestabilizadores que los profesores, en encuentros con los signos de las artes, excavan, abren fisuras en el pensamiento dogmático "el pensamiento como representación-, abriendo brechas para el paso de un pensamiento nómada, escapa, que experimenta y crea aberturas para pasar los flujo de imágenes y fuerzas conversacionales con el fin de expandir los procesos de diferenciación y así inventar nuevas imágenes para los currículos, las culturas y las escuelas con la fuerza de la diferencia.

Palabras clave: contracultura, currículos, diferencia, signos de las artes, maestros.

CULTURE AS ARROWS THROWN IN THE DESERT: ART SIGNS MOVING TEACHING

All that has happened after, he did not know, was born into a desert, it is terrible, to cross a desert is not much, it is not to cross a period of the desert. The terrible thing is to be born on it, to grow in a desert, it is horrible, I suppose because you must have an impression of loneliness (Deleuze, 1988, n.p).

The arrow of thought, transformed into pure force, equally approximates us from the pathways trod by Deleuze and Guattari (1997, p. 18) to whom "[...] "[...] affections cross the bodies as arrows, not as war weapons", i.e., Deleuze and Guattari think this image as a poetic of forces, including, as the target of the arrow and "spiritualized" shot of thought, the culture of a people to come.

To Guattari and Rolnik (1986, p. 15), "[...] the concept of culture is deeply reactionary" because it separates the social work into isolated spheres, standardizes, established, and capitalized for the dominant semiotization way, crossed by their political realities. In his turn, Deleuze (2008) points out that, as an arrow, the assumptions of a culture work as a type of battlefield of operations theater in which the capital would be in charge of economic subjection and the culture of the subjective subjection. It is a merger between two regimes, two dimensions of the capitalist submission process.

However, to these authors, resistance would be intertwined with the submission dimension. Thus, culture, as a generic activity, presupposes a negative idea of culture and a positive problematization. The criticism is directly correlated with creation because it always considers itself as a culture but always about a culture, waiting, if possible, for a culture to come.

Thus, when considering the possibilities of a culture to come, the authors assume and defend a countercultural perspective and/ or resistance against the capitalist models. It is counterculture in the

sense that it is possible to develop singular forms of submission and/or what can be called “singularization processes” (Guattari & Rolnik, 1986, p. 17), refusing and questioning these forms of established coding—, because “[...] they refuse them to build ways of sensitiveness, ways to relate with the other, creative production forms that produce a singular subjectivity. An existential singularization [...].

In a world in which the capital is the general reference of human relations, regardless of the so-called political ideologies that have become indiscernible nowadays, we can perceive the commodification and massification of the ways of dressing, eating, feeling, loving, and consuming:

The capitalist order produces the forms of human relations even in their unconscious representations: how they work, how they are taught, how they love, how they have sex, how they speak, etc. It fabricates the relationship with production, with nature, with facts, with movement, with the body, with food, with the present, with the past, and the future - summing up, it creates the men's relationship with the world and with themselves (Guattari & Rolnik, 1986, p. 42).

Therefore, we see in Deleuze and Guattari that the countercultural tone passes mainly by the opposition of a concept of culture as the materialization of an image of the representational thought grounded over common sense and good sense.

To Guattari and Rolnik (1986), the concept of culture normally involves a sense of “cultivating the spirit”, assuming a correspondence with a culture-value that determines those who have culture and those who do not, erudite culture versus popular one and/or schooling level; a relationship with the sense of “collective culture-soul” in which to each collective soul (peoples, ethnicities, social groups) an identity culture is attributed; the sense of “culture-good” in which the dissemination and culture production are the focus.

Hence, these conceptions permeate teachers' practice and education but not only them. There is always a certain openness to the possibilities of a concept of culture beyond common sense and subjection, a culture to come, with resistance and problematization, a concept of countercultural culture.

Deleuze, to whom culture can and should be something else, calls the recurrent concepts of culture ‘grotesque images of culture’, which find a privileged space in the contemporary world, as a patina of erudition or a depth index, mirrored in “ “[...] the tests, the government slogans, the newspaper contests (which invite us to choose according to our taste, as long as it coincides with the taste of others)”” (Deleuze, 1988, p. 171).

So, it is essential to seek forms through which culture leaves these intertwined and self-enclosed spheres, contraposing them to the concepts of culture-value, culture-group (social or ethnical), culture-good, producing and creating projects of culture singularization that dismantle the particularities and reproduction traits in the social-political, cultural-educational field and, in within the later, teaching.

In this sense, we are, without a doubt, in a crisis and/or a cultural desert, defined mainly by the fact that culture has become a good to be consumed and that its clients changed, as in television, in which the real clients are no longer the audience but the advertisers. Thus, the audience members receive the cultural goods the advisers want, erasing any criticism against commercial advertisements (Pellejero, 2008). Nonetheless, according to Deleuze (1988 *apud* Pellejero 2008), it is clear that there will always be other circuits so that a parallel agency will regain cultural richness, similar to what Nietzsche said: someone shoots an arrow, an arrow in space or even a period, a collective group shoots an arrow and later it falls, someone takes it and shoots it back somewhere else. Creation works this way: literature, cinema, and artistic signs, in general, cross over deserts and make the oasis flourish.

Many arrows have been shot by artists, researchers, teachers, children, and young people who seek to bring life to the desert in the world, to (re)invent it and (re)populate it with more joy, resistance, invention, and, above all, more collective power so that we can live a beautiful life with the force of difference. After all, “[...] we can only wish together”, as Deleuze stated (2008, p. 14). Escaping from the interiority of a culture through the exteriority of encounters, analyzing the connection between the thought movement and a given culture.

Indeed, meetings with paintings, music, cinema, and literature but not on their cultural dimensions, but in the sense that they hide anything that escapes the cultural domain because it is only from these points of non-culture or counterculture that it is possible to go beyond a given culture. (Pellejero, 2008, p. 3- our highlight).

To enact collective wishes in teaching and to move the images of schools, cultures, and curricula, we held encounters with art signs (from cinema and literature) in conversation webs with teachers. Signs are affections that ask for a way and free the variation of life power in school spaces. Therefore, art signs work as thought triggers and allow the problematization of educational and curriculum policies that “try” to belittle the life in/of schools. These meetings expand the power of joy and affirm life in its highest power lever.

Commonly, in the scope of cultural and curriculum policies, in different educational contexts, subjectivation processes are activated through multiple images circulating there. Thus, we question how, in standardized, vertical, and hierarchical relationships, we have been inhibiting the creative activities and the field of possibilities in the curricula experienced in daily school life: What images, sounds, words, gestures, and smells cross the cultures and curricula that are in constantly moving in the schools? What senses and meanings of curricula and culture are created with the multiple images that inhabit the school spaces-times? Can art potentialize curriculum problematization and creation?

We consider curriculum in plural (curricula) inspired by the post-fundamentalist movement (referring to all theoretical-practical perspectives contrary to the defense of universal principles, essentialism, and a non-contingent approach. In Brazil, the theoreticians that stand out in this curriculum

perspective are Marlucy Alves Paraíso, Elizabeth Macedo, Alice Alves Casimiro, Nilda Alves, Sandra Mara Corazza, among others. Curricula because life is woven in a web of multiple lines threads that cannot be reduced to the propositions of national curriculum guidelines and/or Education Secretaries and/or the curriculum syllabuses established by/for schools. Curricula cannot be limited to these, as they go beyond an organizational plan. At the composition level, the curricula are trespassed by relational forces, such as school, family, school community, management bodies, political-economical-social system, media, etc. Even though the tension of the prescriptions and the fundamentalist predeterminations are present, we highlight that the curricula are constituted in networks of complex actions established in an immanence field not determined a priori. Not the curriculum but the curricula! In this perspective, there is not an inner sense of curriculum (a sense in itself) because its meaning is always derived from the contingency of sayings and actions that give consistency to what is experienced in school by different forces in relation.

These are curricula that are lived and boosted by collective forces and desires, entangled by encounters, collective experiences, and events. To affirm the force of encounters means understanding “[...] curricula beyond the processes of learning-teaching to the condition of something solitary, individual, personal, and in the level of awareness’ interiority” (Carvalho, Silva, & Delboni, 2018, p. 814), to rely on learning and teaching that are established in the networks of affections and conversations, through composition, singularization, and differentiation processes.

In this sense, we question: in cultural standardized, vertical, and hierarchical relationships, how are we inhibiting the creative activity and the field of possibilities in the curricula experienced in the school's daily life? Can art potentialize the curriculum problematization and creation?

Methodologically, it is a training-research¹ held with teachers from the municipal system, via *Google Meet*, during the night period in 2021, amidst the Covid-19 pandemic. Initially, the research foresaw the participation of 75 teachers undergoing a significant change because, on the eve of the training start, the city of Serra/ES (Brazil) — as well as other cities from the metropolitan region of Vitória — was strongly pressured by the Federal Prosecution Service to anticipate the return to in-person classes, following a hybrid model. With the return of in-personal work, the teachers were faced with a schedule conflict to participate in the formation activity, leading to a sudden decrease in the number of participants. On the other hand, in this context of return to in-person work and the need to flexibilize the schedule of teachers and trainers, the formation was kept with 42 teachers enrolled and divided into three groups. For this text, we selected only part of the material produced by a group of 14 teachers.

¹ This article is part of a broader research — “Images, artistic signs, instigating learning in curricula in school daily-life: enhancing the constitution of collective bodies,” (Ufes/CNPq), period 2021-2025.

We should also stress our option to present some results of the research at the end as examples of possibilities to reach the formulated objective². To do justice to our theoretical reference, we must say that, in no way will we indicate who is speaking, not only due to the ethical issue of anonymity but mainly because we affirm the power of collective agency of enunciation (Deleuze & Guattari, 1995). We start from the premise that no statement occurs in the individual field, i.e., it is not a speaking being that expresses their ideas in isolation“ One individual or another, considered within a mass, has a pack subconscious that is not necessarily similar to the mass packs they partake," say Deleuze and Guattari (1995, p. 49). They go beyond: “Each of us is involved in such an agency, reproducing the statement when believing we speak on its behalf or speaking on its behalf when producing the statement” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1995, p. 50). Because of this, we do not rely on a text based on creating fictional names for the teachers but allow the statements to appear with their force and pure liveliness. What matters more are the forces that follow them in their statements and how they can expand in conversation with other forces. It is important to follow the force of nomadic thought, which escapes the representations to think and experience the novelty, the unthinkable, and the difference in the curricula. We argue that these inventive forces expand the power of a collective action that desertifies and depopulates schools to repopulate them in this way.

Therefore, this article argues about the use of artistic signs in teacher education as a way to potentialize resistance and/or a thought movement around a countercultural education that affirms life against the processes of capitalist subjection. Dialoguing with post-fundamentalist theoreticians about the concepts of cultures, curricula, and teaching as shared encounters, we debate their relationship with forming a people to come (in this case, elementary school teachers). We argue that in their encounters with artistic signs, the teachers destabilize the dogmatic thought – though as representation -opening gaps for a nomadic, inventive thought, which escapes, experiments, and creates openings for the flowing of pure thought, with no images, allowing the collective body to expand the processes of differentiation, thus, inventing new images for the curricula, the resistance culture, and schools with the power of difference.

CULTURES AND CURRICULA AND E DESERTS: MEETINGS, BECOMINGS, NOMADISM...

In the research trajectory, we see curricula as nomadic experimentations beyond the rigid, pre-defined contours, without the indicative compass that guides the object; they consider the perception of

² As said, in broader terms, the research aimed to problematize which effects of artistic signs, such as film, photos, pictographic, and literary images, provoke the thought movement of elementary education teachers. However, considering the space of the article, we focus on part of the research, presenting only two moments experienced with the artistic signs used in the teacher education process, and we selected only some of the lines spoken during the conversations.

what Deleuze and Guattari (1995, p. 15) call rhizome a good translation of the multiple connections that occur in the ways of culture and curricula. As the Greeks said, the idiots were the inhabitants of themselves (Deleuze & Guattari, 1992). Within themselves, they see new possibilities of thinking and acting with much more resistance than those vulnerable to those varied becomings that present and offer themselves in the fog.

The conceptual characters of Deleuze and Guattari (1992) — the idiot and the nomad — illustrate two possibilities. The first refers to the dogmatic closeness of thinking and acting. The second, related to the nomad, is related to a creature that has its territory produced by the pathway that starts from one point to another but that does not have, in any of these points, fixed limits, as they are points to be abandoned again by the nomadic need (Deleuze & Guattari, 1997).

However, what matters is to consider that we all are, in a way, idiots and nomads. Therefore, we should live an existence with a certain perception of when we are one more than another and, if we believe it is pertinent, change. Recreating ourselves in our own pathway gives our senses and perceptions new ways to handle what we are, where we are, and what we will do.

That is why we want to get rid of ready-made opinions. We only ask for our ideas to connect following the minimum level of the constant rules. The association of ideas had always meant to provide us with protective rules, similarities, and causality, which allows us to give some order to the ideas, to go from one to another, according to an order in space and time, stopping our “fantasy” to wander the universe (Deleuze & Guattari, 1992, p. 259).

The nomad, vulnerable to the fog and the chaos in the relationship created when allowing encounters and, thus, enabling events, would be able to produce thoughts, not only opinions, because he would be in the vortices of the realities produced on levels that cross chaos — “[...] art, science, and philosophy – as forms of thought or creation” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1992, p. 267).

This chaotic flow holds the unlimited speed of birth and fading [...] Imprisoned on its opinion-body-truth, the idiot, through the iron of his mirror, believes himself free, careless, does not notice that the points that delimit his thought, actions, and view as they are not moveable, narrowed to the tiny space of the shield visor of his identity helmet (Deleuze & Guattari, 1992, p. 153).

While the nomad faces and insinuates himself in the fog, the idiot protects itself in tradition, in the previously- said, the easily assimilated, the plausible, the palpable, in the representation of reality. The nomad learns through movement, displacement, the need to expand and leave the house-body, the body-territory³, the nomad is the one that has no point, pathways, nor land, while, obviously, having

³ Deleuze’s concepts of territory, deterritorialization, and reterritorialization are complex “The notion of territory is here understood broadly, which exceeds the use of ethology and ethnology. The existing beings are organized according to criteria delineating and articulating them with other beings and cosmic flows. The territory can be related to a lived space and a system perceived in which the subject feels “at home” (Guattari & Rolnik, 1986, p. 323).

them⁴. If the nomad can be called ‘deterritorialized’ per excellence, it is exactly because the reterritorialization is not done later, as is the case of migrants, and neither in something else, as in the case of the sedentary (in fact, the relationship of the sedentary with the land is mediatized by something else, the regime of property, the State apparel...). On the contrary, the nomad is the deterritorialization that establishes his relationship with the land because he reterritorialized himself in deterritorialization itself (Deleuze & Guattari, 1997). The nomad allows thought by abandoning and creating territories, as the “[...] act of thinking is established in the relationship between territory and land, i.e., as the deterritorialization of the territory to the land, and the reterritorialization of the land to the territory” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1992, p. 113).

When abandoning his territory, the nomad opens himself to the risk and new creations to deal with himself and the encounters he will find in his path. Hence, he seeks to create senses, perspectives, and thoughts. He tries not to give in to the opacity of the fog but wants to enable new forms of seeing, thinking, and feeling within it. He will seek ways for us to understand each other and the world and to live the best way possible to leave and arrive, to learn to feel, think, and see. He may try to abandon the persistent search for the grand truth and worry about the small wavering truths in the path. The aim is to make this means, and this walk between undefined and moving points the territory itself, also moving, and, with it, to produce approximations and relationships with others, to enable life, an intensely creative life, which allows us to think beyond the plausibility and predictability of the paths already wandered and that only lead us to our walls.

Nomadism translates “[...] a pure and measureless multiplicity, the gang, the irruption of the ephemera, and the metamorphosis power”. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1997 p. 13). The challenge is not to think if a curriculum or nomadic teaching have their territory, if they cross landscape point; more than this, it is to notice that, in the case of nomadic curriculum interventions, what is done, what exists is there to be abandoned, changed. It exists in schools, in the layers over the layers of visible interventions, an elusive, abandoned existence.

In each curricula wall lies layers and layers of ephemera. This is the most evident view of the continuous process of territorialization and deterritorialization of the arts in the urban scene, a type of nomadism that, as stated by Deleuze and Guattari (1997), does not necessarily need to leave the place.

The nomad would be the one that acts, undoing the grooves of the spaces created to classify, work, and standardize behaviors that “[...] creates the desert and is created by it. He is the vector of deterritorialization” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1997, p. 53). The desert does not necessarily assume the shape of nothing; on the contrary, it composes "a bunch of stories" galleries of memory layers on the school curriculum walls.

⁴ "The territory is a synonym of appropriation, of subjectivation, closed in oneself. The projects and representations will pragmatically discharge a collection of behaviors, investments, and social, cultural, aesthetic, cognitive times and spaces" (Guattari & Rolnik, 1986, p. 323).

Stories that persist in the images that resist under the overlapped layers of white between the walls exist without their regimes of resistance to gain force, to be active by affections as intensities. To Deleuze and Guattari (1997, p. 78), “[...] agencies are passionate, they are composed by desire. Desire is not related to a natural or spontaneous determination, there is only agencying, agencied, contrived desire.”

Affections are intensities. They cross and recreate speeds and flows in the grooved spaces of barriers, fixed and segregationist frontiers of the cultural processes in curricula, interposing themselves in the interstices “from the filters to the fluidity of the masses” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1997, p. 60). How does one follow the acts of non-authentic intervention in school spaces, arts, and registrations that act without having a place? How do we define this matter-movement, related to fraudulent art, “[...] this matter-energy, this matter flow, this matter in variation, which enters in the agencies and that leave them? A matter, by its nature unstratified, deterritorialized?” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1997, p. 89).

In this perspective, we establish a dialogue with Deleuze and Guattari, pointing out that, though art is organized as a subject, displaying a corporeity, it neither mixes itself with the intelligible formal essence nor the sensitive, formed, perceived thingness” (Deleuze & Guattari 1997, p. 89). When this art enters the folds between curricula and material and digital teaching, the greater it presents itself in “[...] a space-time itself inaccurate”. As the body cannot be reduced to an organism (Deleuze & Guattari, 1995), art is condensed from materialities, affections, expressivities and intensities.

What founds art nomadism is the movement, and this does not mean undoing the organism school curriculum but insists on opening it to “[...] connections that suppose a whole agency, circuits, conjunctions, superpositions, and limits, passages, and distributions of intensity, territories, and deterritorializations, as a land surveyor” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1996, p. 22).

In the teachers’ vital effort, the wish is to overcome the “city with no windows,” the landscapes erected as extensive walls. This is also the challenge that moves teachers’ practice in public schools, as delineating pathways between walls and windows, reaching the between-things, and overcoming curricula that reduce the lives of public-school children to “minimal existences”? (Lapoujade, 2017).

Nomad art can insist on a type of support, in topology, in images repeated to assert the clamor of war machines. This is also the adventure of a teacher who moves under the sign of a “moving science”, a trip that only starts when we burn our ships, as adventure starts with a shipwreck.

Deleuze and Guattari (1992, p. 253) affirm that only art conserves. Nevertheless, what does art conserve? Exactly the affects and percepts, because “[...] art wants to create a finite that reestablished the infinite: to draw a composition plan that, on its turn, carry monuments or composed sensations, under the action of aesthetic figures”.

The images of deserts⁵ makes us think about the cultural and curricula processes and all the codes, norms, rules, standards, and universalisms produced by the educational policies in action and how we relate with the images created in the schools. Displacements, concerns, problematization: could we attribute new meanings to common school objects? Could we think about the culture and curricula to come in schools? What other unexpected looks and arrows can be shot at schools and their inhabitants?

CULTURE AND COUNTERCULTURE AND ART AND EDUCATION AND...

In an interview in 1980, Deleuze stated that “[...]contemporary culture is an offense to any thought”. This provocation led a generation of young people to think about the senses and meanings of a culture. On this occasion, Deleuze assumed himself as countercultural by refusing any cultural reserve. He understood that philosophy could not be defined only formally or methodologically but, mainly, it needed to position itself on the horizon of a given culture. When emphasizing that we could not think of the cultural dimension through the bias of subordination, dialogue, or consensus because what is behind this idea of consensus is always a fight between thought and stupidity, he highlights that: “Always thinking oneself against culture but always about culture, if possible, hoping for a culture to come” (Pellejero, 2008, p. 2).

Criticizing the intellectuals, Deleuze (2008, p. 8) said: “ I hate culture, I cannot stand it. [...] I don't believe in culture; in a way, I believe in meetings. [...] We do not meet people, but things, works”. Following Spinoza's (2007) thought, reason can be defined in two ways. First, by the effort to select and organize the good encounters, i.e., the meetings of the ways that compose with us and inspire in us joyful passions (feelings that agree with reason). Second, through the perception and understanding of common notions, i.e., the relations that enter in this composition, from where other relationships (thoughts) arise and through which new feelings are experienced, this time, actively (feelings emerged from reason)). Deleuze (2002) defends that good meetings increase our power to act. In this perspective, the formal possession of this power to act and know emerges with one principal aim. Thus, reason, instead of floating randomly through meetings, should aim to unite things and beings whose relations area directly composed with ours: “Thus reason seeks the sovereign good or 'our own advantage,' *proprium utile*, which is common to all men (V, 24-28)” (Spinoza *apud* Deleuze, 2002, p. 61). To Deleuze (2002) the, good encounters can happen with humans and non-humans that raise joyful passions and/or the passage from a passive affection regime to an active one.

In this sense, Deleuze (2002) considered that good encounters would increase our power to act and evaluate the relationship of thought with a given culture. He did not want to think about what was cultural in that scenario but to think about what escaped the cultural domain because, in this way, it

⁵ Public domain. See source site.

was possible to go beyond a given culture. Therefore, being counterculture is important to destabilize power relations because when transforming, changing, and desertifying the existing power networks, it would be possible to make the compossible and impossible in cultures and curricula emerge.

Deleuze (2008), thus, affirms that the encounters...are not only with people but with flows and forces, similar to when we go to an exhibition to seek a painting that touches and moves us. A painting exhibition or a trip to the movies, seeking, lurking for an encounter with an idea.

Problematize and experiment differently the cultural products imply encounters but, to do so, we need to look out for these encounters: a conversation, a painting, a movie, a drawing, a short story, all of them can take place in a fold, unfold, refold producing a reversion that bursts the routine and allows us to break away from the pattern, in this case, the curricula and teaching standard.

In this sense, the curricula cannot be understood Cartesianly, as a path to be followed, with definitions and determination. We understand the maze from Deleuze's problematization (1991) in his book *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque*. Leibniz uses the maze to explain the concept of space. Thus, the space is established as a maze with endless folds, as a city is composed of blocks, houses, buildings, rooms, and furniture. There are always folds within the folds, which constitute the spaces, as in origami, "[...] the art of paper folding" (Deleuze, 1991, p. 18).

Therefore, curricula, art, and culture are a crossing of ways, paths, derivations, and bifurcations to whom it is never possible to delineate only one plan or previously defined trajectory exactly because in these webs — or folds — something will not fit and will compose other plans or possible words that will lead to other trajectories and folds. For this reason, Deleuze (1991, p. 17) affirms that "[...] the smallest element in the maze is the fold[...]" because we understand that the maze is multiple, as it is folded in many ways, considered that the webs that compose it change and metamorphosizes endless times. "That is why the unfold is never the contrary of the fold, but it is the movement that goes from some folds to others" (Deleuze, 1991, p. 140).

With this said, we can imagine that multiple plans cross each other, established in these possible worlds, created, and imagined, immanent movements that allow us to fold and refold together. In this pathway and now in the context of integrated world capitalism, we can ask: amidst the massive worldwide production of specific ways of living, dressing, and loving, disseminated by *mass media* and consumed by crowds, can we think about producing singular and singularizing subjectivities that escape the dominant models?

We believe we can. About this, as Guattari and Rolnik (1986), we affirm that if contemporary subjectivation is inexorably anchored in capitalist devices, this does not mean its complete imprisonment. It is always possible to resist the present, to escape the dominant models, to appropriate oneself differently from what is daily offered by the television, the cinema, the boss, the spouse, the school, or the outdoor billboards because this development of capitalistic subjectivity brings enormous possibilities

of deviation and singularization. Summing up, it is always possible to dare to singularize yourself (Guattari & Rolnik, 1986). This way, as Guattari (1992) taught us, nothing is given. One needs to fight for new fields of possibilities, from the understanding that subjectivity is constantly produced, inventing in daily life new ways of existence, and new relationships with oneself and the world.

ABOUT SO MANY OTHER WORDS AND THE ARROWS-FORCES OF ART SIGNS MOVING TEACHERS' PROBLEMATIZATION ABOUT CURRICULA AND TEACHING

In our studies with the teachers, we sought to induce thought in the encounters with artistic signs in conversation nets because, as Deleuze (2010) explains in *Proust and Signs*, "[...] we only think when forced"! The thought can be violated by encountering cinematographic, artistic, and literary images, breaking down the clichés and the "truths" imagined for schools. The rupture of the dogmatic thought creates openings for the flow of forces of pure thought, i.e., an imageless thought that allows the collective body to create images for the curricula, the teaching, and the childhood.

Thus, we question: what forces us to think? What elements make cultures and curricula move? What forces fixate cultures and curricula, stopping them from entering a constant movement? What forces can escape a culture or a given curriculum? What can make cultures and curricula shake/destabilize to create a culture to come, a becoming culture? Questioning does not mean adaptation of representations but a work of thought that questions educational and curricula policies, constantly throwing new and disquieting questions that, when pointing out contradictions, exercise arguing and confrontation of ideas.

In one of the meetings, the triggering element for the conversation network was Manoel de Barros's literature in the book *Exercícios de ser criança*. From Barros's work, the teachers were invited to problematize the current legislation, analyzing the (im)possibility of materializing a national democratic and participative base, as well as the relation and impact of *Base Nacional Comum Curricular* (BNCC-National Curriculum Framework) for teachers' education and work in school daily lives. The teachers point out the difficulty of finding spaces and times to dialogue and to plan their actions collectively. They criticized the lack of public exams for teachers and the policy of hiring temporary teachers and transferring, which hinders the establishment of an organized collective body. They questioned the large-scale evaluation policies and the demands concerned security protocols. However, they indicated some escape and lifelines for schools:

So, we are always trying to seek new forms to do differently. We seek to change when we perceive that things are not working. We have to adapt to the children's reality. To reach each one, seeking the best for their lives. Children can surprise us a lot. We are on rotation, leaving the remote teaching towards the hybrid model, which includes restrictions and security protocols, rules, and norms. Nevertheless, we must remember that children spent a period at home and came back surprising us.

In nets of conversation and solidarity, the teachers questioned the protocols and the norms thought without the participation of those that make school every day. They criticized the proposed plans without students' involvement and pointed out that the events and daily relationships create fabrications and curricula inventions.

The images shown in these meetings made us reflect beyond our possibilities. As a teacher, we can always dare in our teaching work, and this also makes us think about the students: how do we let them have the freedom to express themselves? Children always invite us to go beyond and call us to observe the daily details, but we often do not join their ideas as we are stuck in the plans proposed.

As Pellejero (2008, p. 4) points out, culture exists not to be understood, nor recovered, nor inhabited, “[...]but to escape, to provoke escapes, to do something that escapes all codes: flows and non-coded elements, active and revolutionary escape lines” It is a throwing of darts because only then it is possible to enact devices of resistance and creation.

In the meetings with the schools, we mapped a plurality of viewpoints in which the different relationships are not reduced to oppositions but to possible solutions with different positions in dispute and processes of negotiation and differentiation. Therefore, culture no longer represents

[...] the sum of objective assumptions of an image of thought that prevents us from asking what it means to think and appears as an adventure of the involuntary, which interlinks a sensibility, a memory, and, soon, a thought, with all acts of violence and cruelties needed to trace a new people of thinkers and give rise to the spirit (Pellejero, 2008, p. 6).

Rolnik (2015) presents us with two of the multiple experiences we do in the world, and that subjectivity is willing to apprehend. The first is based on perception because we live experiences by associating them with our codes and representations. This perception allows us to give meaning and establish communication and sociability. However, this perception is not the only one to conduct our existence; several other ways to apprehend the world operate simultaneously, establishing our subjectivity. Another type of experience that subjectivity does is the power around us, which moves the world as a living body. These forces produce effects on our bodies. Such effects consist of another way of seeing and feeling what happens in each moment.

Deleuze and Guattari (1992, p. 194) call these effects percepts and affects. The percepts and affects that cross our bodies boost the constant process of recreating ourselves and our surroundings because they trigger disquiets and destabilization. However, they cannot be represented, so they do not fit the current cultural cartography, risking it. The affections “[...] overflow the power of those permeated by them”.

The short films with their arts, as in Manoel de Barros with their poetics, created sensation blocs that allowed teachers to move their thoughts and fabricate possibilities for the schools. What percepts and affects allow displacements in cultures and curricula? What effects do the meeting with

images (literary and cinematographic) provoke in the conversation nets with the teachers? Do they allow new cultural and curricula movements and the invention of impossible worlds?⁶

This sharing of experiences has enriched our practice. It is good to hear teachers' reports and their daily experiences, improving the formation process. As we have started to think with Manoel de Barros about the water that flows outside the sieve. As teachers, we began to give specific importance to the children's voices. We are sad to see the context of the current society, so we need to value our daily work and share more about what we do.

The effect of art signs in the conversation webs with the teachers reverberate the force of collective action, create bonds and groups, movements that touch and affect us.

Manoel de Barros's literature calls us to the absurd. I was thinking: instead of keeping this expectation that the student will get things right, will do what we planned, to give them a vote of confidence to the student. Because the vote of confidence is for them to do what we want, what we think... And if we think about the possibility of creating absurd with the children? It is very important to allow movements of absurd [...]. To let children surprise us.

With Rolnik (2015), we understand the need to problematize the reactive and conservative macro and micropolitical forces and seek to produce cultural changes and displacements in the networks of power, affections, and subjectivities, because this is the only way we can think about new ways to populate the world. Populate the world with art makes it more joyful, colorful, pulsating, and wishful because art and culture potentialize new curricula to establish a people that is lacking.

Therefore, we need to activate the displacement of the reactive micropolitics of the inconsistent colonial capitalism to create a new concept of politics that would be a micropolitical action in its active sense— "[...] a new way to decipher reality, to situate the problems, and to act from them critically" (Rolnik, 2015, p. 10).

In the formative encounters with the teachers, from Manoel de Barros's work, the teachers exemplified some movements that work as an active force and a countercultural resistance, such as the campaign *Aqui já tem Currículo* ("There is already a curriculum here"), created by the *Associação Nacional de Pesquisas em Educação* (Anped- National Association of Education Research), during the release of the first version of *Base Nacional Comum Curricular* (BNCC- National Curriculum Framework). Teachers from all over Brazil joined the campaign and sent their experiences and curriculum compositions collectively created in their schools and local communities.

⁶ The worlds are called impossible when their sequences and continuities diverge. They cannot coexist and gather in a single series. The completely different versions are said to be impossible. They cannot coexist, be conjugated, mixed, interpenetrated, and relate with a single series because they exclude themselves (Deleuze, 1991).

Another example of active micro-political action debated in the conversations, from the reading of Manoel de Barros, was the movement of high schoolers when more than two hundred schools from São Paulo were occupied to protest against a plan to reorganize the state public system (Pelbart, 2016).

This gesture was transformed into power and collective intelligence because the "intolerable," such as the commodification of education, the current power relationships, and the worn-out ways to think about education, learning, and evaluation processes, were questioned. Thus, other possibilities were contemplated and wished: the (un)thinkable started to be collectively imagined.

Rolnik (2018) highlights that we always oscillate between active and reactive micropolitics. Therefore, we must combat the reactive tendencies within ourselves and our actions and relations. A life's work — an existence ethics. To do so, we need to carefully listen to the affects and percepts responsible for destabilization because the action of desire lies the opening for new possibilities and for creation. In this movement, the virtual world that inhabits the subjectivities updates itself.

I wanted to share what happened with me this week that is very similar to what we are saying: I did a reinterpretation activity with my students of Alfredo Volpi 's work "Boat with birds". When it was time to present, the greatest concern was to show the students' work. So, I set a panel. The letters were not too perfect. And when I showed the panel at school, people were concerned with the perfection of the panel and not the students' mental work. That hurt me a lot, and I was very upset. So, I think we have to rethink our way of working. A suggestion for the other girls in the formation: to enact the students' work and not perfection. There we have a little of our practice, fight, and sensibility.

In the conversation networks with the teachers, we sought to destabilize, through artistic signs, the sensorial-motor arc, making the teachers fabulate new possibilities for the schools. Fabulation goes through becomings that ask for a way. Fabulating is never to speak in one's name. It is to talk through another, in the name of minorities, multiple nomads that populate them, and with whom it populates the world. "To fabulate is to convey the powers that the becomings will raise on us and that is devoid of language" (Lapoujade, 2017, p. 282). The effect of this policy of desire action is a becoming of subjectivity and its immediate relational field.

When questioned, the teachers said that the most important in this pandemic moment to strengthen the collective were encounters, friendship, solidarity, and conversation networks. We have been relying on the possibility of following the processes of collectively creating new images of schools created with the power of the intensive movement of different cultures and curricula practiced and experienced in the schools' daily life. Such a collective and inventive force states the difference as a multiplicity and engenders singularities, exploring the power of the nomadic thought, a thought in constant becoming. It is a way of thinking that seeks to fabricate new life possibilities, other ways of

existence, a life aesthetic, an ethics because the movements and singularities do not wish to be the idea of a single world (Deleuze, 2008).

The revolutionary becomings, boosted by the outbursts of affects and percepts in/of encounters with images and artistic signs, forcing us to problematize and reinvent reality. These are moments in which the collective imagination is triggered to create resistance and new ways of existing, seeking new alliances and new senses for the cultures, the curricula, and teaching. As Rolnik (2015) points out, it is not enough to accept this responsibility as a citizen; one needs to assume the responsibility as a living being to act in the sense of active micropolitics. This condition turns us into agents to create forms of collective existence.

The short film *The Other Me* (École Supérieure des Métiers Artistiques, 2020) was also used as a triggering element of a meeting with the teachers. The film allowed us to think about the routines, how much they cannot robotize, and how we subtly follow the logic of culture and or a curriculum thought by the edicts of their funding agencies, not listening to the collective desires and abdicating the power of joy, so crucial for our lives. As Carvalho, Silva, and Delboni (2020) state, images promote changes in the subjective forms (from within), granting singularities that, when shared, make thoughts shake. “[...] They foresee and glimpse what, we can, with some effort, image to have seeing” (Samain, 2018, p. 35).

Thus, teachers talk about their affections with the images of the film and show how much we need pauses, breaths, fabulation, and contemplation — in the Guattari sense — which means breathing together, thinking together, pulsing together, following hand in hand, seeking recognition of what we do collectively, valuing our inventions, our choices and, mostly, sharing our differences. In this movement, we imagine the possibilities amidst the power of complex and collective action, creating ways to live with more joy and inventiveness, and renovating the images of culture, teaching, and curricula. In this sense, the teachers state:

I think the short film was very interesting. It made me think about the mechanic work in/at teaching. That constant daily work, teaching the same content in the same rhythm. And when we are faced with another opportunity, another possibility. The possibility of finding another world. I thought it was interesting that the character had the opportunity of returning, but he didn't want to. And during every moment of the trajectory, his suitcase was with him. In teaching, this is very strong: my material, my locker, that content, those activities you work on every year. We carry all that with us and don't want to throw anything away. He left his shirt, and the jacket, he left things little by little, small things. This process of gradually letting some things that we think we need or that we will need along the way is very interesting. His decision to leave the elevator and leave the suitcase, as if he was now free to dare and see other possibilities. This scene really touched me in a teaching sense, as sometimes we leave some habits behind and allow inventive teaching to the children by listening to them. Sometimes, I go through my locker and throw some things away. But, I need more.

What is needed? As Caetano Veloso thinks, inspired by the Portuguese saying, “navigating is necessary, living is not”. Life and curricula are established in the immanence plan that does not fit into plans and unchangeable and inflexible rules. The curricula and cultures move in the folds of differentiation processes. Among the networks of powers and knowledges, there are wishing lines that escape, opening flows to move affections and intensities.

I was a bit taken by the little boat. At the moment he enters the boat and lets himself go through the river. But, before that, he stays in that movement of entering or not in the boat, just like the movement of going into the elevator or not. These inter-places of life. Or this, or that, the going and coming.

A teacher provokes us to think about the dichotomies in our everyday lives, as well as the ties of some norms, which hinder the processes of creation and invention:

I also wanted to think about the shadow that follows us. What are the shadows that pull us to our teaching and our lives? What do you think, sometimes, work as shadows in our teaching work? I was thinking about when the shadow bothers the other. The shadow hits the compartment and messes around someone else's work.

The teacher's problematization made the group question the power devices that produce dogmatic teaching. It allowed us to think of students' inventive and creative resistances to teachers' dogmatic teaching. These affective statements worked as shadows inviting us to think and create other possibilities for education, cultures, and curricula. Contemporary subjectivation is inexorably grounded on capitalist devices, which does not mean its absolute imprisonment. It is always possible to resist the present, escape from the dominant models, to appropriate ourselves differently from what is daily offered by television, cinema, the boss, the spouse, the school, or the outdoor billboard because “[...] this development of capitalistic subjectivity brings immense possibilities of deviation and singularization” (Guattari & Rolnik, 1986). Summing up, it is always possible to dare to singularize yourself (Deleuze & Guattari, 1997; Guattari & Rolnik, 1986) and/or resist and experiment with other ways of being in life and the curricula.

Artistic materiality in literature, cinema, music, or painting, would be the one that, in both senses of aesthetic, meet, “[...] they are so mixed up to the point that the sensible being reveals itself in the artwork while the artwork appears as experimentation” (Deleuze, 1988, p. 108). Therefore, the aesthetic does not seek the background of the artistic object because they do not wish to answer what this is but what it can move in the body and the experience, thus the imperative experimental character that Deleuze insists on affirming that: “[...] it is necessary for the conditions of experience, in general, to

become conditions of real experience; the artwork, on the other hand, really appears as experimentation” (Deleuze, 1974, p. 262).

Thus, in its relationship with education in new forms of experimentation, art can become a counterculture. Therefore, culture no longer represents

[...] the sum of objective assumptions of an image of thought that prevents us from asking what thinking means, and appears as an adventure of the involuntary, which unchains a sensibility, an aesthetic, and, soon, a thought with all necessary violences and cruelties to delineate a people of thinkers and give rise to the spirit (Pellejero, 2008, p. 6).

Culture does not exist to be understood, nor recovered, nor inhabited, as Pellejero (2008, p. 4) points out “[...] but to escape it, to provoke escapes, active and revolutionary escaping lines, lines of absolute decoding that oppose culture”. Therefore, in the encounters with the teachers, we witnessed the problematization of school routines, teachers’ procedures, the relationship between education, culture, and art, and the need to seek other possibilities to create inventive curriculum movements. Summing up, the search for other ways for school and teaching to exist, which imply movements of deterritorialization and agency of resistant devices, is understood as creation because every creation is an act of resistance.

Finally, culture in school is understood not as erudition, collective soul, or goods but as an act of resistance that makes itself countercultural when questioning the bases of the social system and the current political-economical capitalism, which establishes the schooling processes.

NOT TO CONCLUDE... AS WE SEEK THE OASIS AND FLOWER, DETERRITORIALIZING DESERTS

In the work *The Transparency Society*, Han (2017) clearly and pessimistically shows the relation of contemporary culture, referring to the control of life and/or other possible words. He argues that the current economic system needs the existence of a similitude between the social relations built by the individuals and social groups, considering that neoliberalism does not work if people act differently because, from the digital social networks, several quantifiable data is produced which allows us to see tendencies and reactions, resulting in algorithmic operations that equate and dominate individuals and social groups.

Thus, according to Han (2017), individuals and social groups are transformed into dividable beings, a mass that is an agglomerate of data, i.e., globalization demands the overcoming of differences between people because the most similar they are the fastest will be the circulation of capital, goods, and information. The tendency is to make everyone similar as consumers.

Hence, mass culture becomes something inevitable because the desacralization of the world guides our activities to market value, disregarding any production that does aim to become a standardized good to be consumed. The transparency violence described by Han as a digital panopticon reflects a

pessimistic political perspective. How to become oasis and flowers deterritorializing this curriculum deserts? Would culture, art, and education be encapsulated in the capitalist system of our globalized world: Han (2017, p. 69-70) leaves an opening when stating that “[...] total control destroys the freedom of action and leads, in the end, to uniformity and, thus, nowadays new configurations are demanded, even in public spaces shared in the cities”. In this sense, we agree and defend the optimistic understanding that there are agencies that affirm life and place us in even more limited existential conditions. If different ways to produce agencies coexist, we need to perceive those that enclose our vital drive, a creative impulse that allows us to escape the automatisms that conform us to bare life (Agamben, 2015).

Taken as power, life and cultural processes cannot be conceived from establishing an ontologically essentialized life in identification and homogenization processes because life always overflows. Therefore, we should not ask, "What is it?" because we would have an essentialist perspective through an identity bias. We need to break away from the questions: "What is culture?", "What is art?", "What is curriculum?", "What is school?", "What is life?" and ask about the relations and possibilities of life and their effects, by the traces through which we are delineating the homogenization and standardization processes or the traces that indicate singularization processes and the affirmation of plurality — a bare life or a life?

So, not to conclude, because there is no recipe, only possibilities in the relational education and culture as *counterculture*, we ask: what deterritorialization lines, lines of active and revolutionary escape have we been creating in our meetings with the artistic signs that permeate the cultures and curricula in schools? Have we been finding escaping lines with so many policies to regulate education: Have we been creating with the teachers new and possible images for the cultures and curricula? Have we been placing cultures and curricula in movement? Have we been creating forces to resist the images of schools and curricula that asphyxiate teachers in measurement scales, indicators of performance profiles, and good conducts? Have we been transgressing these regulation forces, creating collective resistance to build a culture to come?

In the encounters with the teachers, having artistic signs as thought triggers, like arrows shot in the desert to be populated, teachers create connections and agencies that act in the collective bodies as a revolutionary, subversive force, which creates the desire for new experiences and collective creations overflowing. Even with all the sad moments the world faces, the teachers collectively problematized the precariousness of teachers' work in this pandemic scenario, in which the educational inequalities get even more visible. However, in fighting movements, they persist, affirming the sensitive life that pulses with the desire for a better world for all. They deny the imposition of a dogmatic education inspired by an arbitrary hegemonic culture, asserting a *countercultural* education.

REFERENCES

- Agamben, G. (2015). *Profanações* (S. J. Assmann, Trans.). São Paulo: Boitempo.
- Barros, M. de (2013). *Biblioteca Manoel de Barros*. São Paulo: Leya [Collection].
- Brasil. (2018). *Base Nacional Comum Curricular*. Brasília: MEC.
- Carvalho, J. M.; Silva, S. K.; & Delboni, T. M. Z. G. F. (2018). Currículos como corpos coletivos. *Currículo sem Fronteiras*, 18, 801-818.
- Carvalho, J. M.; Silva, S. K.; & Delboni, T.M.Z.G.F. (2020). *Estética da arte de educar*. Curitiba: CRV.
- Deleuze, G. (1974). *Lógica do sentido* (L. R. S. Fortes, Trans.). São Paulo: Editora Perspectiva.
- Deleuze, G. (1988). *Diferença e repetição* (L. B. L. Orlandi & R. Machado, Trans.). Rio de Janeiro: Graal.
- Deleuze, G. (1991). *A dobra: Leibniz e o Barroco* (L. B. L. Orlandi, Trans.). Campinas: Papyrus.
- Deleuze, G. (1992). *Conversações*. (P.P. Pelbart, Trans.). Rio de Janeiro: Editora 34.
- Deleuze, G. (2008). *Abecedário de Gilles Deleuze* [Interview with Claire Parnet]. (P.-A. Boutang, Ed.). Available: <http://www.bibliotecanomade.com>
- Deleuze, G. (2010). *Proust e os signos* (2nd ed., A. C. Piquet & R. Machado, Trans.). Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1992). *O que é Filosofia?* (P. P. Pelbart, Trans.). São Paulo: Editora 34.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1995). Um só ou vários lobos? In G. Deleuze, & F. Guattari *Mil platôs: capitalismo e esquizofrenia* (Vol. 1, pp. 39-52, A. Guerra Neto, Trans.). Rio de Janeiro: São Paulo: Editora 34.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari (1996). Micropolítica e segmentaridade. In G. Deleuze, & F. Guattari. *Mil platôs: capitalismo e esquizofrenia*. (Vol. 3, pp. 83-115, S. Rolnik, Trans.). Rio de Janeiro: Editora 34, 1996.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1997). Tratado de nomadologia: a máquina de guerra. In G. Deleuze, & F. Guattari. *Mil platôs: capitalismo e esquizofrenia* (pp. 11-110, P. P. Pelbart, Trans.). Rio de Janeiro: Editora 34.
- Ecole Supérieure des Métiers Artistiques. (2020). *The other me*. [YouTube]. Disponível: <https://youtu.be/xJs1Z0unEvQ>.
- Guattari, F. (1992). *Caosmose: um novo paradigma estético* (A. L. Oliveira & e L. C. Leão, Trans.). Rio de Janeiro: Ed. 34.
- Guattari, F., & Rolnik, S. (1986). *Micropolítica: cartografias do desejo*. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- Han, B. C. (2017). *A sociedade da transparência* (E.P. Giachini, Trans.). Petrópolis: Vozes, 2017.
- Lapoujade, D. (2017). *As existências mínimas* (H. S. Lencastre, Trans.). São Paulo: n-1 Edições.
- Pelbart, P. P. (2016). *Carta aberta aos secundaristas* (Série Pandemia). São Paulo: n-1 Edições.
- Pellejero, E. (2008). A ideia de cultura na filosofia de Gilles Deleuze. *Diacrítica*, (12).

Rolnik, S. (2015). *A hora da micropolítica* (Série Pandemia). São Paulo: n-1 Edições.

Rolnik, S. (2018). *Esferas da insurreição: notas para uma vida não cafetinada*. São Paulo: n-1 Edições.

Spinoza, B. (2007). *Ética*. (T. T. Silva, Trad.). Belo Horizonte: Autêntica.

Samain, E. (2012). *Como pensam as imagens*. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp.

Submitted: July 21, 2022

Approved: December 16, 2022

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

Janete Magalhães Carvalho – Project coordinator, active participation in the data analysis, and final text review.

Sandra Kretli da Silva – Project sub-coordinator, active participation in the data analysis, and final text review.

DECLARATION OF CONFLICTING INTERESTS

As autoras declaram que não há conflito de interesse com o presente artigo.

The data production for this article is part of a study approved by the Ethics Committee, number 3.733.191, from Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo.