Communication and education for otherness: photographic expeditions as an exercise in the pedagogy of intersubjectivity

That you have to leave the island in order to see the island, that we can't see ourselves unless we become free of ourselves.

José Saramago

Introduction

How to communicate and educate towards otherness? In the context of contemporary Western culture, a dualistic worldview prevails, which separates subject and object, nature and culture, human being and environment, self and other, center and periphery, and native and foreigner. In this scenario, the pedagogical proposal of intersubjectivity developed by Vilém Flusser can be our guiding star when thinking of communicational and educational paths in the development of social impact projects that aim to contribute to paradigm shifts and the reduction of inequalities. In this context, we have chosen to present the photography project with young people belonging to the collective “Nofotofake” of the Heliopolis favela carried out by Roberta Dabdab.

Based on the premises of the photographic gesture as a mobilizing agent for social inclusion and the application of the “pedagogy of intersubjectivity” as designated by Flusser, the project questions the sore points of our era in the fight against the drives of iconophagy (Baitello, 2008), the sedentary habits of thinking sitting (Baitello, 2014), and the alienating and dampening consequences of our hanging existences (Baitello, 2019).

In parallel with these three nodes, the project opens space for relations with Paulo Freire's ideas in the understanding of communication as an exercise in otherness and the freedom movement (FREIRE, 2003), and with the studies of Lucia Leão, who defends the importance of dialog in the construction of shared and flowing knowledge (Leão, 2020).

For our discussion, it is important to start by pointing out that we understand communication and education as central fields in dealing with the reduction of inequalities and in the construction of
practices and situations that broaden the understanding and awareness of diversity. Alterity, in turn, is a polysemic term that deserves some initial points for reflection. With roots in the Latin *alteritas*, which means “to be the other”, alterity evokes a movement of empathy, of putting oneself in the other's place. At the same time, otherness also implies perceiving and respecting the differences of the other, their uniqueness.

In short, when we talk about communication and education for otherness, we are referring to cultural movements and actions that aim to recognize and/or disseminate singularities and differences. The idea that different cultures have different worldviews is implicit in the concept of otherness. It is also essential to affirm that a just and balanced society is necessarily a society that is open to and tolerant of diversity.

That said, we want to go a little beyond this classic definition and add an understanding of otherness in the sense developed by Baitello. In dialog with Flusser's thought, especially in the article “*Ame teu outro como a ti próprio*” [“Love Thy Neighbor as Thyself”], Baitello defends the importance of the other in the process of understanding ourselves: “Where there is no otherness, we don't know who we are... And if we do not know who we are, we accept any portrayal of the other, detached from our own perception. We have seen, lived, shared spaces and times with others and have accepted any creature are presented to us as true. We do not know who we are, so we have no autonomous existence, everything must be dictated and commanded, as in fairy tales in which the mighty hero magically defeats evil. We condemn ourselves to a minority in our relationship with the world, we are no longer responsible, we become "infants" (from the Latin *infans*, one who does not speak, one who does not have their own speech, who cannot speak for themselves). And therefore, without any discernment, we accept the shrill voices that promise the elimination of the other, of the diverse, of everything that is not me. Infantilization begins to occupy any and all spaces and to impose itself as a norm for dealing with the masses of impoverished selves” (Baitello, 2019, p. 97)

Further in line with the pedagogy of intersubjectivity, for Suely Rolnik (1992), otherness is: “...the plane of forces and relations, where the inescapable encounter of beings takes place, an encounter in which each one affects and is affected, which has the effect of destabilizing the form that constitutes each of these beings, producing irreversible transformations. In other words, the inescapable existence of the plane of otherness defines the nature of being as heterogenetic” (Rolnik, 1992, p. 1)

In short, within the concept of otherness we find the fields of forces capable of triggering affections and transformations of consciousness, unveiling processes of encountering the other that not only destabilize crystallized knowledge, but also enable us to be affected. As such, creative projects
that aim to contribute to the processes of otherness are, in essence, political, ethical and poetic (Leão et al., 2019, p.14)

In the development of the proposed pedagogy of intersubjectivity, Flusser’s main influences were Husserlian phenomenology and the anthropophagy of Oswald de Andrade. When discussing the processes of production of knowledge of science, Flusser points to the abyss between humankind and their environment. This dissociation distances us from others and our surroundings. Hence, the anthropophagic question, "how to incorporate the other, and how to be incorporated by the other, without losing one’s own identity?" (Flusser, 1982, p.1), is answered through an "intersubjective" approach.

“Husserl has shown that the fundamental error of Western science is its attitude toward the world. It assumes that man can transcend the world and look at it from the outside. As if man could dispose of a kind of metaphysical crane which can lift him out of the world. In fact, the scientific attitude is God-like, and the point of view science assumes is the one God assumed during the Middle Ages. This is why science can believe that its point of view is “objective”, that its method is “value-free”, and that it can be “unprejudiced”. All of these are Divine attributes, which science attributes to itself” (S.d-6, p. 4)

We know that Flusser landed in Brazil fleeing from Nazism in 1940. He became a naturalized Brazilian, called himself a Brazilian, and lived in São Paulo for 32 years. In “The philosopher as garbage man”, an interview given to the journalist J. C. Ismael for the O Estado de São Paulo newspaper’s Culture notebook in the mid-1980s, during a visit to Brazil, Flusser explains that his proposal for intersubjectivity, understood as a dialectic between ethics, aesthetics and politics, was developed based on his concrete and reflective experience in São Paulo (1941-1972). Also in this interview, Flusser discusses the need to turn to the concrete human reality and to connect science, art and politics. According to him, his life experience in Brazil contributed to his awareness and attitude of responsibility regarding "being in the whole world”. In his words, this responsibility is expressed in the writing of articles on everyday phenomena (Sd-4, p. 19)

Here it is important to underline that, when emphasizing that Western science was based exclusively on the Cartesian affirmation of access to the world from the point of view of “Man”, disregarding everything else – the others (things, non-things), the garbage and the environment – Flusser aims to discuss the problems that arise from this worldview. Thus, Flusser states that the relational consequence of this is the model that we follow, producing and informing knowledge, or a dictator and predator model, as it does not doubt itself, and thereby does not engage with thing with which it dwells, the other: "The interiorizing movement of doubt is stopped early on, and stops at the thinking thing" (Sd-1, p. 105) “The model currently outlined and inapplicable, because there are currently
growing islands in culture, (mainly in the United States and Western Europe), in which the evidence is approximately this. The human circumstance on these islands is full of products (whether durable or perishable, the distinction is very relative). These products form a labyrinth in which men move. Partially engaged in the task of producing more products. Partly in the task of transporting products from one place in the labyrinth to another. Partially - ever more desperately - in the task of consuming the products and making them disappear from the environment. Partially in the ever more difficult task of meeting each other and shaking hands despite the products that interfere and obstruct the paths from man to man. And partly in the task of finding a way out of the labyrinth (perhaps to the nature that has disappeared beyond the horizon). And in all corners of the labyrinth garbage is piling up, that is, products poorly consumed and thrown ‘out’” (Flusser, 1979, p. 36).

Finally, as one of the serious consequences of this approach, Flusser points to the excessive production of humankind: “the metaphysical stance of Western science developed the illusion that the world was the object of man, and man the subject of the world” (Sd-6, p. 5). In line with this reflection, it is essential to question how dichotomous models not only reign in massive cultural products but also in the systems of production of images and data of those who interact with systems. Finally, we cannot forget that dualisms and schizoid worldviews end up maintaining oppositions and conflicts, generating even more inequalities. Communication and education are responsible for proposing other pedagogies: “In parallel to this scenario of fascination, narcosis, submission and consumption of systems and regimes of spectacularization, it is important to consider the clash of forces that operate in the constructions of knowledge and that often surrender to hegemonic and colonial models. Understanding the crisis of paradigms and the need to overcome dichotomies, we propose that the teaching method should be built from the perspective of complexity” (Leão, 2020, p. 2)

Never have so many images been produced, never have so much garbage been produced, so many files to be deleted or even stored in data clouds as giant phantoms. In this mixture of excess and deprivation, our daily lives perpetuate rituals of updating systems and we perceive ourselves increasingly overloaded and at the same time empty of meaning. How can one escape such dualisms? From an archaeological perspective, Flusser presents the third human kingdom, the garbage environment, and deepens the urgency for intersubjectivity. Understood as a way to explore otherness, approximate realities and break the gesture that emits Anthropocene ecosystems, intersubjectivity is a procedure, a conduct.

The pedagogy of intersubjectivity
No man is an island. He is communication (Freire, 1975/2022, p. 34)

Love is an intimate intercommunication of two consciousnesses that respect each other. Each has the other as the subject of their love. It is not a question of appropriating the other. (cf., p. 36)

So, there is an urgent point: for Flusser, intersubjectivity is a procedure, a conduct. By understanding the world in an archaeological manner, Flusser puts us in contact with the layers of phenomena and symptoms that our gestures accumulate on each other and that involve human relations, communication and meetings, and, finally, the kingdom of Garbage. The author defends the use of a socio-ecological, democratic and responsible approach for the understanding of our reality – the background that unites us - and for the construction of otherness and social intersubjectivity.

In the article published in Shalom magazine in 1982, “Amor teu out do como a ti próprio” [“Love Thy Neighbor as Thyself”], Flusser draws the foundations of his anthropophagic model or his intersubjective approach: “Let’s transform Hillel into our context. The problem posed by Hillel is that of intersubjectivity. "love thy neighbor as thyself" becomes: "assume otherness without losing one’s identity." This is the primary problem of anthropophagy. How to incorporate the other, and how to be incorporated by the other, without losing the difference in identity? It is the eternal problem of devouring god, of "enthusiasm". This includes the aspect of the devourer: to become god without ceasing to be man, and the aspect of the devoured: to become man without ceasing to be god. Which is the problem of existence” (Sd-2, p. 90)

The author assumes the urgency for the inseparability of subject and object in relations with the world of life and highlights how “hateful is the model of transforming the other into my thing, to transform myself into the owner of the thing” (cf., p.91). We understand here that Flusser was reflecting on how much the “gesture of informing” or the “gesture of emitting” is a “colonizing gesture” and an internalized model in the organization of Western social life.

Returning to recover the concepts of otherness and alienation listed by Flusser, what interests us is his approach that prioritizes the encounters of bodies from extreme realities and the primary communication in social relations: gestures, dialogs, reflections, and recognition.

The individual inserted in the environment brings the awareness that we live eccentrically in different yet overlapping worlds: 'the others are in my world, and I am in theirs.'

“It is possible to "recognize" the other's point of view, because it is possible to "recognize" me in the other. Recognition is not knowledge. It is a different type of relationship. Because in knowledge
there is an object, while in recognition there are only subjects. Recognition is intersubjective” (Sd-6, p.6).

For Flusser, to create realities is to expand the relationships that compose them, because reality is a field of dynamic relationships that "flow" from one horizon to another with an intention and affirms that subject and object are distinguished only from the intention of the relationship. Here we can highlight a seminal point to bear in mind: that “knowledge” presupposes objectification and “recognition” proposes listening, dialog and intersubjectivity. “This is what intersubjectivity is as a scientific method. And this is also what Husserl intends with his slogan "back to the matter" and "let the things speak for themselves." A new humility in the face of an infinite complexity of phenomena, and a new respect for the equivalence of every point of view in the world, is the result of this method. In short, a scientific attitude that is aware of human limitations and that tries to make the most of them through intersubjective actions” (cf., p.7).

In other words, Flusser invites us to think of a scientific method that goes beyond the divisions between subject and object, overcoming dualisms and embracing the complexities of relationships. In the exercise of the intersubjective approach, we can design research and social projects that allow approximations between different points of view, revealing realities and possibilities of implications of humankind with its surroundings: “expands and deepens the world, making it more real”. (cf., p.6)

The lenses between us and others

It is evident that the lenses we have created have given us ample insight to expand our knowledge. But by restricting our view to a small range of the entire spectrum, they tint perception, leading us to confuse reality with the view we get from them. “But isn't everything here green?” asked Dorothy. No more than in any other city," replied Oz; “but when you wear green spectacles, why of course everything you see looks green to you.” The reliance on a single point of view does not clarify the whole picture. A fixed point of view...a single line of reasoning...can be a trap, where we only find what we are looking for, blind to other possibilities. (Sousanis, 2017, p. 36)

Let's begin this topic by highlighting the reflections on the theme of reading and lenses that "modulate the perspective" or "consciousness" found in the correspondence exchanged between Flusser and Gabriel Borba (1974 to 1986) in order to orient the approach that we are defending and improving.

Under the theme of production and the artistic environment, especially in the Brazilian context, the conversation between the two presents very critical views for those relations. Borba seems frustrated, as if he had found no meaning for what he did. Flusser’s though, on the other hand, was post-
historical and environmental, overcoming the need for the gesture of making, of the product, and incorporating phenomenology and anthropology to understand “reading”, a theme he says he is committed to. “In short, if we define a human as an entity that reads the world as if it were a context, the problem of reading and readings becomes the fundamental problem of all anthropology. Hence my concern that every time I read symbols, I must admit the pre-existing code, and therefore the rupture between symbol and meaning. But if I want to avoid such a rupture and start to read "structurally", (if I suspend the semiotic dimension), I find that the sign is only a sign because I agree to it... In other words, every reading presupposes a code, (that is, spirit), and this is what characterizes man” (Sd-3, 1974, cad 3, p.19).

This conversation between Flusser and Borba deserves to be highlighted. In response to the letter above on 06/08, Borba states: "But my interest is the other way around, not reading, but writing - which certainly implies a reading of the socio-natural partner, but for which I do not have a more interesting methodology" (cf. p.23). We understand Borba's speech as that of one who automatically determines themselves as the subject of the thing – the artist “scribbling” their art – and, from a subjective point of view, a “naturalized” gesture of emitting.

Following this, on 07/23 Flusser writes his concern with the fact that “people who call themselves artists” are using new technologies (at the time, he cites the videotape), always aimed at aesthetic goals and proposing subjective models of the world: "But this is to ignore the virtualities of videotapes .... Your letter has given me new ideas. That's why I have dedicated the Portuguese version of my idea to you". The author attaches the essay named “To Gabriel”, which Borba himself later changes to “Modelos Mudam” ["Models Change"] and publishes in the magazine In:Projeto, by the Faculty of Architecture and Urbanism Brás Cubas in 1979.

It is in this article that Flusser questions the models of scientific research, the crisis of objectivity, and the subjective models, both capable of providing deformations and interferences in the phenomenon studied and presents his intersubjective model as an approach anchored in phenomenology. “As a result, a new point of view (which is new only in the sense of being deliberately assumed to overcome the crisis) is being elaborated everywhere. It is the point of view of those who do not seek to transcend the world, but to assume themselves as being immersed within the world. The elaboration of such a viewpoint, and of models projected from such a viewpoint, is the program of "Phenomenology". Indeed, the models that have been proposed under such a new perspective, will radically change our worldview. For example, our view of the human body. It will no longer be seen as one of the various objects of the world that surrounds us, but as our way of "being-in-the-world", that is, experiencing and manipulating the objects that surround us. Such models, if and when elaborated in a disciplined
manner, will no longer be objective (as if seen by Martians) but intersubjective (seen from the bodily condition common to all men). Nor will they be subjective (seen from a specific subject). However, we still do not have such models, although literature on the "phenomenology of the human body" is increasing and deepening year by year. This has to do with the technical problem of making models” (Sd-5, p. 86).

To think “from the bodily condition common to all men” is to think intersubjectively and means approaching the phenomenon in a democratic and pluralistic manner. Indeed, it allows the perspective of one who is “in relation” to the world of life and to others, horizontally.

Throughout the correspondence exchanged between them, we can identify Flusser “subtly teasing” Borba to review his gestures as an artist and as director of the São Paulo Cultural Center, in an environment saturated with ideologies and subjectivities.

In Flusser's letter to “Gabi” on 05/17/1985, the author, who is always very critical of the Brazilian artistic environment, which he considered outdated and colonized, defends the urgency of reflecting on the transition from the culture of objects (industrial) to that of information and how much this “non-objective universe is also the result of manipulations of symbols, and the whole of society is dedicated to this”. It is in this letter that Flusser points out that, despite not abandoning history, post-history measures the symbolic universe in a continuous ‘time-space’: “In short, it is space (public, private, sacred) that needs to be reflected on in São Paulo, allowing the spirit of the times come spontaneously. This is post-history. Space, not objects. Because the objects cover the space” (Sd-3, cad. 4, p. 04).

In the letter dated 02/22/86, the author suggests that the gesture of “engaging in nothing” is a form of “creativity” and that in the face of an “overfilled” artistic environment, “at most what one can do is engage against it”. (cf., p. 14)

Our argument thus far wants to point out Flusser's lucidity when rethinking scientific and artistic production, and consequently the culture that continues to be informed by modern and subjective gestures - gestures of objectification and control.

The approach that was adopted in the photographic gesture project with the Heliopolis collective follows the Flusserian ecological critical proposition. That is, it is based on the idea of not separating subject and environment and perceiving the active movements between subjects and objects. It is, above all, a proposal based on an ecology for sociability. Based on these parameters, we "operate" the photographic gesture as a bonding gesture in our expeditions.
Helipavisita: the photographic gesture as an exercise in meeting otherness

We cannot know that the world is not as it should be without knowing how it is, nor can we know that the world is as it is without knowing how it should be. We cannot know that the world is not as it should be without knowing that it can be changed, nor can we know that it can be changed without knowing how it is. (Flusser, 2014, p. 10)

Based on Flusser’s pedagogy of intersubjectivity as a perspective of bonding with others, understood here as living beings, things and non things, we will present an experiment of an “anthropo-bio-logical” nature and intersubjective construction, centered on the importance of the practice of the body lived and the relations engendered by it: the photographic expeditions conducted within the Nofotofake project with young people aged 13 to 20 years and resident in Heliópolis¹, the largest favela on the outskirts of São Paulo. We call our expeditions #helipavisita (“Helipa” is the nickname used fondly by residents to refer to the favela).

The independent project “Nofotofake” began in February 2019 and counted on the participation of approximately 30 young people until 2021, recalling that during the period of lockdown/Covid-19, the project was carried out in online meetings. In each semester, some participants left and new ones joined. Without following any fixed structure, the project always had as the importance of listening and dialog between the researcher and the young people a principle. The name “Nofotofake” was chosen together with the participants of the first class, based on the basic prognosis of the research, which is to reflect on what an image is and what is the world of life. In 2020, we received the Pipext, a research stimulus award offered by the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo, whose proposal was to bring two different cultural environments together through two different groups of young people. That is, the young students of the undergraduate courses in Journalism and the Multimedia Communication course at PUC-SP and the young people from the Nofotofake collective in Heliópolis, in order to photograph their respective environments together as a proposal for the construction of an “intersubjective model” of biosocial design.

Our hypothesis is that a complete experience of communication can induce the creation of intersubjectivities between them and indicate paths for a better understanding of sociability between extremes, the search for otherness and dealienation, important concepts to link us to the current world and that require new contributions and innovative approaches. (Dabdab & Baitello, 2022, in press)

¹ Heliópolis, denominated herein by its affectionate form “Helipa”, is the largest favela in the city of São Paulo. With 200,000 inhabitants, it occupies an area of 1 million square meters and lies 8 km from the city center.
The photographic expeditions provide the encounter with the Other, the engagement with the environment, and we emphasize a possibility of reversing the dimensional losses of the world of life that we are "subjecting", or rather, "objectifying" with the socio-cultural, political and technological apparatuses. This historical process disciplines the body, limits access to the environment, reduces cognition and perception and ends up subtracting the human experience of a more comprehensive "being in the world", that is more critical and in line with reality. “Only when you stumble do you realize that you are a subject, only then is it possible to start projecting. Only when one perceives oneself as submissive can one begin to emerge. And so, under the sign of stumbling, the concept of "verticality" acquires its full meaning: it is that attitude that is taken when stumbling, outraged by humiliation, and when trying to transform its subjection into projection. "Verticality", therefore, not as indignation against something, but as an outline for the anthropos, the human. This is done with backward steps. We have literally reached "nothing", the null dimension of digital thinking. It has been a long road. We need to walk back to the world of the body, in which we can be bodies of bodies. The path has actually gone backwards, from space to surface, from surface to line, and from line to point. Or in terms of the world of life, more existentially: from the body to the surface of the image, from the image to the line of writing, from writing to the instant, in the zero dimension of an impossible present” (Flusser apud Kamper, 2016, p. 37).

It is important to point out that it was based on the perspective of these young people – the initial idea was to photograph the favela - that we realized that we were surrounded by very small spaces all the time. It is not only about the interior environments, but the configuration of the favela itself offers narrow and increasingly tapering streets. Our relationship with space has always been very limited and, always surrounded by a lot of trade, a lot of products, a lot of images and a lot of noise.

This feeling of a certain “social imprisonment” that these young people experience spatially and symbolically was confirmed when, in one of our conversations, they stated that they rarely ever left and that the vast majority of them had never been to or heard about Avenida Paulista, the heart of the city of São Paulo, nor the Pinacoteca Museum of the State of São Paulo, the neighborhood of Liberdade, etc. Symbolic places in the imaginary of São Paulo and with access by public transport.

Paradoxically, at the same time, all these young people have cell phones - they produce and receive communications all the time. And even those who don't have mobile internet will sit down and connect when they find a free Wi-Fi point. In relation to the settlement of bodies, Norval Baitello has dedicated an entire book to discuss “thinking sitting about glutes, chairs and images” (2012) and asks
an important question: isn’t it disturbing that our technological civilization, the informational society, does everything sitting down? (Baitello, 2012, p.35)

It is important to note the multiple faces of this contradiction. On the one hand, thousands of young Brazilians living on the outskirts of large towns are deprived of access to the city, practices and meanings of citizenship and intersubjective processes in the Flusserian sense. On the other hand, these young people are captured by the seductions of digital communication networks - without awareness of what this means - and are welcomed in the spectacular, interactive and abundant space by the capitalist logics of algorithms and control, with the symbolic and deterministic coercions arising from this system.

Thus, in dialog with the group of young people, we decided that we would start to investigate other environments outside the favela and that we would go out to “photograph” places that they would like to discover in São Paulo or places that would dialog with the theoretical content of the classes.

Naturally, our meetings and dialogs have become the fundamental basis for the construction of this approach that aims to have the "audacity" to use the bonds we build along the way as the guide in this encounter of cognitions and perceptions that we develop between ourselves, others, and the world. The “model”, which we are proposing with the Heliopolis group, apart from being a methodology developed with “determined goals” and a “point of arrival”, has the Morinian method at its core, as a thinking activity of a “living, and not abstract, subject capable of learning, inventing and creating ‘in’ and ‘during” their path’ (Morin, 2003, p. 18). It is also directly related, as already stated, to the intersubjective model proposed by Flusser in his essays “Ama Teu Outro Como a Ti Própriô”, “Modelos Mudam” and “Phenomenology: a Meeting of West and East?”.

Returning to the project, at a given moment we invited Maria Elisa's mother, Aline, to participate in one of the photographic expeditions. After walking and photographing with us in the district of Liberdade (2019), she wanted to record a statement about her perceptions. We asked her what she thought of photography as a possibility of searching for knowledge. Below is the transcribed statement:

"[13:00, 08/02/2019] "Good afternoon, I came here to thank you for the invitation for the trip to Liberdade and to share a statement about her perceptions. We asked her what she thought of photography as a possibility of searching for knowledge. Below is the transcribed statement:

own, and it’s also a fun way of getting out of the classroom. Photography is even a form of creativity because through it we can have another perspective. What I noticed was that when they are behind the cameras, they pay more attention to looking at something that is sometimes imperceptible, someone's way of sitting, the way they dress, a detail of their hairstyle and even a light bulb! It was very gratifying to be able to recognize that in my daughter today and put my gratitude on the record because it has made her look at life in a different way. Photography brings a lot of knowledge at this age, it’s such a broad view of what we don’t have, for example, because we live on the outskirts, in a neighborhood where we don’t have much quality, where we don’t have many initiatives”.

Aline's observation that “they pay more attention” with the use of the photographic apparatus was already an assumption of the research, and it further urges us to “pay attention” to the potentiality of the camera and the photographic gesture. Our proposition is the gesture as “relational action”, which includes the body “endowed” with six senses operating a “apparatus” that helps it to materialize in four-dimensional space-time, that is, in the here and now, in the present, in reality. This argument is confirmed by the empirical observations of the researcher and the dialog with the group: that the action or gesture of photographing matters even more than its result.

Regarding the photographic gesture and its universe, we can highlight three characteristics pointed out by Flusser: in the book Filosofia da Caixa Preta [“Philosophy of the Black Box”] in 1985: - "Anyone who observes the movements of a photographer equipped with an apparatus or an apparatus equipped with a photographer will be watching a hunting movement.” (p.29) - in the article Fred Forest or the Destruction of the established Points of View (1980s) – “The camera became, as spontaneously, a epistemological tool, an instrument to understand”. (Sd-7, p.174) and in the book Gestures published in German in 1991 - “The man with the apparatus is a human being, which means that he is not only in the situation but also reflectively apart from it” (2014, p. 76).

Thus, by reflecting more deeply on the epistemological role of the camera and its gestures, based on our argument, certain aspects were demonstrated: Is the purpose of photography exclusively to manufacture photographic images? Is the photographic gesture a “producer” of realities? The “game” we propose is to renounce the object of photography and a visual ethnography resulting from it as the ultimate end of experiences and to wager on free, sensory photographic tours of endogenous images, to photograph or not, without the concern of having a descriptive record or a “mission to fulfill”.

We can affirm that both the photographic image and the photographic gesture are “product” and “action” in a relationship established between a “man armed with the photographic camera” and the environment where he circulates. Flusser highlights the etymology of the two verbal strands of
the Latin word *apparatus, adparare* and *praeparare*; the first “implies lurking around waiting for something,” and the second, “availability for the sake of something” (2002, p.19). This means that the apparatus – the camera in this case - can be an instrument to either hunt or to let oneself be hunted.

The author affirms the peculiarity of the photographic gesture as a philosophical gesture, which allows conversation and openness to the surroundings, as being due precisely to the presence of the human being in the binomial man + apparatus, which is not simply positioned in the situation, but faces it reflectively (2014, p. 76). This reflective nature brings awareness of oneself and others, and this is a relevant point for this experiment.

Flusser considers the "hunt" of the photographer – the man with the apparatus - a continuous movement in the four-dimensionality of space-time and consequently a dialectic with the various perspectives of the situation, and which reveals an internal and external tension of this man. For the author, this continuum is about “the unfolding of methodical doubt. And this is the philosophical gesture par excellence” (cf. p.79). We can state that the author is relating the photographic gesture to phenomenology.

We would like to approach, albeit superficially, this dialectical search that the photographic gesture allows, that is, an intersubjective process, with the concept of “eccentric positionality” (1928) of the German philosopher and sociologist Helmuth Plessner (1892-1985), one of the founders of philosophical anthropology. He says that the notion of “*exzentrische Positionalität*” (eccentric positionality) (Plessner [1980] 2003)” of man, that is, having the consciousness of consciousness – knowing that I am a body and that I have a body – is the condition for “acting” reflectively in the environment. Plessner claims that man is an organism constituted of politics: the political runs through all of man’s relations.

Thus, by proposing intersubjectivity as an inclusive approach, which exercises proxemics and otherness with others, Flusser is pointing to an action of being in the political and relational world. Based on contemporary anthropology, we define “other”, as everything that integrates the “*Lebenswelt*” or Lifeworld, living and non-living organisms (living beings, objects, material and immaterial products).

Thus, we rely on research stemming from the praxis of the "hunter gatherers" widely studied by anthropology, as a "direction". For the social anthropologist Tim Ingold, who assumes the same premise we defend, that “the ways of acting in the environment are also ways of perceiving it” (Ingold, 2000, p.09), the gesture of these peoples in relation to their environment is one of synergy, commitment, and learning, and guides us to an ecological approach to perception, in which the body and the senses are the main components.
The knowledge of the world is acquired by moving within it, exploring it, attending to it, always attentive to the signs by which it reveals itself. Thus, learning to see is not a matter of acquiring schemes to mentally build the environment, but acquiring the skills for direct perceptual involvement with its constituents, both human and non-human, lively and inanimate. (Ingold, 2000, p. 55)

Another point of support and convergence between our approach and Ingold’s is in his argument that this “fine tuning of perception and action” present in the gestures of the hunter-gatherers, and which we are proposing here, are not a process of acculturation, but rather a process for the development of skills (“enskilment”): “it is not a transmission of representations, as the acculturation model is implied, but an education for attention” (cf. p. 55).

The gesture of photographing is not located in the open prairie of the paleolithic hunter but in the dense, artificial forest of culture, which means that the jungle is “full of objects with determined intentions”, which make walking through it difficult and, in a way, can immobilize us. But the action of photographing, or the action of a body in contact with new surroundings through photographic expeditions, advances against the intentions of culture, which allows to leave a certain determined position (Flusser, 2002, p. 29). As a gesture of unveiling, it is a gesture towards an encounter with otherness. We legitimize this gesture as a way out of the spatial and social determinism of these young residents in outlying favelas.

**The photographic image as the residue of the experience**

As mentioned above, photographic tours are understood as a praxis that unleashes the ties that “determine” us - a single point of view, a final product, a final methodology - and inserts us into an ecological logic: a lived process of “hunting” and the gestures of man with the apparatus become an authentic conversation his surroundings and an opening to otherness. Thus, the product "photography" does not matter in terms of the final goal. The greatest interest lies in the experience lived in the gesture of photographing.

We lived through several very rich experiences in 2019 with the second group in the project, in a very spontaneous way. During our tour to the Pinacoteca of State of São Paulo and its surroundings, we went to Luz Park to have a snack and talk about the proposed theme, which in this case was to think about the natural and the artificial in the museum/park context.
At that moment when we were gathered together photographing the park, a young girl appeared, around their age, speaking Spanish and asking us to take her picture in the park. Her name was Caína and she soon became at ease with our group.

Nineteen-year-old Guilherme, one of the young people in the group, came closer and said shyly: "teacher, I'm studying Spanish." I quickly thought, what a great opportunity for him to be able to talk to her and test his ability to communicate in the language he is learning.

We will make a brief interlude here to recall Harry Pross's media theory: “"In the primary media, special knowledge is gathered in one person. The speaker must master gesture and mime (...) the messenger must know how to run, ride or drive and thus guarantee the transmission of the message" (Baitello, 2011:02), we realize the importance of communication in the present, a meeting of bodies and constitutive knowledge of otherness“ (Cf. Pross 1972).

Meanwhile, within the ontogeny and phylogeny of the self – I am a body/ I have a body - Baitello proposes a third nucleus, the one responsible for sociability; the “Body asks for Body”. (2018, p. 16)

The interaction with the other generates the important process of "belonging". If and when, for a moment, we no longer need anyone - another person for the most elementary satisfactions of survival, the very need to "belong" would lead us to approximations with other bodies/individu- als/people/beings and, ultimately, to socialization, which in turn reiterates and reinforces "belonging" as a fundamental need. (cf., p. 17)

To continue, since it was time to go back to Helipa, as agreed with the parents of the younger "girls and boys", I proposed that Guilherme and the older ones in the class continue the tour downtown with their new foreign friend, helping her to find the other tourist spots she wanted to visit, so they could take the opportunity to visit them as well. They liked the suggestion and drifted off with the Venezuelan girl Caína to continue the tour towards the Pátio do Colégio. Later, Guilherme said that the experience was very special for him – "the meeting with the foreigner" - because in addition to realizing that he already spoke and communicated well in Spanish, after this encounter he felt more confident to make his dream trip to Argentina at the end of that year. I also heard from 16-year-old Estefany that the afternoon had been “wonderful, in fact, so wonderful that we even forgot to take a picture!!”. 
Based on these statements\(^3\), taken from an informal conversation with them, we can see how precise Flusser's prognosis in the 1980s was when pointing out the escalation of bodily abstraction as a “brake” on the relational experience between bodies and gestures and a consequent apathy (or trust, or faith) in ethical, aesthetic and political action.

As well as how his diagnosis of intersubjectivity, incorporating the perspective of the other - "The other does not exist without me, and I do not exist without the other. It is from the intersubjective, concrete, immediate (and non-mediative) relationship that both arise. (Sd-2, p. 90) – presents us with a simple and ecological solution by inserting human beings in their context and allowing them actions to enrich the social ecosystem as a whole; the importance of the other in stopping the producer gesture: "we even forgot to take a photo!!"

**Discussion and final considerations**

This article sought to discuss how communication and education can contribute to the development of projects for otherness. We began with the assumption that it is necessary to understand the role of communication and education as mobilizing agents of social changes and transformations, which can act in diminishing inequalities and expanding awareness for understanding and accepting diversities (LEAO, 2019, p.43). In our opinion, the photographic expeditions with the young people of the “Nofotofake” collective from the Heliópolis favela elaborated and implemented by Roberta Dabdad are experiences that can function as inspiring models for the creation of other proposals as an exercise in the pedagogy of intersubjectivity.

Thus, our article begins by presenting a brief introduction to the pedagogy of intersubjectivity as proposed by Flusser. Our idea was to draw parallels between the Flusserian proposition and the presentation of the photographic gesture workshop project. As such, Dabdad's project represents a prototype capable of catalyzing experiences that tackle three of the great problems of contemporary culture, as discussed below.

Firstly, the project triggers creative potential of images and, therefore, assumes a role that stimulates the production side of the participants within the circuit of the era of iconophagy. However, as seen in the reports of the agents of the collective, an unforeseen deviation was present and another creative power was triggered. Based on the experience, something unexpected arose, and the group

---

\(^3\) Guilherme and Esthefany's video statements on “the meeting with the foreigner” are available at: [https://www.instagram.com/nofotofake/](https://www.instagram.com/nofotofake/), on 07/19/2019.
bears witness: "we didn’t take photos". At first, the gesture of “not taking photos” seems to indicate mere forgetfulness. However, a slightly more time-consuming look at this gesture reveals a change of pattern, a void, a pause. That is, the "not taking photos" was perhaps the greatest sign of the transformative force of the experience. As Baitello warns us, we live in an era of multiple iconophagic gestures, an era marked by the production of overwhelming images, mirrors and narcissistic gestures where we are simultaneously devourers of images as well as being devoured by them (BAITELLO, 2014). Inserted in this continuous movement, not taking photos became a leap, an escape and, if you will, a breather.

Secondly, we can propose a reflection on the importance of the deterritorialization movement of the workshops. In the proposal of going beyond one’s comfort zone, the chair, the room, the house, the street, and the neighborhood, Dabdab's workshop triggered potentials that challenge another major issue in contemporary culture: sitting thinking. As Baitello (2012) has already outlined, this bodily gesture is accompanied by several flaws and limitations ranging from the loss of perspective and imprisonment to closed horizons. The invitation to get to know the city, iconic points such as the Pinacoteca Museum and Luz Park, not only promoted the discovery of other landscapes, but also enabled experiences of otherness and encounters.

Finally, based on the idea of hanging existences, an entire culture of selfies repeats itself into infinity. For Baitello (2019), these hanging existences are models and copies that make an attentive and curious outlook unfeasible. To face this serious problem, the workshops triggered invitations aimed at meeting the other, for dialog and exchange. As such, in the encounter with the other, our article takes up the initial proposition and once again raises the question: how can educational and communication projects act as an instrument in the fight against inequalities? Although aware of the limits of the actions in the photographic expeditions studied herein, we believe that the foundations of these expeditions, understood the application of an intersubjectivity pedagogy in the Flusserian sense, can provide us with clues and stimulate many other gestural journeys and encounters with otherness.
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