

Art and Aesthetics of Ginga: Boundary for the Future in the inbetween Places of Diversity

Denise Marcos Bussoletti¹ and Vagner De Souza Vargas²

¹ Universidade Federal de Pelotas

Received: 15 December 2012 Accepted: 4 January 2013 Published: 15 January 2013

Abstract

This article aims to reflect critically the possibility of educational practices guided by multiculturalist perspective, seeking to consolidate a Border Pedagogy based on what we stand for as an aesthetic of ginga. Discussing the aesthetics originating from emerging and miscegenation scenarios that the interculturality becomes possible to propose such as the art as the space in which through between boundaries enable us for the exercise of rediscovering other margins in the center of another story. None of this would be possible in our reading, whether the way for dialogue and experimentation to our actions were not the arts. This means that the arts are the ground which enables us deterritorialization of socially constructed norms and dogmas. In our activities, the arts were essential for stimulating reflection on the importance of valuing the diversity as a factor in social development.

Index terms— border pedagogy, aesthetics of ginga, diversity and multiculturalism.

1 I.

First Considerations the concept of border treaty in its most diverse possibilities of apprehension is a fundamental element for thinking in pedagogical proposals that span the differences as a focus of positive deepening to the enrichment of knowledge production in its wide complexity. Currently, few educational proposals are reflecting on concepts that should guide the academic as well as the educational practices in society as a whole (OLIVEIRA; COSTA, 2007; PANSINI; NENEVÉ, 2008).

In this sense, coming in accordance with what will guide the acceptations we've taken for fostering reflections presented in this text, we feel the need to conceive contexts that permeate the educational field starting from a multicultural perspective in the direction of what we defend as another perspective, supported here as intercultural. By multicultural, we rescued what Hall (2006) defines as:

Multicultural is a qualitative term. It describes the social characteristics and problems of governability made by any society in which different cultural communities live together and try to build a life in common, at the same time they retain something of their original identity. In contrast, the term "multiculturalism" is substantive. Refers to the strategies and policies adopted to govern or manage problems of diversity and multiplicity generated by multicultural societies. This is usually used in the singular, meaning a specific philosophy or doctrine that holds multicultural strategies (Hall, 2006, p.50).

Thus, we propose an expansion to the critical perspective of multiculturalism, particularly when applied to the educational field and, for this, we will use reflections carried out through the activities developed in the Pelotas/RS, a city in the south of Brazil, during recent years by the Nucleus of Art, Language and Subjectivity (NALS), highlighting the proposal of the Programme Boundaries of Diversity 1. Initially, it is important to emphasize some terms and concepts that will be needed to conduct our reflexive line.

In this perspective, we also mention what Pansini & Nenevé (2008) understand about the educational context in relation to multiculturalism historically formed: multicultural education proposes a rupture to pre-established models and hidden practices that within the school curriculum produce an effect of colonization in which students

44 from diverse cultures, social classes and ethnic hues take the place of colonized and marginalized by a process of
45 silencing of their condition (PANSINI; NENEVÉ, 2008, p.32).

46 In consonance with these aspects, we believe that the necessary possibility for paradigm changing in the
47 direction of innovative educational proposals involves the recovery of the ethical dimension of educational making,
48 allied to another aesthetic of human existence as its principles. Such direction, questions and confronts the
49 social-economic and political of silencing relationships and rebels against the movements resulting from these
50 relationships that lead to what Boaventura dos Santos (2001) calls as "epistemicide".

51 Beyond the untold suffering and unsaid devastation that produced in people, groups and social practices
52 that had been for him (epistemicide) targeted, meant an irreversible impoverishment of the horizon and the
53 possibilities of knowledge. If today is installed a feeling of blockage by the absence of global alternatives to the
54 way as the society is organized, it is because for centuries, especially after that modernity was reduced to capitalist
55 modernity, we proceeded to the systematic liquidation of the alternatives, when they both in epistemological level,
56 as in practice, not fitted with hegemonic practices ??SANTOS, 2001:329).

57 We understand that in order to a rupture with silencing production models imposed could happen is necessary
58 to focus on searching of the voices silenced concepts, dipping in identifying their differences and problematic of
59 their adversities, in order that the possible distances not turn away yet more their alterities. Thus, we would be
60 minimizing the difficulties in establishing efficient pedagogical proposals, capable of generating identification and
61 significance in many different social groups. We believe that following this perspective we are being faithful to
62 the principle of the Bakhtinian dialogism, contributing to the constitution of a space and time where all voices
63 interest, all voices can and should be heard and that dialogue does not mean replacing or juxtapose announcers,
64 but interact without the dogmatic imposition of a single voice, nor the relativism of an uncritical coexistence of
65 all voices, but by dialectical synthesis of the contrary voices.

66 Saying that, we can refund and taken as an initial basis of the challenge, the contributions of ??cLaren (2000)
67 and what the author presents as the different forms of multiculturalism, differentiating critical multiculturalism
68 of the conservative or business, and distinguish it from liberal multiculturalism. In the first form -the conservative
69 multiculturalism -white cultural elite considers as inferior and incapable the other racial groups, ignoring and
70 denying them the knowledge, customs, beliefs and seeking to construct a common culture that ensures the
71 hegemony of the cultural capital of the middle class. The second way -the liberal multiculturalism -defends the
72 equality between races, based on the assumption that all have the same intellectual capacity, and therefore can
73 compete on equal terms in a capitalist society. The left-liberal multiculturalism -the third way -accept cultural
74 differences and points out that the emphasis on equality between races drowns out the important characteristics
75 that differentiate one breed from another. Anyone working with this perspective tends to treat the difference as
76 an "essence" that exists independently of history, culture and power. Peter ??cLaren (2000) points out that:

77 Revolutionary Multiculturalism recognizes that the objective structures in which we live, the material relations
78 conditioned to the production in which we are situated and the conditions determined which produce us are all
79 reflected in our daily experiences. In other words, the life experiences constitutes more than values, beliefs
80 and subjective understandings , they are always mediated by ideological structures of discourse, power and
81 privilege political economies and social division of labor. The Revolutionary Multiculturalism is a socialistfeminist
82 multiculturalism which challenges the historically sedimented processes through which identities of race, class
83 and gender are produced within capitalist society ??McLAREN, 2000, p. 284).

84 Considering these challenges and limitations, the following text presents some considerations that have
85 contributed to the discussions of the proposals developed in the specific implementation of the Programme
86 Boundaries of Diversity, at Education College, from Federal University of Pelotas (UFPEL), Brazil. Finally, we
87 present the proposal of the aesthetics of ginga as an essential ally that led us to consider the arts as a central
88 element and catalyst for the development of significative processes toward a society where respect for difference
89 and diversity are constituted as essential pillars of our relationships.

90 2 II. Through between the Diversity and the Difference

91 We start from reason that only the pedagogical principles of an education directed to diversity by the difference
92 may provide conditions for effective implementation of emancipatory practices in the Brazilian educational and
93 social scenery. But of which diversity concept are we speaking?

94 To encompass the core of this issue, is of fundamental importance to affirm, according to Homi ??habha
95 (1988: 63), the distinction proposed between the concepts of difference and diversity. For this author, the cultural
96 diversity is an epistemological object, where the culture is apprehended as an object of empirical knowledge, since
97 the difference is a process of enunciation of culture "as 'knowable', legitimate, appropriate to the construction of
98 cultural identification systems", is a process of signification. In the process of signification, the culture affirms
99 itself as a force field where different groups recognize and affirm their own identity, never homogeneous, much
100 less as representations of separation of totalized cultures or "protected in the utopia of a mythic memory of a
101 single collective identity".

102 Among the discussions and conflicts about diversity and difference, Brazilian public policies, enroll in a scenario
103 that is driven by the expressive mark established by the Brazilian Federal Constitution of 1988, initially mentioned
104 that among their foundations, postulates human dignity and the expanded rights of citizenship consecrating the
105 debate that occurs mainly since the 1980s in Brazil, about the respect for cultural diversity in the sense of

106 citizenship training. Since then, several mechanisms have emerged on the national and international perspective
107 of the promotion and defense of human rights.

108 However, although advances in the normative field, the Brazilian social reality denotes the most different and
109 accentuated expressions of inequalities. The National Plan for Education in Human Rights (PNEDH) from the
110 Brazilian government, one of the important actions in the establishment of human rights, since in its introduction
111 highlights the magnitude of inequalities in the Brazilian society and the challenge imposed:

112 There is still much to be achieved in terms of respect for human dignity, without distinction of race, nationality,
113 ethnicity, gender, social class, region, culture, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, generation and
114 disability. Likewise, there is much to be done to enforce the right to quality of life, health, education, housing,
115 leisure, environmental health, sanitation, public safety, to work and to cultural and religious diversity, among
116 others (BRAZIL, 2007: 23).

117 In the Brazilian context as a whole, deriving these social inequalities are evident. One of them is the socially
118 instituted prejudice (in all its nuances).

119 Data resulting from the Brazilian government researches, from the Institute Foundation of Economic Research
120 (FIPE) made upon request of the National Institute of Economic Research (INEP) entitled "Prejudice and
121 Discrimination in School Environment" revealed that 99.3% of people belonging to the school community from
122 501 Brazil's public schools (parents, teachers, staff and students) have prejudice. Prejudices of the most different
123 orders and levels were identified: persons with disabilities (96.5%), ethnic-racial (94.2%), gender (93.5%),
124 generational (91%), socioeconomic status (87.5%), sexual orientation (87.3%), territorial prejudice (75.95%).
125 The study also pointed to the fact that 99.9% of respondents expressed the need to keep a distance of at least
126 some social group specifically. In alarming numbers and scale greater prejudice, there are the following groups:
127 intellectual disabilities (98.9%), homosexuals (98.9%), gipsy (97.3%), disabled people (96.2%), Indians (95.3%),
128 poor (94.9%), residents of the suburbs or slums (94.6%), rural residents (91.1%) and blacks (90.9%) (BRAZIL.

129 **3 MEC/INEP, FIPE, 2009).**

130 This study, combined with analyzes of educational indicators available (sociodemographic, offering, access,
131 participation and efficiency) has shown since the 1990s that even considering the existence of universalists
132 education policies, the reduction of social and educational inequalities is not seen in the same extent. As a
133 result of this situation, specific social groups shall be subject to discriminatory practices and continue to have
134 lower school performance in school, highlighting factors that significantly affect performance generalized positive.
135 In the context of the proposition of affirmative policies and social inclusion, Brazilian public policies have also
136 guided the discourse of diversity through the axes of the social organization and policies necessary to its viability,
137 stating from official documents that:

138 The important advances made by the democratization of society, very leveraged by the human rights movement,
139 point the emergence of the construction of social spaces less exclusive and of alternatives for living in diversity.
140 The capacity that a culture has to deal with the heterogeneities that compose itself became a sort of criteria for
141 evaluating its development stage, especially in times of fundamentalism and intolerance of all orders as we live
142 in ??BRAZIL, 2005: 7).

143 Therefore, we understand and justify the need for the creation and implementation of projects and
144 affirmative actions in order to qualify the educational practices that promote respect for diversity and human
145 rights in the educational space. And, based on this, that we have structured the Programme Boundaries of
146 Diversity, which will be described later.

147 **4 III.**

148 **5 About Borders**

149 Before focusing on the proposal and the actions of the Programme Boundaries of Diversity we feel to be necessary
150 to return again Homi Bhabha. We emphasize therefore that the author introduces his book "Local Culture" with
151 a beautiful formulation of Heidegger which says: "A boundary is not that at which something stops but, as
152 the Greeks recognized, the boundary is that from which something begins its presencing" ??HEIDEGGER, 1971,
153 apud BHABHA1998, p. 20).

154 This leads us to say that thinking boundaries in the field of culture also refers to punctuate them, not only in the
155 presences but also in absence repressed and actively constructed as such. For us, in the case of Latin America, it
156 is still particularly fundamental and needed to be understood. Our borders are marked by absences indisputable.
157 Significant powerful such as hunger, poverty, violence and oppression, perpetuate forms of organization and of
158 subjectivities sustaining of an order producer and reproducer of absences that from its origins to its unfolding can
159 not leave to be radically contested. The catastrophic effects, objective and symbolic, that such absences affect in
160 the lives of thousands people make us ask: is it possible to conceive a Latin American subjectivity that resists in
161 this condition spatiotemporal of frontier?

162 Adding to these considerations is also necessary to resume some reflections proposed by Silveira (2005, p.18)
163 when he says that the borders always imply in a relational level, evidenced by the interaction of differences,
164 whatever they may be. Therefore, if the border exists it is because there is a membranous dimension, permeable
165 or porous, allowing the transit of various elements, which carries a markedly selective character because it is of

166 the "nature" of the frontier which through it occurs the passage, flow or interdiction. So, thus these are various
167 ways of flows: of people, ideas, substances, states of consciousness, objects and, combined with such dynamism,
168 all that it represents in the configuration of more complexity or even construction and dispersion of the senses
169 in the world.

170 Faced with the dispersal of meanings in the world, Boaventura dos Santos (2005) mentions the existence of a
171 certain uneasiness in the air as typical of current times, times considered as passage, and that are independent
172 of a measured time by clocks or ruled by the calendar. There is, in this perspective, a distrust in old maps and
173 the demand for new maps, there is the space of a "interval society" or "a society paradigmatic transition." Space
174 where new boundaries are aligned. And it is in this space and this time that seems to us important to imagine a
175 subjectivity capable of facing such a challenge. More specifically, a subjectivity that allows as a space of exercise
176 and apprehension of uneasiness, related to the creation and the possibility of meeting with the ruptures and
177 continuities necessary to the emergence of new paradigms.

178 This leads us to return Silveira (2005, p.23) when he says that the existence of the frontier involves exchanges
179 that can enclose multiple meanings, points of contact in which the exchange may be favorable for both sides,
180 points of contact where the "hybridization" is possible forming a kind of "third included." From the point of view
181 of this author, we can consider the boundaries as especially symbolic spaces in which differences and asymmetries
182 are well marked, being away from meaning an affectionate bond and destitution of conflicts. For this reason,
183 when considering any educational practice transiting this threshold of the concepts of borders, we have to take the
184 precaution we are blotting the differences in the way of searching for the diffusion of respect and understanding,
185 instead of accentuate inadequate attributes about a perspective for analysis of the differences.

186 Also with Homi Bhabha we will find some clue that enables us to survive, or even live at this time, whose name,
187 if now said by many, we consider still insufficiently assumed. We affirm that we move thus among postmodernism,
188 post-colonialism, postfeminism, and as many other "post" which we can see some confusion, a disorientation,
189 which causes some explicative problems. Facing this, so, we can ask: But then: what is "new" in all this? Bhabha
190 responds, what can be innovative in terms of theoretical and political, in contemporaneity, is the needing for of
191 focusing on moments and processes where the originated subjectivities are produced respecting and articulating
192 the existing cultural differences. This subscribes in a space, called of "in-between places" where different strategies
193 of subjectivity, both singular and collective, can mean new identities, both in the sense of collaboration as in the
194 defining contestation of the idea of society (BHABHA, 1998).

195 Cultural borders, as well as political frontiers are symbolic forms of manifestation of the complex human
196 phenomenon, in which alterity emerges as a fundamental value, since a difference policy configures as possible.
197 To exists the difference, it is necessary that exist margins, boundaries that separate the self from the other, and
198 that allow the game between proximity and distance occurs as an adventure of knowledge as an opening to the
199 dialogue (SILVEIRA, 2005, p.28).

200 In our work, provoked by all of these questions, we put the art as the place of confrontation to the acts
201 of silencing, as educational proposal which transgresses the boundaries imposed as unique, diluting differences,
202 hybridizing thresholds, proposing the art as catalyst and reflexive, all of this through their multiple languages.
203 We adopt the potentially transgressive character of the concepts and standards imposed, in proposing us to
204 transit these "in-between places" where we will find assumptions of still unknown alterities and which through
205 the diversity may be the potentiating the bond in the search for knowledge.

206 In this regard, we emphasize the proximity to the speech of Gómez-Peña (2005, p.203), that even talking
207 about performance art, gives us clues to overcome these concepts to our field of action, when put ourselves in
208 the place of speech, the only social contract that exists is our willingness for challenging authoritarian dogmas
209 and models and continue pushing the limits of culture and identity. It is precisely in the paired borders among
210 cultures, genders, works, languages and artistic forms that we feel most comfortable and where we recognize our
211 colleagues. We are interstitial creatures and bordering citizens by nature -members and intruders at the same
212 time -and rejoice in this paranoiac condition. Just in the act of crossing a frontier, we find our emancipation ...
213 temporal.

214 For this purpose, we also consider what McLaren & Giroux (2000, p.44) refer to say that multicultural
215 education not only has to listen to the "voice of the other," of marginalized groups, but help them to produce
216 new narratives. This requires a committed educator model.

217 In this way, we developed several activities that are part of our proposal with the Program Boundaries of
218 Diversity, where we aim at an emancipatory educational proposal _hybridized of languages, moving through the
219 borders of the differences beyond knowledge and its multiplicity of meanings. For us, the concept of educational
220 proposal does not abandon our allowances of hegemonic references of education, but broadens their horizons in
221 the search of the citizens formation , social agents appropriated with a reflexive speech about their condition
222 and of the other ones in a society so sub divided by the normatization of all kinds, to the point of being able to
223 criticize, questioning and proposing other alternatives to also think this society through another space of respect
224 and understanding.

225 IV.

226 6 Boundaries of Diversity a) Alternatives Toward a Border 227 Pedagogy

228 The Boundaries of Diversity Programme articulates four distinct projects, which have as a unit, the thematics
229 of diversity and tolerance, reuniting from these perspectives: a central project and as origin which is the project
230 "Storytellers", connected to the Nucleus of Art Languages and Subjectivity (NALS), connected to the College
231 of Education at the Federal University of Pelotas (UFPEL), southern Brazil, and aims to rescue the cultural
232 identity of peripheral groups and what we call as "marginal aesthetics" or even as "peripheral aesthetics",
233 promoting its visibility and emancipatory exercise of citizenship through art and culture. Articulated with
234 the project Storytellers, lies the research group "Daily Narratives: identity, representation and culture" that
235 through the research line called "Popular Narratives" seeks to establish a dialogue between different forms of
236 knowledge, produced by the university and the knowledge admittedly popular, strengthening identity perspectives
237 and considering diversity as a structural element and discursive. These projects seek to produce innovative further
238 practical and theory outlined by meeting different narrative territories from the perspective of building alliances
239 that seek to think the university and society as spaces for discussion and possible transformations.

240 A third project is articulated to these is called "Diversity and Tolerance" and the Research group "Intolerance:
241 History and Sensitivities", originating from both practices and actions of the Center for Historical Documentation
242 (NDH) of the Institute of Humanities at UFPEL. The project "Diversity and Tolerance" intended precisely as
243 a space for the articulation of works linked to ethnic, landless colonists, to women and for popular practices,
244 such as the healers. The research group "Intolerance: History and Sensitivities" starting from studies on the
245 Holocaust in World War II, discusses and promotes actions to combat all forms of intolerance in our days.

246 The relationship among the four projects builds upon the formation of "cultural agents", from educational
247 activities. In this perspective, the aim is to create a network of social and cultural formation of dialogues,
248 exchanges and other educational activities, permeated by the principle of the indivisibility of university's
249 extension, teaching, and research.

250 The Boundaries of Diversity Programme has as its general objective, the implementation of a training program
251 of "cultural agents" that occurred and occurs through training courses, workshops, lectures, seminars, cultural
252 events, educational campaigns, exhibitions, papers, contests and artistic and cultural exhibitions. These cultural
253 agents (college students, community activists, social and cultural movements, teachers and students of public
254 schools, the academic community and the general community) have their actions based on the actions of promotion
255 of emerging cultural protagonisms.

256 As a point of connection, we want to create an instance of organizational and deliberative of awareness actions,
257 organization, systematization and valuing of the differences and for promoting tolerance, entitled "Diversity's
258 University Forum". We projected for this, to use the space and the role of the university as a promoter and
259 defender of knowledge, social practices and cultural issues that contribute to the exercise of citizenship, as well
260 as its symbolic expression in the development of local, regional and country culture.

261 The purpose of contributing to the formation of "cultural agents" committed to respecting diversity and
262 promoting tolerance encounters the intention to valuing knowledge, popular culture, cultural practices and
263 aesthetics designed as "peripheral" by assisting and acting for their recognition, visibility and autonomy. Aiming
264 to create the University's Diversity Forum, during the year 2012, were done many workshops and nonformal
265 education activities which have been published in academic articles previously (BUSSOLETTI; VARGAS, 2012;
266 KRUGER, 2012; VARGAS; BUSSOLETTI, 2012; BUSSOLETTI; VARGAS; BAIRROS, 2012). In addition, we
267 organized four events in which we invited people from the community, authorities and persons related to the
268 topics that would be addressed that day to dialogued with the audience about their differences, problems and
269 characteristics in society. For each event, there were artistic performances specific to that thematic and which
270 would serve as mote to promote discussion among participants.

271 This way, the first event addressed the theme of Diversity of sex, gender and sexuality (ALVES, 2012).
272 The second event addressed the issue of social inclusion of people with disabilities and the diversity of human
273 conditions. The third event addressed the ethnic and religious diversity and the fourth event addressed issues of
274 diversity and human rights. Among all these events were made educational activities with group members and
275 also open to the general community in order to prepare participants for the discussion of the next event to come.
276 However, the way we did it was through artistic workshops that focused its actions on thematics that would be
277 addressed later. When we talk about art workshops, we refer to theater, music, dance, performance, film, visual
278 arts and other possible hybridizations.

279 We are interested in as well, through an initiative of the Boundaries of Diversity Programme, exploring the
280 Year 2013

281 7 Global Journal of Human Social Science Volume XIII Issue 282 IV Version I ()

283 A process of identity formation for diversity and the discursive practices that occur in what Bhabha calls "third
284 space translation", or who later identifies as the "inbetween places" of culture, where the different strategies

285 of subjectivity, both singular and collective, can mean new identities, both in the sense of collaboration and
286 contestation of defining the idea of society (BHABHA, 1998).

287 So, considering and by motivating these "inbetween places" provide a possibility of unrest and elaboration we
288 released the following issues as investigative challenge: By what ways, the processes of constitution of diversity,
289 in this boundary condition, coexist harmoniously, or not with the discursive practices in education? Based on
290 the evidence that is produced distinct discursive versions of treatment given to the "Other" in different cultural
291 contexts. How can we verify this production? Who is the "Other" from the perspective of an intercultural
292 education, and how their existence is articulated (if that it could be) with the pedagogical discursive practices in
293 exercise? What representations have different players in the educational process about diversity and difference
294 in culture? Is it possible inter culturalizing the school curriculum from the perspective of cultural diversity and
295 of a culture of diversity?

296 Far away we are still from something that can account for a production more conclusive about this universe.
297 This is the first attempt at systematization the universe of concerns that limit the development and early
298 implementation of this Programme. We believe that entering within the discursive practices that represent more
299 the diversity enables us to address important gaps that exist in terms of this particular academic production. We
300 are convinced that the discursive practices that represent the diversity can contribute to grasp the educational
301 processes in marks of borders and demonstrations taking place around equality in difference and of difference in
302 equality in its multiplicity of meanings.

303 8 b) Border Pedagogy and Aesthetics of Ginga

304 Thinking frontiers in the education and cultural field also means punctuate them not only on the presences but
305 also in the absences repressed and actively constructed in concerning to them. More specifically, as a space of
306 exercise and apprehension of unrest related to the creation and the possibility of meeting the necessary ruptures,
307 with the emergence of new paradigms attentive to the challenges facing education this beginning of XXI century.

308 It seems to us for renewed importance inquiring today about the representations of identity and otherness in
309 ballast of what Cultural Studies suggest as a "border pedagogy" (Giroux, 1992), or what McLaren (1999) termed
310 as a "border identity" created from the empathy for others as passionate as a connection through difference "in
311 the fight" against our failure to see our own reflection in the eyes of others [...] ??McLAREN, 1999, p .193-195).

312 Based on this understanding, we are led to believe that it is urgent to consolidate that can be understood as a
313 "pedagogy of the border." A pedagogy that focuses its commitment for a restoration of critical pedagogical keeping
314 space for questions more than conceptual and finished answers , supporting the radical experience of diversity
315 and difference, by closing and becoming present the lines that sometimes separate and become, unfortunately,
316 the boundaries insurmountable.

317 Whereby of what we have presented until now is that we understand the possibility of treatment and seizure
318 of a model of subjectivity that resists in the condition spatiotemporal of boundary. And it is the understanding
319 of this process that contributes and ends up revealing emerging aesthetics derived from the halfbreeding and of
320 the scenarios in which intercultural leads, configuring what we stand also as an "aesthetics of ginga".

321 The aesthetics of ginga take as the basis the conceptual work of Hélio Oiticica, a Brazilian who lived between
322 1939 and 1980. Revolutionary artist that, through his experimental and innovative work has been recognized
323 internationally. Between the 1960s and 1970s inspired the name and aesthetics of the Tropicalia movement in
324 Brazilian music through his work the "Penetrable Tropicália". Oiticica would not accept strict classifications and
325 definitions, extrapolating and questioning his status as an artist. Some people called him a painter, others as
326 sculptor, even those who had recognized him as architect. This seemed to amuse the artist that produced in
327 the absence of any definition their creative originality. In fact, the only classification accepted by Oiticica was
328 even the inventor, but an inventor particular a "trail-blazer of invention states." In this aesthetic conception an
329 artist does not make born, but transform and unleash creative states. In this process there isn't the figure of the
330 observer, it becomes a "participant". Rolling concepts, Oiticica assumed that there wasn't become an artist, but
331 someone who enabled people to emerge in this peculiar state of creative action elaborating proposals that sought
332 that which is beyond the art to whom he called "invention".

333 Paola Jacques (2003) in her research about the favelas of Rio de Janeiro, enables us to reflect and see these
334 aspects highlighted above, and let us also through the analysis that does the work and the works of Oiticica,
335 see how this is mixed with his life as an artist, dancer, and even more: of a man who lives in slum. A group of
336 elements that allow Oiticica build a proposed model, as suggested by Paola, an "aesthetics of ginga ", a genuine
337 Brazilian product, where the samba and the favelas themselves are the source of inspiration. Spacetime where
338 the artwork is modified by changing the life of the city and the people, in a continuum of contagion, illustrated
339 as a carnival joy (JACQUES, 2003).

340 Of fundamental importance to understand this "aesthetics of ginga" is the conception of "anti-art" from 1966
341 -Proposal 66 and Position and Program. In these formulations, the viewer participation is considered "a principle
342 for the creation," which will culminate in what Oiticica calls "anti-art". The principle of "anti-art" is not imposing
343 the viewer of ideas and finished structures, but seek to decentralize art, shifting the intellectual and rational to
344 the field of creativity, experimentation, discovery, participation, something that transfigure in other orders of
345 signification.

346 Antiart -understanding and rationale of the artist, not as a creator for contemplation, but as a motivator

347 for the creation -the creation as such is completed by the active participation of the viewer, now considered
348 participator. Antiart would be a completion of the collective need of a latent creative activity, which would
349 be motivated in a certain way by the artist: are, therefore, invalidated positions metaphysical, intellectual and
350 estheticians [...] is, thus, a creative achievement which proposes the artist, the realization of this exempt from
351 premises moral, intellectual or aesthetic -the antiart is free of this -it is a simple position of man in himself and
352 in his vital creative possibilities. The "not found" is also an important role (OITICICA, In: Jacques, 2003: p.
353 110).

354 Oiticica breaks definitively with the idea of passive spectator, a mere viewer and makes him through his art, a
355 trigger of experiences. Transfigures the watcher in "participator", this person who dances in space and through
356 time giving plasticity to the work in this way can also be recognized as a collective experience. Participator and
357 work becomes, thus, inseparable, products and producers of other premise aesthetics.

358 A first work totally influenced by this concept and combined with the aesthetics of the favelas are the
359 Parangoles. What are the Parangoles? The Parangoles are covers, tents or banners that incorporate the influences
360 of Brazilian favela and samba, and were made to be worn and preferably to be danced by the participant. Through
361 Celso Favaretto (2000), we recovered as Oiticica recounts the discovery of the word:

362 I found it on the street, that magic word. Because I worked at the National Museum of Quinta, with my
363 father, making bibliography. One day, I was going by bus and in the Flag's Square there was a beggar who did
364 a kind of beautiful thing in the world: a kind of construction. The next day was gone. There were four poles,
365 wooden stakes about two feet tall, he made as if they were vertices of rectangles on the floor. It was a wasteland,
366 with a with a little bush and there was this glade that had this guy stopped and put the walls made of wire
367 twine up and down. Well done. And there was a piece of burlap nailed to one of these strings, saying: "Here
368 is,.." and the only thing I understood, that was written, was the word "Parangolé". Then I said: This is the word
369 (OITICICA, apud Favaretto, 2000: p.117).

370 Oiticica defended that the participant's body could not be seen as a supporter of the artwork, but as its
371 incorporation, the "embodiment of the body in the art work and of the art work in the body." The Parangoles
372 have a character of "environmental structure", whose main nucleus is the "participant-art work" may reverse in
373 participator when watches and as art work when watched, or even when they relate to each other can create an
374 "environmental system" that allows other people outside can watch it.

375 Considering this, we defend the possibility of experimentation with art by education as a web which takes
376 place among boundaries, we aim "the exercises for a behavior," as he said Oiticica, operationalized through
377 participation and the transmutation of the spectator in narrator, whose authorship is manifested by living as
378 a manifestation of life in the direction of creative activity. Between imagination and ecstasy, the proposal is
379 deterritorialise behaviors and possibilities suppressed and / or concealed and grant the educational space in the
380 direction of transgression and resistance of alternative practices, not submissive to the concepts based from the
381 historical and political tradition maintained by the cult of the regularities and stabilities consumable as products
382 of an order contestable.

383 It should also be said that our proposal in the in the Programme Boundaries of Diversity walked in just this
384 sense, deterritorializing behaviors and norms, transgressing imposed borders by exposing them just as material
385 for discussion, reflection and debate among all elements, agents that constitutes them, to thus, within their
386 singularities, extrapolate their self perception and propose other alternatives for alterity where the respect
387 emerges as a result of an educational process. In order for this proposal could be achieved, art and all its
388 possible hybridizations acted as master catalysts in this process, where the reactions resulted in knowledge.

389 V.

390 9 Final Considerations

391 Urge, seems to us, thus, crossing these Inbetween places in the perspective of an archeology of subjectivity
392 conceived under such absences as referred before. An excavation oriented to the silence, to all that is subordinate,
393 suppressed or oppressed. An excavation that is made by the margins, reversing stable centers of power-knowledge,
394 making our north the south, and from the beginning what seemed to be the end. Recovering the understanding
395 that all life and all of history carries a silence. And wanting to hear the silence is traveling for a place before the
396 word that has not yet converted into expressible meanings -one short of the language, place Year 2013

397 10 Global Journal of Human Social Science Volume XIII Issue 398 IV Version I ()

399 A where the world of appearances implode, collapsing the boundaries of "manageable" and provoking new
400 meanings capable of inhabiting the intangible. Seeking hear the silence is accepting the ineffable as a
401 foreshadowing of the deeper meaning of the act of understanding the language and the world.

402 In this perspective, the silence is not representable, it is not interpretable, but is rather understandable.
403 Do not interested us the silence as makeup of the explaining, nor to the silence like a mask disposable of a
404 comfortable meaning as possible. We are not interested neither in the silenced because silence is not cloistered,
405 it is not confinement. Not enough for us, so little the silence which find an comfortable equivalent in the word.

406 We want to get the eco of word that inhabits, supports and remains in its dense in-sounding. We seek the
407 nameless-recognizable -the subjectivity that makes the original boundary a habitat of possible dreams.

408 To include the proposal of a subjectivity that resides on the border, it is necessary to recognize that the
409 stranger inhabits us, as suggested by Kristeva (1994), as another face of our identity. Resides in an area with
410 which destroys our comfort, and where thus, unquiet, we recognize in the other, the stranger, something that is
411 part of ourselves. The stranger starts where arises the consciousness of my difference and ends when faced with
412 the fact that we are all foreigners in constant rebellion with respect to bonds and communities.

413 We propose, thus, the education of a subjectivity in the border which fights against the apparent lack of
414 alternatives or collective will to move. As stated by ??chiller (1999) in the "Letters about the Aesthetic Education
415 of Man," in the late eighteenth century, and remains as an essential topicality, "feeling is the most urgent needing,"
416 the need that crosses times. According to the author, the path to the intellect "needs to be opened by the heart."
417 The sensitive formation is not only a way of making knowledge better, but rather yes to recognize it as effective
418 for the life (SCHILLER, 1999).

419 A sensitive education is that which enables learning, feeling, everything in every way ... An extraordinarily
420 vivid hallucination. Center to where tend the strange centrifugal forces that are the human psyche in its agreement
421 of senses.

422 The learning of subjectivity of this life on the frontier from the perspective of a sensitive education requires
423 a grammar capable of traversing distances in spaces in/finit, aerial, unconcluded, indescribable unpronounceable
424 but deeply experienced and demanding of body knowledge. A desiring body which meaning illuminates when
425 re-knows the limit of the form, the void, the emptiness, that which is in one hand, to be always absent and for
426 another, torment, but on the other is a renewed challenge in metamorphosis and experimentation.

427 From the aesthetic point of view, it would be something to explore the possibility of building a semiotics of
428 desire. Unlike medical practices, semiotic, which nosograph the body slashing down on labels identifiers of the
429 sufferings by the symptoms , putting words entre suffering/ body / illness, a semiology of desire seek senses that
430 confer to body its particular and singular translation, the significance of sensible experience of which he is the
431 process.

432 An aesthetics and grammar that reside behind thought, place where there are no words. Its ground?
433 Antimelodia of a complex harmony of all that is harsh and otherwise. A grammar that reflects the effort in
434 bringing the future to this side. A grammar that pulse through a beating heart in the world. A grammar by the
435 poetic, seek the silences. A grammar without synonyms, which graphy carries the potency of the word freedom
436 and spreading the voice and the time to be what life on the frontier suggests: behind the thought has a musical
437 background, where the deepest thought is a beating heart.

438 We can extrapolate our pedagogical horizons to think similarly to what Silveira (2005) tells us, by stating
439 that:

440 Boundaries are there to be crossed or not. They can represent a hazard, meaning the impossibility of
441 acceptance, as they may represent the ecstasy and communion. It is up to each choice, provided it is not
442 imposed. The crossing borders is an act of freedom, of necessity and to take risks in order to know the difference
443 (SILVEIRA, 2005, p.29).

444 Consolidate a model of subjectivity that persists and resists in the border it seems appropriate to us.
445 Problematize the new aesthetics coming from the emerging and miscegenation and from the scenarios where
446 the interculturality is done such as possible, means to say that we still have much to do. Because living in the
447 frontier implies, first of all, in recognizing that "we are not on the margins of a center, but in the center of another
448 story."

449 Therefore, we believe that our practices with the Programme Boundaries of Diversity and the activities
450 developed by NALS, by giving opportunity to the valuation of the peculiarities that constitute social subjects in
451 their differences, placing them in the full exercise of alterity, enabling them and us to understand the of several
452 boundaries that can be intersect through knowledge. By proposing the concept of diversity more widely, we just
453 realize that the subjects also enlarge the boundaries of identity that in the recognition game constitute them as
454 individuals and as a group.

455 Nevertheless, none of this would be possible in our reading, whether the way for dialogue and experimentation
456 to our actions were not the arts. This means that the arts are the ground which enables us deterritorialization
457 of socially constructed norms and dogmas. In our activities, the arts were essential for stimulating reflection on
458 the importance of valuing the diversity as a factor in social development. Therefore, concluding with Vygotsky
459 (1999), we profoundly believe that "art is rather an organization of our behavior targeting the future, it is a
460 requirement that may never comes to materialize, but that leads us to aspire above our life what is behind it"

461 (VYGOTSKY, 1999: p.320). So, we follow as well, aspiring life and what is behind it, inbetween boundaries that
462 allow us the educational exercise of rediscovering other histories. ^{1 2 3 4}

¹The Programme Boundaries of Diversity, was classified and covered by proclamation No. 4 by University Extension Program, PROEXT 2011 -Ministry of Education and Culture of the Secretary for Higher Education from the Government of Brazil. Performs its functions since 2011 at UFPEL.

²© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

³Year 2013 © 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

⁴Year 2013 © 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

.1 Global Journal of Human Social Science

463 Volume XIII Issue IV Version I ()

464 [Alves and Prado] , Joice Alves , Prado .

465 [Bussoletti and Marcos] , Denise Bussoletti , Marcos .

466 [Bussoletti et al.] , Denise Bussoletti , ; Marcos , Vagner Vargas .

467 [Kruger et al.] , Luana ; Kruger , Denise Bussoletti , Marcos .

468 [Vargas et al.] , Vargas , ; Vagner , Denise Bussoletti , Marcos . *Teatro Sem Fronteiras. Expressa Extensão.*
470 *Pelotas: Editora e Gráfica Universitária UFPEL. Edição especial p. . (dezembro de 2012)*

471 [Brasil and Constituição Da República Federativa Do Brasil ()] , Brasil , Constituição Da República Federativa
472 Do Brasil . 1988. Brasília, DF: Senado.

473 [Bhabha and Da Cultura ()] , H Bhabha , Da Cultura . 1998. Belo Horizonte.

474 [Vygotsky et al. ()] , Lev Vygotsky , Psicologia Da Arte , São Paulo . 1999. Martins Fones.

475 [_____]Pela Mão De Alice (ed.) ()] , _____Pela Mão De Alice . modernidade. 8. ed. São Paulo: 23. Cortez
476 (ed.) 2001.

477 [Schneider et al. ()] , Daniela ; Schneider , Cristiano Pinheiro , Jogo De Máscaras . *Expressa Extensão* 2012. 2
478 p. .

479 [Schiller ()] *A Educação Estética do Homem. São Paulo: iluminuras*, Friedrich Schiller . 1795/1990.

480 [Oliveira et al. ()] *A formação de professoras para a educação especial: multiculturalismo crítico e teoria das*
481 *representações sociais*, Eloiza Oliveira , S G Da , Marly Costa , A De . 2007.

482 [Favaretto ()] *A Invenção de Hélio Oiticica -2. Ed. rev*, Celso Favaretto . 2000. São Paulo. Editora da Universidade
483 de São Paulo

484 [McLaren ()] *A vida nas escolas: uma introdução à Pedagogia crítica nos fundamentos da Educação. Porto Alegre:*
485 *Artes Médicas, 1997. _____.* *Multiculturalismo crítico. São Paulo: Cortez*, Peter McLaren . 1999/2000.
486 18. _.

487 [Silveira and Da ()] *As complexidades da noção de Fronteira, Algumas reflexões. Caderno Pós-Ciências Sociais*,
488 Flávio Leonel Abreu Silveira , Da . 2005. (São Luis, v.2, n.3.)

489 [Giroux ()] *Border crossing*, Henry Giroux . 1992. Nova York e Londres, Routledge.

490 [Hall ()] *Da diáspora: identidades e mediações culturais*, Stuart Hall . 2006. Belo Horizonte: UFMG.

491 [Brasil and Ministério Da Educação ()] *Documento subsidiário à política de inclusão. Brasília: Ministério da*
492 *Educação*, Brasil , Ministério Da Educação . 2005. Secretaria de Educação Especial

493 [Pansini and Nenevé ()] *Educação multicultural e formação docente. Currículo Sem Fronteiras*, Flavia ; Pansini
494 , Miguel Nenevé . 2008. p. .

495 [Gómez-Peña ()] *Em defesa del arte del performance. Horizontes Antropológicos. Porto Alegre, v.11, n.24*,
496 Guillermo Gómez-Peña . 2005. p. .

497 [Kristeva and Julia ()] *Estrangeiros Para Nós Mesmos. Rio de Janeiro: Rocco*, Kristeva , Julia . 1994.

498 [Jacques ()] *Estética da Ginga: a arquitetura das favelas através da obra de Hélio Oiticica*, Paola Jacques . 2003.
499 Rio de Janeiro: Casa da Palavra.

500 [Bairros ()] 'Leituras em Dramaturgia Teatral para a Diversidade'. Mariângela Bairros . *Pelotas: Universitária*
501 *UFPEL* 2012. II.

502 [Vargas ()] *Leituras em Dramaturgia Teatral para a Diversidade. Pelotas: Universitária UFPEL*, Vagner Vargas
503 . 2012.

504 [Mello et al.] Lawrence Mello , ; Estivalet De , Denise Bussoletti , Marcos . *Diversidade sexual: diálogos e práticas*
505 *na universidade*,

506 [Giroux ()] 'Multiculturalismo revolucionário, pedagogia do dissenso para o novo milênio'. Henry Giroux . *Art*
507 *Med McLaren, Peter. (ed.) 2000. (Escrevendo das margens: Geografias de identidade, pedagogia e poder)*

508 [Brasil and Plano ()] 'Nacional de Educação em Direitos Humanos / Comitê Nacional de Educação em Direitos
509 Humanos. -Brasília: Secretaria Especial dos Direitos Humanos, Ministério da Educação'. Brasil , Plano .
510 *UNESCO* 2007. Ministério da Justiça.

511 [Santos and Dos ()] *Para um Novo Senso Comum: a ciência*, Boaventura Santos , Dos . 2005. São Paulo: Cortez.

512 [Extensão ()] *Pelotas: Editora e Gráfica Universitária UFPEL. Edição especial, dezembro de*, Expressa Extensão
513 . 2012. p. .

514 [Brasil and Mec/Inep ()] *Pesquisa sobre discriminação e preconceito no ambiente escolar. Brasília: Ministério da*
515 *Educação, Instituto de Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira, Fundação Instituto de Pesquisa Econômicas*,
516 Brasil , Fipe Mec/Inep . 2009.

517 [Guareschi ()] *Psicologia Social Crítica: como prática de libertação*, Pedrinho O Guareschi . 2004. Porto Alegre:
518 EDIPUCRS.