

Arts, Linguistics, Literature and Language Research Journal

VIDEO DANCE AND SOMATIC EDUCATION

Roberta Suellen Ferreira Castro

Specialist in audiovisual production, art/dance teacher at the SEDUC/PA network and member of the Leminiscaste research group, she investigates Video dance through the research line Theories and Epistemic Interfaces in the Graduate Program in Arts UFPA, in which she obtained technical training and graduations in Dance and Artistic Studies (UC).

Curriculum Lattes: 6559976935905556
Belém, Pará, Brazil.

All content in this magazine is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution License. Attribution-Non-Commercial-Non-Derivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).



Abstract: This writing is an excerpt from the initial reflections of my trajectory as a Master's student in the Postgraduate Program in Arts at ``Universidade Federal do Pará``, thus, this article is committed to investigating the production of subjectivities in an artistic process of Video dance through the bias of the *video maker* in the contemporary context and the teaching internship experience in the discipline Somatic Education, regularly offered at the Faculty of Dance of ``Universidade Federal do Pará``.

Keywords: video dance, somatic education, *video maker*.

PRESENTATION

The writing proposal that I present at this moment is an unfolding and, at the same time, a connection of my current master's research with the field of study of Somatic Education.

The research that I develop in the master's degree is located in the line of study Theories and Epistemic Interfaces in Art and proposes to investigate the Production Processes of Subjectivity of the dancing body in Video dance, from the relationship of the *video maker* from the perspective of contemporary dance. This investigation is articulated, at first, with the body that moves with the camera, constructing choreographic and cinematographic images in real time and in sequence in the interart context.

From the need to exchange concepts and authors that would help me to think and create specific paths on aspects of the Production of Subjectivity for the research of the master's course, I was led to look, within my context which is ``Universidade Federal do Pará`` (UFPA) professors and research groups that dealt with this thematic focus to compose with my research. During this walk, which I consider to be part of the investigative process, I met with the Lemniscates Research Group that is dedicated to the study of Movement

Policies: subjectivities, somatics and education in which the participating members were dedicating themselves to the research project.

This group seemed to me powerful in producing connections between areas of knowledge and acceptance of differences. Given this attractive context, since August 2021 I have been participating as a member of the group and dedicating myself to studies that theorize the production of subjectivities in the field of Somatic Education.

Based on this experience with the research group, together with an initial dive into the field of Somatic knowledge, with the desire for greater depth in the area, I decided to establish a new connection with this field of study: I proposed to carry out a teaching internship in the discipline Education Somatic offered at the Faculty of Dance of ``Universidade Federal do Pará``, under the tutorship of Professor Saulo Silveira.

However, in this context, I have come across some questions that lead me to think: what types of possible relationships are established between Somatic Education and the practices of Video dance production, in which the *video maker* is the protagonist? How could somatic knowledge contribute to creative processes with videos? Is the *video maker's* contact with the somatic practice intervening in the methodological ways of creating Video dance? What modulations does the dancing video maker establish with the somatic context? What is provoked when it is placed in an exchange with another body? What do you feel in the exchange relationship with the other? Where do the processes of production of subjectivity intersect from this encounter?

In addition to these issues, it is important to take into consideration in this path the forces that are linked to subjectivity and feeling, as a researcher. It is becoming possible to perceive an attraction, something that in an "invisible"

way has become so real to the point of standing out as an interest, as an invitation and as an invitation to dwell on the not knowing that this possible connection can be established.

Faced with an intuitive perspective that dialogues with the thinking of Bondía (2014), I place myself in the experience as the subject who describes, interprets and analyzes his own experience, identifying and recognizing in the practice of Somatic Education the collaborative forces that cross the experience of the *video maker* who dance, weaving the bricolage of bibliographical references found in the research project and the experience in the teaching internship.

From the perspective of bricolage as a methodology, the experience is open allowing to shape, create, rebuild and adapt other realities from what happens in the process, in a relationship that takes place between knowledge and human life that is born from a sensitive listening that reveals individual and collective aspect of the human condition (KINCHELOE; BERRY, 2007).

VIDEO MAKER

In audiovisual language, the term *video maker*, *filmmaker* or videographer is designated to the professional who captures images using the camera. It is he who operates by organizing the framing, angle, plane and camera movements. The terms used vary according to the field of activity, which can be TV, cinema, etc. Even though the camera is common use by the videographer and the director of photography, the use takes different directions.

Thus, based on the literary script, the conception of the *storyboard*¹ and *decoupage*² occur in a democratized way between the

director and the cinematographer. Having the *storyboard* as a visual reference, the director of photography is the one who defines the capture and choice of images, making use of the elements: light, shadow, color, framing, dimension, volume, perspective and depth in his visual compositions.

The photographer needs to master the fundamentals of theatrical and cinematographic lighting, have knowledge of the equipment, accessories and technique through a book, website, visit to a museum and exploratory exercise to awaken my senses, in order to develop the sense of observation, sensitivity and the artistic look to “put the head, the eye and the heart on the same line of sight” (MOLETTA, 2009, p. 87-88).

According to Moletta (2009) the cinematographer is a subject who through a differentiated perception translates through the lens, idea, criticism, technique and choices unnoticed potentialities of the world. For him, the aesthetic result of this practice is due to the uniqueness of the subject and the artistic gaze which is constructed through observation, analysis and synthesis.

About the artistic look complements.

(...) It is with this look that he is used to seeing the world, creating his own definition of what reality is. He observes the people and the object around him, quickly analyzes them and elaborates a synthesis through the captured image. This “deformed look” of the photographer does not seek to reproduce the world he is focusing on, but to reinvent it in his own way (MOLETTA, 2009, p. 70).

Another relevant issue of audiovisual language is the transformation of technical aspects of language. According to Little White Lies (2018) film cameras were giant and immobile. In this condition the camera

1 **Storyboards:** integrated into the pre-production stage, the *storyboard* is the outline of the images to be captured, which is expressed through illustrations that pre-determine camera angles and position.

2 **Decoupage:** choice of the most adequate image for each word, sentence or paragraph of a script. The division of the choice of images is divided into sequences, scenes and shots.

movements: panoramic³ (pan), *plongé*⁴, *contraplongé*⁵, zoom optical⁶ and *travelling*⁷ were limited, they depended on using a tripod or rail to ensure image stability and accuracy.

Technological advances made it possible for the film to be replaced by the video camera, which combines audio and image devices in a single device, going from 24 to 60 frames per second. Other technical aspects changed were the size, weight and the insertion of a device that handles motion sensitivity.

The sensor is responsible for entering the light that transforms an electrical signal into an image, it works collaboratively by helping the lens and focus adjustment to control the sharpness and focus of the image, which are programmed for automatic or manual use.

All portable cameras available on the market are made up of a sensor, the main ones being the CCD – *Charge-coupled device*, being the most sensitive in low light situation, it creates sharper image, and the CMOS – *Complementary Metal Oxide Semiconductor*, more common in cell phone cameras, which features lower light capture and image sharpness compared to the previous model.

The insertion of the CCD and the portable size provided not only the improvement of the image quality, but also expanded the creative possibility of capturing the image, extending to the practice of *video maker*, who from that point on has more dexterity to move around in space with the camera over his hand.

Usually used to exercise subjective plan⁸ and long shot, "(...) A handheld camera can create dynamism in an action sequence" (Lies; Thrift, 2018, p. 68). it allows mobility through

space, autonomy to vary the choice of frames and plans, creating "a sense of dramatic immediacy" (LIES; THRIFT, 2018, p. 68).

Unlike the *dancer-video maker*, the conventional *video maker* in carrying out the sequence plan is conditioned to the script that determines what and how the images will be captured, the organization of equipment, wires and the movement of other professionals, who simultaneously follow the action of the dancer in the video maker and actor in the recording studio.

SOMATIC APPLICABILITY IN THE PRACTICE OF THE DANCING VIDEO MAKER

In the light of contemporary dance, Video dance is considered a hybrid product that brings together audiovisual and dance language codes. Although many Video dance productions have appeared in national and international festivals, what has become evident in this journey is the experimentation with editing as choreography and the investigation of a dance that happens for the camera.

As a contribution to these conceptions, the proposition that I form part of the principle of composition in real time occurs through the relationship between the body that moves towards the camera and the body that films dancing. In this context, both star in the choreographic composition, whose corporal technique, creativity and subjectivities of the danced movement appear intertwined as traces on the screen.

About real-time compositing Mundi points

3 **Panoramic:** In order to amplify the view, in the panoramic movement the camera rotates on its own axis and can be directed from one side to the other (right/left) or vertically (up/down).

4 **Plongé:** fixed at a fixed point, the movement is diving from top to bottom on the object or character.

5 **Contraplongé:** fixed at a fixed point, the movement is the inverse of the plongé, from bottom to top.

6 **Zoom:** different from the others, this movement is not of the camera, but of the lens. Zoom involves two movements: zoom-in, which brings the object closer to the image; and zoom-out, which distances the object from the image quickly or slowly.

7 **Travelling:** in this movement, the camera is fixed on a cart coupled to a rail, leaves its fixed place and travels along a path, following the action or character.

8 **Subjective plan:** represents the character's eyes in 1st person, making the spectator see what he sees and feel what he feels.

out:

The body's questioning is interconnected in its ability to perceive and elaborate information while perceiving; It is not an observing body separated from the environment, which looks from the outside in, but rather a body that perceives itself acting and acts perceiving, which observes and modifies, is observed and is modified (CASTRO; BRITO, 2018, p. 1228).

Given this perspective, I understand that the use of the sequence shot, subjective shot and real-time composition allied to the practice of *video maker* que dance proposes a way of doing contemporary dance, through which technical mechanisms enhance the body in danced movement, configuring "a new body dramaturgy, with another construction of the body" (MILLER, 2012, p. 47). It is a dance that is born from the contact of the exchange of subjectivities that is established mainly with the subject who manipulates the camera.

The *video maker*-dancer risks another way of moving with the camera in his hands, investigates and explores creative possibilities of using his own body in relation to himself, with the other and with space, building a network of perceptions connected with the present, producing in time real choreographic, cinematographic images that synthesize what I call choreovideographed aesthetics.

The body present in Video dance is the same one that Miller (2012) defines as a living, open and flexible body capable of potentiating the deconstruction of patterns, which allows stimuli and exchanges of experiences, of possible crossings between the body that dances, who films, watches or edits with a thought on dance.

The contributions that Jussara Miller (2012) brings from the Klaus Vianna technique to Somatic Education, which I add to the production of Video dance, is the conception of the integral body where the "soma" is synonymous with I, with singularity, it is the

body in 1st person where the individual is aware of his movement in the process by which he expands the choreographic investigation.

Far from standardization, repetition or mechanization of movement, what he wants is the construction of a sensitive, perceptible singular body that produces subjectivities that are only possible through the constant exercise of sensitive listening, which starts in the body reverberating in everything it accesses with its presence. Aware of himself and of the exploratory possibilities, readiness makes the video maker an autonomous subject who performs "self-regulation in its physical, psychic and emotional aspects" (MILLER, 2012, p. 13) and, spatially, in an investigative relationship that is modified to every move.

By basing the technical conception of the body in the somatic field, Miller (2012) proposes an open approach, emphasizing the need for an available body that abdicates pre-established patterns of movement in favor of the production of self-knowledge, so that there are conditions to negotiate the use of self-knowledge in the relationship with the other and with space. In this sense, the refinement of the sensitive body is the result of a synesthesia in daily work and, more relevant than the transformation of the scene, it must be in a constant state of readiness and observation, present conditions to connect with the environment and have autonomy of creation choreography (MILLER, 2012).

For Miller (2012) the scenic body is the result of artistic making from the somatic study originating from perception training, via exploration of the body in search of the construction of an organic body that aims at awareness, understanding and elaboration of the attention of the body in its completeness. For Miller, body education enables the transformation of motor skills and self-perception in the individual process, "when you experience a profound transformation

process, all planes are integrated, and then, the essence of our artistic production also changes” (MILLER, 2012, p. 73).

Made possible by the exploratory use of the sense organs, sensations stimulate different perceptions, which enhance the experimentation and recreation of images and information that are seen as a choreographic gesture, eliciting different expressive modulations of movement that fill the space with the presence of one’s own body, destroying models internalized by the movement.

FROM HETEROGENEITY TO MULTIPLICITY

Starting from a perspective based on the idea of micropolitics, the politics of subjectivation appears as a mediator of the crossing of subjectivities that emerge from the inner strength of heterogeneous bodies, which ask for passage to agitate, exchange, spread configuring in another way (ROLNIK, 2006).

The idea defended by Rolnik (2006) about the exchange with the other, starts from the conception that places vulnerability as a condition for the process of creation to be re-signified, causing “the other to cease to be an object of projection of pre-established images and can become a living presence” (ROLNILK, 2006, p. 2). Although this question is possible, in practice the deconstruction of this conception demands time and dedication to study oneself.

On this question Rolnik (2006) points out, the cortical capacity is defined by the figures of the subject and object in a relationship of exteriority, it consists of the conservation of known representations, guaranteeing the stability that throughout our lives we were instigated to seek. Rolnik assures that the way to blur the border between man and the world is to anesthetize the vulnerability to the other.

Arriving at this stage of surrender to

vulnerability is the same as asking you to walk aimlessly in a cave, whose only guarantee is darkness. Would we be in a position to carry out this endeavor? How could this be possible, if throughout our lives we have been conditioned to “learn the world in its forms and then project the representations we have on them, in order to give it meaning” (ROLNILK, 2006, p. 2).

I understand vulnerability as a force field and connect Rolnik’s thinking to Jussara Miller’s in relation to the issue of the territory of one’s own body:

In this territory in transformation, the labile body emerges, that is, the own body in an exploratory and perceptible state. I speak of the body itself as the body constructed by the perception and awareness of movement through sensory stimulation, or rather, the body felt in the experience of movement. “The notion of one’s own body comprises both the perceived body and the lived body, in short, the sensitive body (MILLER, 2012, p. 73-74).

In contrast, subcortical capacity builds in a different way.

It allows us to apprehend the world as a field of forces that affect us and are present in our body in the form of sensations [...] the other is a living presence made up of a plastic multiplicity of forces that pulsate in our texture sensitive, thus becoming part of ourselves. The figures of subject and object are dissolved here, and with them that which separates the body from the world (ROLNIK, 2006, p. 3).

Under this bias Rolnik (2006) proposes a body perspective that exists through the articulation of sense organs, which together are capable of moving the forces of the world. For her, the paradox between the “vibrating body” and perception mobilizes and drives the power of thought as an artistic creation as new sensations stimulate and incorporate the texture of the sensitive, conditioning the subject’s new contours and existential

substrates.

The rhizome, a concept defended by the philosophers Deleuze; Guattari (1995) adds to the practice of Video dance, as it deals with different bodies and practices that, when they come into contact, multiply. When one body is connected to another “semiotic chains of all kinds are connected in different ways of coding” (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 1995, p.14).

The existence of a crisis of reference makes these bodies negotiate their values in favor of a presence that operates the crossing of these forces in a dimension that goes beyond the known. It makes vulnerability a driving force field that drives other modes of existence (ROLNIK, 2006).

Based on Deleuze’s conception; Guattari (1995) I affirm, the conditions of the body, space, camera, production of body images and others, determine the overflow of forces, through bulb, intensities, speeds, actions, rods or underground flows revealing subjectivities that potentiate, add, complement, makes up the difference. In the agglomeration of diverse, perceptive, mimic, gestural acts, subjectivities blur the boundaries of space, environment and body. Under this condition, difference does not dampen the creation process, it multiplies it.

The multiplicity in Video dance is presented through the resulting image on the screen, but it is not fixed to it. “A multiplicity has neither subject nor object, but only determinations, magnitudes, dimensions that cannot grow without changing its nature” (Deleuze; Guattari, 1995, p. 15), that is, the nature of the subjects who dance.

The growth of dimensions in a multiplicity changes from the nature of the subject as its connections increase. The exploration of danced movement would contribute to the corporal repertoire. Activating this knowledge in real-time composition would configure what Deleuze; Guattari (1995) call “machinic

agency”.

For them, a rhizome would have no position, only lines that make up when they exchange information. The multiplicity is defined by abstract lines, of escape or of deterritorialization that nature when it connects to others, propitiating the existence of the plane of consistency. (Deleuze; Guattari, 1995). In this sense, the subject’s corporeity is a mixture of lived events, feelings, experience, concepts, formations, marks of life among others, linking in a “brittle of affections with variable speeds” (Deleuze; Guattari, 1995, p. 17), in relation to the that goes beyond the boundaries of the body itself.

To conclude, I would like to emphasize that this production does not end with this article. It is just the investigative beginning of my master’s research, in fact, a training session articulating the somatic field as an investigative action of the body and its subjectivities. To conclude, I appropriate Deleuze’s concept; Guattari (1995), clarifying that there will still be loose threads to be connected, deconstructed or reformulated for the continuation or unfolding of this reflection.

REFERENCES

ROLNIK, Suely. **Geopolítica da cafetinagem**. Núcleo de Estudos da Subjetividade. Programa de pós-graduação em psicologia clínica. PUC. São Paulo, 2006. Disponível em: <https://www.pucsp.br/nucleodesubjetividade/Textos/SUELY/Geopolitica.pdf>. Acesso em: 24 mai.2022.

DELEUZE, Gilles; GUATTARI, Félix. **Mil Platôs: capitalismo e esquizofrenia**. Trad. Aurélio Guerra Neto e Célia Pinto Costa. Ed: 34, vol. 1. Rio de Janeiro, 1995.

BONDÍÁ, Jorge Larrosa. **Tremores: notas sobre a experiência e o saber da experiência**. Trad. Cristina Antunes; João Wanderley Geraldi. Ed, Autêntica. Belo Horizonte, 2014.

KINCHELOE, Joe L; BERRY, Kathlen S. **Pesquisa em Educação: conceituando a bricolagem**. Ed. Artmed. Porto Alegre, 2007.

MILLER, Jussara. **Qual o corpo que dança? Dança e educação somática para adultos e crianças**. 2ª Edição. Ed: Summus. São Paulo, 2012. p. 13- 80.

MOLETTA, Alex. **Criação de Curta-metragem em vídeo digital: uma proposta para produções de baixo custo**. 2ª Edição. Ed: Summus. São Paulo, 2019. p. 41-88.

LIES, Little White; THRIFT, Matt. **Guia para fazer seu próprio filme em 39 passos**. Trad. Edson Furmankiewicz. Ed: Gustavo Gili. São Paulo, 2018.

CASTRO, Roberta Suellen Ferreira; BRITO, Waldete. Destino das imagens: bricolagem de imagem e coreografia no processo de edição em videodança. In: ARTE COMO: ENGAJAMENTO POLÍTICO OU FUNÇÃO ESTÉTICA, 4, 2018, Belém. Anais (...) Belém. Ed. PPGARTES/ICA/UFPA, 2018, p.1220-1235. Disponível em: <https://www.ppgartes.prosp.ufpa.br/Anais%20do%VIII%C3%B3rum%20Bienal%20de%20Pesquisa%20em%20Artes.pdf>. Acesso em 01 set. 2022.