ABSTRACT
The research discusses the historical ideologies transmitted by cinematography, which cause the loss of meaning, insensitivity and intellectual stiffness by the absence of (self) criticism. Thus, this hermeneutic type of study proposes to look at the conceptions of gender and sexuality conveyed by cinema, in an attempt to review their repercussions on the experience of educational thinking. The shared problems need an attentive and critical-reflexive sensitivity to productions, to resist the spread of inequalities, exclusions and prejudices, the only way to generate new understandings through intersubjective processes, breaking with the fads to make this device an aggregating vehicle of experiences. Humanizing social practices oriented towards the recognition of differences. Underlying film productions is the dominance of the cultural industry, which in its market logic promotes the repetition of certain discourses until they become passive truths in the face of the world. In this scenario marked by technical reproducibility, we show that there is little resistance from the film industry, which reveals gender and sexuality paradigms, highlighting contemporary issues. We conclude that these technological artifacts in education need to serve as impulses to rethink human action under penalty of the teaching processes reproducing exclusion, prejudice, uniformity and insensitivity to others and the plurality of experiences. It is about correcting the deformations of recognition through re-education that enhances human differences and social recognition.
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RESUMO
A pesquisa debate sobre as ideologias históricas transmitidas pela cinematografia, que causam a perda de sentido, insensibilidade e o enrijeçamento intelectual pela ausência de (auto) crítica. Assim, o presente estudo, de caráter hermenêutico, propõe olhar as concepções de gênero e sexualidade veiculadas pelo cinema, na tentativa de rever suas repercussões na experiência do pensar educacional. Os problemas partilhados precisam de uma sensibilidade atenta e crítico-reflexiva frente às produções, para resistir à disseminação de desigualdades, exclusões e preconceitos, única forma de gerar novas compreensões mediante processos intersubjetivos, rompendo com os modismos para fazer desse dispositivo um veículo agregador de experiências humanizadoras da prática social orientada para o reconhecimento das diferenças. Subjacente às produções cinematográficas, sobrevive o domínio da indústria cultural, que em sua lógica de mercado promove a repetição de determinados discursos até que se transformem em verdades apasstativas frente ao mundo. Nesse cenário marcado pela reproducibilidade técnica, evidenciamos que há uma pequena resistência da indústria cinematográfica, que descortina paradigmas de gênero e sexualidade, evidenciando questões contemporâneas. Concluímos que esses artefatos tecnológicos na educação precisam servir como impulso para repensar a ação humana sob pena dos processos de ensino reproduzirem a exclusão, o desrespeito preconceituoso, uniformizador e insensível ao outro e à pluralidade de experiências. Trata-se de corrigir as deformações do reconhecimento por meio da reeducação que potencializa as diferenças humanas e o reconhecimento social.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE

Reproducciones de Género Por Cinematografía: ¿Caminos Hacia la Educación?

RESUMEN
La investigación analiza las ideologías históricas transmitidas por la cinematografía, que causan pérdida de significado, insensibilidad y rigidez intelectual por la ausencia de (auto) crítica. Así, el presente estudio, de carácter hermenéutico, propone examinar las concepciones de género y sexualidad convebidas por el cine, en un intento de revisar sus repercusiones en la experiencia del pensamiento educativo. Los problemas compartidos necesitan una sensibilidad atenta y crítica-reflexiva hacia las producciones, para resistir la difusión de las desigualdades, las exclusiones y los prejuicios, la única manera de generar nuevos entendimientos a través de procesos intersubjetivos, Rompiendo con los modismos para hacer de este dispositivo un vehículo agregador de experiencias humanizadoras de la práctica social orientadas al reconocimiento de diferencias. Detrás de las producciones cinematográficas, sobrevive al dominio de la industria cultural, que en su lógica de mercado promueve la repetición de ciertos discursos hasta que se convierten en verdades apálabivas frente al mundo. En este escenario marcado por la reproducibilidad técnica, evidenciamos que existe una pequeña resistencia de la industria cinematográfica, que revela paradigmas de género y sexualidad, evidenciando temas contemporáneos. Concluimos que estos artefactos tecnológicos en la educación deben servir como impulso para repensar la acción humana bajo pena de los procesos de enseñanza reproducir la exclusión, la falta de respeto prejuiciosa, la uniformidad e insensible al otro y la pluralidad de Experiencias. Se trata de corregir las deformaciones del reconocimiento a través de la reeducación que potencializa las diferencias humanas y el reconocimiento social.

PALABRAS CLAVE
Initial Considerations

Gender inequalities span the entire history of mankind from the earliest times, through witch-hunt to the present day, bearing the hallmarks of political, social and educational setbacks of ancient contradictory patterns. In cinematography, issues of gender and sexuality are (re)produced, therefore, the relevance of the critical analysis of cinema in education, to sensitize the debate between opposing and discordant voices regarding the perpetuated prejudices in society, since the visualization of movies lead us to rethink the present. Cinematographic works are paradoxical, as they both evidence patterns that can be re-signified in the communicative-dialectical educational debate and coincide with a mass culture of socio-historical reproductions, taken in a mechanical and silencing form, supported by the cultural identification of subjectivities (pseudo-autonomy that shapes subjectivities) to the commodity and formed by the media.

The problem is that technological artifacts are often decontextualized and disconnected from a rationality and historicity that learns from knowledge, so that cinematographic works deal with homogenizing simplism and addressing serious interests that cause psychic suffering, as is the case: gender and sexuality issues. Technicist visions end up inserted in society in a superficial way, as a machine of transmission and reproduction of uniforms, exclusions and prejudices, which does not qualify the experiences provided, falling into the simple position of spectators, prioritizing the pleasures over the demands of analysis, criticism and contradiction. In this scenario, the educational potential lies precisely in the possibility of reinventing oneself and recreating oneself from the human condition, which activates thinking and awakening to dialogue with life's ambiguities and dilemmas.

In contemporary society, gender inequality is strongly linked with the system of patriarchy, which historically and culturally was built, presenting the female figure as being submissive and inferior to the male, an understanding that needs to be constantly revised through freedom of speech and communication. We find in the art of cinematography a potential opinion-maker, which can both legitimize ignorance at work by homogenizing gender issues of marketing interests and can be recognized as a way of reinventing itself for contact with otherness (in an attempt to put oneself in the other's place) and with the differences, aiming to problematize and apprehend the world. Underlying film productions, according to the Frankfurtian theorists Adorno and Horkheimer (1985), survives the cultural industry, which in its market logic (of interests focused on consumption, disposal and production of needs and buying desires) promotes an uncritical posture, your viewers to the world. The dialectical thought of contradiction in articulation with historicity is pointed as the remedy to overcome socialized semi formation, since it begins to question the gear of the world of which we are part.

Faced with these precepts, the essay proposes to critically look at the conceptions of femininity, masculinity and gender inequalities transmitted by cinema, which tend to homogenize human thought by subjecting it to the isolated object of technique. From the need
for new attitudes that take into account a society that develops in history through the power of communication, the following question arises: how to develop a critical stance in education against cinematic artifacts to break the propensity for ideas prejudice and disrespect for gender and sexuality issues? Are there cinematographic works marked by contradiction and openness to thinking and acting that are not in line with the illusory totalitarianisms of the market? Thus, aiming at new school dispositions for the construction of gender equity and the rupture with the supply of the cultural industry in an attempt to, at the same time, modify it through reeducated actions.

The research has its foundation in the hermeneutic approach, which aims to produce knowledge through mediation and communicative relationship between subjects and the environment, because it inspires dialogues of knowing oneself in another (GADAMER, 2002). As the subject relates to the other and the cultural context, he/she becomes (re) known as a subject of his/her own history and citizen of the world, making critical analyzes of the lived conditions. We emphasize the need for an education for diversity that forms critical subjects interested in emancipation from cultural products, which, when serving for training, are also instruments against the producer-author. Habowski, Jacobi and Conte (2018, p. 276) affirm that the “hermeneutic dimension comes from the openness to the common language between the subjects, which gives rise to new meanings to the political dimension of giving voice to the other” because it opens the new texts, which are characteristic of the circularity of cultural processes and the communicative interdependence of social movements. After all, in the field of education we cannot privilege the product over processes under penalty of falling into authoritarian postures and cultural exploitation through the reception and reproduction of ideologies. From the hermeneutic approach we interpret the texts, speeches and present some provocative and appropriate films to think about the pedagogical practices of resistance to conformism and with gender perspectives that can be problematized in the classroom. It is about elaborating new reflexive movements for the recreation of this artistic composition, in the sense of making life itself an expression of the art of educating, representing something inherent in human formation and learning itself.

The study is divided into three sections. The first characterizes cinema as a means of ideological transmission of the cultural industry, as Adorno and Horkheimer argue, and of Benjamin's technical reproducibility. sexuality for the cinema. Then, we highlight that there is another part of the film industry, still a minority, that seeks to break with some gender paradigms, helping to build a society that is critical of itself and understanding of the other, and that can be problematized in the classroom, they are the documentary The Testimony (2015), the Spanish movie Todo sobre mi madre (1999), and finally, the movie Orações para Bobby (2009). Finally, we emphasize that cinema has an educational and communicative power that should be valued as a pedagogical means to promote critical reflections, in a period of intense and surprising transformations, which may announce the overcoming of mere reproducibility.
Gender Inequality and Cinema Broadcasting

Although gender inequality passes through established norms, it is not resolved through legal issues, since it has been part of historical roots since ancient times. In accessible language, this is reflected in the role of women in society, which historically comes to be seen as being inferior to men, that is, it only gains identity in culture when it is associated or dependent on man (from the biblical origin that from the rib of Adam), due to religious beliefs that authenticated such understanding, crossing social customs, especially in Hebrew society, marked by patriarchalism and hierarchies in social relations, removing all its dimension of parent, mother (the one that foretells life) and warrior. As a consequence of the time, Aristotle himself, a great thinker of the third century BC, contradicting Plato, in the description of the Republic, states that the family or the domestic government must be constituted by “the master and the slave, the husband and the wife, the father and the children”. (Aristotle 1991, p. 11). Based on this premise, he points out that "in all species, the male is evidently superior to the female: the human species is no exception." (Aristotle 1991, p. 13).

Regarding the powers in the family, he stated that “as far as sex is concerned, the difference is indelible: whatever the age of the woman, the man must retain his superiority” and that “the strength of a man consists in imposing himself, that of a woman, in overcoming the difficulty of obeying” (ARISTÓTELES, 1991, p. 29; p. 31). In these passages a pejorative view of women is evidenced by virtue of veiled or explicit codes of this relationship necessary for the formation of female identities due to legacy inheritances. Further on, again the woman is discredited to the category of weakness of courage, lack of energy, of firmness, of decision, according to the words of Aristotle (1991, p. 44):

Temperance and justice even differ between free people, one of whom is superior and the other inferior, for example between man and woman. A man’s courage would approach pusillanimity if it were only equal to that of a woman, and the woman would be bold if she were no more reserved than a man in his words.

It is evident that the Aristotelian understanding does not have its application in contemporary society, mainly from the claims of feminist movements that women reached spaces in the labor market, gradually gaining greater independence. However, the difference is what constitutes us in the coexistence of hybrid social relations. Subsequently, sexual liberation helped to make visible the differences with feminism and postfeminism, constituting the liberation of women as a marginalized and stigmatized object to provide sexual services to men. In the current configuration, women are increasingly occupying leadership spaces at various resorts, taking over and affirming their social position.¹

¹ It is worth noting that the Brazilian political reality is indifferent in relation to women’s struggles for equity in their different spheres (leadership spaces, salaries, self-assertion and social position), besides the fact that women elected and / or appointed to important positions, in particular, most of them called themselves anti-feminists. Thus, many of the social rights and working spaces that women have gained over the past decades are compromised with the current historical context, as equal rights are proclaimed to women for assuming
Even so, women continue to be discriminated against in the social arena, because now with a double workday they have coordinating positions and remain with the integral duties of housework, often solely responsible for the education and care of their children. For this reason, we realize that female emancipation originated a double exploitation, and even though the discourses are progressive and liberating, because in practice we see conservatism and hierarchization of gender relations. It is in this arena that we identify salary differences in women-dominated functions, such as teaching, where we observe the lowest salaries paid in Brazil and contradictory social values.

In turn, the media were born and raised in Europe rooted in the process of industrialization that has been going on since the nineteenth century. In the middle of the twentieth century, capitalism created premises for a consumerist society strongly based on the media, especially the cinema. From the perspective of Benjamin (1994), cinema emerges as a possibility of technical and cultural reproducibility, due to the intensity of the mass movements generated that make cultural goods accessible to all. Benjamin (1994, p. 170) defines the aura "as a singular form composed of spatial and temporal elements: the unique appearance of a distant thing, however close it may be." Thus, the aura presents a distance between the object and the observer, a transcendent and hidden character in the work of art, however, stunted in the technical age by its reproducibility on a large scale. Through this mediatization, the aura relates to the expansion of human experience, breaking with the dichotomy between distance and proximity.

As already mentioned, technical instrumentality causes cultural reproduction and homogenization in the ways of thinking, and may subvert imagination to commodity, the result of the intersection of technical determinations, where magic is manifested through technique. Benjamin, in 1930, identified that through the creation of filmic characters with whom we identify we produced fanciful narratives that served as an antidote to the psychotic desire of the human being. The power of cinema lies in the fact that it gives us the possibility for different experiences and sensations from our daily lives, allowing us to share something very different, besides the exposure value. Thus, it is noticeable how much cinema causes an unconscious involvement of the subjects, due to the technical quality, manifesting the ability to architect nonexistent realities.

By transforming the relationship between human beings and technology, cinema alters human relations, as it gives the possibility to experience the world in other ways and through other perceptions, notably technological devices, which allow us to see what was not seen at all. naked eye, showing the human being what was recorded only in his brain (BENJAMIN, 1994). The camera has the power to bring to the visible what previously only our unconscious saw through the imagination, like the small imperceptible particles, allowing the enlargement of space with its lenses, to stretch or shorten the image to obtain a different framing, and within the standards. But it turns out that we do not look at the world through the technical
device, but look at the device itself, because we are immersed in the search to uncover new possibilities for life that the device offers. The act of looking at the world through the framing of the camera is an action that can modify the perception of the present and interpersonal relationships (BENJAMIN, 1994).

Benjamin (1994) considers cinema as an art that comes closest to the modern human being, the new ways of seeing everyday reality, expanding the objects that end up being taken as synonymous with the expansion of knowledge. The masses, many times uniformed seek in film productions a distraction captured in contemplation of the perceptive surface. In the words of Benjamin (1994, p. 194),

Reception through distraction, which is increasingly observed in all domains of art and is a symptom of profound transformations in perceptual structures, has its privileged setting in cinema. And here, where the collectivity seeks distraction, the dominant tactile governing the restructuring of the perceptual system is by no means lacking. It is in architecture that it is in its element most originally. But nothing reveals more clearly the violent tensions of our time than the fact that this tactile dominant prevails in the optics universe itself. This is exactly what happens in the cinema, through the shock effect of its image sequences. Thus, from this point of view, cinema is also the most important object of that science of perception which the Greeks called aesthetics.

For Benjamin (1994), the aestheticization of the world by means of communication in the age of capitalism links images to thought, but it is thought itself that is represented through the image, in which the knower treats it as a way of dominating subjectivities and reproduce concepts and ideologies. In this sense, cinema is a collective cultural artifact that, through technical reproducibility, facilitates the process of alienation and sociocultural massification, as it transforms ideas into commodities, the intellectual field into productivity and market competitiveness. It is in their enjoyment that the lack of subjectivation of the individual's own desires and needs occurs, in the name of a massive consolidation of the cultural industry, which is based on this process of loss of subjectivity through the standardization of values and the status quo. Thus, Benjamin identified the art of cinema in the space of the industrial bourgeoisie, eliminating intervention and ensuring objectivity. Thus, it distances itself from the Frankfurtsians, because it did not see the cultural industry solely as a potential for alienation, a domination of subjectivity, but stressed that in history the human being could also evolve. In his words, "history is the object of a construction whose value is not homogeneous and empty time, but a time saturated with now". (BENJAMIN, 1994, p. 229).

This market logic not only added to the trends to be consumed, but also the human way of thinking and acting in life in society, provoking a form of standardization of the person through the dictatorship of certainties. Cinema is the nomenclature given to the seventh art, which absorbs and makes use of the others, and is even called impure art, perhaps because of its interest and instrumental action, which silences and interrupts the listener's thinking with the world and isolates it in the story line. plot. For Loureiro (2008, p. 141),
The films of this industry show characteristics such as: 1) they present themselves as more real than reality itself, but, contradictorily, make use of a fictional reality in which happy end is fundamental; 2) appear as a faithful mechanism of reproduction of the sensible world; 3) They do everything to match the phenomenon that appears on the screen to the real world itself, and thus contribute to maintaining the viewer's conformism.

In this perspective, the impasses that drive sexual discrimination and coexistent gender inequalities in society are sustained and promoted by the cultural industry with its film productions closely linked to the politics of reproduction. For Adorno, the transformation would lie in making known the contradictions of today's society. In cinema the female figure is disqualified and objectified in countless productions, as a fragile being and inferior to the male, presenting this as a mere object of pleasure of man. This shows the preservation of patriarchalism by the cultural industry, which is maintained by maintaining the status quo and repudiating any manifestation contrary to its imposition, allowing the preservation of gender inequality and the elimination of any possibility of a search for the dialogical overcoming of this. unanimously.

It is possible to say that gender is a social construction and that perhaps the difference lies in the relation of this subject to the concrete conditions of life. Patriarchalism, for example, which historically endures is not a natural condition, but the imposition and maintenance of a way of life that determines social thinking. It seems that the role of women, in countless occasions and contexts, is inferior to that of men, whose greater purpose is the result of the denial of voice and female freedom in the name of dominant power interests. The passionate way in which we incorporate the ideas of the cultural industry perpetuates an uncritical system that we learn in practical dealing with the objective, functionalist, and lazy world of developing a practical and positive self-correlation with the other person, arising from experiences of disrespect. Kaplan (2002, p. 212) clarifies some invisibilities and ideologies:

The way women are imagined in conventional Hollywood dramas emerges from the male patriarchal unconscious. These are the fears and fantasies of men about women that we find in movies, not women's perspectives and concerns. I also argue how Hollywood melodrama can (see my 1992 book Motherhood and Representation), in some of its forms, express women's sufferings, conflicts, and oppressions as a result of patriarchalism, but most of the genres Hollywood still focus on men's desires and male fantasies.

Most film productions not only maintain the status quo but spread hegemonic, segregating ideologies, inequalities in thinking for future generations. By the time we come into contact with any cinematographic work, a normative way of thinking from shared truths is already being instilled. Looking at children's film productions, for example, we see princesses and princes dictating and controlling ways of being, thinking, and acting. This cultural homogenization begins in the dictum of pink being feminine and masculine blue, until the awareness that the girl should play with pans and dolls while the boys with strollers and balls. Gubernikoff (2009, p. 69) reiterates that the "intentional manipulation of audiovisual language is fully accepted by the general public, and its main objective is to
create a likelihood with reality, to pass through the real world”. The subject who clashes with this common pattern is seen as a different, strange, problematic subject, and is now rejected and excluded from the social realm.

The gender inequality widespread in cinema not only remains in children's works but is evident in film productions as a whole. The woman is treated as a submissive, domesticated being, who should have no opinion of her own, can never be a midwife of ideas in a hermeneutic sense, and subsume to man's directives and pleasures. For Bordwell (2005, p. 32), “through cinema technology, narrative structure, 'enunciative' processes and particular types of representation (e.g., those of women), cinema builds the subjective positions that are defined ideology and social formation”. And any form of contrary manifestation is seen as pathological or associated with female rebellion. Cinema is a major public opinion maker and reaffirms that “our culture has spread the idea that a woman's body is a sight to behold, and that she must know her place (probably by the side of a tank or stove)”. (GUBERNIKOFF, 2009, p. 72).

The gender-validated gender inequality not only annihilates women's opportunities in social life, but also gives rise to violence, personal offenses, abuse, deprivation of rights, exclusion of certain identity claims, bullying and sexual harassment, rape, humiliation, disrespect and family violence become naturalized in daily life and indifference to the suffering of the other (the other woman) becomes legitimated in the argument of superiority of men. According to Feitosa, Lima and Medeiros (2010, p. 4),

Violence is the oldest instrument of expression of the power of man, and it is present in the lives of millions of women of all social classes, races/ethnicities and sexual orientation. It is through this instrument that the male world imposes its domination at a time when women dare to counteract their role. The different practices of violence against women, such as physical, symbolic, sexual and patrimonial, have been naturalized within society and are present in both intimate and public spaces.

With each cinematic work produced, with rare exceptions, we highlight a media that serves capitalism (for money and power) and dimensions stereotypes of the social imaginary, as if the issue of gender were synonymous with (in) capacity or limitation, when, in fact, we know that it is a matter of conflict on an interpersonal, sociocultural and unnatural level. The patriarchal historical system is deeply rooted and maintained, so that even in the face of various achievements on the part of women today, such as the right to vote by suffragists, political office and social relevance, women are still taught on the assumption the symbolic regulations. Many female speeches are repudiated and equality of rights is ignored, just as “in Hollywood movies a woman is denied an active voice and a speech and her desire is subject to male desire. In silence, they live frustrated lives or, if they resist this condition, sacrifice their lives for such boldness.” (KAPLAN, 1995, p. 24).

Lauretis (1994) proposes the concept of gender technology and identifies the sex-gender system as a system of representation, which assigns meanings in life in society and considers that the gendered individual is created not only by sexual difference but by
linguistic and linguistic codes. sociocultural representations. The central point for the author is the idea that gender issues are reproduced by the various social technologies, institutionalized practices and daily actions that constitute the subjects in the world and that promote affiliations or identifications to models of subjectivity of men and women.

In thinking of gender as the product and process of a number of social technologies or biomedical apparatuses, it is already going beyond Foucault, whose critical understanding of sexual technology has not taken into account the differentiated appeals of male and female subjects, and whose theory, by ignoring the conflicting investments of men and women in the discourses and practices of sexuality does in fact exclude, although not preclude, consideration of gender. (LAURETIS, 1994, p. 208-209).

Lauretis (1994) points out that cinema is built within a historical perspective that conveys speeches, meanings and specific practices of a given social purpose, and it is possible to perceive cinema as a relevant instrument in the creation and maintenance of forms of subjectivation, constituting a technology of genre. One of the ways in which the image of women is commercialized by cinema is pornography, which, even if not advertised on society's billboards, is a present element in society's life. The pornographic production viewed today also on the Internet, not only propagates the power and domination of men before women, but also brings consequences that break with human dignity and democratic achievements. Women are presented as men's sexual objects, giving legitimacy and naturalness to sexual aggression and gender inequality.

This system supported by the cultural industry makes use of cinema for its legitimation in a kind of programmed segmentation of human cultural evolution. Clearly, we cannot eliminate cinematic art as a sphere of reciprocal and complex recognition that requires dialogical thinking at the frontiers of thought. Gender inequality emerges as a form of renunciation in thinking, which in its objectified, objectified and deluded form, differs knowledge from experience by the principle of blind domination and ideological appearance linked to the economic apparatus. Therefore, aspects of gender inequality need to be discussed in the formative field, so that changes operate in the face of the offenses and humiliations of the experiences lived in our society. Injustices and discriminations are legitimized since the difficulty of understanding between differences and social positions of participants.

Other Perspectives of the Cultural Industry

In Benjamin's (1994) proposal, cinema could have a progressive impact, not only because it made distraction an advantage with cognitive gains, but because it made it accessible to the general public, directing knowledge towards the public communication of social contradictions, leading people to access to knowledge that occurs in social esteem. Thinking of cinema as a critical, imaginative and challenging resource is an interesting and possible alternative, because the way films are built to dialogue with the lives of those who watch allows for various reflections on society, politics, prejudice, inequalities, uncertainties
and values of life in their educational processes. From this perspective, the film "[...] does not exhaust itself, retains its germinating force, being able to provoke astonishment, reflection and other developments even after a long time has passed". (CONTE, 2012, p. 167). The conflicting experiences inscribed in the films promote the educational possibility of putting oneself in the place of the other and of recognizing oneself through the practical reflection of the works, in the sharing of convictions, ways of seeing the world and historically constituted values, thus promoting the recognition and the cultural self-understanding of a dynamic society open to contingencies. Education cannot give up such cultural experiences precisely because of the established bonds and the patterns of recognition and openness that enables the socialization of the human being, in their complex and pluralistic relationships that guide the readings and actions in the world. The deviation of this experience of mutual recognition and self-reflection about the productions and the cultural tradition itself implies social pathologies because it causes the loss of the formative sense (of the intersubjective structure) of the socialization of the human being.

Given the complexities and challenges presented by cinematographic works, it is possible to redefine their own explicit and underlying dimensions in disrespectful experiences, in order to coordinate studies that generate processes of review and (re) critical construction of the knowledge conveyed. After all, filmic artifacts also serve for human expression, (re) knowledge of differences and production of new ideas, involving seduction, feelings and emotions, in a dimension of otherness, provoking debate about cultural paradoxes, reviewing ways of thinking, and act in the social field. Therefore, “the chance for a film to become an emancipated product lies in the effort to break with that knots, that is, with the a priori (unconscious and irrational) collective character and to put it at the service of the Enlightenment intention: critical self-reflection about yourself”. (LOUREIRO, 2008, p. 145).

Film reproductions serve as a means of publicizing the dilemmas that pervade society, serving as a voice for those who would never be able to speak and be heard. In a way, cinema that springs from small groups and regional contexts becomes a reflection of its own culture and a revolutionary tool. The problems presented are not limited to discussing issues funded and detached from history, but arise from poignant issues of social classes, differences of nationalities, difficult and peripheral conditions, avoiding the minimization of identity. It is in this process that cinematography opens possibilities for the presence of cultural diversity and plurality, in which the hierarchy and chasm between high and low culture is set aside in favor of imagination and (co) creation, paving the way for the recognition of differences and everyday experiences, in a poetic and artistic style.

All this to affirm that there is a resistance on the part of cinematography (still minority), which breaks with this consumerist, elitist and patriarchal paradigm, bringing in its films subjects of reality and poignant. These are themes that need the involvement and research of the school community so that, based on the fairness of dialogue, it can (re) build a society critical of itself and understanding of the world. It can be said that this niche of the seventh art has brought to popular knowledge issues that are silenced by the global media and
portray the problems experienced in the daily lives of ordinary people and serve as the basis for research, mostly documentaries. It is for this reason that we present below some film productions that bring a new historical perspective on gender issues that can be problematized in the classroom.

*The Testimony*, a documentary directed by Vanessa Block, deals with the prosecution of nearly 30 soldiers from the Democratic Republic of Congo on charges of mass rape of women and adolescents from a village in Rwanda’s Congolese territory in 1994. Note that this is the first time the Congolese judiciary has prosecuted and prosecuted this type of crime, bringing victims to be heard in court. They are women born and raised in the mold of a patriarchal and extremely chauvinistic society, where the wife is directed to housework, farming and servitude to her husband. Virtually all women were abandoned by their partners after the criminal event on the grounds of being infected or unclean because they had been raped. The documentary presents the interviewing moments with the women and some trial sessions such as the victims' inquiries.

The Spanish film *Todo sobre mi madre*, directed by Pedro Almodóvar, is quite comprehensive, as it focuses on the themes of motherhood, transvestite, faith and religion, sexually transmitted infections (STIs) and prostitution. The character Manuela, a nurse in a Madrid hospital, early loses her only child, hit by a car. Manuela plunges into a deep depression, causing her to return to Barcelona in search of her son's father. The return to the city allows her to rediscover Agrado, a former friend and transvestite whose profession is prostitution. Still in Barcelona, Manuela meets Rosa, a nun who works for people with the HIV virus and who finds herself carrying the virus and pregnant with a transvestite. What is most striking about the film is "the naturalness with which scandal and transgression appear and become themselves objects of attraction and, why not, of spectator identification." (MALUF, 2002, p. 144).

*Todo sobre mi madre* is a film that presents multiple perspectives in a single story. The theme can be approached from the perspective of single parenting and its challenges in a patriarchal and chauvinistic scenario. In addition, the issues that emerge from trauma in families and in this particular case, in mothers losing their children due to tragic and early death. Another dimension covers the affective relationships of men and women religious and how this is viewed and interpreted by the extramural and intramural community. It also explores the theme of travestility, a subject perhaps more visible to viewers, especially the use and affirmation of transgender bodies. For Maluf (2002, p. 148),

Transgender experience is one of the themes that have enabled a renewal of reflections, concepts and theory itself within the field of feminist and gender studies. This is because - in its different forms of manifestation - it has revealed aspects of gender that have long been relegated either to its theoretical construction or

---

2 The Testimony Directed by Vanessa Block, 2015. It is an American short documentary.

comparative perspective with other cultures. Precisely the aspects that stand out most in the reflection on the transgender experience are linked to the artificial and fabricated character of gender and gender differences, that is, its cultural, social and political fabrication.

Interesting to take into account the process of gender and identity construction, since it is correlated to the socio-cultural construction, from lived experiences leading to the process of collective identification. In fact, “everything about my mother goes a little against those films that have the tension between concealment and discovery as their theme (and which are based on another tension: whether it's a man or a woman, and the proof of the nine is the anatomical body, noun, objectified)”. (MALUF, 2002, p. 145). In the case of the transgender person, there is a paradox regarding the construction of the subject, since “the one who is structurally in the subject position seeks to build himself contingently as a subject, no longer in the structurally fixed position, but in the unstable experience of transformation”. (MALUF, 2002, p. 151). The person who transforms shifts the position of subject from a structurally fixed place, breaking a biological, social and political paradigm. Thus "the embodied experience of 'becoming another', while dramatizing the mechanisms of difference-making, is nonetheless an anti-heraldic enterprise that destabilizes the dominant politics of subjectivity." (MALUF, 2002, p. 151).

In another movie Prayers for Bobby portrays the story of the character Bobby Griffith and the way his mother, Mary Griffith deals with issues of homosexual orientation, due to prejudice and taboos arising from religious issues. The film represents the 1970s and 1980s in California, at a time marked by Christian doctrine. Bobby would like to become a writer, but this dream is shattered by his death at the age of 20 when he decides to jump off a bridge for living in a troubled territory of identity. Mary's effort during the film is to get Bobby to accept the sinful situation by determining the symbolic space he will occupy in society. And from this awareness he employs a power relationship for Bobby to initiate a process of change in his sexual orientation. Taken by religious discourses that exclude homosexuals as unfaithful and unworthy of God's love, she begins to create difficult paths for the family, especially for Bobby, who loses his connection with the sacred by indetermination, silencing and annihilation of his presence. active, in the confused and erratic world in which she lives.

The search for various treatments for “gay healing” begins when Mary reads the phrase in a psychological treatment book: “If a homosexual who wants to renounce homosexuality meets a psychiatrist who knows how to cure homosexuality, he has a great chance of becoming homosexual. a happy heterosexual and on the axes.” From this, Mary takes her son to a psychiatrist and demands that Bobby be enthusiastic for the cure to be effective, stating that he is mistaken about his sexuality for not relating to a girl, suffering a kind of mutilated sexuality, reinforcing to let the father come closer to his son to offer him a figure of masculinity. Mary also distributes messages throughout the house with biblical passages stating that homosexual orientation is a sin, encouraging a change of life through
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overbearing insistence. Sometimes, before Bobby sleeps, his mother says prayers that God will heal him in his sleep. In the film, the character suffers regressions with invasive behavior through speeches given by the psychiatrist, a religious group and his own mother.

Thus, suffering from exclusion and prejudice and not knowing how to deal with the difficulties of the repression environment, Bobby opts for suicide as an extreme act to end his physical and mental suffering. Mary tries to get rid of the guilt and suffering of losing her child by seeking support in a church where there is a priest who recognizes homosexual-oriented subjects. The character begins to attend the priest-oriented group and learns new conceptions about homosexuality. In one of her statements to the priest, Mary says, "Now I know why God didn't heal Bobby, didn't heal because there was nothing wrong with him." In the film situation, experiencing Bobby's tragic death led Mary to learn from this suffering to review her own truths, since homosexual people are targets of regression in prejudiced spaces. In the plot, Priest Whitsell (Dan Butler) in dialogue with Mary after Bobby's death states: “Having blind faith is as dangerous as having no faith at all. Questioning your faith gives you a deeper faith.” Questioning allows us to find answers to overcome one's own human limits and prejudices, which no longer correspond or should not correspond to life's experiences and movements. Mary realizes that her blind faith has been established on the basis of the absence of critical self-reflection.

However, by interacting and addressing the problematization of common experiences aimed at openness to multiculturalism and respect for differences, these types of cinematographies make viable an analysis of the various conceptions and understandings dormant or forgotten by the dominant culture. The experience of scenes resignified in educational dialogue generates a sensitized look at sociocultural practices, making all participants of the most humanized for the recognition of historically constructed strangeness, in a movement of interpretation and denaturalization of human action. When discussing about cinematography, respect for diversity is promoted, trying to collaborate to repress acts of exclusion in life in society, where everyone fights for (re) knowledge and respect as a social right.

Benjamin (1994) highlights the cinema as humanity's cultural artifact, since it affects the whole population, generating greater sensitivity, because the cinematic images are immensely significant, capable of entering the real world and the social imaginary. This critical experience of films leads to new perceptions of the world, since it emerges as a possibility of an emancipated formation that articulates rationality and sensibility, in the recreation and renewal of thinking and acting. Reflecting on the characteristics of the film in the classroom, we understand that "it opens us to the experience of the optical unconscious, just as psychoanalysis opens us to the experience of the drive unconscious." (BENJAMIN, 1994, p. 189). The development of the look on these film themes is of great relevance due to the lack of spaces for the realization of these social dialogues, which generates the reproduction of misconceptions, prejudices and taboos that are deposited even in virtual environments.
Cinematography can serve as a pretext and propulsion for dialogue on sensitive and complex issues of human interrelations, problematizing social, economic, gender exclusions and collaborating with debates about the collective imagination. Thus, we show that resistance cinema is creating movements of renewal of social practices for a less unfair society, regressive and violent with differences, and that has great repercussion in the unfinished languages of the world of (re) mutual knowledge. Mulvey (2005, p. 357) broadens this debate by stating:

[...] As 16mm technology brought another look and opened the cinema for women in the 1960s and 1970s, digital technology has made even more difference, perhaps not only for women, but also for women, for people trying to document situations of oppression. Palestinians trying to document their condition, Israeli militant women going to Palestine and trying to film what happens at border checkpoints. In this sense, digital cinema can act as a kind of documentation force, which is particularly useful in these moments of confrontation. I think that in these situations it becomes particularly important.

The interest in debating gender issues and sexuality orientations is still rather shy, given the structures of life in society, the historically suffered mutilations that make subjects different targets of repression in the face of human ambiguity and indeterminacy. This is how debating films with the intention of respecting differences meets the performative and metamorphosing culture, because film productions are in arenas that are capable of replicating, compiling, in the same filmic work, a multiplicity of meanings with social values, interests, ideologies, which keep alive the search for knowledge and dialogic learning. “One of the most important functions of cinema is to create a balance between man and apparatus. Cinema does not accomplish this task only because of the way in which man represents himself in front of the apparatus, but in the way in which he represents the world, thanks to this apparatus”. (BENJAMIN, 1994, p. 189). Thinking of cinema as a critical and challenging resource is an interesting and possible alternative, because the way films are built to dialogue with those who watch allows for various reflections on society, politics, prejudice, and the uncertainties of life.

Cinema and Movements in Education - Final Reflections

From the moment we recognize an educational potential in the cinema, we are valuing different teaching and learning resources available and belonging to the reality of most students, including even those who do not have the opportunity to go to the cinema but can watch the movie. This pedagogical medium enables the construction of a bridge between the imaginary and reality, seeks to create relationships with the existing and dialogic meaning links between art, life and education, as a window for knowledge. Insofar as it enables another mass relationship with art, cinema in education is not exhausted, but retains its germinating force in the renewal of pedagogical practices and in its ability to provoke reflection, amazement and other questions about the views of art. worlds and the differences it portrays. Cinematography arouses our feelings, social arrangements, emotions and thoughts through the images and tendencies imbued with this art. In addition, it stimulates our
curiosity, as well as teaches us to view everyday issues from another perspective, problematizing collective actions naturalized by education. It is about helping the student in the critical and scientific reading of everyday life, through an emancipated gesture in relation to cinema and film works, initiated by the act of questioning and doubting, so as not to silence the contradictory or fall naively into collective alienation.

The value of this resource in pedagogical action is in the search for complex, interconnected meanings, transformers of perceptions and promoters of new contradictions and differences in relation to the existing human condition. The film permeated by pedagogical intentionality receives a relational and interdisciplinary dynamics of contents that justifies the praxis of social reality. Thus, it is essential to be careful in choosing the film for interpretive and formative recognition around reality, emphasizing the identification of themes and a critical assessment of the subject assisted in their interrelationships. This is fundamental for the (re) construction of knowledge. Using cinema in school is a chance to reunite with the art, aesthetics, ideologies and values involved in these works. From the unfolding and manifestations of the students, the teacher needs to articulate the cinematographic work with other sources of knowledge, not forgetting that the cinema motivates and provokes a debate about contents and themes for the teaching and learning process. For Napolitano (2011, p. 14),

The peculiarity of cinema is that it, besides being part of the communication and mass culture complex, is also part of the leisure industry and (let’s not forget) it is also a collective and technically sophisticated work of art. The teacher cannot forget these various dimensions of cinema when working films in school activities.

However, care must be taken in choosing the film by relating the age range to be worked on, as every work conveys content, codes and languages, which can be used in favor of a more fertile interpretation of school content or against education. The intensity of some cinematographic aspects must be considered in the choice of the work, so that it does not generate conflicts or reality clashes, but an interdisciplinary, dialogical and integrative practice of meanings. And thinking of interdisciplinarity, we could cite several filmic works that address specific issues and issues of geography, history, science and other fields of knowledge, or that explore social issues such as school violence, drugs, sexuality, pregnancy, among other topics. It all depends on the teacher's goals and intentionalities because it depends on the project that he has to develop with the work, which can be simply to convey an information or idea, as well as to stimulate human criticism, through a collective debate, seeking to destabilize the certainties and biases of students. Films can remove people from the comfort zone, disengaging them so that they can reflect on current issues or to change their attitude towards the world, with more autonomy of action before reality.

Cinematographic works arouse thinking, as they present possibilities for new understandings of human complexity and multiplicity, which can be brought into the public and democratic sphere of communicative action, technological changes in this field. With this perspective, Benjamin considers that the democratization of film production is a progressive
trend and emancipating dimension, since it has an active potential in the production of culture and provoking the renewal or not of social standards by the power of communication. The massification of subjects through cinema reveals how much this technique of cultural reproduction has the capacity to influence thoughts, identities and actions, including the incessant repetition of lies that assume connotations of multimedia truth. By observing the issues inherent to the film work, we can look at the same phenomenon in different ways, discussing, analyzing and interpreting images, sounds and communication patterns, assuming the critical posture in relation to the propagated events.

The study shows that there are favorable elements for the development of this formative process in society, as a form of critical self-reflection to resist normative and exclusionary thinking. Thus, we make possible an appreciation of the various dormant conceptions and understandings of the repressive and dominant culture, reconstructing with the recognition of the other the transformation and the cultural dialogue. When we break with the ideologies regulating dialogue and legitimizing dictatorships of truth, it will be possible to use cinema as a device to reconstruct knowledge of communicational potential, overcoming the coercive, authoritarian and dehumanized relations of the global market of gender inequality.

For all this, we see the need to develop a critical look at the linearities as such prejudices and ideologies are passed on, having pedagogical practice a fundamental role in this educational-critical debate, promoting research, other forms of dialogue and new understandings in classrooms, with a look at the differences in relation to gender interlocutions. To follow new directions for the recognition of gender identities, it is essential to build a living and interdisciplinary dialogue with differences, whether through intercultural films or other knowledge exchanges, as a condition of possibility to talk about these issues, exercising the In-depth reading of social differences, to put oneself in the other's place, and this does not happen automatically, but implies openness to the distinct and one's own resistance to the phenomenon of alienation from the other. Education can bring transformative educational practices to develop social esteem and respect for solidarity, overcoming segregation and social Manichaeism inscribed as a social dimension of human formation.
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