Public Humanities (2026), 2, e89, 1–13
doi:10.1017/pub.2026.10201

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS PUBLIC HUMANITIES

ARTICLE

Museums as Counter-Environment in the Digital Age

Rebecca Taylor

Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, USA
Email: rt2904@tc.columbia.edu

(Received 01 March 2026; revised 29 April 2026; accepted 29 April 2026)

Abstract

As museums confront the virtualization of cultural life, institutional discourse often succumbs to "virtual panic," framing the future primarily around technological adaptation. Rather than treating this digital turn as a threat or a trend, this essay argues that the crisis presents an opportunity for the museum to reclaim its vital humanistic function as a counter-environment to the frictionless speed of contemporary life. Drawing on Hartmut Rosa's critiques of societal acceleration, I theorize virtual panic as a misguided effort to render the gallery as seamless as a digital feed, which risks reproducing conditions of alienation. Grounded in my personal experience revisiting Picasso's '*Girl Before a Mirror*' (1932) across decades, I examine how the gallery acts as an attentional sanctuary, where artworks invite modes of attention that counter habits of distraction. The museum's power lies in its productive friction: its ability to sustain slowness, ambiguity, and perceptual depth. Conceived as a sphere of resonance, in Rosa's sense of the term, the museum emerges as a site for scaffolding self-reflective engagement with the past, present, and possible futures through meaningful encounters with works of art. In an age of simulation, museums remain indispensable by offering a rare space to encounter resistance and resonance.

Keywords: aesthetic experience; attention; contemplative pedagogy; digital acceleration; resonance

On a recent museum visit, I watched a visitor stand before a painting while scrolling through an accompanying digital guide. Their attention was on the device and its seamless flow of information—audio narration, contextual images, and suggested links. The artwork, though physically present, seemed almost beside the point. The encounter was efficient and weightless.

Scenes like this are an outcome of what might be called *virtual panic* in museum culture: a diffuse institutional anxiety that, in an age of digital saturation, museums must accelerate to remain relevant. This pressure is increasingly framed not as one strategy among others but as a condition of institutional survival. Yet this panic misidentifies the problem—and, in so doing, risks obscuring the museum's most vital public humanistic function. Rather than competing with the speed and smoothness of digital culture, museums are uniquely positioned to offer something increasingly rare: a counter-environment. By this, I mean a space structured not by optimization, but by duration, mediation, and resistance—conditions that invite sustained attention and reflective encounter.

© The Author(s), 2026. Published by Cambridge University Press. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.

https://doi.org/10.1017/pub.2026.10201 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Herein, I argue that the museum's value lies precisely in what cannot be streamlined: the slow unfolding of perception, the gap between object and interpretation, and the way artworks refuse instant comprehension. These moments of friction are not failures of access or engagement. They are the grounds on which meaningful encounter becomes possible. As public institutions, museums matter not only for what they display but for how they structure shared conditions of interpretation—spaces where meaning is made slowly, reflectively, and in the company or view of others. In an era defined by compression and simulation, the museum will remain indispensable not by keeping pace with the digital but by being a *sanctuary* where we can dwell—attentively, imperfectly, and in time—within an uncertain and resistant world.

1. Virtual panic: manifestations and implications

The rhetoric of institutional survival has increasingly become synonymous with digital acceleration. Over the past decade, and particularly in the wake of the pandemic, the discourse has treated digital transformation not merely as an operational upgrade, but as an existential imperative, warning museums that digitalization and gamification are the only way to capture the attention of younger audiences.[1] Museum boards and administrators, watching audiences flock to frictionless, Instagram-friendly pop-ups like Immersive van Gogh and the Museum of Ice Cream, often internalize this logic.[2] The panicked museum attempts to lubricate its own spaces, hoping to make the encounter with art as effortless as a swipe. The manifestations of this panic are pervasive. We see it in the explosion of projection-mapped exhibitions—where the resistant, physical boundaries of historical paintings are dissolved into floor-to-ceiling videos and light shows—as well as in augmented reality (AR) apps that gamify the gallery space.

Underlying these trends is what Anna Kornbluh identifies as a cultural obsession with 'immediacy'—a drive towards frictionless, unmediated consumption in which the gap between subject and object is treated as a flaw to be engineered away.[3] The "digital twin"—a high-resolution, infinitely zoomable surrogate—exemplifies this drive. Stripped of its physicality, the masterpiece loses its *alterity*, offering optical mastery at the cost of genuine encounter.[4]

To argue for the museum as a counter-environment is not to adopt a Luddite posture. Digital archiving, open-access scholarly images, and online pre-visit planning are valuable advances of the modern museum. The crisis arises only when the logic of the digital interface—its demand for immediacy, its intolerance of friction, its gamified reward systems—is imported into the physical gallery to mediate the encounter itself. The problem is not that museums use digital tools, but that in their panic to remain relevant, they mistake the frictionless delivery of information for the resistant work of humanistic encounter.

[1] See Bakken et al. 2015; Cesário et al. 2020; Cesário and Nisi 2023; Charitonos et al. 2012; Klar 2025; Knight et al. 2016; Kretzschmar 2025; Myrczik and Myrczik 2014; Rosemary 2024; Tullin 2025a; among others.

[2] See Tullin 2025b and Clairet 2024, among others.

[3] Kornbluh 2024.

[4] For a rich discussion on art's *alterity*, see David Joselit's *Art's Properties 2023*. Isaac (2008) makes a closely related observation in her ethnographic study of digital interactives at the National Museum of the American Indian, where she finds that "media technology itself has become the museum object" (287)—visitors frequently engaged with the digital surrogates rather than the material objects they were ostensibly designed to illuminate. Isaac's framework underscores that the issue is not technology per se but its capacity to displace the very encounter it claims to mediate.

https://doi.org/10.1017/pub.2026.10201 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2. The museum as counter-environment and "attention sanctuary"

To describe the museum as a *counter-environment*—to borrow Marshall McLuhan's term for those spaces and practices that make the surrounding medium perceptible by standing outside its logic—is not to romanticize slowness or reject technology outright.[5] It is to recognize that museums are organized around a fundamentally different relation to the world than the one that structures most contemporary digital environments. Where digital systems increasingly privilege speed, immediacy, and control, museums foreground duration, mediation, and material resistance—features increasingly treated, as Kornbluh has argued, as obstacles to be eliminated rather than as the conditions through which meaning and judgment become possible.

Sociologist Hartmut Rosa has poignantly diagnosed why modern life feels strangely empty. He argues that meaningful relations to the world cannot be produced through optimization alone, using the term *resonance* to name encounters in which we are addressed by the world and respond in ways that change us—encounters that depend on openness, duration, and a fundamental lack of control.[6] Crucially, Rosa insists that resonance requires 'uncontrollability'—the fact that such encounters cannot be manufactured or engineered. Environments designed to minimize friction in the name of efficiency risk closing off precisely the conditions under which resonance can occur, rendering the world increasingly manageable but *affectively* mute.

"Resonance," Rosa argues, "requires a world that can be reached, not one that can be limitlessly controlled"; the confusion between the two "lies at the root of the muting of the world in modernity."[7] Virtual panic is an institutional expression of precisely this confusion. In our rush to make artworks maximally accessible—zoomable, algorithmically curated, informationally exhaustive—museums risk converting reachability into controllability and, in doing so, mute the very encounters they hope to facilitate. The digital twin makes a painting entirely controllable: it can be zoomed, rotated, annotated, and consumed at will. But it is precisely this total control that forecloses resonance. The physical painting in the gallery, by contrast, remains reachable—we can stand before it, attend to it, allow it to address us—while preserving a fundamental uncontrollability: the work does not yield itself on our terms.

The consequence of this frictionless environment is what Rosa calls "alienation"—a condition in which the world appears as a resource to be managed rather than a living counterpart capable of answering back.[8] When museums succumb to virtual panic, they reproduce this alienation within their own walls. A visitor following a perfectly optimized

[5] McLuhan 1964; McLuhan and Moos 1997; McLuhan and Parker 1968; see also Allan 2014, 2018. McLuhan's central claim—that we cannot perceive the environment we are immersed in, and that anti-environments are required to render the dominant medium visible—has obvious purchase here. In my account, the museum performs this work twice over: it renders the digital environment perceptible by departing from its logic, and it preserves a different mode of attentional and temporal life within that departure.

[6] Rosa 2020, 2019. Rosa's sociological account of "resonance" differs from Stephen Greenblatt's (1990) influential museological use of the term, where resonance names an object's capacity to evoke the broader cultural and historical world from which it emerged. Françoise Lionnet's (2001) reading of Greenblatt in colonial museum contexts extends this. My use is more aligned with Rosa's: resonance as a relational mode of address rather than as an attribute of the object alone, though the two senses are not unrelated—what Greenblatt calls resonance describes some of the conditions under which Rosian resonance becomes possible.

[7] Rosa 2020, 57.

[8] Rosa 2020. Rosa discusses the Marxist-Weber-Arendtian lineage of *alienation* at length on pages 21–29.

https://doi.org/10.1017/pub.2026.10201 Published online by Cambridge University Press

digital pathway may 'see' every masterpiece and trigger every interactive prompt, yet leave entirely untouched. The efficiency of the interface forecloses the vulnerability that resonance requires. If the museum's public task is to offer an alternative to contemporary alienation, it cannot do so by mimicking the very technological interfaces that produce it. It must stubbornly protect the conditions of uncontrollability.

Rosa identifies the museum as exemplary of spaces that cultivate readiness for resonance: "a place," he writes, "to come into contact with things in a way that is geared not towards escalation or control," but "where we are inwardly open and ready to be called."[9] The museum, on this account, is not merely a repository but a dispositional space—one that creates the conditions of openness under which resonance becomes possible, though never certain.

Museums, at their best, quietly resist closure by functioning as what D. Graham Burnett and Eve Mitchell call *attention sanctuaries*: sites for the active, collective cultivation of attention. They advocate the purposeful construction of attention sanctuaries as a "valuable component of any comprehensive strategy for addressing the public consequences of societal-scale digital platforms."[10] On this account, they must be designed, maintained, and collectively upheld—not accidental by-products. Crucially, attention sanctuaries do not dictate what one must attend to, nor do they promise protection from distraction altogether. Instead, they protect the *conditions* under which attention can become sustained, receptive, and self-directed.

Long before this language emerged, museums enacted this function through their design, norms, and practices. To enter a museum is to cross a physical threshold that interrupts the reactive rhythm of the street—not by enforcing reverent silence (the hum of conversation and shared discovery is the very sound of a healthy public sphere at work) but by functioning as a spatial speed bump. Ascending steps, checking a coat: these are somatic acts of unburdening that signal a shift in how the body is expected to move. Inside, the enfilade of interconnected galleries or the deliberate spacing of objects forces a pacing that resists the logic of the endless scroll. Benches invite lingering without outcome. These are not neutral aesthetic choices but ethical commitments to slowness, attention, and reflection—commitments the artworks themselves honour by resisting instant comprehension.

Seen in this light, the contemporary impulse to make museum experiences ever more seamless, interactive, and digitally immersive reflects a misunderstanding of the institution's public humanistic task. The risk is not technological mediation per se, but the erosion of the attentional conditions that make encounter possible. As counter-environments and attention sanctuaries, museums do not compete with digital culture on its own terms. They offer something increasingly rare: a space in which attention is not captured but cultivated—and where resonance, though never guaranteed, remains possible.

This urgency is particularly acute for younger audiences.[11] Adolescence is a foundational period for identity construction and the development of personal narratives, but today's youth face new anxieties and the relentless pace of the digital feed; the space for self-

[9] Rosa 2020, 56.
[10] Burnett and Mitchell 2025, 9.
[11] Twenge 2023. See also Berardi 2009; Haidt 2024; Hayles 2007; and Twenge 2019, among others.

https://doi.org/10.1017/pub.2026.10201 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reflection is increasingly compressed.[12] When museums mimic the speed of smartphones, they deprive young people of one of the few remaining civic spaces designed for introspection. Recent observations from NYC Teen Arts Week suggest that teens themselves may crave the conditions museums are equipped to provide—willingly setting aside their phones and valuing sustained, face-to-face connection with peers who share their interest in the arts.[13]

3. The educative and civic value of the museum as attention sanctuary

In a digitally saturated city where physical space is increasingly optimized for transit and commerce, the museum offers a rare civic footprint designed explicitly for loitering, pausing, and returning. While the spatial architecture of the museum implicitly supports these temporal encounters, a growing number of institutions are now explicitly countering "virtual panic" through the programmatic adoption of contemplative pedagogy. Rather than investing solely in digital overlays or gamified apps, these museums are actively training visitors in the rigors of sustained, mindful attention. Programmes such as 'Mindful Moments' at the Getty and "The Observant Eye" at The Met, as well as various programmes at the Guggenheim, Rijksmuseum, and Yale University Art Gallery, demonstrate a deliberate institutional pivot towards introspection and slowness.[14] Similarly, initiatives like 'The Sanctuary Series' at the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum and the 'ArtinSight' programme at MASS MoCA approach the gallery not as a space for the rapid extraction of art-historical facts, but as a site for deep, embodied looking.[15] Many of these initiatives are grounded in the ethos of "slow looking"—a pedagogical commitment summarized perfectly by educator Rika Burnham: "if you don't stop, you don't see anything."[16] Since 2008, there has been an annual initiative called "Slow Art Day" that now garners more than 200 participating museums hosting slow-looking events.[17]

By formally programming mindfulness and intra-spective encounters, these institutions are *actively* fulfilling their mandate as attention sanctuaries. As scholar Nico Roenpagel has noted, this contemplative approach "re-shifts the focus to the experience itself, more specifically, towards an awareness of the experience," demanding a concentrated state of "presence."[18] Museums must recognize that in an era of digital immediacy, the public does

[12] See Habermas and Bluck 2000; Hall 1904; Pasupathi and Weeks 2011; Sumner, n.d.; Zaff and Hair 2003, and others for more on the important role of identity construction and personal narratives during adolescence. See Anderson et al. 2023; Balleys et al. 2020; Bermudez 2016; Haidt 2023, 2024; Torrijos-Fincias et al. 2021, among others for a better understanding of how Gen Z and now Gen Alpha have been affected by growing up in this environment.

[13] Taylor 2026. Recent qualitative work also supports this observation. In a small survey of Gen Z and Millennial respondents, Huberman (2025) found that the majority reported "screen fatigue," and that none cited technology engagement when asked what would make a museum interesting to visit. Respondents instead emphasized the value of museums as "a needed break from the digital world" and "a rare chance to disconnect and focus" (4).

[14] For more about the "Mindful Moments" at The Getty, see Migdol 2022; "Meditation and Art" at the Rijskmuseum, see de Bruin 2019; "Being Present with Art" at Yale University Art Gallery, see Filipowska et al. 2024; "Engaging with Silence" at the Guggenheim, see Murphy 2016 and 'The Observant Eye' at The Met, see The Metrop. Mus. Art n.d.

[15] For more about the programs at The Gardner, see Gowda et al. 2018 and Smith and Zimmermann 2017, and at Mass MoCA, see Thompson and Tobin 2018.

[16] Tishman 2017 on slow looking; Burnham 1994 for the quotation. See also Burnham and Kai-Kee 2011 and Roberts 2013.

[17] See Bown 2022; *Slow Art Day | April 11, 2026*, n.d.

[18] Roenpagel 2018, 100.

https://doi.org/10.1017/pub.2026.10201 Published online by Cambridge University Press

not just need access to art; it needs to be taught *how* to hold attention, tolerate ambiguity, and recover the interpretive distance that the digital feed has systematically erased.[19]

As editor Michelle Moon notes in a recent special issue of *Journal of Museum Education* titled "Museums and Contemplation: Acknowledging Our Roots, Renewing Our Approaches," this is not new terrain for museums:

> Museum spaces in the nineteenth century developed around an improving intention to elevate the sensibilities of their visitors....Museums resembled sacred spaces not only in intent but effect...the proper response expected of visitors, and often explicit aim of the museum, was to experience feelings of awe and wonder, and position oneself in humble relationship to the greatest works of people and nature.[20]

However, Moon cautions that while our primary goal of revitalizing the contemplative in the museum is, as with this tradition, to facilitate a "deep encounter between a visitor and an object," we must be careful not to replicate the principles of authority, elitism, and singular interpretation of history, culture, and objects embedded therein. Instead, we must invest contemplative practice and pedagogy with our modern "principles of shared authority, multivocality, and personal meaning making," inviting visitors to "fulfill their own purposes for learning, connection, and growth."[21]

4. Lessons from multiple encounters with Picasso's *Girl*

I have returned to Picasso's *Girl Before a Mirror* (1932) at MoMA many times over the years.[22] Each time, the painting seems unchanged; each time, I am different. What draws me back is not recognition but the conviction that our conversation has only just begun.

On another visit, I found myself lingering longer than intended. The painting did not demand my attention, but it did not release it either. Looking at the doubled woman, I became acutely aware of my own temporal doubling. I remembered the first time I saw the painting as a young woman, anxious and uncertain, reading myself into its bright surfaces and dark interior. Returning following a period of intensity, the painting felt less like a mirror of present identity and more like a companion across time. Past, present, and possible future selves seemed to gather there, not in resolution, but in uneasy coexistence. Each return carried forward what Dewey calls "funded" meanings—accumulated significance drawn from previous encounters—while also opening the possibility that this visit might reveal something unforeseen.[23] The painting had become, across these returns, an "epiphanic memorial": a stable ground to which I could return across geographic and temporal displacement and from which new understanding might emerge.[24]

[19] A persistent counter-argument holds that friction and slowness are inherently exclusionary, catering only to an educated elite while digital interventions democratize access. To equate digital seamlessness with democratization, however, is to confuse ease of consumption with true accessibility. Engineering away the friction of the encounter does not democratize art; it strips visitors of the opportunity to exercise their own interpretive agency. This pattern is visible even in well-regarded teen programs, where the emphasis on social engagement and peer-led activities—while effective at drawing teens through the door—can inadvertently displace the scaffolded aesthetic encounter that the museum is uniquely positioned to offer (Taylor 2026).

[20] Moon 2025, 414.

[21] Moon 2025, 414.

[22] Picasso 1932.

[23] For more on "funded" meanings, see Dewey [1934] 2005 and Greene 1998.

[24] See James [1902] 2008 and Pawelski 2007.

https://doi.org/10.1017/pub.2026.10201 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The painting does not offer a smooth, illusionistic window into another world; it is aggressively flat, heavily outlined, and structurally dissonant. The woman on the left is rendered in curving lines and luminous tones, and her face divided into a serene lilac profile and a sun-like frontal view. Yet, the mirror offers no true reflection: the figure in the glass is darkened, her colours bruised, her features slipping towards abstraction. The thick black lines that separate the colours compartmentalize the canvas, creating visual friction. The painting refuses to synthesize its contradictions, demanding that the viewer hold the serene and the grotesque, the youthful and the aging, simultaneously in mind.

To see this dissonance at all requires a suspension of the urge to scroll past—and what made that suspension possible was not simply the artwork, but the conditions of the gallery itself. There was no pressure to move on, no notification tugging at my attention, no imperative to extract meaning efficiently. My habits of scanning and interpretation began to slow. I noticed the thickness of the paint, the way the figure's outline wavered, the subtle violence in the mirror's reflection. I noticed my breathing.

This was not immersion in the sense promised by digital experiences. Nothing surrounded me; nothing responded to my gestures. I was held, instead, in a space that allowed attention to deepen without direction. I did not feel transported elsewhere; I felt more fully *here.* The museum did not merely house the artwork; it made possible a form of attention through which the work—and I myself—could matter again.

Yet while my encounter with Picasso's *Girl* felt deeply interior, it was not isolated. My quietude was supported—and occasionally interrupted—by the physical presence of strangers: the shuffling of feet, the hushed murmurs in different languages, the negotiation of stepping aside so another might see. These are not distractions from the artwork; they are reminders of our shared embodiment. We practise presence not in a vacuum but in public, witnessing one another's attempts to slow down and grapple with objects that resist instant comprehension.

5. Scaffolding contemplative encounters for the public

I call the contemplative, attentional practice I've just described—of coming back into relation with an artwork and with oneself—*Re-presencing.*[25] Through ritualized return to the same artwork across time, *Re-presencing* transforms aesthetic consumption into something educative and potentially transformational. The past is not consumed as information but encountered as something that addresses us; the present is not optimized but inhabited; the future is not predicted but opened as a space of possibility. This temporal thickness is precisely what is flattened in digitally accelerated environments, where experience is designed to be immediate, interchangeable, and endlessly updated. *Re-presencing* invites us to inhabit questions rather than rush past them towards answers—reframing uncertainty as a space for engagement, connection, and discernment.

These are capacities that do not develop automatically; they must be cultivated. Research suggests museum visitors spend less than 30 seconds looking at each artwork on average—a statistic likely to worsen as attention is increasingly 'fracked' and commodified.[26] As Maxine

[25] Taylor and Ball 2022; Taylor 2025, forthcoming-a, forthcoming-b.

[26] Smith et al. 2017; Findlay 2017 (on the 30-second statistic). On attention as 'fracked,' see Burnett 2023. For more on the commodification of our attention, see Berardi 2009; Burnett and Smith 2023; Hari 2023; Odell 2019; Williams 2018; and Wu 2016, among others.

https://doi.org/10.1017/pub.2026.10201 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Greene insisted, "the capacity to perceive, to attend, must be learned."[27] Many young visitors report anxiety around subject knowledge or feel ill-equipped to analyse what they see, leading to feelings of exclusion in the gallery.[28] True democratic access, therefore, requires institutions to scaffold the experience of looking rather than engineer the friction away. Contemplative programmes like The Observant Eye or Re-presencing provide frameworks for deriving meaning from complex objects, transforming the museum into a training ground for sustained attention. There are no guarantees here—but this is the "beautiful risk of education" museums must take.[29]

6. Understanding the collective and civic stakes

What the *Re-presencing* example makes visible is not simply an individual moment of reflection but a broader humanistic function that museums are uniquely positioned to serve. The experience of lingering before an artwork, of allowing time to stretch and meanings to remain unresolved, is central to the museum's mission. Beyond personal benefit, the museum functions as a training ground for "civic muscles"—patience, receptivity, and the ability to dwell with ambiguity. As digital platforms enclose users in algorithmic echo chambers designed to accelerate outrage, the gallery's insistence on the slow unfolding of meaning serves as a vital democratic counter-practice. By maintaining the gap between viewer and object, the museum demands that we bridge that distance not through technological shortcuts but through sustained attentional labour.

To stand before a painting made centuries ago is to be reminded of our provisional place in a larger historical continuum—relief from the narcissism of the immediate present.[30] Where digital platforms operate in a flat, perpetual "now," the physical object insists that meaning is not downloaded but collectively forged across generations.

This practice is essential for intergenerational learning, where access to information is too often confused with formative encounters with difficulty. The rise of generative AI—the apotheosis of Rosa's controllability—only intensifies the stakes. When AI presents complex histories as seamless, authoritative summaries, it strips away the human labour of interpretation. The museum's task, then, shifts towards what we might call *a pedagogy of not-knowing:* by placing us before a cracked canvas or an incomplete sculpture, the institution insists that some things cannot be instantly resolved. In an AI-mediated world promising immediate answers, the museum remains a rare civic institution brave enough to leave a question open.

7. Somewhere to land

As contemporary museums find themselves under the pressure of virtual panic, there is a danger that they may neglect not only their mission but also their "unique points of differentiation," to borrow a term from the business world. In the rush to remain relevant, museums risk mistaking speed for vitality and seamlessness for access. Yet what the museum uniquely offers the public is not speed but space—a place to slow down, to attend, and to encounter a world that does not immediately yield itself. Conceived as counter-

[27] Greene 1981, 137. See also Barton 2014, 2019, 2023; Costantino 2004; D'Olimpio 2022; Gallagher and Ihanainen 2015; Greene 1995; and Sontag [1961] 2001, among others.

[28] See Andrews and Asia 1979; Baum et al. 2000; Rabkin and Hedberg 2011; and Winstanley 2013, among others.

[29] Biesta 2015.

[30] Strainchamps 2023. See also Adamson 2020; Bakhtin 1981; Burnett 2003; Roenpagel 2018.

https://doi.org/10.1017/pub.2026.10201 Published online by Cambridge University Press

environments and attention sanctuaries, museums offer the conditions that contemporary life increasingly erodes—the gap between object and interpretation, the stretch of time required for perception to deepen, the quiet in which self-reflection becomes possible. These are not luxuries or nostalgic holdovers. They are civic and humanistic necessities.

Rosa's distinction between reachability and controllability offers the most precise way to understand what is at stake. When museums succumb to virtual panic—when they attempt to make the encounter with art as frictionless, immediate, and controllable as the digital feed—they do not expand the public's access to art. They foreclose the conditions under which art can address us at all. "Our exasperation," Rosa writes, "has its roots not in what is still denied to us, but in what we have lost because we now have it under our control."[31] The museum's task is to resist this loss—to preserve spaces where the world remains reachable precisely because it has not been brought entirely under control.

The future of the museum, then, does not hinge on outpacing the digital or perfecting immersion. It depends on the institution's willingness to preserve spaces where friction is allowed, where attention can settle, and where encounters remain unpredictable. In doing so, museums continue to perform a vital public task: helping individuals and communities relearn how to be present—to the past, to one another, and to the fragile possibilities of shared futures—without rushing to resolution. The visitor I watched in that gallery, scrolling through the digital guide while a painting waited in silence, was not encountering the work. The work was reaching out, as it always does, but the interface had made the visitor unreachable. The museum's most urgent task is to ensure that this reaching out—unpredictable, uncontrollable, and irreplaceable—still has somewhere to land.

Rebecca Taylor is a doctoral candidate and part-time lecturer in the Department of Arts & Humanities at Teachers College, Columbia University, where her research spans aesthetics and philosophy of education with a focus on aesthetic experience, attention, contemplative pedagogy, and affordance theory. Her scholarship has appeared in the *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, and *Education & Culture*, among other venues. She is a Fellow of the Royal Society for the Arts and a 2026 Life Worth Living Program Fellow at Yale University. Her professional background spans more than two decades of leadership in the arts and culture sector, including roles at The Museum of Modern Art/MoMA PS1, The Getty, and The Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles.

Author contribution. Conceptualization, Project administration, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing: R.T.

Conflicts of interests. The author declares no competing interests.

References

Adamson, Glenn. 2020. *Marking Time: Objects, People, and Their Lives, 1500–1800*, edited by Edward Town, and Angela McShane. Yale Center for British Art.

Allan, Kenneth R. 2014. "Marshall McLuhan and the Counterenvironment: 'The Medium Is the Massage.'" *Art Journal* 73 (4): 22–45. https://doi.org/10.1080/00043249.2014.1016337.

Allan, Kenneth R. 2018. "Marshall McLuhan's Counterenvironment within the Stream of Defamiliarization." *Imaginations: Journal of Cross-Cultural Image Studies* 8 (3): 111–28. https://doi.org/10.17742/IMAGE.MA.8.3.8.

Anderson, Monica, Michelle Faverio, and Jeffrey Gottfried. 2023. *Teens, Social Media and Technology 2023*. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2023/12/11/teens-social-media-and-technology-2023/.

[31] Rosa 2020, 117.

https://doi.org/10.1017/pub.2026.10201 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Andrews, Kathryne, and Caroli Asia. 1979. "Teenagers' Attitudes about Art Museums." *Curator: The Museum Journal* 22 (3): 224–32. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.1979.tb00949.x.

Bakhtin, M. M. 1981. "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel." In *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, edited by Michael Holquist, translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. University of Texas Press. https://hdl.handle.net/2027/heb09354.0001.001.

Bakken, Sven Magne, Sven Magne Bakken, Palmyre Pierroux, and Palmyre Pierroux. 2015. "Framing a Topic: Mobile Video Tasks in Museum Learning." *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction* 5: 54–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2014.12.001.

Balleys, Claire, Florence Millerand, Christine Thoër, and Nina Duque. 2020. "Searching for Oneself on YouTube: Teenage Peer Socialization and Social Recognition Processes. ." *Social Media + Society* 6 (2): 205630512090947. https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120909474.

Barton, Georgina (ed). 2014. *Literacy in the Arts: Retheorising Learning and Teaching*. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-04846-8.

Barton, Georgina. 2019. *Developing Literacy and the Arts in Schools*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429316067.

Barton, Georgina. 2023. *Aesthetic Literacies in School and Work: New Pathways for Education*. SpringerBriefs in Education. Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-7750-3.

Baum, Lynn, George E. Hein, and Marilyn Solvay. 2000. "In Their Own Words: Voices of Teens in Museums." *Journal of Museum Education* 25 (3): 9–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/10598650.2000.11510425.

Berardi, Franco. 2009. *Precarious Rhapsody: Semiocapitalism and the Pathologies of the Post-Alpha Generation*. Minor Compositions.

Bermudez, Juan Pablo. 2016. "Social Media and Self- Control: The Vices and Virtues of Attention." In *Social Media and Your Brain: Web-Based Communication Is Changing How We Think and Express Ourselves*, edited by C. G. Prado. ABC-CLIO, LLC. https://doi.org/10.5040/9798216015840.ch-004.

Biesta, Gert J. J. 2015. *Beautiful Risk of Education*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315635866.

Bown, Claire. 2022. "What Is Slow Art Day?" *Thinking Museum*, March 30. https://thinkingmuseum.com/2022/03/30/what-is-slow-art-day/.

Bruin, Andreas de. 2019. "Meditation and Art—The Conscious Perception of the Great Works of Painting." Conference Proceedings. The Future of Education 2019, June 28. https://conference.pixel-online.net/library_scheda.php?id_abs=3853.

Burnett, D. Graham. 2003. "Mapping Time: Chronometry on Top of the World." *Daedalus* 132 (2): 5–19.

Burnett, D. Graham. 2023. *100 Fracking Eyeballs*. Asterisk.

Burnett, D. Graham, and Eve Mitchell. 2025. "Attention Sanctuaries: Social Practice Guidelines and Emergent Strategies in Attention Activism." *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1546 (1): 5–10. https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.15313.

Burnett, D. Graham, and Justin E. H. Smith (eds). 2023. *Scenes of Attention: Essays on Mind, Time, and the Senses*. Columbia University Press. https://doi.org/10.7312/burn21118.

Burnham, Rika. 1994. "If You Don't Stop, You Don't See Anything." *Teachers College Record* 95 (4): 520–5. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146819409500406.

Burnham, Rika, and Elliott Kai-Kee. 2011. *Teaching in the Art Museum: Interpretation as Experience*. Getty Publications.

Cesário, Vanessa, and Valentina Nisi. 2023. "Lessons Learned on Engaging Teenage Visitors in Museums with Story-Based and Game-Based Strategies." *Journal on Computing and Cultural Heritage* 16 (2): 28:1–28:20. https://doi.org/10.1145/3575867.

Cesário, Vanessa, Daniela Petrelli, and Valentina Nisi. 2020. "Teenage Visitor Experience: Classification of Behavioral Dynamics in Museums." *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, New York, NY, CHI '20, April 23, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376334.

Charitonos, Koula, Koula Charitonos, Canan Blake, et al. 2012. "Museum Learning via Social and Mobile Technologies: (How) Can Online Interactions Enhance the Visitor Experience?." *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 43, 5, 802, 819, ahead of print. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2012.01360.x.

Clairet, Mathieu. 2024. "From Storytelling to Storyliving: Immersion in the World of Gen Z and Alpha." Eneon, April 5. https://www.eneon.group/from-storytelling-to-storyliving-immersion-in-the-world-of-gen-z-and-alpha/.

Costantino, Tracie E. 2004. "Training Aesthetic Perception: John Dewey on the Educational Role of Art Museums." *Educational Theory* 54 (4): 399–417. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0013-2004.2004.00027.x.

D'Olimpio, Laura. 2022. "Defending Aesthetic Education." *British Journal of Educational Studies* 70 (3): 263–79. https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2021.1960267.

Dewey, John. (1934) 2005. *Art as Experience*. Penguin Publishing Group.

https://doi.org/10.1017/pub.2026.10201 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Filipowska, Roksana, Hannah Weinberg-Wolf, and Alexa Vaghenas. 2024. "Being Present with Art: Mindful and Interactive Engagement with Art Lowers Stress While Increasing Attention and Belonging." *Journal of Museum Education* 49 (3): 334–47. https://doi.org/10.1080/10598650.2023.2217568.

Findlay, Michael. 2017. *Seeing Slowly*. Prestel Verlag.

Gallagher, Michael Sean, and Pekka Ihanainen. 2015. "Aesthetic Literacy: Observable Phenomena and Pedagogical Applications for Mobile Lifelong Learning (MLLL)." *European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning* 18 (1): 15–33. https://doi.org/10.1515/eurodl-2015-0002.

Gowda, Deepthiman, Rachel Dubroff, Anna Willieme, Aubrie Swan-Sein, and Carol Capello. 2018. "Art as Sanctuary: A Four-Year Mixed-Methods Evaluation of a Visual Art Course Addressing Uncertainty through Reflection." *Academic Medicine* 93 (11S): S8–13. https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000002379.

Greenblatt, Stephen. 1990. "Resonance and Wonder." *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 43 (4): 11. https://doi.org/10.2307/3824277.

Greene, Maxine. 1981. "Chapter VI: Aesthetic Literacy in General Education." *Teachers College Record: The Voice of Scholarship in Education* 82 (5): 115–41. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146818108200506.

Greene, Maxine. 1995. *Releasing the Imagination: Essays on Education, the Arts, and Social Change*. Jossey-Bass.

Greene, Maxine. 1998. "A Rereading of Dewey's Art as Experience." In *The Handbook of Education and Human Development*, edited by David R. Olson, Nancy and Torrance. Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1111/b.9780631211860.1998.00005.x.

Habermas, Tilmann, and Susan Bluck. 2000. "Getting a Life: The Emergence of the Life Story in Adolescence." *Psychological Bulletin (US)* 126 (5): 748–69. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.126.5.748.

Haidt, Jonathan. 2023. "Kids Who Get Smartphones Earlier Become Adults with Worse Mental Health." After Babel, March 9. https://www.afterbabel.com/p/sapien-smartphone-report.

Haidt, Jonathan. 2024. *The Anxious Generation: How the Great Rewiring of Childhood Is Causing an Epidemic of Mental Illness*. Penguin.

Hall, Granville Stanley. 1904. *Adolescence: Its Psychology and Its Relations to Physiology, Anthropology, Sociology, Sex, Crime, Religion and Education*. D Appleton & Company. https://doi.org/10.1037/10618-000.

Hari, Johann. 2023. *Stolen Focus: Why You Can't Pay Attention—and how to Think Deeply Again*. Crown.

Hayles, N. Katherine. 2007. "Hyper and Deep Attention: The Generational Divide in Cognitive Modes." *Profession*, 187–99.

Huberman, Shayna. 2025. "We Don't Need More Screens in Museums." *Public Humanities* 1 (January): e158. https://doi.org/10.1017/pub.2025.10064.

Isaac, Gwyneira. 2008. "Technology Becomes the Object: The Use of Electronic Media at the National Museum of the American Indian." *Journal of Material Culture* 13 (3): 287–310. https://doi.org/10.1177/1359183508095497.

James, William. (1902) 2008. *The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature*. Longmans, Green and Co. https://doi.org/10.1037/10004-000.

Joselit, David. 2023. *Art's Properties*. Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691236056.

Klar, Annette. 2025. "Gen Z Want Immersive Marketing Experiences in 2025." Socially Powerful, March 7. https://sociallypowerful.com/post/immersive-marketing.

Knight, Kathryn, Kathryn B. Knight, Randall Davies, and Randall S. Davies. 2016. "Using a Mobile Dichotomous Key iPad Application as a Scaffolding Tool in a Museum Setting." *Interactive Learning Environments* 24: 814–828, https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2014.924532.

Kornbluh, Anna. 2024. *Immediacy, or the Style of Too Late Capitalism*. Verso Books.

Kretzschmar, Roland-Philippe. 2025. "From Immersive Rooms to Instagram Reels: Gen Z's New Art Economy." Substack newsletter. The Art Bystander, September 11. https://theartbystander.substack.com/p/from-immersive-rooms-to-instagram.

Lionnet, Françoise. 2001. "The Mirror and the Tomb: Africa, Museums, and Memory." *African Arts* 34 (3): 50–93. https://doi.org/10.2307/3337878.

McLuhan, Marshall. 1964. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. McGraw-Hill.

McLuhan, Marshall, and Michel A. Moos. 1997. "The Relation of Environment to Anti-Environment." In *Media Research*. Routledge.

McLuhan, Marshall, and Harley Parker. 1968. *Through the Vanishing Point: Space in Poetry and Painting. With Internet Archive*. Harper & Row.

Migdol, Erin. 2022. "How Mindfulness Is Unlocking a Whole New Way of Seeing Art." Inside Getty, December 13. https://www.getty.edu/news/how-mindfulness-is-unlocking-a-whole-new-way-of-seeing-art/.

Moon, Michelle. 2025. "Museums and Contemplation: Acknowledging Our Roots, Renewing Our Approaches." *Journal of Museum Education* 50 (4): 413–5. https://doi.org/10.1080/10598650.2025.2605811.

Murphy, Shannon. 2016. "Engaging with Silence: Using Art as a Heuristic to Develop Understanding about Meditation." In *Mindfulness and Educating Citizens for Everyday Life*, edited by Malgorzata Powietrzynska and Kenneth Tobin. SensePublishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-570-8_7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/pub.2026.10201 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Metrop. Mus. Art (The Metropolitan Museum of Art). n.d. "The Observant Eye." Museum. Accessed February 25, 2026. https://engage.metmuseum.org/events/education/workshops-and-classes/academic-and-research-programs/college-and-university-programs/the-observant-eye/fy25/the-observant-eye/.

Myrczik, Eva Pina, and Eva Pina Myrczik. 2014. "Satisfying Personal Needs at the Museum: The Role of Digital Technologies." *MedieKultur: Journal of Media and Communication Research* 30(20): 176–196. https://doi.org/10.7146/mediekultur.v30i57.16055.

Odell, Jenny. 2019. *How to Do Nothing: Resisting the Attention Economy*. Melville House.

Pasupathi, Monisha, and Trisha L. Weeks. 2011. "Integrating Self and Experience in Narrative as a Route to Adolescent Identity Construction." *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development* 2011 (131): 31–43. https://doi.org/10.1002/cd.287.

Pawelski, James O. 2007. *The Dynamic Individualism of William James*. State University of New York Press. https://doi.org/10.1353/book5243.

Picasso, Pablo. 1932. *Girl before a Mirror. March 14. Oil on Canvas, 64 x 51 1/4″ (162.3 x 130.2 cm)*. The Museum of Modern Art. https://www.moma.org/collection/works/78311.

Rabkin, Nick, and E. C. Hedberg. 2011. "Arts Education in America: What the Declines Mean for Arts Participation. Based on the 2008 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts. Research Report #52." In *National Endowment for the Arts*. National Endowment for the Arts. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED516878.

Roberts, Jennifer L. 2013. "The Power of Patience: Teaching Students the Value of Deceleration and Immersive Attention." *Harvard Magazine.* 116(2): 40–43.

Roenpagel, Nico. 2018. "Knowing Body, Knowing Time: Contemplative-Embodied Art Engagement as an Inventive Research Practice." In *Embodied and Walking Pedagogies Engaging the Visual Domain*, edited by Kim Snepvangers and Susan Davis. 97–120.

Rosa, Hartmut. 2019. *Resonance: A Sociology of Our Relationship to the World*. Translated by James C. Wagner. Polity.

Rosa, Hartmut. 2020. *The Uncontrollability of the World*. Translated by James C. Wagner. John Wiley & Sons.

Rosemary, Falola Titilope. 2024. "Leveraging Artificial Intelligence and Data Analytics for Enhancing Museum Experiences: Historical Narratives, Visitor Engagement, and Digital Transformation in the Age of Innovation." *International Research Journal of Modernization in Engineering Technology and Science* 6 (1): 4221–4236. https://doi.org/10.56726/IRJMETS49059.

Slow Art Day | *April 11, 2026.* n.d. Accessed April 28, 2026. https://www.slowartday.com/.

Smith, Jessie Schlosser, and Corinne Zimmermann. 2017. "The Sanctuary Series: Co-Creating Transformative Museum Experiences." *Journal of Museum Education* 42 (4): 362–8. https://doi.org/10.1080/10598650.2017.1371520.

Smith, Lisa F., Jeffrey K. Smith, and Pablo P. L. Tinio. 2017. "Time Spent Viewing Art and Reading Labels." *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts* 11 (1): 77–85. https://doi.org/10.1037/aca0000049.

Sontag, Susan. (1961) 2001. *Against Interpretation: And Other Essays*. Macmillan.

Strainchamps, Anne, host. 2023. *Deep Time: The Tyranny of Time.* To the Best of Our Knowledge, June. https://www.ttbook.org/show/deep-time-tyranny-time.

Sumner, Rachel. n.d. "'Who Am I?'–Identity Formation in Adolescence." Act for Youth. Accessed November 23, 2024. https://actforyouth.net/resources/n/n_identity-handout.cfm.

Taylor, Rebecca. 2025. "Re-Presencing: A Pedagogical Framework for Ritualized Engagement with Art Grounded in Deweyan Experience." *Education and Culture* 41 (1): 62–91. https://doi.org/10.7771/1559-1786.1923.

Taylor, Rebecca. 2026. "Attracting and Engaging Teens: Lessons from Research and Practice." *Journal of Museum Education* 0 (0): 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/10598650.2026.2614267.

Taylor, Rebecca. forthcoming-a. "Re-Presencing: Aesthetic Education of the Soul in the Spirit of James, Dewey, and Greene." *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 60 (3).

Taylor, Rebecca. forthcoming-b. "Re-Presencing: Ritualized Aesthetic Experience for Meaning-Making & Growth Amidst Perpetual Crises." *Contemporary Issues in Aesthetics*, Historical and Philosophical Aesthetics.

Taylor, Rebecca, and Joan Ball. 2022. "Re-Presencing through Artistic Reverie: Implications for Postdigital Theology." In *Postdigital Theologies: Technology, Belief, and Practice*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-09405-7_14.

Thompson, Laura Dickstein, and Amanda Tobin. 2018. "*ArtInSight*: A Contemplative Approach to Museum Gallery Teaching and Learning." *Journal of Museum Education* 43 (4): 334–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/10598650.2018.1512820.

Tishman, Shari. 2017. *Slow Looking: The Art and Practice of Learning through Observation*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315283814.

Torrijos-Fincias, Patricia, Sara Serrate-González, Judith Martín-Lucas, and José Manuel Muñoz-Rodríguez. 2021. "Perception of Risk in the Use of Technologies and Social Media. Implications for Identity Building during Adolescence." *Education Sciences* 11 (9): 9. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11090523.

https://doi.org/10.1017/pub.2026.10201 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Tullin, Peter. 2025a. "The Immersive Revolution." REMIX Summits. https://www.remixsummits.com/immersive-experiences/.

Tullin, Peter. 2025b. "What Is Driving the Growth of Immersive Experiences?" REMIX Summits. https://www.remixsummits.com/what-is-driving-the-growth-of-immersive-experiences/.

Twenge, Jean M. 2019. "More Time on Technology, Less Happiness? Associations between Digital-Media Use and Psychological Well-Being." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 28 (4): 372–9. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721419838244.

Twenge, Jean M. 2023. *Generations: The Real Differences Between Gen Z, Millennials, Gen X, Boomers, and Silents — And What They Mean for America's Future*. Atria Books.

Williams, James. 2018. *Stand out of Our Light: Freedom and Resistance in the Attention Economy*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108453004.

Winstanley, Carrie. 2013. "'Museums and Galleries? No Thanks, Not for Me.' A Critical Review of Attitudes to Museum and Gallery Visits among University Students on an Education Degree Programme." In *Museums and Higher Education Working Together*, edited by Anne Boddington, Jos Boys, and Catherine Speight. Routledge.

Wu, Tim. 2016. *The Attention Merchants: The Epic Scramble to Get inside Our Heads*, First edition. Alfred A. Knopf.

Zaff, Jonathan, and Elizabeth C. Hair. 2003. "Positive Development of the Self: Self-Concept, Self-Esteem, and Identity." In *Well-Being*, edited by Marc H. Bornstein, Lucy Davidson, Corey L.M. Keyes and Kristin A. Moore. Psychology Press.

Cite this article: Taylor, Rebecca. 2026. "Museums as Counter-Environment in the Digital Age." *Public Humanities,* 2, e89, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1017/pub.2026.10201

https://doi.org/10.1017/pub.2026.10201 Published online by Cambridge University Press