

History and audiovisual narratives: on fact and on fiction

História e narrativas audiovisuais: de fato e de ficção

Historia y narrativas audiovisuales: de hecho y de ficción

Marcus Freire¹

Rosana Soares²

Abstract *The paper intends to relate two different fields: audiovisual discourses (on cinema and on television) and the historical discourse as a way of articulating social imaginaries. It aims, therefore, to make a comparative analysis of diverse indicial narratives in order to establish their repetitions and variations concerning the way of recalling and reconstructing sites of memory through the representation of historical facts.*

Keywords: *History; Discourse; Cinema; Journalism; Documentary*

Resumo *O artigo busca relacionar dois campos: os discursos audiovisuais (cinematográficos ou televisivos) e o discurso histórico como lugar de articulação de imaginários sociais. Buscamos, desse modo, realizar uma análise comparativa entre diferentes narrativas de caráter referencial a fim de estabelecer suas recorrências e dissonâncias no modo de evocar e construir lugares de memória a partir da representação de fatos históricos.*

Palavras-chave: *História; Discurso; Cinema; Televisão; Documentário*

Resumen *El artículo pretende relacionar dos campos: los discursos audiovisuales (cinematográficos o televisivos) y el discurso histórico como lugar de arti-*

¹ Associate full tenured professor of the Postgraduate Programme in Multimedia and of the Department of Cinema of the Campinas State University Unicamp – UNICAMP, Campinas, SP, Brazil; marcius.freire@gmail.com.

² PhD professor of the Postgraduate Programme in Audiovisual means and processes and of the Department of Journalism and Publishing of the School of Communications and Arts of the University of São Paulo – USP, SP, Brazil; rosanasoares@gmail.com.

culación de imaginarios sociales. Buscamos, de esta forma, realizar un análisis comparativo entre diferentes narrativas de carácter referencial a fin de establecer sus recurrencias y disonancias en el modo de evocar y construir lugares de memoria a partir de la representación de los hechos históricos.

Palabras-clave: *Historia; Discurso; Cine; Televisión; Documental*

Date of submission: 18/04/2013

Date of acceptance: 13/05/2013

The title of this article derives from the problematisation of the tributary concepts of history and cinema studies. The notions of truth, objectivity and reality (crossing the theories about the modes of the construction of the representation and presentation of the historical world) are considered fundamental in the academic debate on the discursive formations which constitute the contemporary imaginary and the status of pictures.

The establishment of borders between fact and fiction has occupied the field of audiovisual studies since some time. In this article, we propose to think about this question on the basis of a displacement: to seek in the audiovisual artefacts the limits between what we will call referentiality and that which, on the other hand, manifests itself as “fictionality” inside such artefacts by privileging contemporary narratives that are present in fiction films, documentaries and/or reports which approach similar thematic topics. By doing this, we assume the non disjunction between fact and imagination in a radical way and, in a broader way, between reality and fiction. Truth and reality usually go together in the discourses which take the objective and faithful representation of the historical world as its operation mode, in opposition to those which are considered as fictional discourses. By means of the analyses, we will attempt to problematise the dichotomies which are commonly attributed to the media discourses and to emphasise a space propitious to the circulation of hybrid genres, susceptible to be re-signified by the audiences.

This thematic topic inserts itself into the debate about audiovisual formats which are more and more convergent in technological, aesthetic and narrative terms in which factual forms and fictional forms compose, in the cinema and on television, a diverse way of reconstituting the recent history of the different social groups that are represented in the media. Among the analytic possibilities which are available for this study, we will seek to point out in the contemporary audiovisual discourses in which way a certain mode of inscription of the “real” inserts itself in their narratives and establishes a reading contract copied from the referentiality and the naturalization of their artifices. Thus the proposed topic deals with such discourses in order to establish a comparative study between them and to point out their points of contact and distance and the speci-

ficities of each one. In this way, the approximations and distancing of the cinematographic and television narratives are the *locus* in which we will try to demonstrate the hypothesis that the contemporary audiovisual discourses constitute themselves on the basis of hybridisms between factual and fictional elements and, more than that, on the basis of a reaffirmation of the possibility of the faithful representation of historical reality or, on the contrary, of the problematisation of this possibility.

In recent years, the proliferation of digital technologies in the capture, edition, production and diffusion of pictures brought new elements to the already traditional debate on the limits between documentary films and fiction films. The division between discourses which supposedly affirm their authenticity by establishing narrative strategies and, consequently, the articulation of meaning effects based upon the supposed representation of the facts – as if it were possible to have *direct* and not mediated access to them – and, on the other hand, those discourses which assume their provisory character and the premise that every representation is already in itself the construction of a staged *truth*, has followed the analyses about audiovisual production. Under the name of “real” – its risks, challenges, limits, returns, outbursts or implosions – discourses have been articulated, which assume, as a basis, what we call *referentiality*, that is to say, historical elements taken in an objective way in order to compose the reports about the facts, on the contrary of what is supposed in the fictional discourses, in which ways of fiction they are put into action in the composition of their narratives.

In the field of language studies, such discourses concern the studies the focus of which is the referent, that is to say, that which the enunciated refers to and not the enunciator’s or co-enunciator’s functions or the interactions they establish between each other. The referential discourses, such as journalism, construct themselves and are supported by the faith of the pretended objectivity, neutrality and impartiality of their reports. By seeking to present the facts in an impersonal and direct way, they become opaque discourses, because they hide the modes of construction of their enunciation by means of distancing strategies, of the presentation of information and context elements; and of the objectiva-

tion of the narrative by means of the use of data and descriptions. It is a predominantly denotative discourse, even when, according to Barthes, even the factual reports have as a meaning effect the simulation of a real by means of a “referential illusion”, that is to say: finally what is to be found is not the real, but its evocation. The contrast between science and literature established by Barthes explains such relationship: “Nonetheless, even when they use all the attributes which can make the scientific discourse aesthetic, we must admit, together with Barthes, that the ‘beautiful’ scientific discourse makes references, it constructs itself on the basis of something which is outside of it and on which it depends. This is not the case of literature, which need not give account and is not subjected to the vicissitudes of the historical world, since it creates an autonomous world” (FREIRE, 2012: 43).

One of the possibilities of approach of this thematic topic is Bakhtin’s proposal when he studies the question of the “polemic” which is present in every discourse, a movement which is involved in the act of addressing of an “I” to a “you”, crossed by the orientation of such speech to the referent or to the other’s speech. Bakhtin (2003) divides the types of discourse into three: “First type, the speech exclusively directed to its referent; second type, the objectified speech or the speech of a represented person, that is to say, the diverse variations of the quoted discourse; finally the speech in two voices or bi-vocal with diverse directions” (GRILLO and VELOSO, 2007: 237); in its more intensive form the “other’s” discourse actively influences the author’s discourse, being reflected in it, it is where its polyphonic effect comes from.

Thus in the field of the discourse (cf. BAKHTIN, 2003), on the contrary of the possibility to establish an *origin*, there would not be a beginning nor an end, but an *intermediate space*, a place of incessant unfolding, a space permanently updated by the reader and which can be extended to journalism on the basis of the contributions of history: “The most essential reality is the most hidden; it is situated neither in the absence of the discourse nor in its explicitness, but in the intermediate space of its latency, thus it needs a particular listening or reading in order to reveal itself to itself” (DOSSE, 1993: 336). Nonetheless from

the necessity to construct narratives which are representative of our subjectivities and appurtenances derives this desire for truth (authenticity, legitimacy, fidelity) which we very often find present in the audiovisual production. With regard to this, an interesting paradox explains itself: at the same time as the factual reports pretend to be objective and exempt, they constantly perform a work of *re-signification* of the facts in narratives, unfolding themselves in a double layer of mediations. On the contrary to the access to truth and to the representation of reality, it is a process of discontinuities which inscribes itself into such reports.

Among the referential discourses – those in which the historical facts present themselves as raw material in favour of the construction of an objective truth –, we can include some production forms which are present in journalism and in the documentary, as if by instituting the possibility of *reproduction of truth*, its imaginative dimension were absent. In the present time, it is convenient to observe the spreading of audiovisual genres which are based upon the old and new realisms (especially on television and on the internet), in which they attempt more and more to find the “degree zero” (to borrow another of Barthes’ expressions when he treats the “effect of the real”) of the inscription of reality. It is in this way that security cameras, home videos, amateur registers and *live* transmissions proliferate on the screens, they re-assume a naturalist perspective (and some times a naive one) with regard to the modes of the construction of representation, thus obliterating one of the fundamental premises of the documentary films which could be extended – why not? – to the journalistic reports: the possibility to offer a “creative treatment” to the concrete elements which constitute their narrative, instead of seeking to offer non mediated evidences of reality.

In a book published in 1997, together with Jean Planchais, at that time editor-in-chief of the newspaper *Le Monde*, symptomatically entitled *Les médias et l'histoire* [*Media and History*], Marc Ferro makes an assessment which, in a certain way, illustrates a kind of relationship we have with the so-called referential pictures and with those which, not being referential, are replete with pretended historical contents. But before let us go out from a somewhat obvious assessment, but the essence of

which must not be ignored, because it is the very premise for the development of this article: still according to Ferro, “for the common sense history deals with ‘that which occurred’, it is the knowledge of the past. Its discourse ceases in the present time and becomes ‘topicality’. *The facts of the present concern the journalists, the sociologists*. The journalist ‘makes’ history, participates in the events and, consequently, he contributes to history” (FERRO and PLANCHAIS, 1997: 15). By the way, this assessment meets another one, of an Englishman, Sir John Seeley, history professor at Cambridge, who said: “History is past politics: politics is present history” (*apud* BURKE, 1992: 10).

We come back to Ferro’s assessment we referred to above. According to him, until the 1960s the elites’ disdain for television was near to the same disdain they nourished with regard to cinema until the Second World War when only the *actualités* (the news) interested, that is to say its documental aspect. In a certain way this is what occurred with television until the time we mentioned, when the same elites directed their attention to television news programmes. That is to say that for a very long time the moving pictures, being vehiculated either by cinema or by television, deserved the right-thinking audiences’ consideration when they were reproducing – according to them – data of the historical world; when they were anchored in this historical world and when they established with it that mimetism which they supposedly performed in the beginnings of the cinematograph and which for decades people believed that they could go on establishing. It is as if there were a come-back to that “scrupulously honest” artist, of whom Rancière spoke, an artist who does not cheat, who cannot cheat, since he only “registers” (RANCIÈRE, 2001: 8).

But Rancière says this by adding that “this register is no more this reproduction of the things which is identical to the one in which Baudelaire saw the negation of the artistic invention. The cinematographic automatism resolves the quarrel between technique and art and changes the very status of the real”. And how is this status of the real modified? The glance through the view finder of the camera does not register the object of its gaze such as it is to be found in the historical world, such as

it reaches his retina and fixes itself on it for some tenths of a second. In order to seize it with the help of that so special instrument it must make choices and these choices are never innocent, destitute of any intentions. Even when it manifestly attempts to be neuter, such choices obey its subjectivity, its impulses of the moment, its eventual fascination or its repulsion to what it sees. Thus this art to copy the historical world is already changing the very “status of the real”, as Rancière said (RANCIÈRE, 2001: 8).

Thus the documentary as well as tele-journalism, the *great report* or, in order to sum up, the non-fiction film in a general way, can never be considered as the conveyers of “objectivity” and, much less, of “truth”. They are all constructs, artefacts fabricated by the hands and by the eyes of those who grasped the register instrument called “cinematographic or video-graphic camera”.

Beyond the ontological bias which is subjacent to any register process of the historical world by means of the animated pictures, those which are created specifically for this means of communication which is television deserve that we rapidly look at one of these processes. We will refer to the programmes with journalistic coinage, which by using the characteristics that configure the reports that illustrate the news vehiculated in the tele-journals engender *facts* which are *planted* into the historical world so that they become news. We are not referring to the reality shows, in all their numerous variables, but to the influences which they leave on the television reports.

Let us take as an example a historical fact such as the creation of the Parque Indígena do Xingu [Xingu Indigenous Park] (before denominated Parque Nacional do Xingu [Xingu National Park]) by the brothers Villas Bôas, in 1961. Recently a fiction film was produced about this event, just and simply entitled *Xingu* (Cao Hamburger, 2012)³. But in the year of its fiftieth anniversary (2011), Rede Globo de Televisão [Brazil’s largest broadcasting television] carried out a series of reports which

³ Official site of the film: <http://www.xinguofilme.com.br/>.

were presented in the weekly programme *Fantástico*, we will deal with in the following paragraph.

The television series⁴, denominated *Expedição Xingu* [*Xingu Expedition*] which was shown on Sundays between August 21st and September 24th 2011, counted on a journalist's (Rodrigo Alvarez) leadership and participation, besides eight university professors (of the same age as the brothers Orlando, Claudio and Leonardo at the time of the expedition). Its participants were selected among more than five hundred registered people and they did again the trajectory from Barra do Garças, in the State of Mato Grosso from where they went to the Serra do Roncador until they arrived at the Parque Nacional do Xingu and to the Kamaiurás tribe; they used clothes "of that time" (of the brothers Villas Bôas' expedition, which began in 1943) and they experienced "the Indians' routine: the women lived together with the Indian women and did craftsmanship whereas the men learned the typical *huka huka* fight", according to the official propagation notice of the series. In one of Alvarez' declaration, in the last episode, he affirmed that "the life style had not changed in any way since the time in which Villas Bôas had arrived here: women take care of the plantation and men of hunting and construction"⁵. The reiteration of the possibility to repeat the historical expedition and the little intervention in the space of the park contrasts with the one which is presented in Cao Hamburger's film. In a text of the propagation of the programme we read that:

The six-episode series is permeated with photos, documentaries and videos of this important episode of Brazil's history. And in order to confer even more reality upon this adventure, Rodrigo and the university professors used clothes like those that were used at the time of the expedition, they carried bag packs and food such as rice, salted *paçoca* (*carne seca* [sun-dried beef] with maize flour), pumpkin, beans and fish, when they

⁴ Complete episodes: <http://fantastico.globo.com/Jornalismo/FANT/0,,JOR447-15607,00.html/>. Galeria de fotos [Photo Gallery] on the site Globo.com: <http://fantastico.globo.com/Jornalismo/Fantastico/1,,GF87497-7762,00.html>. Access on: 07/10/2012.

⁵ See site: <http://fantastico.globo.com/Jornalismo/FANT/0,,MUL1670473-15607-447,00.html>. The notice of the propagation of the new panel is entitled "Expedição Xingu: jovens universitários embarcam em aventura heroica". [Expedition Xingu: young university professors embark on a heroic adventure Access on: 07/10/2012.

were near the rivers. All this in order to reproduce to the maximum what was available at the time of the brothers Villas Bôas⁶.

Between one and another episode (and up to the present one), diverse reports, such as the one which was transmitted by the evening news programme of *Rede Bandeirantes* [Brazilian television network] (*Jornal da Band* [Band News] 20/04/2012)⁷, dealt with the conflicts about the land disputes in different regions of Brazil, especially in the South of the State of Bahia, in which *fazendeiros* [*fazendeiro*: owner of a large farm, called *fazenda*] and Indians are put as opponents in the dispute, the first as victims, the second, shown as invaders⁸. Just in the space of the interaction, when the conflicts should be negotiated, the tension becomes exasperating, because we do not know what to do with the other when he “invades” our near space – like when the Indians require rights of citizenship, trade, territory, to be acknowledged as “Brazilians”, in the contrast between identity and alterity. As we are integrants of a colonised country, and, in the Brazilian case, supposedly open to ethnic and racial differences, we ask who would be our other – and maybe it is the Indian, still another extreme for us, due to his life style, culture, values, religion, social organisation and to the fact that apparently he does not desire the economic development, so he is, in our view, in a symbolic place which has been established in the course of time.

The reality show aspect of this *telejournalistic/indianaonesic* adventure totally contradicts Ferro’s considerations when he affirms that “the facts of the present concern the journalists” and that they “write the immediate history” (FERRO, 1997: 15-23). But the “fact” in question did not exist and does not have anything “historical”. It was created for the

⁶ See: <http://fantastico.globo.com/Jornalismo/FANT/0,,MUL1670473-15607-447,00.html>. Access on: 07/10/2012.

⁷ For the pictures of the report, see <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jarUHauwuqk>. Access on: 07/10/2012.

⁸ The indigenous question in the media is not restricted to television; it is also frequent in daily newspapers and weekly magazines. Diverse reports were carried out in 2012, about conflicts mostly relative to land demarcation in Brazil, in which the Indians are generally described as the distant and barbarian others. See, as an example, an article published in *Folha Online* about the liberation of a section of the Estrada de Ferro Carajás, operated by the company Vale, that, according to the newspaper *Folha de S. Paulo* had been blocked by Indians of the guajajara and awá-guajá communities as a protest against the resolutions involving the judgment of the Terra Indígena Raposa Serra do Sol [Indigenous Land Raposa Serra do Sol] (“Indians evacuate section of the Estrada de Ferro Carajás”, 05/10/2012).

television cameras in order to be vehiculated by them. It is more that which Daniel Boorstin called “pseudo-event” (1992) in the 1962s, when television was still at its beginnings. In his book *Image. A guide to pseudo-events in America*, this author affirms that “reality ended up having as a competitor its own representations” and he suggests that, by means of our relationship with the historical world, there exists an impressive set of *false* events that are created by the media, which we call “pseudo-events”. He even affirms that “always when a pseudo-event disputes the audience’s attention with a spontaneous event in the same field, the pseudo-event tends to dominate. What happens on TV will hide what is outside TV”. He defines what a “pseudo-event” is in the following enunciation: “(...) it is an event which possesses the following characteristics [and he quotes four characteristics, but we will only refer to the first]: (...) it is not a spontaneous event, but it appears because it was planted or instigated by someone” (BOORSTIN, 1992: 10-11).

Nonetheless in the film *Xingu* we are in front of the creation of pictures which, to quote Rancière, “are not firstly the manifestations of the properties of a certain technical media, they are operations: relationships between a whole and its parts, between a visibility and a potency of meaning and emotion which is associated with it, between expectations and that which fulfils them” (RANCIÈRE, 2003:11). On the contrary of the series, by putting in relation a “same” and an “other”, such pictures establish central points on the basis of which they distinguish them from those which only refer to themselves (like in the reports we quoted), actually addressing the Other they want to stage.

Within this scenario, and contrasting with it, the question of the construction modes of representation – especially of subjects that are traditionally excluded of them (be it in terms of production, reception or interpretation) – can be elaborated on the basis of some notes about the film, in which the discourses (or their vestiges) about the Indigenous construct themselves initially on the basis of the representation of a diverse, distant other. Thus, with regard to this narrative, we see how a non *representable* other appears – like in the television reports and in the strangeness at that time, reconstructed in the film – that,

in the course of the plot, oscillates between absence and presence, invisibility and visibility. In terms of discursive positions, we can affirm that the *other*, whoever he be - and in an intense way the Indigenous who are inscribed in the film - indicates unfolding elements which go from the non-said (forbidden in the discourse) to the consented inclusion in order to finally assume a position of protagonism, an always uncomfortable position which points to moments of identity affirmation and adhesion:

The picture of the film is not opposed to that of television broadcasting like alterity to identity. Television broadcasting also has its other; the effective performance of the stage. And the cinema also reproduces a performance which is effectuated in front of a camera. Simply, when we speak of the pictures [of Xingu], we do not speak of that relationship: it is not the relationship between what happened in other places and what happened under our gaze, but it is the operations which engender the artistic nature of what we see. Thus the picture designates two different things. There is the simple relationship which produces the similarity of an original: not necessarily its faithful copy, but simply that which is sufficient to take its place. And there is the set of operations which produces what we call arts: that is to say precisely a modification of the similarity (RANCIÈRE, 2003:14).

In *Xingu*, we notice a displacement which removes the Indian from invisibility and puts him in the diapason of exoticism (as it is common in traditional tele-journalism reports), in the example of a recent *Globo Repórter* programme of June 6th, 2012) or of the acquiescence (as it was presented in the report series *Expedição Xingu* [*Xingu Expedition* we already referred to, that was shown in the programme *Fantástico*) in order to assume it finally as other extreme, but an identity of its own, a movement which was rehearsed since the producer's first visit to the park:

The idea was to get to know the place, the people, the customs and to know the Indians' point of view about the white and the brothers Villas Bôas. (...) The villages harmoniously integrate themselves into the landscape; at the same time they delimit and emphasise the human presence.

(...) I understand the dimension of what we intend to do. Our film is not only about those guys who changed Brazil's destiny, but, about the encounter of civilisations. Ours and the other one. The other one, so-called primitive, reveals itself as sophisticated. An organised society with rigid ethic codes, with its individuals' education with more value. And that lives in harmony with its environment (HAMBURGER, 2008).

It seems to us that the film is tangential to the distinction established by Rancière, between “a distant other” (that, as long as it lasts like this, does not incommode) and a “close other” (that begins to incommode us just because it becomes more present and similar to us). In the indigenist question, we perceive that the idea of *preservation* – presupposed in the journalistic programmes – is harmonious with this attempt to maintain the Indians distant, be it in order to try to “understand” their culture or “to civilise them”:

The liberal “tolerance” permits the folkloric Other, deprived of his substance (with the multiplicity of “ethnic food” in a contemporary megalopolis), but it denounces any “real” Other due to his “fundamentalism”, since the nucleus of Alterity is in the regulation of his delight: the “real” Other is, by definition, “patriarchal”, “violent”, he is never the other of ethereal wisdom and of the bewitching customs (JAMESON and ZIZEK, 2003: 157).

In the programme *Globo Repórter*, as well as in the series of *Fantástico*, the journalist is the one who shows a distant world, supposedly isolated and never filmed, in order to present us its way of life and customs. Without operating at the diapason of prejudice (which is very often manifest in reports of traditional tele-journals, they are stereotypes – even if covered by the interference of the politically-correct jargon when they deal with this topic – which we see parading in the presented colours, songs, food and traditions. The reporter exposes himself to the Indigenist without getting involved by them, with being actually there, but, on the contrary, he attributes them the place of assistants in the scene, reinforcing the scission between us, the urban white and them, the isolated Indians. The *Fantástico* series, anterior to this programme, aggregates

elements of reality show in the form of a journalistic report and reaffirms narrative hybridisms, but as in *Globo Repórter*, it generates meaning effects which are proper to television and opposed to those that are perceived in *Xingu* as well as in the documentary *Serras da desordem* [*The Hills of Disorder*] (Andrea Tonacci, 2006), important counterpoint when we deal with thematic topic.

The more paradoxical this can seem to us, the construction strategy of a fact on the basis of the way of being in the world of this other that, in this case, are the Indians – strategy which, as we saw it, borrows attributes from the reality shows –, has nothing new. Actually its origin is almost as old as that of the very ethnographic film and in harmony with the classification – the first that was carried out about this “documental genre” – by André Leroi-Gourhan, would correspond to the second of the three categories he conceived in 1948: “The public documentary film or ‘exoticism film’, which is a kind of journey film”. In this kind of film, it was common – and it was even a rule – that the explorers, travellers, adventurers etc., got involved with the aborigines of the visited regions and posed for the objective. The contrast between the I and the Other was evident and confirmed the superiority of this “I” in relation with this distant, savage, “other”, so different from the civilised, clothed “I” to the audience.

This strategy is at the origin of the large reports and even in the reports *tout court*. In the reports, the journalist participates, dives, walks in the forests, he attempts to shoot with bow and arrow... Finally, in contrast, he becomes for some time, the exotic other because he is far from his habitat and immersed in that of the other, normally distant, but so near now due solely and exclusively to the co-presence in the same space and time, but infinitely, radically distant in the way of occupying and acting on this stage he himself constructed.

Xingu, the film, deals with a question which remains obscure and of complex thematic topics in the media (in their current discourses), the indigenous presence in Brazil. The contradiction precisely resides in the fact that, if we assume this hypothesis, the distant and radical other would be precisely that which we have as the nearest, the most local,

the most aborigine, the most traditional, the most proper, (at least from the point of view of a supposed founding imaginary), which is precisely the indigenous culture. In this sense, the “distant other” and the “near other” meet: it is a question of the subject’s positions or, precisely, of a moment of tension in which the “distant” other stops being “domesticated” (accommodated in his place) and he becomes an “extreme” other (putting himself outside the place in which he should be). Let us think of Halls proposition (2000: 75), with regard to identities removed from specific times, places, histories and traditions, identities that seem “to fluctuate freely” in the context of a globalised social life in their styles, with the active participation of the interlinked communication systems and media pictures. Thus we can affirm that the “other” operates in a relational way with the “same”; it incommodes precisely when it becomes more similar to that one. The question of the social stigmas, for example, points out this aspect: the stigmas, differently from the prejudices, concern the other that becomes close when, on the contrary, it should stay “in his place”, since he does not find space in the discourses that are propagated.

In its final scene, *Xingu* puts us face to face with another announcement, in the film, as isolated and inaccessible: we see in close-up an indigenous man of a tribe that had not been found at that time, who faces us in a haughty challenging way, as if he established his radicalism as non-domesticated Other. Nonetheless, at the same time, the film problematises this *encounter* and allows us to foresee, in the future time of the filmic narrative, which is our present time, the domination processes that derive from that. On the contrary to groups that are considered as social minorities (Negroes, women), the Indigenous will never be able to become a “white man”, one of us – not even by means of acculturation attempts or, on the contrary, of the preservation of his “authenticity”. When we think about the problematic question of the “near other” and of the “distant other” and their visibilities by means of the observation of the Brazilian Indigenous today, it is the identity question and the ways of construction of his representation that we intend to approach, evoking other discourses.

References

- BAKHTIN, M. Os gêneros do discurso. In: *Estética da criação verbal*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2003.
- BOORSTIN, D. J. *Image. A guide to pseudo-events in America*. New York: Vintage Books, 1992.
- BURKE, P. *A escrita da História: novas perspectivas*. São Paulo: Editora Unesp, 1992.
- DOSSE, F. *História do estruturalismo. Volume 1. O campo do signo*. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp, 1993.
- FERRO, M.; PLANCHAIS, J. *Les médias et l'histoire. Le poids du passé dans le chaos de l'actualité*. Paris: CFPJ Éditions, 1997.
- FREIRE, M. *Documentário: ética, estética e formas de representação*. São Paulo: Annablume, 2012.
- GRILLO, S. V. C.; VELOSO, S. R. A. Diálogos entre Maingueneau e o Círculo de Bakhtin. *Revista Filologia e Linguística Portuguesa*, n. 9, p. 229-250, 2007.
- HALL, S. *Identidade cultural na pós-modernidade*. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A, 2000.
- HAMBURGER, C. A outra civilização. Xingu, maio de 2008. *Folha de S. Paulo*, Ilustríssima, 22/04/2012, 2012.
- JAMESON, F.; ZIZEK, S. *Estudios culturales. Reflexiones sobre el multiculturalismo*. Buenos Aires: Paidós, 2003.
- RANCIÈRE, J. *O descentendimento: política e filosofia*. São Paulo: Ed. 34, 1996.
- _____. *La fable cinématographique*. Paris: Seuil, 2001.
- _____. *Le destin des images*. Paris: La Fabrique, 2003.
- SOARES, R. L. *Margens da comunicação: discurso e mídias*. São Paulo: Annablume/Fapesp, 2009.