

AESTHETIC EDUCATION AND SENSITIVITY FROM THE THOUGHT OF FRIEDRICH SCHILLER

*Graciele Maria Coelho de Andrade Gomes.¹
Mário de Faria Carvalho.²*

ABSTRACT: In this article, we reflect on the aesthetic formation of man from the dialogue established between Friedrich Schiller and the Duke of Augustenburg, what we know today as the letters of Schiller. We try to problematize some theoretical assumptions present in these letters regarding the subject and how this construction shapes subjectivity from aesthetic sensations. The objective of this research is to understand the (de) appreciation of the sensitive and the (dis) equilibrium between human nature, sensibility and aesthetic education of man, with Schiller's letters as a universe of reflection. It is a research of a bibliographic nature, of an exploratory-descriptive nature. The premises presented in the present study point out that the questions raised by the philosopher are still present to the understanding of how aesthetic formation dialogues with the constitution of subjectivities, morality and, above all, with the appreciation of sensitivities as mobilizers of human existence.

Keywords: Education. Aesthetics. Sensitivities. Schiller.

EDUCAÇÃO ESTÉTICA E SENSIBILIDADE A PARTIR DO PENSAMENTO DE FRIEDRICH SCHILLER

RESUMO: Neste ensaio refletimos sobre a formação estética do homem a partir do diálogo estabelecido entre Friedrich Schiller e o Duque de Augustenburg, o que conhecemos hoje como as cartas de Schiller. Busca-se problematizar alguns pressupostos teóricos presentes nestas cartas a respeito da pessoa e de como este constrói sua subjetividade a partir de sensações estéticas. É assumido, na presente investigação, o objetivo de compreender a (des)valorização do sensível e o

¹ Mestranda em Educação Contemporânea - Universidade Federal de Pernambuco (2018). Especialista em Educação em Direitos Humanos - Universidade Federal de Pernambuco (2015). Licenciada em Desenho e Plástica - Universidade Federal de Pernambuco (2009). Licenciada em Pedagogia - Centro Universitário Internacional (2017). Membro do Grupo de Pesquisas Transdisciplinares sobre Estética, Educação e Cultura (UFPE-CAA/CNPq). Possui experiência/interesse nas áreas de Arte, Educação, Educação em Direitos Humanos e Estética.

² Doutor em Sciences Sociales - Université René Descartes - Paris V (2008). Diplôme d'études Approfondies (DEA) em Ciências Sociais - Université de Caen Basse Normandie (2001). Graduação em Design - Ecole d'Architecture de Grenoble (1996), Graduação em Design - Universidade Federal de Pernambuco (1992). Professor Associado Nível I do Núcleo de Design e Comunicação e Professor Permanente do Programa de Pós-graduação em Educação Contemporânea, ambos da Universidade Federal de Pernambuco / Centro Acadêmico do Agreste. Pesquisador do CEAQ - Centre d'Etude sur l'Actuel et le Quotidien, da Associação Nacional Ylê Setí do Imaginário e do Núcleo Interdisciplinar de Pesquisas sobre o Imaginário. Líder do Grupo de Pesquisas Transdisciplinares sobre Estética, Educação e Cultura (UFPE-CAA/CNPq) e Vice-líder do Grupo de Pesquisa Movimentos Sociais, Educação e Diversidade na América Latina (UFPE-CAA/CNPq). Orienta estudos sobre: Interculturalidades, Artes e Educação. Interessa-se por pesquisas que reflitam sobre Expressões Artísticas, Cultura Popular, Estética, Sensibilidades, Barroco, Pós-Modernidade, Estudos Pós-Estruturalistas, Teoria maffesoliniana e do Imaginário e Gênero.

(des)equilíbrio entre natureza humana, sensibilidade e educação estética do homem, tendo as cartas de Schiller como universo de reflexão. Trata-se de uma pesquisa de natureza bibliográfica, de caráter exploratório-descritivo. As premissas apresentadas no presente estudo apontam que as questões suscitadas pelo filósofo continuam atuais à compreensão sobre como a formação estética dialoga com a constituição das subjetividades, da moral e, principalmente, com a valorização das sensibilidades enquanto mobilizadoras da existência humana.

Palavras-chave: Educação. Estética. Sensibilidades. Schiller.

INTRODUCTION

Thinking about an intersection between education and subjectivity translates itself by the challenge of reflecting on sensibility as a path into those fields. The collective imaginary – layered into the static perspective, supposedly neutral and hermetic about the notion of the truth – translates human capacity of feeling and make sense of things as an eccentric aspect. Plural and unfinished perspectives of world are subjugated by the increasing positive rationality.

These assumptions take shapes in several spaces and speeches that surround human formation. On the other hand, those debates reflect the failure in trying to comprehend the diversity of reality by a rational-binary perspective of the world. Considering the imperative of overcoming pure rationalism, we consider in this study the necessity of new paths in personal formation that stimulates the perception of world by a “sensitivity reason”,³ as Michel Maffesoli (1998) suggests.

In this sense, we conjecture and search to present in this article an outline of what could be considered a critical valorization of the rational as a permanent perspective and an influence into the foundation of personal perception of reality. Therefore, we start from a reflection about the aesthetic education of humans, and, in that way, we discuss some possibilities of this route from the philosophy of Friedrich Shiller (1759-1805).

The discussion of this philosopher about aesthetic and politics, which are not necessarily leveled by the Kantian perspective of duty, based new horizons for discussions and intersections between aesthetic and sensibility. They elevate art to a philosopher science capable of shaping the human soul (SÜSSEKIND, 2011). Rising personal free-will to a tuned and balanced with your subjectivity – status established to the extent that this contemplates the beauty from your transited spirit being – discussing the person and the reach to several sensibilities by the self-symbolic projection. The debate becomes pertinent in the search by comprehending the building of aesthetic person and the subjectivity of the world, aspects that fragilize itself by the everlasting demands of a mechanical rationality, still presents in contemporaneity.

The extreme rationalism has been translating the image of a person branded by the selfishness and by the oversight of the other. It's about reinsuring personal impulses – which are antagonists to the consideration of the subjectivity – as a first ethic. Therefore, the selfishness, the technic and the rationality positivists unfeasible several sensible experiences and deny the possibility of the existence who prior the sense.

This depreciation of the sensitive in order to overvalue rationality, as stated before, appears cyclery and it was already object of reflections since the XVIII century. Friedrich Shiller, the philosopher to whom we appeal as theoretical resource for this study, was worried about this phenomenon. He ensured that the sense-being was the key to his proposals (HAUSER, 1995). His concerns about the disregard of the sensitive by the person joined by the historical violence – referring to the French

³ All the quoted books and authors were read in Portuguese and freely translated to English

Revolution – end up being the core of the dialogue between him and the Augustenburg's Duque, known as the Schiller's letters nowadays.

The letters showed aspects connected to the time-being society, end of XVIII century, when they were written, which are close to questions lived in contemporaneity. In those letters the art appear as a mean to reflect on social problems, built by an aesthetic education, which are objected by the full training of being, and that would occur by the balance between opposite feelings and, at the same time, elemental to the human-being, which are the impulses, formal and sensitive. Aesthetics would become, then, what is possible to be experienced and built by the art, the harmonious recreation of two impulses connected by the human nature.

The eternal appeal to positivism, the pragmatic and the technique, where there's no space for emotion and subjectivities, feelings are associated to expendable. Antagonistic, let's see the return of sensibility, the balance between reason and emotion, believing this is a more accurate definition of what is, indeed, the human capacity of present happiness. The subjective/emotional world has an intimate relation of the construction of an aesthetic perception of things, made us reflect on sensitive and affectionate experiences lived in our daily routines.

The rationality that we were – and still are – subjected made us perceive the world under a negligent perspective. The strict rational discourse does not allow us to imagine, live it and feel it in a plural and ludic way. The supposed impartiality and the distance from aesthetic experiences in the daily bases should not gain, undoubtedly, more power.

Based on those assumptions that we built the necessity of thinking an aesthetic education. This notion allows us to think about a free and full field being. Therefore, emerging from this perspective, this disquisition assumes as problematic research the following question: what are the theoretical premises of aesthetic education and sensibility presented by the letters? Therefore, others secondary questions joined the elected problematic, such as: is it possible to reflect, based on Shiller's letters, the (de)valuation of sensitive and the aesthetic education? Which questions are raised by the dyad of rationality/sensitivity in the author's philosophy? Thus, the main objective of the present dissertation is to reflect, from Shiller's letters, the (de)valuation of the sensitivity and the aesthetic education.

We propose, consequently, the following specific objectives: discussing aesthetic concepts from Shiller's letters, and propose a critical-aesthetic debate, about the (de)valuation of the sensitive in contemporary society.

The present disquisition of studying education issues and the (de)valuation of sensitive, based on the epistolary aesthetic philosophy of Shiller, is justified, primarily, by the necessity of balancing, questioning the rational versus the sensitive, thinking the sensitivity as a path to overcome the rational paradigm of human existence, highlighting the world comprehension by the subjectivities and sensitivity.

AESTHETIC AND SENSIBILITY IN FRIEDRICH SHILLER'S LETTERS

Reflexing on the space/time that Friedrich Shiller's experienced his life, considering the such as agitated political moment as the French Revolution (1789-1799), lead us to comprehend the philosopher uncomfortable about the depreciation of the sensitivity and, therefore, his defense of the reconciliation between rationality and sensibility as a path to human ennobling.

This reconciliation would be a reflected condition as an infinity task, never finished into the process of a person formation, this process, often, per Shiller (2002, p. 36): "rises below and beyond to take by violence what in his opinion he is unjustly refused". The philosopher comprehends that the overlap of sensibility by irrationality/strength as a result of the awaken calling for his condition of: "long

indolence, [...] illusion inflicted on oneself”. About this condition Veiga (1994), alludes that the person, searching for autonomy and plenitude, would revoke himself and his subjectivity from an alienation and a parted way of living.

Schillerian assumptions indicates that the comprehension of being is made by the understanding of the importance of his own nature in congruence with the recognition of yours mixed nature, perceived by distinct and elementary impulses of the own human condition, being them: the sensitive impulse and the formal impulse (SHILLER, 2002). Those impulses ground the tension between reason and sensibility as human constructors. This conflict is a present part of the search process to human fullness, on how the externality is conceived and, specially, about those who submits to an outsider reality, the law of necessity.

This path makes up the mixed nature of the person. The recognition of being a part of your own historical and social trajectory, assumed in permanent dialogue. Trying to understand the human being, aesthetic can conduct the thinking flow. Under a Schillerian look, it is the way you build the world objective and subjective, stablishing what Silva (2001) denominates as a theory based in evolution phases, which seeks, from beauty, found a free being in a balanced state, in harmony with both sensibility and rationality essence, as said by Suzuki (2014). According to Shiller,

Man, therefore, has first to receive the matter of activity or reality (that the supreme intelligence draws from itself), and he receives it, by way of perception, as something existing outside him in space, or as something alternating in time. This matter which alternates in him is accompanied by his self which never alternates - and always remains itself in every alternation, that is, to make of perceptions the experience, the unity of knowledge, and of each one of the species of phenomenon in time the law of all times, this is the prescription given to it by its rational nature. In so far as it is modified, it exists; insofar as it remains unchangeable, it exists. Man, therefore, representing in his perfection, would be the enduring unity which remains eternally the same in the tides of modification (Schiller, 2002: 60-61).

According to Shiller, the sensitive nature of a person comes from the reality and the amplification of her perception about what is visible or not. It is ‘to be in us’, not ‘us on time’. It is transforming to world what it was only a shape. This route awakens the humanity provisions and constitutes other worlds, sensation affirms about the person in certain moment and in certain way of looking (BARBOSA, 2004). This time notion is what Shiller (2002) denominates as state, videlicet, moment at which it joins, in a universal way, the multiplicity of people and their particularities, reach the imagination composed by the sensitive look. In that conceptual dimension the infinity nature of people overflows, people, and, state, rises “himself” and your determinations. Propositions about the coexistence between rational (person) and the mutable of state, what Shiller (2002, p. 61) says by mentioning that “the men, therefore, presented as perfection, would be the durable unit that remains eternally the same into the waves of modification” and “he only exists through modification, he exists, by remaining immutable, he exists”. In the opposite direction, the rational nature demands absolute formality. It seeks to form an outside world that allows the constitution of valid and immutable laws, breaking the sensitivity ‘logical’.

Shiller (2002) propose thinking rationality without denying sensibility, defending that this will be the tonic of human formation, and that through her the person could reach other world views, signifying it. Sensibility should come from an aesthetic formation that value human, which should develop as goal, simultaneously, sensibility and rationality from beauty. This states the importance of an aesthetic knowledge to individual formation and to overcome this positivist technique and this hermetic rationality as dictum of the way to know and recognize the world (BARBOSA, 2004).

Shiller conceives beauty as a platonic superior ideal – eternal and indivisible – that would be in a balance point between looking and experiencing (reality). The platonic beauty has reverberations in art, it constitutes and arranges different realities. He considers ideal beauty as the only reference

capable of guiding sensibility and human. He values the work of art by affirming that: “[...] beauty in the experience plan it would be by opposite, eternally dual, because in an oscillation balance can be disturbed in two different ways”. (SHILLER, 2002, p. 65). This balance proposed by aesthetic emerges like a careful fusion between two elements that mobilize the individual: the feeling and the comprehension.

Aesthetic is related to the perception of feelings. It is all that affects our perception, helps to build meaning that connects reason, experience and sensations. Your potential is into the sensitive world, for reason and beyond (SÜSSEKIND, 2011). All everyday experience is, potentially and subjectively, an aesthetic one. It is capable of challenge our understanding and build a response about what was observed or lived. Therefore, the aesthetic consolidates itself in the sensibility of being. In Shiller, it is associated to the path that lead to the ethical-sensitive improvement of the person. When you think about the superior aesthetic values – the beautiful, the ugly, the truth and others – that can instigate the emotional perception of the world in the spirit of being, the person reaches an undeniable state of freedom and becomes balanced (SÜSSEKIND, 2005).

Shiller stands for a reconstruction of the unity of human nature and reach freedom by the unification of the antagonist impulses (SÜSSEKIND, 2011), considering as noble those that awake for this possibility. Adding, yet, that in the “aesthetic state” all the citizens are free, independent. Considering that, in this state, there is an “ideal of equality”.

Involving social and political syntheses, as well as the symbolic expression of art, are traces broader than beauty and are built by human nature, being, the beauty, the essential and pure dimension of our nature. Shiller (2002, p. 141): “Only beauty make everyone happy; and all human being experiment your magic and all of them forget your own limitation”.

By the aesthetic culture, besides getting more free-will, becomes more human and reaches balance (SÜSSEKIND, 2011). For Shiller, it’s by beauty that you reach out free-will. This one allow the emerge of the idea of humanity and bound the unique and the multiplicity, the individual to the specie and the subjective to objective. We can comprehend that all of beauty combinations are influenced (SILVA, 2001) to realize that, in Shiller’s view, beauty is action, unlike the theoretical Kantian’s philosophy.

We have the beauty as the unification of sensitive and formal nature (SÜSSEKIND, 2011), as a rational comprehension of the impression by reading about form. Therefore: “[...] the beauty allows men a passage from sensation to thinking” (SHILLER, 2002, p. 96). It’s about the ideal of beauty of being, what made fulfil himself and what releases him from the controversy between the spirit precision and the shortage of matter. Thus, freedom is synonymous of being fulfilled and founded in your subjectivity, from which the person is her own fundament, permanently, and only by performing the set of their two natures – rational and sensitivity – can found full existence.

As a result, the aesthetic experience, by giving free-will to person, shows itself as a fertile to knowledge and, allows, from the taste to reach full subjectivity. We think, just like Barbosa (2005), that the taste can support the morality by eliminating extreme obstacles that would avoid logical determination of the will. Once we consider what Shiller (2002) called physical freedom, only following will. Moral freedom, new definition for will, with prudence, it’ll reach this path of contemplation and living.

In this sense, the author presents the concept of a playful impulse that, according to him, comes from aesthetic formation. It is an element of character outside of man and art, being a junction of these aspects. He stated:

Therefore, the playful impulse, in which both act together, will exert on the soul a coercion of a character both moral and physical; therefore, since it suppresses all

contingency, it will also abolish all coercion and liberate the human being on both the physical and moral plane (SCHILLER, 2002, p. 61).

Therefore, we think about the taste as a particularity of people considered to be sensitive and that they are able to control their impulses. It's in this capacity of keeping it firm and to contain oneself, that rationally bloom the free will and that, according to Barbosa (2005), drawn the nuances of Shiller about this act/power. The author defines this notion as aesthetic free-will, being for this culture that sensibility touches people and this one recomposes herself face the empty will based on resulted sense of her human condition.

It assumes aesthetics, allied to individual and collective subjectivities, as a revealing essence of realities lived by different subjects, including processes that explain their place in the world. Therefore, the sensitive approach of artistic representations is an important element to the understanding of everyday life, the relations established between different subjects, and even the composition of images about certain societies and about the relations of power established in them.

Shiller (2002) distinguished personal subjectivity and your existence based in a mutual arrangement with yourselves. By recognizing the fact that the person is substantiated in herself, it was not possible trying to be what it's not in experience. Therefore, we are, as well, what we feel, without any space for trying "to be out of yourselves". Thereby, the person would comprehend her "sensitive self" and her "formal self". It's by the interaction between those two impulses that Shiller (2002) alludes the third one, the one that would be capable of bringing harmony to those mentioned before. It's about the "ludic impulse", something exterior to the person and to the art and that emerges trough aesthetic. The ludic, according to Nunes (2006, p. 55), "releases the men from nature exterior judge and from exclusivist rational demands", being a free force from a spiritual order that harmonizes the subject that is in the sense with form which is the action of thinking.

Thus, the aesthetic education of person comes from de balance of the presents impulses of our dual nature, placed by Shiller in his letters about aesthetic. The author thinks the use of the aesthetic resources into the personal formation, from the intermediation of beauty, in which the work of art is the instrument of improvement and where she's seem as in constant transforming being, who learn and resignify the world. It's about a full being made of pleasure, that lives from his feelings and the senses built by and in the own being, in you refine, that transcends you technical and rational condition.

THE SENSITIVITY RETURN: AESTHETIC FORMATION OF HUMAN AND OTHERS SHILLERIAN NUANCES

Going deeper into the discussion brought by the fifty and sixty Shiller's letter, which bring it up the disconnection or the lack of entanglement established between the State and the venerable and marginalized portion of society. Observing the reflection of a nasty treatment in our daily society, based on a hegemonic perspective of the world, capitalist and patriarchal. This relationship, couldn't allow human being to trace a less bitter path than the one he's trace, neither allow the law to be as not welcome by the population as they are now, predictable outcoming from the social discrepancies allowed by the State – actually, poorly understood, as they were not built thinking about the multiplicity of society and the financial under favored.

Therefore, the society – branded by depreciation of what is connected to subjectivity – tend to reinsure selfness instead of virtuosities such as love and altruism (HAUSSER, 1995). The formation of sensitivity, due the aesthetic path, becomes a possible perspective for reviewing society coexistence. It provides new perspectives to deal with the problems resulted by the rational-binary model imposed.

Contributes with the comprehension of multiples human identities, as founded in Schillerian letters, in which the author alludes the human-being as a savage, barbarian or domesticated. The savage human-being would be the one in whom the emotion reigns the principles, that elevates nature and despise the art. The barbarian corresponds to the one who despises in order to fulfill your principles and disgraces nature and sensitivity. And, ultimately, the domesticated human-being translates as the one who can rein his own will, honoring freedom and it's a friend of nature (SHILLER, 2002).

Each human-being is inserted and participates in your social context in a different way. Perspectives of the world and the way desire emerges in each individual tracks this path. The paradigm of being together, certainly, lies in the overlap of reason and in the prioritization on personal will and desire from the harmonious and sensitive collective coexistence (HAUSER, 1995). The will, according to Kant (2007, p.67), is the “faculty of determining yourself acting in conformity with the representation of certain law” and, therefore, “the will is not, thus, submitted to law, but is in a way that is also legislate itself, and, precisely because of it, submitted to law, (that it itself can be considered author).” (KANT, 2007, p. 72). Trough Kant (2007) we glimpse the rational acting – or the moral acting – as premises to “be in the world”. The Kantian reason, as a guide to the propulsive will to success in an ethical perspective of life, according to an Aristotelian thinking, founding in sensibilities a possibility of convergence between what is commensurable and what is connected to subjectivity.

Considering moral, built outwardly of person, and that the moral person is the one who act from your own judgment of responsible value, which comes from the conscience of what is fair or not fair, bad or good, we can assume that the moral can't follow the impulse of desire and, therefore, the person outside the moral irrationally obeys your self-strength of realization and accepts and join selfish acts, coming further from this desired freedom. For Kant (2007), the moral is responsible for regulating the way which every individual act, both individually and jointly within society, and the ethic is connect to obligation, especially to the obligation on freedom and the coexistence with happiness and virtue.

Comprehending freedom is starting to understand our wills and how they are lead considering the will of the other and how they can lead to conflicts. According to Porta (2002, p.122), we experience some possibilities of freedom and will, from which:

The free being is not the one who acts without any law, but the one who imposes his own law to himself. As consequence, a free being is a rational being and vice-versa. The will is own cause to rational beings. Free-will is a property of will. What is free or is not will. The will is free when denominates herself. A free-will is an autonomous will. Free-will and a will submitted to law to Kant are the same thing. Moral law is nothing but free-will legalized.

The ethical and moral formation are based in the intention of acting. We need to reflect on values. It is in this context that Vaz (1988) defines ethic (ethos) as the space where the human-being is construed, a solid and stable place raised by the own person by the laws, the costumes and the standards. Ethic is, at the same time, branded by subjectivity and sings a knowledge by whom we are capable of distinguishing and make sense to things and reality. Ethics, encircles each person character, and rules the being conduct, not letting him be influenced in front of behaviors that do not follow his moral pattern.

Therefore, the moral person is differentiated based on her capacity of judging and position herself from those values. In what concerns the way of the human being situating themselves in society, Shiller still raises the question of writing a Constitution, for those who're not educated to comprehend it, and live it without leaving you own free will either political and social, reinforcing the ennoblement of character based on those discussions:

Political and social free-will is and will ever be the most sacred of values, the most dignified objective of all the efforts and the essential idea of all civilization. But this grand building can only be built under firm ground with ennobled character, and it'll be required starting from the creation of citizens to a constitution, before power, give these citizens a constitution. (SCHILLER, 2002, p. 169).

To think about the ennobled person image – which is not imposed, but learnt through the dialogue between “*me*”, reality and the “*other*” – we noticed, from a Nietzschean view, that the person ends up inhibiting their instincts to survive the State’s bureaucracy. So, the person, by fear, abdicates elements of her human nature. The unrighteousness, that disregard as a part of human nature, for example, it is not handled, and, soon enough, is materialized by acts. Thereby, punishment dressage the person, but it does not make her better. The righteousness becomes nothing but a result of non-exercising the unrighteousness and not feeling righteousness as a part of existence. The idea of a creating God and a man as an eternal indebted contributes even more to this person domination and with bad formation of you conscientious that, according to Nietzsche (1998), let the human being weak and sic, snatching your strength, your free-will, and, by end, your subjectivity.

The person develops two psychic tendencies in front of the realization of the impossibility of existing without being: the submissive or tamed person, which represents the painful weariness of living in the world, and the rebellious about the consumed act, which brings chaos to society. According to Luckács (2003), Shiller in his superior aesthetic reflections ends up coming to the most existential of the classical philosophical questioning, which is comprehend the necessity of intellectually reconstruct the person in herself, and that ends up being socially shattered or subdivided in partial principles. In the recreation process, we can realize the necessity of art, according to what is raised by Silva (2011), in which, from ethical principles, it is capable of bringing a less divided and less confusing world, a sensitive consummation to the person, which present herself through beauty.

It is based on this sensitive view that subjectivities and performances of the world are considered. The person starts to comprehend and to make sense of what and what would be her duty. Therefore, aesthetic education follows an increasingly accepted comprehension in what concerns your contribution for each person seize herself as belonging to her world (SUZUKI, 2014). The sensibility of this proposal made us accept and also comprehend “When the light emerges in men, there’s no more night outside of him; when it’s quiet inside him, the storm is falling in the world, and the conflicting forces of nature find rest in enduring limits” (SHILLER, 2002, p. 126). Reflecting on those words, the dual situation of the person resides in find herself into herself or succumb to external forces and, only them, suppress her passion and the outcomes of either the situations.

Considering the person and her necessities to fully extend her potential, we think the sensitive as a safer and more consistent path to those outcomes, once that sensitive allows that we establish a bridge between our essence and what is external to us, in order to respond our excitements thinking about what is outside of us, what we do all the time based in what time made us, being this, maybe, the start point where “we know that mind’s sensitivity depends, in second degree, from the vivacity and, according to its extension, from the richness of our imagination” (SHILLER, 2002, p. 39) and from where we recognize the world’s devaluation directly connected to the fact that “the man without a form despise every speech grace as being bribery, every finesse in treatment as being dissimulation, every kindness and greatness in behavior as being exaggeration and affectation” (SHILLER, 2002, p. 54).

Kant (1980) in his work Critique of Pure Reason, discuss about the necessity of the reconciliation between the sensitive and the intelligible, making beauty both the person feels what she thinks and what she thinks. Nature is only beauty when it makes sense to the person. There’s no beauty without sensation and comprehension. Therefore, the beauty is in nature and in art and it is the person, from her aesthetic formation, sponsoring the approach of the sensitive and from the intrigue to reconcile them from the look.

Consequently, the aesthetic formation contributes for the moral formation of the person from the intermediation of the sensitive resources of beauty. In this path art is the instrument of improvement of the feelings, in which the person is assumed as a constant transformation being in what concerns as how she perceives the reality – what is not only affirmed by Shiller, but is also reinsured by Veiga's (1994, p.154) words: "Art, in all of its extensions, is, in this sense, the path to man's realization and nature's transformation as a support to human freedom".

According to the author:

Man does not exist to return to a lost unity, but to achieve a previously non-existent autonomy that, from the alienation and fragmentation of earthly life, tries to conquer a new fullness. This fullness does not allow the abandonment of the world; requires its transformation. Art, in all its extensions, is, in this sense, the way of the realization of man and the transformation of nature as a support of human freedom (VEIGA, 1994, p.154).

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Human conduct is built and constituted from her value's notions and ethical judgements. Educate yourselves aesthetically leads acting in agreement with dignifying judgement of each being in coexisting with the other. Aesthetic education is a path to moral, sensitive and political formation of the person; she gives support for each person to assume and contemplate the world from sensibility, from self-knowledge, and realize her wishes in as responsible way.

Art, as aesthetic experiences coming from her contemplation, are supports to both a deeper world's reflection and to our own identity. The ludic impulse presented by Shiller, for example, is an important premise to comprehend about how to look and feel the world after free ourselves from the speediness and the devaluation that we give to our empty way of feeling.

Sensitive experiences, by moving the subjective human nature and how they construct their living, made it possible to work with pleasure memories, free memories, connected to other perception of the person and the reality. Therefore, the rational would comprehend the impressions that the sensitivity causes in the same instant of time. This action would be capable of withdraw the person from a numbness State, from the devaluation of your own sensitive essence, always so subjugated by hermeneutics that reduce human being, your looks and your passion to even more hermetic notions.

By feeling the beauty in art, we allow us to free ourselves and built new ideas about the world. Just as problematized by Shiller in his letters, this path would guide us to self-knowledge from the convergence between rational and sensitivity that beauty is capable of provoke in those who contemplates it. We see how intriguing is the enigmatic character of life, and how much it is necessary in the learning process of looking and feeling things around us, where the behavior reveal itself as we can look beyond the rational reach – from the first impressions, we can deepen looking on the subjectivities of human being, it's imperative to realize there's no way to build this delight by being moved only by the reductionist reason of the act.

The contemplation enriches itself by making possible to the observer to capture in himself strength capable of refining him, to the point that he can reach his state of moral free-will. The person becomes aware of both his will and the space of the other and realizes that there must be a sure limit in the realization of these wills, which is only possible by knowing our own nature. That must be well defined and ethically high, so that we can comprehend the plural dimensions of societies.

Even not being Shiller's concerns, the questioning of those writings repercussions, in contemporaneity, into the reading of the capitalist model of society that we live in, where the individualism and the competition can restrict, scientifically, actions of pleasure free-will into

human's actions. We do not allow us to feel the world, we do not let us being affected by what sensitize us.

Therefore, we see that where there is not space for dialogue, intolerance overlap itself and reign and potentialize the conflict and the antagonisms as a collective space brand. This premise reinsures the incessant research for aesthetic formation of the person, which can contribute with the process of moral formation in a society surrounded by binaries and conflicting experiences. Human being has a necessity of art, not because it's an example of sophistication, but to recognize the person as a being full of passion and because art confers the sensitivity required to deal with the vicissitudes of existence. Comprehending the value of otherness, of exchanges, to the person feel herself into the other, just like the other in her. It's about, more and more, keep ourselves distant from notions/thinking individual-rational, thinking about the balance between the collectivity and the subjectivity.

REFERÊNCIAS

BARBOSA, Ricardo. A especificidade do estético e a razão prática em Schiller. **Kriterion**, Belo Horizonte, N. 112, p. 229-242, dez., 2005.

_____. **Schiller & a cultura estética**. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 2004.

FISCHER, Ernst. **A necessidade da arte**. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1983.

HAUSER, Arnold. **História social da arte e da literatura**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1995.

KANT, Immanuel. **Fundamentação da metafísica dos costumes (1785)**. Tradução de Paulo Quintela. Lisboa: Edições 70, 2007.

_____. **Crítica da razão pura**. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1980. Série Os pensadores.

LUKÁCS, Georg. **História e consciência de classe**. Tradução de Rodnei Nascimento. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2003.

MAFFESOLI, MICHEL. **Elogio da Razão Sensível**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1998.

NIETZSCHE, F. **Genealogia da moral: uma polêmica**. Tradução de Paulo César Lima de Souza. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1998.

NUNES, Benedito. **Introdução à filosofia da arte**. 5. ed. São Paulo: Ática, 2006.

PORTA, Mario Ariel González. **A filosofia a partir de seus problemas: didática e metodologia do estudo filosófico**. São Paulo: Loyola, 2002.

SCHILLER, Friedrich. **A educação estética do homem, numa série de cartas**. Tradução de Roberto Schwarz e Márcio Suzuki. 4. ed. São Paulo: Iluminuras, 2002.

SILVA, Jorge Anthonio e. **O fragmento e a síntese: a estética objetiva de Schiller**. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2001.

SÜSSEKIND: Pedro. Schiller e os gregos. **Kriterion**. Belo Horizonte, vol. 46, n. 112, p. 243-259, 2005.

_____. O impulso lúdico: sobre a questão antropológica em Schiller. **Artefilosofia**, Ouro Preto, n. 10, p. 11-24, 2011.

SUZUKI, Márcio. O belo como imperativo. In: SCHILLER, Friedrich. **A educação estética do homem, numa série de cartas**. Tradução de Roberto Schwarz e Márcio Suzuki. São Paulo: Iluminuras, 2014, p. 9-20.

VAZ, Henrique Cláudio de Lima. Fenomenologia do Ethos. In: VAZ, Henrique Cláudio de Lima. **Escritos de Filosofia II: ética e cultura**. São Paulo: Loyola, 1988.

VEIGA, Marcelo. Da “Teoria do Belo” à “Estética dos sentidos”: reflexões sobre Platão e Friedrich Schiller. **Anuário de Literatura**. Florianópolis, UFSC, vol. 2, p. 147-155, 1994.