

Art-ethnography and the theater of the oppressed: educational dialogues in non-formal spaces with the MareMoTO group¹

Igor Federici Trombini

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-1541-2190>

Alessio Surian

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6251-2939>

Abstract: The article focuses on the practices of the Theatre of the Oppressed (TO) in the struggle to transform the local context and power relations in the communities of Rio de Janeiro through the ethnography of a journey with the MareMoTO group. Specifically, the ethnography seeks to understand how dialogic relationships take place from a Freirean perspective and in the production of knowledge within a TO group. It also seeks to explore the power of the TO practice in deepening articulations between formal and non-formal educational spaces, which overcome symbolic exclusion and cognitive injustice by proposing other ways of producing knowledge, based on polyphonic narratives. To this end, we delve into the intersections of five concepts characteristic of ethnography and Augusto Boal's pedagogical-political-theatrical practice in order to investigate how relationships occur in groups and how an open and dialogical relation with alterity, characteristic of these collectives, enhances aesthetic-epistemological creations that trigger another understanding of reality and ways of transforming it. Based on the observations and analysis of the rehearsals, presentations and workshops by MareMoTO, we understand the characteristics that make up TO, such as: the transformation of the passive spectator into an active protagonist, the modification of reality through invisible languages, the expansion of synesthetic dialogue, the decentralization of the voice that produces knowledge, the establishment of a horizontal space inviting dialogue that proposes transformation at different levels, and the broadening of aesthetic production as key to knowledge production.

Keywords: education; ethnography; field research; theatre of the oppressed.

1 Introduction

This work is based on the master's dissertation by popular educator and researcher Igor Federici Trombini which was carried out with the aim of investigating the relationship between ethnography in non-formal educational spaces and the pedagogical-political-theat-

¹ This article has been translated into english by Alessio Surian.



rical methodology “Theatre of the Oppressed”, on the basis of fieldwork with the MareMoTO theatre group, made up of young people from the Maré favela complex in Rio de Janeiro.

The article is divided into three parts. The first part addresses the praxis that constituted the methodology of this research, of an ethnographic nature, with approximations of participant observation, interrelating three concepts of this study with the “Theatre of the Oppressed”: methodology, addressing local-global relationships; polyphonic narratives; the processual nature of phenomena, discussing works by Boal (2009, 2013), Bárbara Santos (2016), Mattos (2011), Clifford and Marcus (2016) and Castro (2015).

The second part seeks to understand how dialogic relationships take place in educational processes based on TO work and what their possible impacts are on educational subjects and spaces, reflecting on how both propose forms of knowledge production that overcome symbolic exclusion (Xiberras, 1993) and epistemic injustice (de Sousa Santos, 2007) by taking into considerations the territories, conflicts and subjects that make them up.

Finally, the third part reports on fieldwork with the MareMoTO group, focusing on the rehearsals, meetings, performances and workshops held in Rio de Janeiro, with a focus on the Complexo da Maré during 2016 and 2017, relating them to the possibilities of creating heterotopias (Vannucci; Junqueira; Diniz, 2021) and short circuits (Deleuze, 2013) in educational spaces, capable of oxygenating them and proposing other forms of dialogue: synesthetic, dialogical and transgressive.

This work is inspired by Boal (2009) who says that “one of the main functions of Art is to reveal, make sensitive and conscious those everyday theatrical rituals, spectacles that go unnoticed, even though they are potent forms of domination” (Boal, 2009, p. 141). Forum theatre is a good way of understanding works of art as vehicles capable of articulating criticism from the violent side of society. In Forum-Theatre, the representation of the situation of oppression offers an interpretation of what happens in everyday life in the form of a question that has not been answered: the question is put to the audience so that they can guide the path that the narration can take, thus becoming co-authors of the play (Sanctum, 2012, p. 50).

2 Methodological approaches between Theatre of the Oppressed and Ethnography

Since methodology is a form of structuring abstractions, and since it leads the reader down the paths travelled by the researcher, it is important to examine the construction of this methodological process at the outset. As well as describing the methodology chosen for this work, we also intend to reflect on the issues that arose during the fieldwork, in relation to the Theatre of the Oppressed (TO) and studies on ethnography “ which, rather than being seen as a way of accessing the other, redirects the reader to the way in which the ethnographer seeks to describe, in his fantasy of reality, the other” (Clifford; Marcus, 1986, p. 9).

Here we describe the intersections between ethnography and OT, bringing three concepts developed by Boal (2009; 2013) and further developed by Bárbara Santos (2016) to describe the pedagogical-political-theatrical methodology, and three others proposed by Mattos (2011) and Erickson (2004) to portray ethnography in education.

The local and the universal – In ethnography, the individual has singular value. This is the basis for ethnographic research in both anthropology and education. Based on his work with the Arawete people, Viveiros de Castro (1986) perceived a range of forms of kinship, perspectivism, cosmology and warfare, which “did not try to explain the world of others but allowed us to multiply our world” (Castro, 2015, p. 231). The holistic vision that the author established with these concepts was only possible through the study of a specific people. The broadening of Western perspectives on these features of social organization was only possible through the specific analysis of a singular people. The particular broadened the universal, not by universalizing the singular, but by creating a broader perspective rich in terms of diverse possibilities.

When Mattos (2011, p. 103) studies images of exclusion in the classroom, she focuses on a specific class, the class of teacher Leonora at the São Sebastião School (fictitious names). The conclusions about teachers’ control and authoritarianism in the classroom are based on a specific study, with a particular teacher and class, which makes it possible to extend the results to a whole school. The point is not to generalize the conclusions by indicating that classrooms in all public schools in Rio de Janeiro display these behaviors, but to universalize these results based on a constant, by showing that this behavior exists recurrently in the educational system and that it generates the same result in all these spaces where it occurs: school failure.

What stands out about extending particular cases to macro-social contexts is the possibility of finding recurring cases in different spaces and at different times, which have a procedural relationship and very similar results. The power of studying different particular cases ethnographically is that the diversity of situations analysed can provide more textured and in-depth understandings.

Similarly, in order to understand how social oppression is structured, what causes it, what drives it, what makes it last over time, what its social, economic and psychological impacts are, a multiplicity of perspectives on this particular issue is necessary. Analyzing it through the eyes of the social sciences will provide a macro-political understanding capable of unravelling elements of its structure. Analyzing the same oppression through empirical experiences, with subjects who live it in their daily lives, will provide another wide range of insights into its forms of structuring, its impacts and its characteristics. The more diverse the subjects who elaborate their perspectives on how they experience social oppression, the more refined the characterization of it becomes, the more textures will form in the com-

position that aims to understand it. In this way, ethnography and education seek the subject-object dialectic, epistemological constructions that structure a complex and profound panorama of what they intend to unveil (Mattos, 2011, p. 44).

Boal (2009), when presenting the concept of asceticism in the process of constructing Forum Theatre plays, follows a similar line of methodology adopted by this segment of ethnography:

Like the filmmaker's camera, which, when it moves away from the centric point of the object being filmed, includes elements that surround it, so too, in a particular conflict, we must not descend to its singularities, conjunctural, but ascend to the structural: from the phenomenon to the law that governs it, to its causes - Rising! (Boal, 2009, p. 189).

According to Bárbara Santos (2016, p.199), the process of rising “consists of giving visibility to the macrostructure that is often masked, covered up in the microcosm of everyday life”. This process takes place during the dramaturgical creation stages of a play, where, through a particular story or the composition of multiple stories, a social oppression experienced by the members of that group will be portrayed. The process of rising is dialectical, both on the part of the group staging it and on the part of the *spect-actors* and *spect-actresses*² who will watch the play. The former, by creating, staging, narrating and listening to oppressions similar to those they have experienced, deepen their understanding, not just as a phenomenon experienced individually, but as a recurring fact, socially constructed and structured. It is from the contradictions that emerge in the specificities of each story that they begin to understand the complexity of these social problems.

In the same way, when *spect-actors* and *actresses* take part in a Forum Theatre session or workshop³, they are invited to think about possible solutions to the oppression that has been presented, left open in this dramaturgy, without an answer as to how to solve it. From there, the *spect-actors* and *actresses* enter the scene with ideas, embodied through their bodies and perspectives to deepen dialogues and concrete propositions on how to resolve that oppression. The dramaturgical elaboration resulting from each *spect-actor's* or *actress's* proposal is the synthesis of the dialogical process of each social oppression staged, which will then be elaborated again with the proposal of the next *spect-actor* or *actress*, who

² Spect-actors and actresses are the spectators in the theatre of the oppressed, but because they have an active role in creating strategies that resolve the oppressions dramaturgically staged, they are given this name in the methodology.

³ Forum theatre is one of the techniques that make up the TO methodology, in which a dramaturgy is presented that portrays a social oppression that the group performing it doesn't know how to resolve. Thus, following the technique's dramaturgy (Boal, 1975), it opens up a question, as yet unanswered, and offers the stage space for the spect-actors and actresses to enter the scene and theatrically devise strategies for overcoming it.

begins their scenic proposal after extensive mediated dialogue about the intervention just presented. This is the process that Konder (1981, p.12) calls dialectical overcoming, which is “simultaneously the negation of a given reality, the conservation of something essential that exists in this negated reality and the elevation of it to a higher level”. Each scene or piece of Forum Theatre created is a pedagogical-political-theatrical invitation for a joint elaboration, for a production of meanings shared by this particular group, but which starts from the particular, from a history experienced in a specific territory.

By oppression, Boal (2009) means any act that prevents the development of citizens’ aesthetic and cognitive capacities. Boal’s aesthetics of the oppressed (2009), in turn, refers to the techniques developed to resist epistemic injustice and promote democratic freedom.

In order for this oppression to be understood in its macrostructure, it is necessary to work on analogies and specificities. These are elements that indicate the recurrence of oppression, where it becomes clear that a particular history is perversely legitimised in different spaces and situations. Forum theatre is not used to analyse a specific problem of a certain person; the point is to understand the social implications that influence and determine relationships based on this individual history (Santos, 2016).

Aníbal Quijano (2001) shows that colonial exploitation is legitimized by a colonial imaginary that establishes immeasurable differences between the colonizer and the colonized. Notions of race and culture function as taxonomic devices that generate opposing identities. For the author there is “nothing less rational than the claim that the specific worldview of an ethnicity to be imposed as the universal rationality, even if that ethnicity is called Western Europe. For this is, in fact, claiming for a provincialism the title of universality” (Quijano, 2001, p. 43, our translation).

Thus, studying the local case in order to understand its universality is the origin of both the ethnographic study and the staging and presentation of a theatre-forum play. Both aim to unveil socio-cultural complexities, and to do so they see the singularities of specific situations as the basis for understanding and dialogue on the proposed theme.

The “history of knowledge is also geo-culturally marked, it has value, color and place of origin” (Walsh, 2004, p. 2 our translation). For authors such as Walter Mignolo (2005), there is an urgent need for practices to challenge the very concept of knowledge, establishing epistemological links between geo-historical sites and theoretical production.

For example, in the collection organized by Clifford and Marcus (2016), Coelho says that.

The intellectual effort of the texts of ‘the writing of culture’ could be defined, in its essence, as a project to endow the ethnographic text with its own visibility. Instead of attributing to it a “transparent” quality, of taking it as a way of access to the culture of the “other” whose best chance of success would reside, precisely, in its opacity, the authors of this collection redirect the reader’s gaze to the text itself, to the way in

which the ethnographer seeks to describe, in his “fantasy of objectivity”, the “other” object of his research (Coelho, 2016, p. 8-9)

That is, assuming his identity, the author would write from what would be an attempt, a “fantasy of objectivity,” for facts that compose an “other subjectivity.” It was no longer about the prerogative of “giving voice to the other.” It is a biologically, socially, and culturally impossible fact since this other has always had it, has always been understood by its social group, and has always constructed sets of meanings based on its voice, which was only not legitimized by a hegemonic culture and economy, therefore, invisible. At this point, the field of ethnographic study began to give importance to the multiplicity of voices, understanding that even this network of perspectives would not bring a truth, a totality of what was narrated, but an amplified vision, a deeper and more complex portion of what was proposed to be studied. This ethnography would no longer be based on the passivity of listening and the reciprocity of speaking, it “replaces the monologue with dialogue, provokes an aesthetic integration so that there is no alienation from everyday life” (Tyler, 2016, p. 204). In other words, assuming his identity, the author would write from what would be an attempt, a “fantasy of objectivity,” for facts that compose an other subjectivity. It was no longer about the prerogative of giving voice to the other. It is a biologically, socially, and culturally impossible fact because this other has always existed, has always been understood by its social group, and has always constructed sets of meanings based on its voice. This voice, however, has never been legitimized by a hegemonic culture and economy, and is therefore invisible. At this point, the field of ethnographic study began to give importance to the multiplicity of voices, understanding that even this network of perspectives would not bring a truth, a totality of what was narrated, but an amplified vision, a deeper and more complex portion of what was proposed to be studied. This ethnography would no longer be based on the passivity of listening and the reciprocity of speaking; it “replaces the monologue with dialogue and provokes an aesthetic integration so that there is no alienation from everyday life” (Tyler, 2016, p. 204).

It is therefore essential to delve deeper into reflections on the importance of polyphony in academic work. Marcus (2016, p. 268) defends the idea of ethnographic writing “designed for the reciprocity of perspectives, for the dialogical context for the incorporation of multiple authorial voices into a text controlled by a single author”. This is also what de Sousa Santos says when he says that we don’t have modern solutions to the modern problems we face and that for this “it is not simply new knowledge that we need, but a new model of knowledge production” (de Sousa Santos, 2005, p. 21). To this end, he suggests that we overcome indolent reason, so that we can dialogue with “the inexhaustible epistemological diversity of the world” and so that we don’t “create reductionist categories” (de Sousa Santos, 2005, p. 25).

From here we seek to understand how narratives about the production of knowledge and the concept of culture have been constructed. At the end of the 1980s, Hall defined culture as ‘the real, solid ground of the practices, representations, languages and customs of any particular historical society contradictory forms of common sense that take root in popular life and help to mould it’ (Hall, 1986, p.26). Willis (1977) also proposed the impossibility of defining culture separately from the rest of social life, so that politics, economics, the erotic, the social and the ideological should be studied in relation to each other in order to understand it as a whole form of life. On the other hand, these anthropologists, who were looking for different ways to talk about the ‘Other’ and their cultures, announced the need to study the deconstruction of the concept of culture, since this, in guiding research, often produced generalisations and typifications that led to the creation of constant illusions (Clifford; Marcus, 2016, p.16).

Similarly, in his studies on ethnography and education, Mattos (2011) emphasises the importance of polyphony for the construction of a web of meanings in the quest to unveil the culture being studied, while at the same time warning of the risks of this questioning of ethnographic authority having diverted attention from a previously relevant theme in ethnographic questioning, which focused on the theory versus practice controversy (Mattos, 2011, p. 28), which investigated how these multiple voices could seriously impact the quality of ethnographic research in education.

In this way, thinking about counter-hegemonic forms of knowledge production today is necessary in different spaces for learning and interlocution of knowledge, where multiple voices make up an epistemological diversity capable of overcoming cognitive injustice and the social injustices that result from it. The “Theatre of the Oppressed” appears in this sense as a methodology that proposes the reappropriation by the oppressed of the production of culture and meanings against hegemony.

With regard to the concept of polyphony and plurality of perspectives discussed above, Castro argues that “the world is made up of a multiplicity of points of view: all existents are potential centres of intentionality, which apprehend other existents according to their own respective characteristics or powers” (2015, p. 180). At TO, when we talk about the democratization of the means of artistic production (Boal, 2013) as a fundamental human right, we use a principle similar to that of ethnographic polyphony. Its praxis is present not only in the creation of TO plays with grassroots groups, who tell their stories and their perspectives on this story. It is also present in Forum Theatre performances, where the groups address a social problem that impacts them, without offering a closed answer to it, but on the contrary, posing a question to the spect-actors. It is these subjects who, after watching the play, will leave the usual place of passivity found in the ranks of traditional theatre to establish a new

kind of behaviour in this social space, where after a process of reflection and dialogue, they will intervene on stage.

The construction of the polyphonic narrative in TO needs to be divided into two distinct moments. The first is the composition of the Forum Theatre piece, which has polyphonic characteristics as the essence of its work. To understand this, we cannot reduce the concept of polyphony to simply collective speech/writing. It is necessary to unravel some aspects of this narrative proposal in order to see its potential.

Tyler (2016, p. 201) describes polyphony as a “better metaphor for the ethnographic text because it evokes sound, listening, simultaneity and harmony” rather than linearity. The Forum Theatre play is a better metaphor for representing social oppression than a traditional play or other one-dimensional narrative because it is composed of a tangle of meanings, created over a long period of time, which involves individual speech as well as collective listening to build a group vision step by step. It involves simultaneity not only in the subjects, who have both speaking and listening roles, but also the simultaneity of different meanings in the poetic construction of a social reality.

Because it is broad, theater is a “better metaphor.” It dialogues and recreates itself on a symbolic thought as well as on a sensitive thought, which Boal defines as being the first, a poetic thought of language, and the second, an aesthetic thought of language (Boal, 2009, p. 40). Through these thoughts, together, a subject expresses himself in an aesthetic and dialogical way. Dialoguing through her own senses and with other subjects that make up the collective in which she participates, she develops a polyphonic language.

Polyphony also presents another element, described by Fisher (2016, p. 308) as “the subversive potential of alternative perspectives ‘of minorities’ in relation to tacit assumptions of dominant ideologies” that are fundamental to creating a more “realistic, nuanced and structured” ethnography (Fisher, 2016, p. 308). Presenting alternative perspectives is an inseparable factor in the narrative construction of the “Theater of the Oppressed”. When the Marias do Brasil group, made up exclusively of domestic workers, debate through theatre the need for them to have a formal contract and basic rights, they demonstrate the possibility of “the performativity of the feminine pointing to the construction of everyday characters in bodies that have historically been distorted and shaped by the social invisibility of domestic work” (Fisher, 2016, p. 97). Theatrical polyphony is significant here because no ethnographer could narrate the story of these women with such power, since the only possible narrative that encompasses so many textures of this tangle of social, professional and personal life will be composed exclusively by the protagonists who have experienced this path, which is transformed through theatrical language into polyphonic dialogue.

This is the second moment in which we distinguish polyphony in the Theatre of the Oppressed. The dialogue proposed through Forum-Theatre has a different polyphonic narrative

construction, with many of the consonant items that have been described so far, but with some singularities. What we want to emphasize at this point is what Fisher (2016) describes as bifocality or reciprocity of perspectives. This is the ideal that anthropology has always aimed for of “seeing others against the backdrop of us, and ourselves against the backdrop of others” (Fisher, 2016, p. 277), as a juxtaposition of perspectives that doesn't just come from one side (the researcher) but is reciprocal and includes the perspective of the researched.

In Forum-Theatre, when the performance is over, a dialogical reflection is encouraged with the spect-actors and actresses. At this point, the staged reality is being problematized. The points that constitute that oppression are raised and a parallel with the reality experienced by that specific audience is placed in collision with what was presented during the play. During this process, the spect-actors and actresses are invited not only to reflect on the dramaturgy being staged, but to suggest strategies for overcoming this social oppression, which will not be described by the spect-actor but staged. During this process, there is a constant and dynamic reciprocity of perspectives, since the audience does not play a specific role in ‘interpreting’ the story presented. Their perspective is requested, it is necessary for there to be an effective forum. The very etymology of the term (forum) is an invitation to debate. In this way, the popular group presents a discourse, which is essentially composed of a question. “We live in this reality, we don't know how to overcome it, what do you suggest?”. At this point, the composition of that forum will require the narrative reciprocity of the spect-actors and actresses. With their proposals, they will create a complementary narrative to that problem, which after each intervention (there are at least three per forum), will undergo a new dialogical analysis by the other spect-actors and actresses. The aim here is not to reach a conclusion, a specific solution to that oppression, but to work on discussing the need to act in the face of that reality. And therein lies the continuous and reciprocal educational process between the TO group and the spect-actors and actresses.

With regard to the processual nature of phenomena – Ethnographic methodology has certain specificities that differentiate it from other research methodologies. Among them, the search for procedural phenomena is perhaps the most important. Ethnography is interested in investigating the variations of a given experience and the relationship between these variations and the variations of macro-social contexts (Mattos, 2011, p. 28). To do this, it moves away from the premise used by other methodologies and looks at the causes of the social phenomena it studies, moving into another perspective, one that will allow us to understand how these facts, phenomena and experiences happen, and what their pattern of recurrence is, how it connects with the socio-cultural context in which it occurs, how it develops and relates to other social groups.

This is why we believe that processual rather than causal phenomena are the basis of ethnographic work. Not just because it seeks out the logic of the processes of the social

relations it studies, but because the ritual in which ethnographic research itself takes place has a different logic. The process, both of research and of the phenomenon studied, is dialectical and is concerned with the totality of the problem. Thus, assuming the dynamic nature of ethnographic research is also part of understanding it. This dynamism is basically made up of the constant variation in the ways in which the subjects experience the events they take part in, as well as the varying meanings they give to these events over time.

As ethnography is based on everyday relationships and these happen spontaneously, it becomes untenable to seek a viewpoint that does not accompany this process. Oliveira (2009, p. 94), inspired by Canevacci, reports that there is a need to “approach and live with chaos as a platform for expanding knowledge”. Thus, the procedural relationships of the methodology follow the same dynamics as the everyday life that is to be studied.

Like ethnographic research, TO creations are based on the search for the procedural nature of facts. Through this symbolic language, the aim is to understand how relations of oppression occur in the lives of oppressed subjects. Their causes are studied by the group, mainly as a basis for researching and putting together plays that dialogue about the oppression reported, but the main quest is to understand how they occur, how they are structured, how they impact on those subjects and, above all, how it is possible to transform them.

The methodology doesn't just aim to find out what the possible solutions are, but how they might develop, what partnerships are needed for them to become “concrete and ongoing actions” (Santos, 2016, p. 192) and how social subjects can be mobilized to work together to overcome these social structures. This stems from the theoretical field of TO. In practice, we also see a lively and intense procedural logic. The private stories that underpin the creation of plays are a small part of what is shared and built collectively in these meetings. The relationship between the individuals who make up the groups goes beyond the search for a language to express themselves. The nature of OT is procedural because, being aesthetic, it is a “relationship between subject and object that produces knowledge” (Santos, 2016, p. 298). It is in this relationship that its logic of movement takes place. The various games and exercises of TO enhance this relationship between subject (oppressed) and object (oppression). This logic is inseparable from the everyday power that makes up the lives of these people. In this way, it is unthinkable not to consider that “every everyday life can be considered a work of art” (Maffessoli, 1996. p. 148). Daily life is lived, experienced and re-signified all the time by these individuals, and there is no way that there is no creative impulse in this process of creation and living together. The shared production of knowledge has a unique logic. The other here is not the object, but the subject of research and creation. It is from the relationship that exists within these spaces and groups that the work developed provides a fertile environment prone to the production of knowledge, inherent to a language that only happens effectively when different

perspectives and knowledge clash and complement each other, and are perceived as fundamental to aesthetic, pedagogical and cultural creation.

3 Theatre of the Oppressed and epistemological ‘gaps’

The “Theatre of the Oppressed”, the pedagogical-political-theatrical methodology on which this work focuses, was developed by Brazilian theatrical artist Augusto Boal in the mid-1950s, when he was still director of the Arena Theatre in São Paulo. Its development is based primarily on his praxis as a director in the capital of São Paulo, his practice and research based on political and popular theatre (Costa, 2016) and stems from the group’s confrontations in the search for a Brazilian theatrical aesthetic, followed by the need it perceives to dialogue theatrically with the Brazilian people (Boal, 2013).

The process of developing the methodology took place over decades and has characteristics that intersect with the development of Freirian popular education, which in the same period (the late 1950s and early 1960s) travelled through the interior of Brazil in processes of literacy for young people and adults and raising awareness among the population through artistic, educational and cultural mobilization organized by the Popular Culture Movement (MCP), the National Union of Students (UNE) and the Cnbb (National Conference of Bishops of Brazil).

Thus, looking at the roots of TO, but especially the processes of developing its methodology, one realizes that it was created from practical experiences, from confrontation, it was rethought theoretically and methodologically, always based on the facts that happened as a result of its application. This led to the structuring of three concepts that are central to its understanding, which are intrinsically linked to Freire’s methodology: 1) In the Theatre of the Oppressed, the content of the plays must always be based on the grammar of the oppressed. In other words, it is based on real stories, lived by oppressed subjects, who, with the aim of seeking ways to overcome these social oppressions, dramatize what they have experienced, formulating their perceptions of how they are structured and how they should be confronted; 2) These stories are staged together with other subjects who are experiencing the same social oppression, who sometimes share histories, territories, communities and, of course, these oppressions. Everyone has the right to participate in this aesthetic-theatrical dialogue. They have the right to elaborate their versions of what they live and think, starting from their place in society, and 3) Aesthetic-theatrical participation cannot be passive, nor can it only take place verbally, maintaining the pre-established distance between actors and spectators. It needs to be active. Subjects can and must take to the stage, which in turn must remain a democratic space, open for other voices, aesthetics and bodies to express themselves through their plural narratives.

The Symbolic exclusion and cognitive injustice based on these initial elements, it is possible to say that we perceive this pedagogical-political-theatrical methodology as a

counter-hegemonic form of knowledge production that enables new educational arrangements and other spaces for knowledge production. These other forms sometimes intersect with formal educational spaces and in these intersections, they bring to light mechanisms of symbolic exclusion (Xiberras, 1993) present in educational spaces that are closely associated with the development of cognitive injustice (de Sousa Santos, 2007).

According to Martine Xiberras, symbolic exclusion happens through the establishment of normative values or the disruption of marginalized values, marginalizable from an ethnocentric perspective, through the rupture of meanings, through “stigmatizing world representations, through denial or ignorance, through collective anguish or atavistic hatred” (Xiberras, 1996, p. 22). In education, as we mentioned earlier, this manifests itself in a variety of ways.

When possibilities for overcoming symbolic exclusion are brought up, there is talk of structured forms that guarantee the inclusion of other knowledge, behaviors, everyday life and oppressions in learning spaces and the production of knowledge. These forms move towards reducing the fundamental aspect of exclusion, which is social injustice, which in turn, according to de Sousa Santos (2007), can only be overcome as epistemic injustice.

In developing this concept, de Sousa Santos (2007), argues that economic and cultural relations in the West are still structured on the ‘abyssal’ cartographic relations that separated the old and new worlds in the colonial period. In this way, he argues that social injustice is closely related to cognitive injustice and that both can only be overcome through the construction of post-abyssal thinking. When he talks about abyssal, the author is referring to an abyss that separates two incommunicable worlds. On one side is what is legitimate, real, scientific, tangible, explainable, rational, while what is on the other side is considered non-existent, and as the author puts it, “non-existence means not existing in any way that is relevant or comprehensible. Everything that is produced as non-existent is radically excluded because it remains outside the universe that the very concept of inclusion considers to be other” (de Sousa Santos, 2007, p. 1). In abyssal thinking, the co-presence of the two sides of the abyss is not conceivable, while what is on this side is legitimized by the exhaustion of the relevant reality, what is on the other side only remains “non-existence, invisibility and non-dialectical absence” (de Sousa Santos, 2007, p.1).

Thus, when we think about the ways in which knowledge is produced and legitimized in modern societies, we are faced with an eradication of what is different. It’s not just about separation, the marginalization of other perspectives, but about “the capacity to produce and radicalize distinctions” (de Sousa Santos, 2007, p. 2). It’s not just about showing difference, or even hierarchizing it, but transforming difference into inequality, in such an extreme way that what is below in the hierarchization is below the visible, buried.

It’s important to emphasize that in this epistemological conception, what is ‘on this side’ is granted epistemological sovereignty over other knowledge considered to be alterna-

tive, and even with the disputes that exist between different areas of knowledge (science, theology and philosophy) they are all on this side of the abyss. Even though there is a huge gap between what is considered science and philosophy and theology, they are all considered to be producers of knowledge and are legitimized. Meanwhile, there is a range of other epistemologies that are on the other side, the invisible side, the submerged side. These are the “popular, lay, commoner, peasant and indigenous knowledges that lie beyond the universe of true and false” (de Sousa Santos, 2007, p. 3 e 4).

On the other side there is no real knowledge; there are beliefs, opinions, magic, idolatry, intuitive or subjective understandings, which at best can become the object or raw material of scientific investigations. knowledge is rendered incommensurable and incomprehensible because it obeys neither the scientific criteria of truth nor the criteria of knowledge recognized as alternative. (de Sousa Santos, 2007, p. 4).

Thus, it is understood that social exclusion is not only linked to structural issues, present in the economic, educational and labor sectors, related to the right to land, health, transport and decent housing, but also directly affects the ways in which knowledge is produced. Thinking not just about other forms of knowledge, but about other ways of producing knowledge (de Sousa Santos, 2007) is essential for overcoming cognitive injustice. Ways that make it possible to see other worlds, other perspectives, other grammars, expressions and languages that can bring out what has been submerged since colonial times, and which has only exacerbated the vast social, economic and epistemological inequality, establishing a system of profound exclusion.

Although the concept of exclusion is understood from a number of different perspectives, there is a common understanding in many of them that we are talking about subjects who are pushed out of the material and/or symbolic market of a set of certain values stipulated by a given society (Xiberras, 1996). According to Wanderley (2014, p.18), the “excluded are not simply physically, geographically or materially rejected. Not only from the market and its exchanges, but their values are not recognized, in other words, there is also a cultural exclusion”. In other words, when we use the term exclusion, as ambiguous and polysemic as it may be, we are referring to subjects who are on the margins, on the outside, not belonging to a certain group or space where those who are included would be, who conform to the characteristics, rules and agreements for their acceptance, in other words, they have all the conditions that make them belong.

Although there has already been a deep and diverse study of the concept of exclusion in the field of education, it is essential to lay some foundations here so that we can think about the different ways in which it materializes and how informal and non-formal spaces for the production of knowledge and education can overflow into formal spaces, oxygenating relationships and

boosting reflections on alternatives for an education that can bring criticality to these invisibilities, with the aim of problematizing, decoding and understanding them in order to overcome them.

Material exclusion and symbolic exclusion manifest themselves in society in various spaces, whether institutionalized or not. It manifests itself through holes in the social fabric, which precisely because of its structuring logic generates the social symptom of exclusion. However, this research has shown that non-formal education spaces and practices, when in dialogue with formal spaces, have the capacity to propose possibilities for overcoming both these symbolic exclusions and cognitive injustices, mainly because they bring other perspectives, other aesthetics than the hegemonic ones. In fact, it doesn't consist of 'bringing in', since these 'other' perspectives, looks and aesthetics were already present in formal educational spaces, impregnated in the bodies, behaviors and expressions that pass through them. But in these intersections, it is possible to see a reinforcement of the process of dis-invisibility, that is, the intentional action of making purposefully invisible practices visible (de Sousa Santos, 2003), expanding understandings of the world and making it possible for other ways of producing meanings to be not only allowed, but empowered.

4 Encharcado – MareMoTO and the multiplication of the methodology

The Centre for Theatre of the Oppressed (TO) was created in 1985 and its first project in the Maré complex was set up in 2004 (Santos, 2017). The Theatre of the Oppressed Group (GTO) MareMoTO was formed in September 2014 as part of the Theatre of the Oppressed in Maré project, carried out by the TO. The project lasted two years (between publicising the project and setting up the groups) and resulted in the formation of three GTOs, with the participation of 35 young people, who in this period totalled more than 1,500 hours of workshops in theatre, music, digital culture, set design, costume design and 85 performances in schools, theatres, institutions and public spaces.

MareMoTO was one of three groups formed (the other two were Maré 12 and Marear), organised territorially according to the proximity of the members' homes. At the beginning (2014), the group was made up of fifteen young people aged between 15 and 19, residents of the Complexo da Maré, and held weekly rehearsals on Saturdays in the shed of the Museu da Maré. At the end of 2014 and 2015, the group, which at the time had Flávio Sanctum and Claudete Félix, former members of the TO, as its "Curinga"⁴, dedicated itself to working on some of the basic concepts of TO, carrying out games and exercises that make up the methodology, and proposing listening spaces to understand what themes the group would like to work on using the meth-

⁴ Curinga is the term used in TO to indicate the person who mediates in the forum theatre between the play and the actors and actresses. It is also the person who, during the meetings/rehearsals of the TO groups, leads the rehearsals, proposes games and exercises, articulates the sharing of stories, indicates possible modifications to the play. The Curinga takes the role of popular educator, director and playwright.

odology. They then went on to create the dramaturgy that would give rise to the group's first play (A Marcha de uma Borboleta), a play that centered on gender issues within the Favela da Maré.

When this research began in 2016, a new "curinga" took over work with the group. This "curinga" was a young woman in her thirties, who had worked in different Latin American countries and was closer to the discussions and themes proposed by the young people in MareMoTO. The group, in turn, remained a partner of the CTO, but without an institutional link.

At the end of the year, the group applied for the PAT (Territorial Autonomy Plan), a call for proposals designed to financially support 48 projects in the twelve territories where the Caminho Melhor Jovem (CMJ) project operates. Each project was awarded R\$15,000.00 for performances, samples, exhibitions or workshops related to each group's area of cultural and educational activity. CMJ was a public policy of the State of Rio de Janeiro, managed since 2015 by the Secretariat for Sport, Leisure and Youth (SEELJ) and funded by the IDB (Inter-American Development Bank), which aimed to work on personal and professional development through direct and participatory dialogue with young people living in areas with Police Pacification Units (UPP) or in the process of being pacified, working in fifteen favelas on Rio de Janeiro.

Figure. MareMoTO after rehearsal on 10/08//2016.



Fonte: Paula Castellsagué (2016)

There were a number of criticisms related to projects that were in some way linked to the UPPs, a government programme widely criticized by residents of Maré and other favelas in Rio de Janeiro, including by MareMoTO participants, mainly because of the lack of dialogue between the state and local populations, directly impacted by the pacification project,

and also because of the expansion of the truculent and arbitrary actions of the military police in the favelas where it was being implemented.

MareMoTO's proposal in this call for proposals was to hold workshops to multiply TO in spaces for the production of culture and knowledge in Maré, for young people aged between 15 and 29, reflecting on aspects of oppression present in the *Complexo de Favelas da Maré*, where they studied and lived, based on aesthetic dialogues proposed through theatrical exercises and games. Four workshops were held as part of the project covered by this PAT call, but here we will focus on one of them, in order to deepen the discussions triggered by this intervention and to discuss the educational possibilities and the production of meaning and knowledge from working with this pedagogical-political-theatrical methodology in formal educational spaces.

The multiplication workshop in question took place on a Monday, 21 November, at the *Vianinha* State College (fictitious name). The workshop was planned to last approximately three hours, from 9am to midday. This week, the students were in exam week. They took their exams from 7.30am until 9am and then, as they couldn't be released before midday, they stayed on the court taking part in the activities that the coordinators had proposed for the week, which was celebrating Black Awareness Week.

When we arrived, there were around 50 students on the court. They knew there was going to be an activity there, but they didn't really know what it was about. We had disseminated information about the workshop, passed on a description to the school coordinators, but apparently the students who were there were there by chance. It was 9am and we started talking to the group of students to understand why they were there. After a while, when we realized that most of them weren't there eagerly awaiting the workshop, we understood that starting a conversation about a theatre workshop, Theatre of the Oppressed, wouldn't work, they were talking, playing football, they didn't want to hear anyone proposing a theatre workshop. Let alone talk about the oppressed.

Therefore, the members of MareMoTO got out some instruments used in the group's plays and proposed a game that is used as a warm-up before performances. The game was simple. They created a basic rhythm and repeated everyday words (Yes, yes, yes. No, no, no). The group spoke the first words and the students responded to the second. In the proposed rhythm. Then, when they were already feeling musical, they added the words bread bread bread, and they replied honey, honey, honey. Within this, a musical game is created, interspersing the question: yes, no bread, with the students' answer: no, yes, honey. In rhythm. Finally, we add João, João, João, and they answer Luis, Luis, Luis. And then it's a rhythmic, chaotic mess.

There, there was a point of contact! The group walked in a musical procession around the court until they reached a circle in the middle of it, where the group's jokers talked about

the workshop proposal. The workshop took place on the court, which is literally in the centre of the school, where most of the classrooms have access, after the staircases, which faced the entrance to the canteen, always a busy spot. So, during the workshop, many young people passed by, were surprised by the movement, looked around, some were interested and asked others what was going on, others were indifferent, and still others were annoyed by the occupation of the court, a place where most of them play football and volleyball in their free time.

Some of the students knew the members of MareMoTO, as some of them live in the same favela complex. Some of them had already seen the group's presentations, so in a short time most of the workshop participants were already at ease, seemingly calmer after that day of tests. Because they explained from the outset that the group originated in Maré, there was great interest in better understanding who they were. They weren't 'outsiders' coming to do an activity to occupy their free time during this week of exams. They were young black men and women just like them, coming to talk about theatre, which, as one member of MareMoTO said, "starts from real life, from stories from your lives", and problematizes everyday situations, looking for ways to find languages to explore what is already there, in practices, on the streets, in habits, in dances, in bodies, to talk about what disturbs, bothers and oppresses.

The group then began the workshop with the game Me Toca, which is a warm-up game, then Colombian hypnotism (first category, games to demechanize everyday movements); then the game '1,2,3 by Bradford' (second category, rhythmic demechanization); Forest of sounds (third category, demechanization of the senses); the game Complete the image (fourth category, demechanization of the gaze) and finally the four in motion, which is a demonstration of how a Forum Theatre works.

During the Completing the Image game, in pairs, the participants shake each other's hands as if to say good morning and freeze. From there, one of them unfreezes and creates another image using the frozen image of their pair without moving it. Once this (static) image has been created, the other of the pair unfreezes and creates another image with the one they see, and so on. The idea is to work on polysemy through the bodies in sculpture. At one point, a MareMoto member conducting the exercise froze a specific image of two students and called all the other participants to analyze the frozen image (the analysis is part of this exercise).

The frozen scene consisted of a black girl standing with her hand outstretched over the head of a boy, also black, crouching down with one leg bent and the other on the ground. The group member leading the activity provoked the other participants to say what they saw there. One student replied that she saw a baptism, a blessing. Another student said that it looked like someone from the family lecturing their son or nephew. Someone else said that

it looked like a “escracho”⁵, but it didn’t seem to be between family members, but someone from outside, a drug dealer for example. This led to the following dialogue:

- Student 1 – This is the law, it’s the law of the favelas, of the slums, this is the law of drug trafficking, that the person who is X9 dies early. That’s the law of drug trafficking, it’s not the law of our home, the law of our life that we take into our lives, it’s the law of drug trafficking, that’s the law of drug trafficking.
- Member of Maremoto - Do you agree with this law?
- Student 1 – No, I don’t think so.
- Member of Maremoto – Why do you think this law, this way of resolving things, happens? Why do you think that in order for me to show someone else I have to kill them?
- Student 2 – to make people afraid.
- Student 3 – not to do it again.
- Student 1 – to intimidate people. For him to be the biggest, he intimidates people.
- Student 2 – so that he has power, he intimidates others
- Member of Maremoto – Do you think this is a form of oppression?
- Several voices – Absolutely
- Member of the Tsunami – and does it work?
- Student 1 – unfortunately it works.
- Student 4 – if it didn’t work, no-one would die anymore
- Member of the Tsunami – and from this, do you think you can’t be whatever you want in the place you live?
- Student 5 – You can be whatever you want, but you can’t say whatever you want.
- Student 6-Yes! You can be what you want, but you can’t say what you want.
- Member of Maremoto – Do you think it’s everyone who challenges this and thinks it’s unnatural, who doesn’t naturalize it?
- Student 1 – A lot of people are born in the favela, they have the same upbringing as a guy who nowadays is a bandit and nowadays is a lawyer, a doctor. Everyone chooses their own path. (Workshop at C.E. Vianinha, 21/11/2016)

In this exercise, the polysemy of images and looking at them from multiple perspectives is worked on with the students. From this, analyses are made of the references and repertoires in the production of meanings that are part of the participants’ daily lives. This particular image showed the different ways in which the students there felt controlled in the territory where they live. At the beginning of the dialogue, the ‘favela law’ mentioned is not exactly a law devised and enforced by the state. It’s related to a set of practices that, although they don’t exist formally, haven’t been democratically discussed and regulated by a state body, are widely known and followed by those who live there, in Complexo da Maré (as well as in other favelas in Rio de Janeiro). Knowing this set of rules is essential for sur-

⁵ Escracho is a colloquial expression that refers to when some state authority acts in a truculent, insulting, or humiliating way with the population.

vival in this territory. It's not part of the school curriculum but is learnt from an early age in everyday social interaction, in the multiple relationships that are established from childhood onwards. It's not just about being "X9",⁶ but about living in these doubly controlled spaces, since living in the favela means being under the laws of the state and simultaneously under the 'laws of drug trafficking'.

Based on his studies of Foucault, when he analyzed the transition from disciplinary societies to control societies, Deleuze (2013) states that in disciplinary societies the subject constantly moves "from one closed space to another, each with its own laws: first the family, then the school, then the barracks, then the factory, now and then the hospital, eventually the prison, which is the means of confinement par excellence" (Deleuze, 2013, p. 223). Through discipline and confinement, the aim of these disciplinary societies was to organize time and space at all times in order to optimize and increase productivity. The strict discipline inculcated through this lifelong confinement was fundamental in making it difficult to escape the normative model, which outlines a behavioral pattern and rigorously establishes ways of following it.

In the transition between the disciplinary society and the society of control, there are disciplinary devices, but also others with a greater focus on the subjective control of the subjects. Control is thus exercised in the open; it doesn't need enclosed spaces or an apparent disciplinary tool. In this sense, control no longer needs to be exercised through confinement, grouping and strict disciplinary processes. It can be done effectively by the state, but also as a side effect of the neoliberal practices that prevail in society, as in this case in the workshop, represented by the daily presence of both the armed arm of the state, the police, and drug trafficking, which act in a concrete and violent way in these daily lives, but also in the creation of a set of cultural norms that are present in various spaces in the favela, thus acting as disciplining institutions.

This can be seen when the student taking part in the workshop spontaneously suggests that the image refers to drug trafficking laws. She talks about something extremely violent that has a direct, physical impact on her, which means that she can be whatever she wants, but she can't say whatever she wants. From this, she emphasizes the set of practices she is subjected to, which exerts concrete and constant control over a large part of what she does and says, however informal and illegal the control of the drug trade may be. However, control also takes place through various cultural and symbolic practices. It's interesting to note that immediately after this speech, the same student reproduces a typically meritocratic discourse, built on various symbologies and experiences that she has seen and experienced during her life, which underpins this hegemonic discourse that also

⁶ X9 is a colloquial expression referring to a person who denounces, exposes, or reveals information to authorities at the expense of others.

has a direct impact on her. In this second speech, she says that there are a lot of people in the favela who have the same upbringing as a guy who is now a thug, but is now a lawyer, a doctor. Everyone chooses their own path, in other words, right after talking about how the life of a favela dweller is subject to these trafficking laws, the student suggests that it is the individual who builds their path, regardless of the forces that impact them, the opportunities they have, the social structures to which they are bound, or the violence they suffer on a daily basis. From this perspective, the student somewhat excludes the multiple inequalities and injustices that young people from favelas go through in order to graduate from primary school, high school, enter university, finish university and enter the labor market, since according to her the central point is not the conditions and social aspects of that territory, but the personal choice of each person.

Boal (2009, p.141) states that “social relations in everyday life are structured as spectacles in which the power relations that exist between the members of that social segment are displayed”. The playwright also says, drawing a parallel between the society of the spectacle and these spectacular everyday relationships, that “one of the main functions of art is to reveal, make sensitive and aware of these everyday theatrical rituals, which go unnoticed, even though they are a powerful form of domination” (Boal, 2009, p.141).

After this moment in the workshop, the discussion about living in the favela continued, resulting in the following dialogue provoked by one of the MareMoTO participants.

MareMoTO member – So what do you think you can do to change your life? Be entitled to rights?

Student 5 – move out of the favela

Student 3 – *laughs*

MareMoTO member – But what can you do while you’re in the favela?

Student 1 – Study! To have a better life! To really get out of there. Because when you live in the favela, you’re subject to everything! You’re liable to leave home and not be able to come back. You leave, then there’s an invasion. Most of the time, those who have nothing to do with the story end up being hit. So you have to study or try to improve your life to get out of there.

MareMoTO member – But do you think just leaving is a solution? What about the other people who will remain inside? Is there no solution? Do you think...

Student 1 – I honestly don’t know a solution for the favela.

MareMoTO member – But don’t you think you’re informing yourself, if you improve, you won’t be able to help either.

Student 7 – You can help and offer it (the favela) what you want to be, understand?

Student 1 – Think of a project to help young people not to enter this life.

MareMoTO member – There’s a question. A project for favela youth!

Student 1 – A project!

MareMoTO member – And where are we from?

Student 1 – From Maré!

MareMoTO member - within our group there are people who are studying at university, which is what I'm going to tell you. When we joined Maremoto, everyone had no idea about politics, no idea about various things, which we as favela residents do have the right to. We learnt to understand. That there is a whole government issue, so that favela residents don't have access to culture and education. I think it's very important that I tell you this. Not that the theatre changed our lives, that it totally influenced us, but that we can dream and chase our dreams, that it's very important to want something better for ourselves, you know? And that's it. I'm a favela dweller like any of you, but we're there. But I think that's what matters. Favela residents, and what matters is that favela residents occupy the spaces that are theirs, yes, college is a right, yes (workshop at C.E. Vianinha, 21/11/2016).

From this moment on, as a result of the same exercise, we can see how an aesthetic-dialogical dialogue is characteristic of both the TO and the educational processes proposed from these workshops held by MareMoTO. The young woman from MareMoTO begins by questioning the possible ways of transforming the reality mentioned in the previous dialogue about the 'trafficking law'. She replies that the only way out is to leave the area. From this response, the search to unveil the situation begins. The previous dialogue talked about what the favela territory consists of, what it is made up of. Here, they were trying to understand how to transform it. Would it be possible to transform it? What could be done to make this transformation real? Wouldn't leaving be the best thing to do? What about those who didn't leave? All the questions led to reflections and searches for strategies to transform that particular situation, that reality. They were all based on situations and perceptions that those young people living in the area had. It was about their oppressions, their friends, their families, their lives. At this point, the aim was not to find the most assertive description of the favela (Boal, 2009, p. 141), or the strategies with the greatest potential for transformation. It was about establishing a dialogical, horizontal space in an institution that sometimes still reproduces the characteristics of a competitive, meritocratic society focused on individual benefit, characteristics that are in line with those of the banking education that Freire (1970) refers to so often.

By establishing this aesthetic-dialogical space, loopholes are opened up. Freire argues that "dialogue is an existential requirement. And, if it is the encounter in which the reflection and action of its subjects, addressed to the world to be transformed and humanized, are in solidarity, it cannot be reduced to an act of depositing ideas from one subject to another" (Freire, 1970, p. 45). As an existential requirement, dialogue cannot be occasional in the educational process. To be real, it needs to start from where those with whom it is proposed to dialogue are, where they see meaning.

When a dramaturgy is presented about a particular oppression, or when a simple image is created during a theatre play, and it is capable of triggering several layers of inter-

pretations, this is an indication of something that is to be elaborated collectively. In this momentary space, young people are called upon to participate synesthetically and verbally as the protagonists of their educational process. We see an active process, triggered by a generating theme (Freire, 1970) common to most of the students, which, based on a repertoire of legitimate meanings among them, makes it possible to create a series of aesthetic-theatrical representations in which they are effectively linked to the proposed educational process, establishing dialogical learning processes, which are inherent to both OT and education as a practice of freedom (Freire, 1970).

This can be seen in the dialogue above, both in the male and female students who respond to the young woman from MareMoTO, who says that the only way to change her life is to leave the favela. In the questions that this young woman from MareMoTO asks afterwards, we can see a provocation to look for something beyond, something broader, that doesn't just change their lives individually, but questions how to transform the lives of favela dwellers in the favela and not outside it.

The question they ask, based on the perceptions that the students observe in the game, is why access to basic rights in the favela is so different from those who live in the 'other city' and, based on this, how it would be possible to change certain social structures that directly affect favela residents. Based on the elements that make up their territory, the students make it clear that they don't see any possibilities for transformation in the favela, which is inherent to the situations they experience. But this impression cannot be absolutized either, since the people who are there talking to them (members of MareMoTO) are also favela residents. Even from the same Maré favela.

As the exercise unfolds, MareMoTO members bring up the context of the workshop being held in a school with students mostly from the "favela of Maré and Alemão"⁷. The young woman from MareMoTO briefly recounts the history of some members of the group, both individual changes caused by going to university and the desire for social change based on political engagement and the proposal to dialogue and articulate with other young people in the area, to influence public policies aimed at young people and favela residents, and to occupy political decision-making, discussion and debate spaces that are rightfully theirs.

This position, that in other contexts could sound as a paternalistic discourse, seeks to list examples to be followed, guiding institutions that would legitimize and boost the social ascension of a few individuals. But starting from that young woman, that theatre group, that workshop held, the school where it was held, the method used, the subjects with identity

⁷ Maré and Alemão's favelas are located close to the International Airport, in the North Zone of the metropolitan area of Rio de Janeiro. In the decade of 1962, a neighborhood called "Serra de Misericórdia" was created by Leonard Kaczmarkiewicz, a Polish migrant, from whom the nickname "morro do alemão" derived, meaning German's favela."

affinities who proposed the workshop and especially the process by which they arrived at that particular subject, at those particular possibilities for socio-territorial transformation, it is possible to elaborate some epistemological and educational expansions possible through these methodologies and these aesthetic-dialogical processes.

In this workshop held at C.E. Vianinha, the work of TO with the school's students is also characterized by the multiplicity of languages it explores in the course of its activities. The corporeality that is given to the proposed dialogues, together with the multiple forms of expression that are proposed, become another focus for epistemological expansion. The students are called to dialogue, but they are not bodily passive, they are not restricted to a certain space, they do not have to give their opinion only verbally, responding to a question that is also posed verbally.

In this workshop, students are invited to express themselves in as many different ways as their senses allow. With this possibility in mind, the workshop proposed games from the four categories of TO, with the aim of recognizing and broadening different forms of expression, in the different languages through which we can work on the most different themes that impact us and are connected to everyday life. Victório (2014, p. 227) argues that “every process of aesthetic creation is also a production of knowledge a privileged space in which the workings of life and the intense workings of beauty come together”. It is on the basis of these doings that we see theatre as a way of producing transgressive knowledge, doings and aesthetics that come from powerful and multiple bodies, which open up countless possibilities for analysis, creation, collective elaboration, existence and learning.

In the work organized by Freitas, Education, Art and Life in Bakhtin (2013), Goulart discusses language from a Marxist perspective, where she describes the political-philosophical architecture of everyday life, “which cannot be linked to a particular ideological sphere, precisely because it deals with the communication of ordinary life, which involves the set of inner everyday sensations that reflect and refract objective social reality” (Goulart *apud* Freitas, 2013, p. 72). Here, the author delves deeper into the way Bakhtin saw the construction and social involvement of subjects based on the everyday life they were immersed in, and the multiple ways that language enabled them to reinterpret the meanings they saw themselves in, where they could “become freer and more creative to reformulate standardized genres” (Goulart *apud* Freitas, 2013, p. 73). The author believed that the “plural experience of enunciative life, a transitory place of passage” (Goulart *apud* Freitas, 2013, p. 73) could conceive of a multiplicity of meanings present in dialogue that could serve both closure and openness, both liberation and oppression.

MareMoTO's workshops and presentations show that everyday life and the meanings present in it are the driving force behind a fertile dialogue that opens up possibilities for epistemological constructions.

As Santos (2016) argues, recounting his experience for more than fifteen years alongside Boal,

They are going to dramatize reality, we create a metaphor, an image of the real: a representation that expresses a certain perception about the real. Thus, we move away from reality itself to see it in its image, which allows us to broaden the vision of what has happened” (Santos, 2016, p. 203).

Starting from reality, from the oppressions and everyday experiences of those who live them, characterizes the dialogical power of the method. Hence, creating scenes, plays, interventions or even short dialogues during the workshops exemplifies the power of Boal’s proposal that social subjects re-appropriate the means of artistic production into languages of demand.

In this way, bringing the method closer to formal educational spaces shows not only the possibilities of widening these gaps that establish effectively dialogical and aesthetically transgressive spaces and moments, but also the possibilities of the pedagogical-political-theatrical methodology overflowing between these different educational spaces. This is because we understand the dialogical characteristics of TO between subjects, but also the dialogical power of the method between these different educational spaces.

This thought was further developed in the subsequent workshops we held within the PAT, held at *Centro de Estudos e Ações Solidária da Maré* (CEASM), located in the Complexo da Maré, more specifically in Morro do Timbau, in February 2017 with three pre-university classes, as well as in the presentations of the MareMoTO Forum Theatre play, held in schools, universities, community museums and other educational spaces.

Based on these experiences, it is possible to indicate some crossings of the application of the methodology in this territory, which we call soakings caused by these MareMoTO interventions, not only in the subjects who took part, but also in the spaces and institutions where they were carried out.

We realize that through pedagogical-political-theatrical interventions, it is possible to create echoes and resonances in the spaces where they are produced in such a way as to provoke “short circuits that open up the present for the future, modifying institutions” (Deleuze, 2013, p. 214). Short circuits because, for a brief moment, they establish another logic of knowledge production that leaves traces. As a methodology, when it overflows, it widens gaps that already exist within these institutions, or even opens up new ones. Proposals such as learning through transformative action; the change from passive spectator to active protagonist (spect-actor); social and political intervention through theatre; the modification of reality through the construction of territorial languages (Teixeira, 2007); the production of knowledge from aesthetic creation that comes from histories of oppression, but

also from the daily and cultural characteristics of specific groups, all these characteristics of the TO methodology, have the possibility of destabilizing the logic of the institutions through which it passes.

These destabilizations can be characterized as heterotopic manifestations, where they create situations that disorganize the domesticated life of the society of control and make invisible things visible (Vannucci; Junqueira; Diniz, 2021). Heterotopia, from a Foucauldian perspective, according to the author, is different from utopia because it takes place in a space that can actually be localized, but in another space-time dimension. Unlike utopia, which takes place on an abstract plane, imposing a benchmark, a place to be reached, which as you move further away, heterotopia takes place on the plane of the real and the possible. They are not revolutionary, destitute, but take place in another dimension that overlaps with real space, as if it were a perceptual bubble where the participants return home with a residual dramaturgy” (Vannucci; Junqueira; Diniz, 2021).

During the MareMoTO workshops and performances, it's possible to say that for a brief moment a perceptual bubble was created. The shift to a dialogue that is not only verbal, but that encompasses other senses, other languages within those institutions that are mostly verbal; the decentralization of the voice in the production of knowledge; the transition of protagonism on stage, which has no owner, but is open and inviting to anyone who wants to participate in that aesthetic experience; the denaturalization of everyday social facts through stories lived by young people from that territory, the invitation to practical transformation, through action regarding an oppression that crosses part of those young people present. These practices, characteristic of TO, have the capacity to create a heterotopic space during the moment of their application.

The residual dramaturgy that Vannucci describes can have a direct impact on those students, who then come to the institution with other proposals and experiences. Deleuze (2013, p. 30) argues that “there is no revolution of the oppressed if desire has not taken a revolutionary position”, while Vannucci and her colleagues states that the aesthetic revolution is not a direct action on the world but revolutionizes the ways in which we see the world (Vannucci; Junqueira; Diniz, 2021). From this, we think that various spaces within the school institution can be created parallel to and overlapping with it, where experimentation with freedom, uncompromising expression and pleasure in production can be revived. Not that the school, as an institution, doesn't provide students with this kind of experience, but we believe that due to some of its characteristics, listed throughout this work, oxygenation is necessary to provoke constant short circuits. In a way, the proposition of small heterotopic moments appears to be a kind of materialization of the viable utopianism defended by Freire (1970). It indicates the viability of other proposals in the production of knowledge, the

relationship between educational agents and the constitution of knowledge. Possibly transformative, dialogical and moving towards education as a practice of freedom.

5 Conclusion

According to Arnulf (2022), the practice of Theatre of the Oppressed becomes a method of emancipation that allows the imbalance of participation to be restored: the actors have the opportunity to take ownership of the social and political issues of their time and to think collectively about new ways of transforming the contexts in which they live.

MareMoTO was formed as a collective, a group of young people who chose TO as a language, as a tool for aesthetic and social emancipation, knowledge production, articulation and dialogue between different spaces within the territory where they live. During the 22 months in which the fieldwork was carried out with the group, it was possible to observe these multiple collective, horizontal, powerful narratives, which transgress the method itself, oxygenating ways of relating, of doing theatre, of producing meanings and senses, starting from multiple daily lives that broaden the ways of understanding the world, its relationships, its oppressions, its creative powers.

Delving deeper into the work with the pedagogical-political-theatrical methodology made it possible to draw parallels with ethnography, the methodology of this research, in order to indicate possibilities for cross-referencing central aspects of both, which even though they are developed in different areas of knowledge, share concepts and elements that are central and dear to both, such as the detailed study of the relationship between the local and the universal; the powers of polyphonic narratives and the processual nature of phenomena.

Through the creation of Forum Theatre plays and TO workshops, it was possible to see the possibilities that escape dichotomous visions and perspectives, to broaden the textures that make up social entanglements and the power relations that stem from them, and thus to seek other forms of knowledge production that are synesthetic and open. TO, as a polyphonic theatrical language, has shown during performances in colleges, schools, squares and museums that it is possible to suggest proposals for dialogues that go beyond monologues, that prioritize reflection over imposition, that are open rather than restrictive, that democratize and horizontalize the prevailing verticality.

Similarly, the study of a collective working with TO has shown that it is a methodology that makes it possible to broaden dialogue in the educational, political, aesthetic and theatrical fields, and allows for the conception of other ways of existing, creating and producing knowledge. It thus demonstrates that knowing and doing, aesthetics and knowledge constitute the same work (Victorio, 2012). This is evident from moments of elaboration on the real, on looking at everyday life through multiple perspectives, which even make it possible

to oxygenate and transgress the standardization and institutionalization of learning, knowledge and the educational experience. Thus, proposing other ways of learning that overcome symbolic exclusion (Xiberras, 1996) and cognitive injustice (de Sousa Santos, 2007), and from this, enable and encourage the overcoming of social oppressions rooted culturally and socially in Brazilian institutions and society.

Furthermore, by making it possible to create heterotopic moments (Vannucci; Junqueira; Diniz, 2021), it enables the redefinition of roles between the subjects that make up an educational and knowledge production space. By theatricalizing the daily lives of ordinary people, young people from Complexo da Maré, it is possible to reimagine and strengthen the democratization of these spaces.

REFERÊNCIAS

- ARNULF, Fanny. Da prática teatral à luta pelo reconhecimento: o Teatro do Oprimido nas favelas do Rio de Janeiro. In: **Todas as Artes, Todos os Nomes**: II Congresso Internacional Lusófono. Cap.4.3,p. 314-325, Universidade do Porto. Faculdade de Letras, Porto, 2022... Disponível em: <https://ler.letras.up.pt/uploads/ficheiros/19482.pdf>. Acesso em: 21 de junho de 2024.
- BOAL, Augusto. **A Estética do Oprimido**. Rio de Janeiro: Garamond, 2009.
- BOAL, Augusto. **Teatro do Oprimido e outras poéticas políticas**. São Paulo: Cosac Naify, 2013.
- CLIFFORD James; MARCUS George, (org). **A escrita da cultura: poética e política da etnografia**. Tradução por Maria Claudia Coelho. Papéis Selvagens. Rio de Janeiro: EdUERJ, 2016. 388p.
- COELHO, Maria Claudia. Sobre tropas e cornetas: apresentação à edição brasileira de Writing Culture. Cap. 1, p.7-25. In: James Clifford; George Marcus, (org). **A escrita da cultura: poética e política da etnografia**. Tradução por Maria Claudia Coelho. Papéis Selvagens. Rio de Janeiro: EdUERJ, 2016. 288p.
- DE SOUSA SANTOS, Boaventura. Para além do pensamento abissal: das linhas globais a uma ecologia dos saberes. **Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais**. v. 78, p.3-46. 2007.Acesso em: <http://journals.openedition.org/rccs/753>. Acessado em 21 de junho de 2024.
- DELEUZE, Gilles; GUATTARI, Félix. **O que é a filosofia?** São Paulo: Editora 34.1991.
- FREIRE, Paulo. **Pedagogia do Oprimido**. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra. 1970.
- GOULART, Cecilia Maria Aldigueri Política como ação responsiva: breve ensaio acerca de educação e arte. In: Maria Teresa de Assunção Freitas. **Educação, Arte e Vida em Bakhtin**. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica Editora, Cap.4, p. 75-104, 2016. 128p.
- MAFFESOLI, Michel. **No Fundo das Aparências**, Petrópolis, RJ: Editora Vozes, 1996.
- MATTOS, Carmen Lúcia Guimarães de. Imagens da exclusão na microanálise da sala de aula: uma instância interativa de confronto cultural. In: Carmen Lúcia Guimarães de Mattos; Paula de Almeida Castro (Eds) **Etnografia em Educação: Conceitos e Usos**. Cap. 4, p.101-116, Campina Grande, PB: Eduepb, 2011.
- MIGNOLO, Walter. **La idea de América Latina: la herida colonial y la opción decolonial**. Gedisa Editorial: Barcelona. Tradução de Silvia Jawerbaum y Julieta Barba. 2005. 241p.
- OLIVEIRA, Gustavo Rabelo Coelho de. Desordeiros. Uma pedagogia urbana extrema. In: , Gustavo Rabelo Coelho de Oliveira. **Pixação: arte e pedagogia como crime**. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) - Faculdade de educação, Universidade Estadual do Rio de Janeiro, Cap.4.; p.83 a p.101, 2009, 371f.
- QUIJANO, Anibal. Colonialidad del poder, cultura y conocimiento en América Latina”, In, Walter Mignolo (comp.). **Capitalismo y geopolítica del conocimiento**. Partell, Cap.2,p 119-131, Madrid, ES: Ediciones del Signo. 2001.

QUIJANO, Anibal. Colonialidad y modernidad / racionalidad, In: Robin Blackburn; Heráclito Bonilla (eds) **Los conquistados. 1492 y la población indígena de las Américas**. Tercer Mundo Editores; Flacso: Libri Mundi, Santafé de Bogotá, Colombia, Ecuador, p.437-448. 1992.

SANCTUM, Flavio. Do negativo social à transformação do real. Aproximações entre Boal e Adorno. **Sala Preta**, São Paulo, Brasil, v. 12, n 2, p. 45-50, 2012. <https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.2238-3867.v12i2p45-50> Disponível em: <https://www.revistas.usp.br/salapreta/article/view/57485>. Acesso em: 22 junho de 2024.

SANTOS, Barbara. **Teatro do Oprimido Raízes e Asas: uma teoria da práxis**. Rio de Janeiro: Ibis Libris, 2016. 532p.

VANNUCCI, Alessandra, JUNQUEIRA, Christine; DINIZ, Guilherme. **Crítica do Teatro Brasileiro no século XX**. Ufmg: Horizonte da Cena. Curso veiculado no YouTube em 10 de junho de 2021. Disponível em: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y7aeN3xzwFo>. Acesso em 28/03/2023.

VICTORIO FILHO, Aldo. Estéticas nômade: outras histórias, outras estéticas, outros...ou o funk carioca: produção estética, epistemológica e acontecimento. **Visualidades**, v. 6, n. 1 e 2, 2012. <https://doi.org/10.5216/vis.v6i1ei2.18085>. Disponível em: <https://revistas.ufg.br/VISUAL/article/view/18085>. Acesso em: 22 jun. 2024.

WALSH, Caterine. Geopolíticas del conocimiento, interculturalidad y descolonización, **Boletín IC-CI-ARY Rimay**- Instituto Científico de Culturas Indígenas. Ano 6, n. 60, p.1-6, 2004. Disponível em: <http://icci.nativeweb.org/boletin/60/>. Acesso em: 22 de junho de 2024.

WANDERLEY, Mariangela Belfiore. Refletindo sobre a noção de exclusão. In: Bader Sawaya (org.) **As artimanhas da exclusão: análise psicossocial e ética da desigualdade social**. (14ª ed). Petrópolis: Editora Vozes, Cap.1, p.17-26, 2014.

XIBERRAS, Martine. **As Teorias da Exclusão: para uma construção do imaginário do desvio**. Lisboa, PT: Instituto Piaget, 1996. 256p.

Received in November/2023 | Approved in April/2024

MINI BIOGRAPHY

Igor Federici Trombini

Master's degree from the Faculty of Education of the State University of Rio de Janeiro (UERJ). Consultant at the Brazilian Fund for Biodiversity – Funbio. Researcher in the Environmental Education Projects of the Federal Environmental Licensing – Ibama, in traditional communities along the coast of Rio de Janeiro.

E-mail: igor.trob@gmail.com

Alessio Surian

A PhD in Pedagogy and Educational Sciences from the University of Padova. Associate Professor of University of Padova. Director of CIRSIM, the Interdepartmental Research Centre for Intercultural and Migration Studies.

E-mail: alessio.surian@unipd.it