

## CINEMA IN REVERSE SHOT

André Parente

**André Parente** artist and researcher of new media and communication technologies, received his doctor degree in cinema and philosophy from the University of Paris VIII. In 1987, he became a professor and researcher at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ), where he founded the Image-Technology Center (*N-Imagem*). Between 1977 and 2006, he made a number of videos, films, and installations with a chiefly experimental and conceptual approach. Among his main books, we highlight *Imagem-Máquina* (1993); *Sobre o Cinema do Simulacro* (1998); *O Virtual e o Hipertextual* (1999); *Narrativa e Modernidade: os Cinemas Não-narrativos do Pós-guerra* (2000); *Tramas da Rede* (2004); *Cinéma et Narrativité* (L'Harmattan, 2005); *Preparações e Tarefas* (2008).

According to Michel Foucault, a device has three different levels. Firstly, the device is a heterogeneous set of discourses, architectural shapes, propositions and strategies of knowing and being capable, subjective dispositions, and cultural inclinations. Secondly, the nature of the connection between these heterogeneous elements. Finally, the discursive formation resulting from the connections between such elements. This perspective leads us to the understanding that the image we have of cinema—a dark room where a film is screened telling us a story and making us believe that we are before the actual events—and what we call a cinema form is a discursive formation, an episteme, that makes three dimensions converge in its device: the architectural (the dark room), the technological (image-capturing and projection system), and the discursive (the hegemonic representative model) dimension<sup>1</sup>.

The cinema form is a representation model born around 1910 and is connected with a series of experiments approaching a kind of subjectivity that emerged in the 19th century and can be detected in several aesthetic manifestations, such as neoclassical painting, image devices (phantasmagoria, dioramas, pans, stereoscopic photography), Balzac's and Dickens' novels<sup>2</sup> (with their new techniques in portraying characters, actions, space, and time), the Parisian passages (predecessors of the present malls), Baudelaire's *flâneur*, which became the character par excellence of immobile trips. Walter Benjamin was the philosopher par excellence of this new world, articulating these phenomena in a vision of the world, a new episteme.

In the end of a century of domination of the cinema form, we would like to make two or three general remarks. The great technological changes transformed the production, distribution, and reception of cinema (sound film, television, video, digital image), but did not weaken the cinema form, which became strengthened, instead. Nevertheless, these transformations draw the attention to a series of experimentations with the cinematic device that had been completely restrained along the film history. Lately, those experimentations have been revived and readdressed with regard to two

<sup>1</sup> This is a representation model: "industrial-representative narrative form" (IRI, a term coined by Claudine Eizykman), "institutional mode of representation" (IMR, a term used by Noël Burch), "transparency aesthetics" (a term used by Ismail Xavier). Cinema, as a representation system, was not born with its technical invention for it takes about a decade to crystallize and set itself as a model.

<sup>2</sup> In his essay "Dickens, Griffith and Ourselves," Eisenstein shows how much the aesthetics rooted in the American cinema owes to the British writer. To him, "Dickens gave the American filmmaking much more than the idea of the parallel-action editing." Sergei Eisenstein. *A forma do filme* (Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1990).

theoretic-practical force fields: the expanded cinema and the cinema of attractions. Presently, we have witnessed the emergence of a third field of experimentation that encompasses another set of manifestations that began in the late 1980s and was named the cinema in museums or the cinema of the artist. Two issues are immediately raised: what is there in common between these manifestations and to what extent can we articulate them with a broader set of phenomena with which they are linked like in a new discursive form?

The expanded cinema—filmmakers of experimental cinema, particularly Jonas Mekas, used this term even before it was employed by Gene Youngblood—is mostly oriented toward a radicalization process of experimental cinema, especially the American films, by resorting to happenings and performances using multiple projections or other rooms other than the movie theater, many times combining the projection with other art expressions, such as dance, music, architecture, photography, etc. The expanded cinema is an attempt to create the viewer's participation process. Everything takes place as if the film show set the viewer's body in motion, thus moving him/her away from the chair, as used to happen in rock concerts, raves, etc. This is a cinema with behavioral functions that sought intensifying the visual and sound perceptive effects on the viewer's body.

The term cinema of attractions is related to two forms of narrative-flow interruption: writers such as Roland Barthes and Jean-François Lyotard (and later Serge Daney, Laura Mulvey, and Jacques Aumont among others) called the attention to the image freeze issue. It was about analyzing what—of an affective (ponctum), perceptive (figural), political (feminism), or conceptual (rereading) nature—would displace the image from the narrative flow where it was. To Lyotard, experimental cinema ("acinema") had two main trends—that of maximum speed and that of maximum stillness—that by and large ruptured the average motion of cinema and hence interrupted its narrative flow. On the other hand, more recently, a group of film theorists (André Gaudreault and Tom Gunning) adopted the term cinema of attractions as a way to draw attention to the fact that the cinema of the early times would privilege the image to the detriment of the narrative flow.

Now, cinema in exhibitions, cinema in museums, or cinema of the artist is mostly related to the spatialization of the image and interruption of the temporal flow, be it either of the film or of the installation space. Installations are images arranged in the exhibition space, when actually in cinema, including the cinema of attractions and the expanded cinema, the images are arranged along time (be it either the diegetic time or the show/happening time). In the former, there is no more sequentiality. Sequentiality is contingent or given by the unique route followed by each visitor/observer.

The idea of breaking the cinema device down into its primary dimensions (architectural, technological, and discursive) is what, as we understand it, constitutes the common denominator for the expanded cinema, the cinema of attractions, and the cinema in museums. Recently we went deep into a discussion on the concept of device. We are not resuming

this discussion here in such a short period of time, though. Let us say, in a very simplistic way, that we have retained the relational aspect from the device. What is interesting in the structuralist thought (or even poststructuralist), which is a thought of the device par excellence, is that it seeks thinking the force fields and relations that constitute the subjects and signs of the cultural systems. For us, the device exists as long as the relation between heterogeneous elements (enunciative, architectural, technological, institutional, etc.) concurs to produce a certain subjectivation effect to the social body, be it either of normality and deviation (Foucault), territorialization or de-territorialization (Deleuze), or appeasement or intensity (Lyotard). Expanded cinema, cinema of attractions, and cinema in museums are, as we understand it, new ways of producing subjectivity in cinema.

The cinematic device is, at the same time, a set of relations in which each element is defined by opposition to the others (present/absent) and in which the space of the absent (imaginary or virtual) becomes the place (this is what makes it visible) where a nonpresence mixes with, better yet, superimposes on, a presence. The same happens with the shot/reverse shot. According to Burch, the procedures of representing space-time in the classical films—the camera movements, decoupage operations, continuity rules, editing—primarily come down to shot/reverse shot, inasmuch as they converge for the creation of a single effect: to put the viewer on board of an "immobile trip". The shot/reverse shot is one of the important devices of the cinema-representation model and appeared in the American films around 1910. Later, it was theoretically formulated by Lev Kuleshov, interested as he was in understanding the space and time representation process in the American films. In his beautiful book *La Lucarne de l'Infini*, Noël Burch dug out information exhaustively about the birth of the procedures that culminated with the birth of the classical cinema, named by him Institutional Mode of Representation (IMR), which includes that of the shot/reverse shot and of other building devices related to it, such as the link shot at 180 degrees.

In this brief article, we would like to address a couple of installations from the shot/reverse shot perspective. Since the shot/reverse shot is an important building device for the film space and since the installations are image-spatialization forms, thinking the shot/reverse shot within the installations offers an opportunity to question oneself not only about how this device is reenacted in installations put up in the cinema-in-museum style, but also about how the image-spatialization process takes place in relation to the exhibition space.

We look into the shot/reverse shot issue for a better understanding on how the strategy of boarding the viewer on the "immobile trip" typical of the transparency aesthetics is or is not deconstructed or transformed into the exhibition cinema. Next, we do a small taxonomy of the way the works put in doubt the shot/reverse shot issue. The aim here is to think the different ways of using this device in the cinema-in-museum format so as to understand the spatialization process of the exhibited cinema. Although the shot/reverse shot is addressed in the works of great contemporary artists—Douglas Gordon, Eija-Liisa Ahtila, Stan Douglas, Pierre Huyghe, Doug Aitken, Isaac Julien, Sam Taylor-Wood,

Anthony McCall, David Claerbout, inter alia—, whose works produce a reenactment and recreation of the cinema experience, we would like to use this article to comment on some artworks made in Brazil.

### Works with the shot/reverse shot issue

Henceforth follow the comments on four experiences in which the shot/reverse shot technique is addressed and its most frequent use is twisted in the piece of work because, as we will see, a series of disturbing elements are interposed with the shot/reverse shot.

Artist Rosângela Rennó, who is used to working with archive images, recently created a video installation entitled *Febre do Sertão* (2008). In this installation, the characters Diadorim and Riobaldo, from the film *O Grande Sertão*, by Geraldo and Renato do Santos Pereira made in 1965, act in a shot/reverse shot (where the shot corresponds to one screen and the reverse-shot to another one) with the homonymous characters of the TV series directed by Walter Avancini in 1985. The points of inflection between the crossed dialogs are marked by the editing of the whirlwind, a very common atmospheric phenomenon in the Brazilian backcountry shown in both productions for being a fundamental conceptual element—"the devil on the street, in the middle of the whirlwind"—from the novel *Grande Sertão: Veredas* [The Devil to Pay in the Backlands], by João Guimarães Rosa. In this case, Rennó expresses the shot/reverse shot in a movement that contains two complementary facets. On the one hand, it is the privileged device by means of which the film becomes de-narrative, that is, it constitutes and de-constitutes itself at the same time (it is always the same and another). On the other hand, it creates a situation that reveals the representation system underlying the images. Actually, as seen in other of her works, Rennó shows us that when we "consume" images, we are captured and converted into actors of a network (or of a whirlwind), which stresses certain views of the world. In the case of this installation, Rennó plays with the affections of the characters and hence creates a game where the feeling is constantly displaced and floods the character in which it incarnates. According to the artist, "the close-ups of Diadorim and Riobaldo were selected based on the narrative, emphasizing the anguish arising from the repressed, cursed, and forbidden love."

Artist and photographer Solon Ribeiro made a series of videos and installations entitled *O Golpe do Corte* (2004-2008), wherein Ribeiro uses a collection he inherited from his grandfather of about thirty thousand frames taken out of films. These frames were carefully collected and kept in albums with the film name and year and the actors in it. Actually, Ribeiro's quasi-cinema works show a close relation with the *Cosmococas* (1973) by Hélio Oiticica and Neville d'Almeida, especially in what pertains to the violence of the "pop star" image appropriation. Some other times, Ribeiro's work goes beyond the sense of appropriation to become a sort of live archive with an added performance dimension, in which the artist interacts with the images in a shot/reverse shot game. In one of the series pieces, Ribeiro appears

in a slaughterhouse, in the middle of the dead-cattle remains. The images on the frames, packed with glamour, are completely violated by gestures of the artist, who interacts with the meat, blood, guts, and the images of the project frames. Sometimes he seems to be the *Bandido da Luz Vermelha* [The Red Light Bandit] (a homonymous character in Rogério Sganzerla's classical film), sometimes a Glauber Rocha in trance. In one of the works, Ribeiro uses subtitled frames and makes up an imaginary dialog between the characters. These dialogs are permanently displaced and shifted for the fact that there is no continuity, since each actor/character only has one line because the artist counted on one single picture of each one of them.

In *Um, Nenhum e Cem Mil* (2002), Katia Maciel built a new filmmaking experience with the interactive dialog-generation interfaces. In the foreground, there are images of characters uttering love-cliché sentences ("You never think about me," "We need to talk," "I love you," etc.) and the user can intervene and establish new dialogs with them. Therefore, sentences that are apparently inconsequential, uttered by randomly selected talking heads, make narrative exchanges filled with meaning and emotional expression appear as a result of the user's interaction. Upon every choice taken, the system shuffles the sentences, thus randomizing the dialogs. The old shot/reverse shot device was used in the experience to bring about new narrative possibilities by building an interactive graphic interface. It is curious to note that sometimes the dialogs do not work and make evident how artificial the process is. Other times, nonetheless, two absolutely commonplace and cliché sentences come to life and open doors to a true dialog. This work leads us to think on the shot/reverse shot basic principle, the *Kuleshov* effect. For those who do not remember, the Kuleshov effect was one of the first attempts to formalize the editing process and was created in 1922 by the Russian filmmaker and theorist Lev Kuleshov. Kuleshov's idea was that the meaning of an image depends on how it is edited, that is, the juxtaposition of the shots. Bearing this in mind, he experimented with the shot/reverse shot by alternating a same picture (a man's face with a neutral expression in the foreground) with different pictures (an empty plate, a child weeping, and a naked woman), which thus generated three distinct meanings: hunger, tenderness, and desire. The same happens in Katia Maciel's work: the same sentences generate different meanings when rearranged by the user: sometimes they appear as cliché dialogs, sometimes they convey a renewed meaning, as if the dialog had just happened right there in front of us.

The shot/reverse shot technique appears as a central issue in my installations. In *Curto-circuito* (1979, 35-millimeter film), a man (Joel Barcelos was a film actor and director who worked with great directors such as Glauber Rocha, Júlio Bressane, Ruy Guerra, and Bernardo Bertolucci) is fleeing and no one knows why. Sometimes he does so on foot, other times by car. There is a mood of oppression in the air (we were living under dictatorship). The film does not have a reverse shot and therefore we cannot see whether there is someone chasing him. In an installation-style version, two images are projected in loop (2007, Modern Art Museum, Rio de Janeiro). On one of the screens, the man is seen running away on foot and on the other, by car. There are, however, two passage shots: he comes running and enters the car; he stops the car and runs off. These shots are used to create a double-face loop installation. While the man runs away on foot on the

shot screen, he runs away by car on the left screen, and, at a given time, everything is reversed. Then, on the shot screen he is going into the car and, on the reverse shot screen, he is leaving the car. This alternation enables one to bring about a situation in which the man seems to be fleeing from himself, in a sort of circular Cortázar-style work.

### Works that insert the reverse shot in the shot

In *Passei-o* (2005), artists Gisela Motta and Leandro Lima create a video installation showing a train track in a still shot. Not much happens until we start hearing the typical noise of a locomotive approaching. The sound system employed is very powerful, especially in regards to low frequencies, the bass, insofar as we feel our body as if a very heavy vehicle were going by right there in the gallery or the museum. The whistle blows increasingly higher until the train goes down the tracks. While the train passes, however, we see in each one of the cars incrustated images, images that the artists had captured from the window of the train and show the reality of the low-income and poor neighborhoods in the urban outskirts where it passed through. After a surge of images (in reverse shot) inserted in the cars (shot), the previous calmness is restored and it will remain until the sound of the next train approaching is heard again. *Passei-o* plays with the insertion of the reverse shot in the shot, as if the train were a mirror where we could see the peripheral reality of the space where it had traveled, making the viewer puzzle over what s/he sees and the space s/he is occupying.

*Voracidade Máxima* (2004), by Maurício Dias and Walter Riedweg, is an interactive video installation whose subject is prostitution in the globalized economy seen from the perspective of the gigolos in Barcelona. With a remote control or mouse, the viewer is driven to choose a gigolo out of eleven young men that appear lying down agonizing in an urban crossing, on the pavement of which it was written the “top voracity” imperative. Like in an interactive game, once activated, we see an interview with one of the young men made by one of the two artists (Dias and Riedweg). The interviews took place in settings that remind the beds in those sex-oriented hotels. Interviewer and interviewee are lying down in an attitude suggesting intimacy. Nevertheless, the interviewees’ faces are covered with masks of the artists. These masks are concurrently a way of protecting the interviewee’s privacy and a strategy to deconstruct the usual device of documentaries, which sets a separation between us and them, since conventional documentaries do assume the existence of such difference. When projecting the shot (us) in the reverse shots (them), *Voracidade Máxima* touches in the interstice of the relations, unconcealing the relations of power, knowledge, and subjectivity.

*Estereoscopia* (2005) is an interactive installation based on two pictures of a couple that look at each other in shot/reverse shot. An infinite zoom that wraps the image of two people photographed in shot/reverse shot (chief device of the audiovisual representation) conceptually reproducing a fractal image (the part contains the whole). The work brings forth a number of major conceptual issues: the “loop” in digital art; the fractal image, in which the parts contain

the whole; the separation of the image and the sound; the temporality in the photographic images. In this installation, we sought to achieve what we call fractal poetics. The fractal presents itself as an intermediate dimension capable of making us move back and forth the continuous and the discontinuous, order and disorder, the local and the nonlocal, the part and the whole, the shot and the reverse shot. The—intermediate—fractal dimension in an installation is multiplefold. The installation is barely distinguishable as far as the technique is concerned. We do not “know” whether it is photography, cinema, or infographics. On the other hand, with regard to the picture of the characters, we are always in an intermediate dimension, between one and the other. Another paradox is found with regard to the relation between sound and image, since the dialog mentions a mirroring interiority—“I want to see what you are seeing of me in you”—that is belied by the image, which is pure exteriority, like in the Moebius band. The dialog is a free indirect discourse where “me” is another. Vertigo of the digital mantra that multiplies what is heard in what is seen, always the same that continues the other, which is me, which is you. In the garden of the digital dainties, I am you and you are me, sharing an infinite virtual depth.

### Works that use the reverse shot to temporalize images

In *Entre Margens* (2004), I incorporate, by means of visual and sound landscapes, the intermediate, virtual, and metaphysical condition from *Terceira Margem do Rio* [The Third Bank of the River] (João Guimarães Rosa). On one end, the shot shows an image of the river. “The river changes continually: day, evening, afternoon, night. The light and the movement of the water show that time passes and does not pass, stops and does not stop, it circulates” (Maciel 2008). On the other end, the landscape in reverse shot: “the land remains, the land that, in the slow sway of the grass, looks at the river unhurriedly. Halfway through, in-between, the viewer that watches, as he hears a voice whispering the story. The voice floods everything with the word, where everything is continual, all the time. The word is strong. A drawing of the son that keeps the glance of time is made. Waiting for the father that has gone and does not return. Sadness of an absence that remains. The grandson on the lap of the daughter that comes to show the father that sees nothing. The silence of the mother that says nothing. The emptiness of the world on the edge of life: only landscape. Ultimately, the screens touch each other through a pan movement that turns the river into land and the land into river” (Maciel 2008). The film about the river ends at the beginning of the film about the land and vice versa inasmuch as the river and the land are like the two sides of the same film, just like the picture in the Moebius band. As a matter of fact, the topological relation of the shot/reverse shot in many of my works is seen through the Moebius band geometry. We always have one single sequence shot that travels from status A to status B projected so as to face the same shot but with a reverse synchronicity. We can, therefore, say that the shot film is always a permanent series of transformations of the reverse shot and vice versa. What they show, in each case, changes: a man fleeing from himself within a Kafkanian oppression context, where anything is a reason to feel being



chased; a father that went to live nowhere, the third bank of the river; and a paradoxical love dialog (“I want to see what you are seeing of me in you”).

In *Enchendo-vazando* (2006), a video installation by Marcellvs L. showcased in the 19th Bienal de São Paulo, we see the same image of a beached boat, out of the water, projected on two screens in shot and reverse shot. At first, we do not understand the difference between the images. But gradually (and that depends on when each viewer steps into the installation), we notice that the framing of the boat sways differently from the other sway. This sway reveals the location from where the image was taken: from another boat at sea. If we wait a little longer, we see that the sway of one of the images starts slowing down, whilst the other, instead, gathers momentum. Thus, when this phenomenon is related with the title, we understand that both images are the same, shot from the same location, and split in such a way to have the image of the boat taken from a boat at the seashore while the tide was coming in and the other while the tide was going out. This shot/reverse shot relation, purely temporal, cyclic, makes us think of installations like *Der Sardemann* (1999) and *Entre Margens* (2004).

### Works that question or engage the viewer

The first videos made by Sonia Andrade, a series of eight untitled videos that took her to be acclaimed as a pioneer (1974-1977), show two recurring subjects: TV and the artist’s gestures and attitudes. The last video of the series puts together both subjects. The video shows Andrade appearing in front of a “wall” of four TV sets five times—“wall” is the typical way of referring to installations that uses several TV monitors in a wall-like arrangement. In the first four, she comes in to switch on each set tuned in to a different channel (Tupi, Globo, Record, and Manchete—which, if I’m not mistaken, were the existing channels at the time). After the viewer had time enough to see and identify the types of images and shows, all of them all too banal, Andrade would come into the scene, for about a dozen minutes, repeating incessantly: “Turn the TV off!” Her idea was to simply test the viewer’s patience by showing that his/her passivity—which explains why no one confronts the situation and turns the TV off—is what sustains the system. This piece of work, with great political power, especially if we recall the time when it was made, in the middle of the military dictatorship, engages the viewer, who is supposedly on the other end watching the video and able to turn the monitor off or not.

In 1978, I made a film-installation entitled *Os Sonaciremas* (1978), a false documentary about “a tribe that covers the area from the Oiapoque to Chui” (a metonym of the Brazilian territory). “Os sonaciremas” is a perfect anagram of “the Americans” [in Portuguese]. The film uses the movie screen to make it literally “reflect” the viewers in the reverse shot, true objects of the film. In fact, the film does not have figurative images, only black and transparent tips besides fade-in/fade-out transitions. Neither a camera nor a moviola was used. The film could be compared to an attempt to make an

image that would mirror the viewer’s condition, as if s/he would only hallucinate about his/her position/condition in the cinematic device. Nonetheless, the illusion process that cinema creates is so strong that the viewer does not recognize him/herself in the resulting pictures (sound). The film *Os Sonaciremas*, like the conceptual works of the letterers, is anchored in the idea of device, in its structuralist meaning. The film runs like the mermaids singing, purely virtual, which serves as a basis to call the viewer, in reverse shot, to imagine what would this described culture be, which is his/her own, but that s/he, however, cannot perceive because it is always at a distance, like the place to travel across.

### Works that neutralize the reverse shot

To conclude, we would just like to point out a type of work in which the possibility of the reverse shot is neutralized by the panoramic and/or immersive image. Actually, in the panoramic installations, either of film or video, particularly in the closed-circuit installations, there is a complex process of annulment of the reverse shot. I say complex because the shot and the reverse shot are solely determined by the visitor, who sometimes looks to one side of the room, sometimes to the other. Artists such as Bruce Nauman, Nam June Paik, Peter Campus, Dan Graham, and Steina and Woody Vasulka used the closed circuit to make installations where the chief focus was on experiencing the artwork.

In one of his most interesting installations, *Video Surveillance Piece. Public Room, Private Room* (1969-1970), Bruce Nauman transgresses the private space to offer the viewers the image of a space where nothing happens and the viewers are there to see something, though. A surveillance camera sweeps the entire space where the viewer is. In that space, there is a TV set showing the space swept by the camera. However, no viewer is seen in that space. All that exists is an empty space. Undoubtedly, the image puzzles the viewer, since his/her expectation of seeing him/herself in the space is frustrated. Partially frustrated, though, since s/he sees him/herself, not in the space, but on the TV shown within the empty space. The viewer is prompted to confront the gallery space with the image generated by the device in real time and which is then returned to the space, in a game where one is reflected and transforms the other. In fact, *Public Room, Private Room* deals with the presence/absence relation in such a way that the game of the viewer’s presence/absence in the space where s/he is found is transferred to the shot/reverse shot relation, where the shot is the public room and the reverse shot is the private room. The work operates based on such figure of the chiasma, a turn from the inside into the outside, from the private into the public, from the presence into the absence, from the shot into the reverse shot.

In a more recent version of the film *Os Sonaciremas*, we created a happening entitled *Cine-movido* (a happening-installation made in the Fortaleza Audiovisual School in 2007) engaging the viewers. At the same time that the film is projected, there is a video camera capturing the image of the viewers watching the film. This image is projected by a video projector over the image of the film. When the image is dark, black, the image of the viewers appears. They

take a good amount of time to realize that the projected image is their own image captured in real time. The result is a mirror image, infinite, since the video image is made and projected simultaneously, thus playing a mirror game with the infinite shots. This type of situation directs our thoughts towards the use the pioneers made of the closed circuit, in panoptical installations that neutralized any reverse shot.

### Bibliography

Burch, N. *La Lucarne de L'infini*. Paris: Nathan, 1990.

Bonitzer, P. *Champ aveugle*. Paris: Gallimard: Cahiers, 1982.

Maciel, K. (Org.). "Margens da palavra." In *Transcinema*. Rio de Janeiro: Contra Capa, 2008.

Parente, A. "Cinema do dispositivo." In Penafria, M.; Martins, I.M. *Estéticas do digital*. Cinema e tecnologia. Covilhã: Labcom, 2007.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Cinema de vanguarda, cinema experimental, cinema do dispositivo." In Cocchiarella, Fernando. *Filme de artista (1965-1980)*. Rio de Janeiro: Contra Capa, 2008.