

O DOCUMENTÁRIO ~ CIBERNÉTICO: MODOS DE OBSERVAÇÃO PELA CIBER- NÉTICA DE SEGUNDA ORDEM THE CY- BERNETIC DOCUMENTARY: WAYS OF OBSERVATION BY SECOND-ORDER CY- BERNETICS

DIOGO JOSÉ DA COSTA PINTO

PT | EN

Diogo José da Costa Pinto é documentarista e pesquisador no Nomads.usp sobre a correlação entre cibernética de segunda ordem e cinema documentário.

How to quote this text: D. J. C. O documentário cibernético, modos de observação pela cibernética de segunda ordem. **VIRUS**, São Carlos, n. 8, dezembro 2012. [online] Available at: <<http://www.nomads.usp.br/virus/virus08/?sec=6&item=2&lang=en>>. [Accessed: 06 May 2022].

Keywords: cybernetics; documentary; observation; conversation; system; communication

Ensaio:

Is it necessary to review the forms of observation in documentary filmmaking? The incentive to produce film records that hold observations of a way of life, customs and local glances should overlap formalism and a particular field of view that a documentarist imposes about its subject. An observer who interferes in the system in which he participates aiming to receive its energy and information through the clash with its "social actors" (NICHOLS, 2005) and "historical worlds" (NICHOLS, 2005) enriches the audiovisual work, turn itself part of an ethic within the reach of a reality that arises as the voice of the documentary, and as Pierre Lévy completes, it extends the observation process to a more effective approach of a guarantee of truth. [LEVY, P., year]

The goal of this paper aims to clarify starting by the characteristics of the Communication Theory, the General Systems Theory and the Complexity Theory, by the theorists Shannon and Weaver, Ludwig Bertalanffy and Edgar Morin, respectively, and by Second-Order Cybernetics, and forms of observation found in some types of documentary.

The categories of analysis that will be used grope the analysis of documentaries; the director's position in the work, both in the stage of filming, as in pre-production and post-production; the director's relationship with the team and the "social actors" (NICHOLS, 2005); and the way that the edition determines the reflection and observation of the viewer.

Stuart Umpeby and Eric Dent in "The origins and purposes of several traditions in systems theory and cybernetics", traces the idea that each viewer constructs an image of their world dependent on their experience. They emphasize, moreover, that information is described as something that comes in, is processed and leaves, within the process of cybernetic observation. Thus, the documentary film presented here as guided by Theory of Second Order Cybernetics, seizes the essence of the documentarist, as formed by his/her experience, and proposes the passage of filmic devices to the hands of those characterized with a different view until then, the "social actors" (NICHOLS, 2005) of the documentary register.

Therefore, the second-order cybernetics, as highlighted in the writings of Bernard Scott, discriminates, if collated with the theory of documentary film, these positions of the observer in a work namely: an observer/ documentarist that interferes in the system; the observation/ camera of observed systems; an intervention in the centre for an ethnographic format; an observer / documentarist that receives the energy and the information from the documented system.

Under these circumstances, the director of the documentary imposes himself as a part of a larger system and sees himself as one of the elements of the operating structure of observation that he wants to establish with its subject of study. As coordinator of a observational dynamic documentary that the process proposes, the director of the work arises in favor of the "historical world" (NICHOLS, 2005) to be understood and observed, morphing into character of the audiovisual product and perceiving himself as receiver of the camera observation. Therefore, this coordinator/director/character is also agent in the observed centre and places himself as interventionist in the space and the individuals around. This way, as a character of the social space, the director modifies the perception of the recorded moment and modulates itself a truth that exists only by the lens of that camera at that moment, in this instance. For that, the observation of the observed systems is necessary when the director leaves the comfort and security that the "behind the camera" proposes and is transported towards the centre which he observed, being at the same time, observed and observer.

Another highlight is the length of time filming in a certain community, when the director and team identify themselves as part of the observed community. It is clear, now in this moment, that the observation is disguised as a partiality of an experience for a view that is part of that space, of that community. According to this sphere, Bill Nichols highlights the participatory filmmaker and researcher's position:

"When we view participatory documentaries we expect to witness the historical world as represented by someone who actively engages with, rather than unobtrusively observes, poetically reconfigures, or argumentatively assembles that world." (NICHOLS, 2005, p. 116)

"The researcher goes into the field, participates in the lives of others, gains a corporeal or visceral feel for what life in a given context is like, and then reflects on this experience, using the tools and methods of anthropology or sociology to do so." (NICHOLS, 2005, p. 115)

In this sphere of a new way of observing, the theories of conversation and culture, from the authors Pangaro, Pierre Lévy and Bill Nichols, are chosen as priors for the formation of a basic skeleton for running a film guided by cybernetic principles. Thus, as the documentary is a creative process that seeks significance about a certain issue, expectation becomes a fundamental element in the entire course of audiovisual production. According to the Theory of Conversation established by Pagaro it stands out, that by modifying the expectations arisen by knowledge, by reality, or by the perspective of the other the documentarist achieves the goal proposed, fostering the production of a documentary with the voice of the observed. That is, in the interview process, the artifice of contravention of the "social actor" and consequently with the viewer in a particular subject, concludes a process of reflection and learning by whom hears and listens. This causes thus a willingness to reflect and attracts greater attention to what is said. Being practiced this opposition by the documentarist, from the conception of the pre-production of the film on, with the aim of taking the viewer and the "social actor" (NICHOLS, 2005) of his habitual state of comfort, it inspires a transformation and performance while participating in a filmed reality.

For this, Pierre Lévy perceives that the hierarchical pyramid of control must be modified and when translated to film, it is observed that this hierarchy - documentarist / documented - should be taken as context, according to the circumstances in order to esteem individual skills. Here, the line between perceived control of camera equipment and crew film by director, assign as objects of representation in favor of those "social actors" (NICHOLS, 2005) expressing their voice not only through interviews, but by the choices of shooting and audio recording, (than be represented as a whole). The stream of consciousness within a network acts as a memory and is represented by the capability of each "social actor" (NICHOLS, 2005) also being the author of the documentary.

It must be evident that the positions of a documentary and the information circulating in the mainstream media should contain experiences that address livelihoods, identity, desires, culture and bias that each look of certain individuals, tribes, communities, societies and ideologies exert on themselves. The information cannot dominate the aims of the experience, since this is observed by the differences that surround us and the multiple identities that seek to be heard. The control of culture and information need to have a democratic character that the documentary should realize beforehand. Since, as discussed then, allowing audiovisual devices that enable the observation to become effective under the circumstances from the perspective of the Other.

So, for what belongs to culture in the age of cybernetic systems, there is no longer a fetishism of the object itself, but a fetishism of interaction processes, of simulation. In this respect, Nichols discusses a range of modifications of culture that Walter Benjamin wrote in "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" (Benjamin, 1936) translated into contemporary technology. Documentary filmmaking is then parallel to the discussions proposed by Nichols. In the first instance, it appears from the text of Nichols that media is a simulation product of an event. As an example, Nichols uses the Wikileaks video that shows american soldiers shouting from a helicopter at a car moving occupied by civilians. In this case, the screen format and simulation of a video game are evident. Here the question is, whether the types of documentaries aired today in the mainstream media does serve a public addicted to the language of video games and how the documentaries can reach those public. In this case, can't it relate to the filming process as a way of interaction between documentarist/documentated inserted within a simulation system that relies on the experience of one another? Fundamentally, wouldn't the process be a way of simulation in a system? Wouldn't the frame be a equivalent mediator of a computer screen or a television? The filmic device is set as the machine that generates images into an unforeseeable event within the documentary field. That is, the perceived tension between the potential creation of a cybernetic ideology as opposed to tight and biased preservation of existing social relations predetermined. Taken up in this way, in a system of addict language of simulacra, the passage of the film devices to the characters of different realities can foster a new look at the world in a spectrum of control that escapes the confines of the documentarist. But close to a reality more latent and less conditioned.

As a solution, Nichols lies in language, speech and message and in style and rhetoric, discriminated in his text "The Work of Culture in the Age of Cybernetic Systems" (NICHOLS, 2003), as basic elements of a documentary work amenable to a more effective reflection of those inserted in it, as of the public. In addition, Nichols proposed three structural changes, which are the economic mode of production, the nature of art and the categories of perception motivational bases for the maintenance of exemplified simulation modes.

To do this, the beacon becomes essential in income rituals in which the ability of the camera to introduce an "optical unconscious" revealing the forms of interaction that we reject for our eyes. Under these circumstances, the documentary film is in the dimension of unpredictability and of forms of interaction among its participants and its public reception with the abstract sphere that its director should consider. Being, the documentary as a transformative character, it should be considered as an impetus for political expression that directly touches its viewers, breaking the fourth wall opacity of perception.

From this, the type of observational documentary exposed by Bill Nichols, comprises a holding diminished by the director, but at the same time, it uses the montage to enable the reflection of the one who observes the scene. The viewer includes a look at the film event with potential so that it can realize its variants and deduct their own opinion about that event. Reaching up, another agent about the meaning of a documentary intended as ideas from Second Order Cybernetics. Consequently, as in the case of a "social actor" (NICHOLS, 2005) who uses film devices to construct a look at the proposed topic in the documentary, the viewer, in this case, has the freedom to guide their reflection without the direct influence of the director in the montage. The rhetoric and mastery of cut are ported to the background in favor of the multiplicity of interpretations that this record can cause in the individualities of each viewer. Bill Nichols adds:

All of the forms of control that a poetic or expository filmmaker might exercise over the staging, arrangement, or composition of a scene became sacrificed to observing lived experience spontaneously. Honoring this spirit of observation in post-production editing as well as during shooting resulted in films with no voice-over commentary, no supplementary music or sound effects, no intertitles, no historical reenactments, no behavior repeated for the camera, and not even any interviews.

(NICHOLS, 2005, p. 110)

It appeared, therefore, a documentary mode that inserts the voice of the other as part of dialectic between documentary and documented to reach a broad object, insert to the public. The conversation and interaction between the "social actors" (NICHOLS, 2005) and filmic devices becomes a means to an everyday dialogue. An interaction process that allows an intelligent observation as part of the desire of the other.

The theory of conversation by Pangaro versed in his paper "The Past Future of Cybernetics: Conversation, von Foerster and the BCL" crosses again the documentary study as well as the question of culture proposed by Pierre Lévy and Bill Nichols. The forms of interaction with the environment and through the environment shape the main contributions that the conversation can offer to the cinema on a first contact. The interaction with the environment is portrayed by complete cycles by organisms - individuals - through the environment, not by themselves internally. That consideration should be called into account on a documentary that deals with individuals and systems as a whole. So, the documentarist must enter the "social actor" (NICHOLS, 2005) within a network of systems, retro feeding by the perception of the environment and then return it to the middle. This causes a memory and modifies these environments, fostering new experiences in their interlocutors and changing them constantly. At this point, taken up the ideas previously exposed concerning experience, memory and unpredictability of the documentary, the director is participatory and social individual susceptible to changes in filmic process. Being thus appears that the interaction between the "historical world" (NICHOLS, 2005), their "social actors" (NICHOLS, 2005) and the film crew essential to the completion of a finished cybernetic documentary.

The interaction with the environment has a camera as an intermediate device that intends the control for whom is behind it. But, how to get out of this provision of the order for a more participatory form of both parties within a process of control in conversation? One answer could be found in the director also being part of the history and appearing besides the character interviewed, both filmed by the camera. The documentarist as part of the process can help resolve the camera control. Therefore, the objective is a new tax and the goal deprecated by documentarist divided in common with the "social actors" (NICHOLS, 2005) search a truth spoken by both.

O DOCUMENTÁRIO ~ CIBERNÉTICO: MODOS DE OBSERVAÇÃO PELA CIBER- NÉTICA DE SEGUNDA ORDEM THE CY- BERNETIC DOCUMENTARY: WAYS OF OBSERVATION BY SECOND-ORDER CY- BERNETICS

DIOGO JOSÉ DA COSTA PINTO

PT | EN

Under all the precepts discussed, in the company of the ideas of control, stability systems, instability given to the complexity and metalanguage to use transdisciplinary, the documentary reaches a creative process that considers the whole and implies a nonauthoritative voice to the product. The General Systems Theory and Complexity Theory, participatory overused in cybernetic theory, adds new elements to the composition of this documentary advocated in this essay.

Taking the types of documentary discriminated by Bill Nichols in his book "Introduction to Documentary" as the poetic, the expository, the observational, the participatory, the reflective and performative, one realizes that they elaborate modulations of directors participation in the observation forms and dealing with an object theme. These points of views run normally in a previous position of the documentarist to research and to record. Therefore, they do not consider the potential hidden behind multiple "social actors" (NICHOLS, 2005) that permeates the multiple representations that may exist in "historical worlds" (NICHOLS, 2005) and within the narrative documentary.

Therefore, from the study of the general systems and Complexity Theory, which are permeated by concepts that the second-order cybernetics raises, the documentarist tends to produce a more comprehensive and informative scenario than its object of study. Extending a range of observations from a thematic point, the choice of the modes of documentary cited by Bill Nichols explores accurately for treatment of reality. Furthermore, contacts with unpredictability and accuracy are more effective in the processes awaiting the registration of an audiovisual documentary.

Finally, across the Complexity Theory, the General Systems Theory, the Theory of Communication, conversation and the second-order cybernetics, the documentary evolves into a model of careful observation of the multiple realities portrayed, the value of imposing voice according to the participation characters, the forms of reception and translation by contemporary viewers of the place of documentary in the political and social space.

Bibliography

BENJAMIN, W., 2005. A obra de arte na era de sua reprodutibilidade técnica. In: BENJAMIN, W. *Magia e Técnica, Arte e Política: ensaios sobre literatura e história da cultura*. 7. ed. São Paulo: Brasiliense, pp.165-196.

NICHOLS, B., 2005. *Introdução ao documentário*. São Paulo: Papirus.

NICHOLS, B. *Representing reality, issues and concepts in documentary*. Indiana: Indiana University Press.

NICHOLS, B., 2003. The Work of Culture in the age of cybernetic systems, In: WARDRIP-FRUIN, N., MONFORT, N., *The Media reader*. Cambridge: MIT Press, pp. 625 - 641.

MÜLLER, K.H., 2007. The BCL - an Unfinished revolution of an Unfinished Revolution, In MÜLLER, A., MÜLLER, K.H., *An unfinished Revolution?*, Wien: Echoraum, pp.408-474

PANGARO, P., 2007. The Past-Future of Cybernetics: Conversation, von Foerster and the BCL, In MÜLLER, A., MÜLLER, K.H., *An unfinished Revolution?*, Wien: Echoraum, pp.144-187

FRANÇOIS, Ch., 1999. *Systemics and Cybernetics in a Historical Perspective, Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, Syst Res. 16, pp.203-219

SCOTT, B., 2004. *Second order cybernetics: an historical introduction, Kybernetes*, pp. 1365-1378.

MINDELL, D.A., 2002. Cybernetics and Ideas of the Digital, In: *Between Human and Machine*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, pp.276-306

HEYLIGHTEN, F., CLIFF, J., 2001. Cybernetics and Second-Order Cybernetics in: R.A. Meyers (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Physical Science & Technology* (3rd ed.), New York: Academic Press

UMPLEY, S., DENT, E., 1999. The Origins and Purposes of Several Traditions In: *Systems Theory and Cybernetics*, Published in *Cybernetics and Systems: An International Journal*, 30:79-103

Filmography

O Fim e o Princípio, 2006. Eduardo Coutinho, Brazil, 110 min.

Rua de Mão Dupla, 2004. Cão Guimarães, Brazil, 75 min.