This is to certify that the
thesis entitled

THE 1922 WEEK OF MODERN ART AND ITS CELEBRATIONS: A STUDY OF HISTORICAL RECONSTRUCTION AND NATIONALISM IN BRAZIL

presented by

DANILO MEZZADRI

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Master of Arts degree in Musicology

Major Professor's Signature

8/7/2007

Date

THE 1922 WEEK OF MODERN ART AND ITS CELEBRATIONS: A STUDY OF HISTORICAL RECONSTRUCTION AND NATIONALISM IN BRAZIL

By

Danilo Mezzadri

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF MUSICOLOGY

2007

ABSTRACT

THE 1922 WEEK OF MODERN ART AND ITS CELEBRATIONS: A STUDY OF HISTORICAL RECONSTRUCTION AND NATIONALISM IN BRAZIL

By

Danilo Mezzadri

Since its inception, the 1922 Week of Modern Art has been subject to numerous historical reconstructions. Each of these reconstructions attached a new meaning to the original event according to its author's agenda. The purpose of this thesis is to observe those revisions and portray a deeper understanding of one of Brazil's most interesting historical periods in art. This goal is achieved by a study of the social and political connections that guided each one of these historical reconstructions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank many people who helped me shape this thesis into its present form and helped me think about Brazilian modern art history under several different perspectives. First of all, I thank Dr. Michael Largey, for his inspirational teachings on musicology and for his belief that I could succeed with this project. I thank my wife Susie, for patiently going through many readings and incarnations that this paper took before its final version.

In Brazil, I thank my brother Humberto, for his generous help in providing me with the much needed research material, as well with his insightful comments about modernism. I also thank my friend and former teacher Dr. Mauricio Dottori for his insightful comments about Brazilian music history.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents for always supporting me in the blind adventure that I took when moving to a different country and starting a new life in music. I also thank the Ruggiero family, for generously adopting me as one of their own.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The 1922 Week of Modern Art is generally understood as one of the most important events in Brazil's art and musical history. It divides Brazilian art history in between Romantic and Modern periods and it is considered by many scholars as the germinating point of Brazil's nationalistic period (Burns 1968; Cunha 1960; Mariz 1980 and 1994; Amaral 1972; Nist 1967; Applebey 1983; Bastazin 1992; Passoni 1998; Neves 1991; Williams 2001; Schwartz 2003).

Other scholars, such as Camargos (2000) and Micelli (2001), contest such a division as well as the overall relevance of that event. Micelli, in a ground breaking work that analyzes the cultural elite in Brazil and its relationship with political power, saw the use of the Week of Modern Art as mark in Brazilian history as a political tool used by new academia, supported by an authoritarian government, to "date the [previous] owners of the intellectual authority during the 1920s."[1] This division reclassified and reduced the importance of older and independent artists into a "pre-Modernism" sub genre (Micelli 2001, 16). Camargos, in a book exploring the life and political influence of the wealthy coffee baron Freitas Valle, goes as far as affirming that: "the understanding of the Week of 22 as a mark zero of the Brazilian modern culture is a historic reconstruction resulting from the hegemonic position that the intellectual group

[1] All translations from Portuguese are made by the author unless otherwise noted.

guided by Mário de Andrade enjoyed in the national scene" (Camargos 2000, 193).

In this thesis I will demonstrate that Mário de Andrade and those followed his nationalistic teachings enhanced the Week of Modern Art's importance and changed its meaning. Through government sponsored anniversary celebrations, the 1922 week long art festival went from an interesting art event with marginal ramifications, to a historical landmark phenomenon, considered by many scholars as the single most important art event in Brazilian history. Concurrently, a peculiar view of Modernism, mixed with strong nationalistic ideals, became the new standard to measure importance and quality of Brazilian art, obliterating and antagonizing any other aesthetic value that did not fit into this position.

The 1922 Week of Modern Art was created by a heterogeneous group of intellectuals and financed by the highest members of São Paulo's oligarchy. It happened from February 13th to 19th in 1922, and it resided in São Paulo's Municipal Theater, the city's most sophisticated and largest cultural venue. An exhibition, consisting of 19 architectural projects, 17 sculptures and 64 paintings, was presented in the theatre lobby during the entire week. Three night gala concerts, filled with lectures and chamber music performances, completed the schedule. Each gala concert focused in the topics of painting, sculpture, and music. The music component featured chamber works by mostly Heitor Villa-Lobos, and they performed by professional musicians from Rio de Janeiro.

Although the 1922 Week of Modern Art was highly publicized and discussed in the newspapers of the time, it was all but forgotten for twenty years. In 1942 it started to be celebrated as the birthplace of a striving Brazilian nationalistic movement. From that point on, almost every 10th anniversary of the event is marked by production of new works about the Week of Modern Art and its ramifications[2].

A study of the event itself and its celebrations, associated with a study of the cultural and political circumstances surrounding them, revealed that the 1922 Week of Modern Art had become, since its creation, an important object of cultural identification to those who participated in it and to those who claim influence from it. As such, not only its content but also its *raison d'être* has been transformed and used in different instances to suit particular points of view. More than often, the 1922 exposition was used to represent the rebellious intentions of its participants and to represent the birth of Modernism and Nationalism in Brazil.

Chapter I focuses on theoretical constructions about the subject of Nationalism and Historical Construction as they apply to this thesis. It defines terms used in the subsequent chapters as well as analytical tools employed through the study of the Week of Modern Art and its diverse celebrations.

---

[2] The following books have extensive passages regarding the Week of Modern Art and its participants: Andrade 1942; Di Cavalcanti 1955. Starting in 1960s we have: Cunha 1960; Bopp 1966; Nist 1967. During the 1970s we have: Martins 1970; Amaral 1972; Batista, Lopez and Lima 1972; Brito 1974; Lara 1972; Wisnik 1977. During the 1980s we have: Neves 1981; Mariz 1983 and 1984; Igreja 1989. During the 1990s we find the following specialized literature: Bastos 1991; Bastazin 1992; Mandatto 1992; Alembert 1992; Oliveira 1993; Rezende 1993; Passoni 1998. More recently we find: Travassos 2000; Boaventura 2002; Camargos 2002; Schwartz 2003.

Chapter II interprets the Week of Modern Art as an art event prepared by a young generation of artists with solid support from the elite. Newspaper articles, reports, ads, and editorials are analyzed in conjunction with a study on the narrow connections in between the Week of Modern Art articulators and São Paulo's oligarchy. This chapter also has an analysis of the first instances when the 1922 event has its significance altered according to personal agendas.

Chapter III focuses on the crystallization process of an "ideal history" about the Week and its participants. "Ideal history" is a term used in this thesis to describe the historical reconstruction portraying the 1922 modernists as cohesive group of artists who created a revolution in Brazilian arts and society[3]. This process took shape manly during the Vargas Regime (1930-1945) and again, a study of the connections in between artists, intellectuals, and those in power takes place.

Chapter IV examines the Week of Modern Art as a contested ground where different studies and narratives about the original event collide. The "ideal history" about the Week is contested through different criteria, including historical facts and political connections. This final chapter observes the differences in between narratives that see the Week as birthplace of the Brazilian Nationalism and narratives that challenge this interpretation. This thesis concludes with observations on how the 1922 Week of Modern Art became a clear example of objectification of history since its implementation. In other words, the 1922 group

[3] This particular term was coined by Tadeu Chiarelli in a book about the importance of Monteiro Lobato's work as art critic. In Tadeu Chiarelli, *Um Jeca nos Vernissages* (SãoPaulo: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo, 1995), 20.

of modernists created an art event to gain access to São Paulo's oligarchy, and later on held the same art event as a talisman to promote a Nationalistic agenda in Brazil. An appendix provides a complete copy of the 1922 Week of Modern Art program of events.

CHAPTER I: THEORETICAL TOOLS

In order to better understand the reasoning behind the different meanings attached to the 1922 Week of Modern Art, we must reflect on how that event could have become subject to very different manipulations. In this initial chapter, three analytical concepts are explained in a context relevant to this thesis. The goal is to give adequate theoretical support not only to observe, but also to understand the transformation of history in modern Brazil. These three concepts are: Construction of History, Nationalism, and Objectification of Culture.

Construction of History

Micheil-Rolph Trouillot, in a study about the construction of history and its relationship with power, states: "at best, history is a story about power, a story about those who won" (Trouillot 1995, 5). Trouillot's statement is based in a constructivist point of view that understands history as a contested ground where different narratives constantly compete for the status of being considered the true account of past events. Trouillot asserts that those with power to control the dissemination of knowledge and the production of narrative are the ones most able to write history according to their interest.

This constructivist point of view holds itself quite accurate when applied on a study about Brazil's economic and intellectual elites. For example, Mário de Andrade, Mennotti Del Picchia, and Heitor Villa-Lobos, to cite three artists whose participation in the Week of Modern Art are observed in this thesis, were personalities whose lives and intellectual production became widely known not only because of their intrinsic qualities, but also because of their close relationship with those in power. Due to their direct participation in the making of the 1922 Week of Modern Art, their names are cited as primary sources of substantial literature about that event and on several topics related to the Modernism in Brazil[4]. Because of their close ties with Brazil's top officials, these three intellectuals held the powerful position of being creators of the widely believed narratives about the Modernism in Brazil[5].

Since all three names cited above participated in the Week of Modern Art and had ample input in the production of its narrative, the following question posed by Trouillot, when dealing with historic construction, becomes quite intriguing: "Why don't all winners tell the same story?" (1995, 6) Or, in an

---

[4] A prime example of that is Vasco Mariz's book about entitled *História da Música no Brasil.* In this particular book, used today as basic literature in Brazilian music schools, Mariz offers a description of the 1922 Week of Modern Art that is based solely on an interview with Villa-Lobos – someone well known for overstatements about his own life adventures. Vasco Mariz *História da Música no Brasil* (Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1983)

[5] The relationship among those who held positions of economic power and those who wrote about history in Brazil is so tight that the following authors produced substantial studies on this subject alone. Carlos Guilherme Mota *Ideologia da Cultura Brasileira: Pontos de partida para uma revisão histórica* (São Paulo: Editora Ática, 1977); Michael L. Conniff and McCann, Frank D. *Modern Brazil: Elites and Masses in Historical Perspective* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989); Sergio Miceli *Intelectuais à Brasileira* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2001); Cláudia Maria Ribeiro Viscardi *O Teatro das Oligarquias: Uma Revisão da "Política do Café com Leite"* (Belo Horizonte: Editora C/ Arte. 2001); Daryle Williams *Culture Wars in Brazil: The First Vargas Regime, 1930-1945* (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2001).

adaptation customized to this thesis: Why don't all participants of the Week of Modern Art tell the same story? Perhaps the answer to this question is hidden not in the disputed narratives themselves, but in the process which created them. In other words: rather than trying to untangle a 'correct version' from several different narratives, one should focus on how these narratives were produced. As Trouillot states:

> History reveals itself only through the production of specific narratives. What matters most are the process and conditions of production of such narratives. Only a focus on that process can uncover the ways in which the two sides of historicity intertwine in a particular context. Only through that overlap can we discover the differential exercise of power that makes some narratives possible and silences others. (1995, 25)

When dealing with the very early narratives on the 1922 Week of Modern Art, I will focus on their process of production and by doing so I will demonstrate that authors who were participating in the 1922 event were also preparing the early narratives by describing it in their own newspaper columns, giving interviews, and writing books about it. These authors/participants are understood as "subjects [who engaged] simultaneously in the socio-historical process and in narrative constructions about that process" (1995, 24). Furthermore, by focusing on the relationship of power in between these subjects, who created and narrated the event, and São Paulo's oligarchic members, who financed the event, I sustain that theses same authors/participants had a clear strategy to inflate the

importance of the Week of Modern Art, silencing their critics and impressing their patrons.

Interestingly, the process of historical construction around the Week of Modern Art did not happen only during the event itself. It also happened during its anniversary celebrations. By analyzing the vastly different levels of importance that are attributed to the 1922 Week of Modern Art during the 1942, 1972, and 1992 anniversary publication of articles and books, I argue that the event had its basic narrative constantly changed over time. The change of historical narrative through time is not a new subject and once again, Trouillot points out a theoretical solution:

> Silences enter the process of historical production at four crucial moments: the moment of fact creation (the making of sources); the moment of fact assembly (the making of archives); the moment of fact retrieval (the making of narratives); and the moment of retrospective significance (the making of history in the final instance). (1995, 26)

By applying this analytical tool on the various historical interpretations about the Week of Modern Art, I will establish in the next chapters that its main actors were directly engaged in at least two of those moments: "making of sources" (e.g. preparing newspaper articles that portrayed the Week of Modern Art as a revolutionary event) and in "making of narratives" (e.g. retrieving only the articles and versions that supported their point of view when writing about that event). Later on, during the military government in Brazil (1964-1985) a third

silence entered the process: "Making of history". It happened when State sponsored celebrations of the Week of Modern Art helped to solidify a compound of similar versions created by the authors/participants of the 1922 event. It is during the military government that several selective retrospective materials and commemorative books about the Week of Modern Art were published. The version created by the authors/participants made its way into the annals of Brazilian art history.

Fortunately the "making of archives", an important part of the historical process that was largely left up to local newspapers, remained intact throughout this past century. Thanks to recent research done by Boaventura (2000), Camargo (2000), Miceli (2001)[6] and others, it is finally possible to gather substantial information about the initial repercussions of the 1922 Week of Modern Art and the relationship of power between the main participants of the event and São Paulo's oligarchy. As we will see in the following chapters, this new information gives voice to some of the "silences" created by the early narrative and its authors.

Nationalism in Brazil

[6] Boaventura's research is focused in republishing almost all the newspaper articles that circulated during the weeks preceding and following the Week of Modern Art. Camargo's research is focused in the life of José de Freitas Valle, one of the main art patrons in São Paulo. Miceli's research is focused in the politics of Brazil's cultural elite during the First Republic (1889-1930) and the first part of the Vargas Regime (1930-1937).

During the first half of the 20th century Brazilian Modernists labored with ideas about national identity and its place in a global context. Ideas such as historical purpose, logical progression of a national consciousness, and self-identification among a large and diverse population were common topics of discussion among the Brazilian Modernists[7]. Although ideas of identity in a national scale are not exclusive to Brazilian modern thinkers, their successful use of Nationalism as a logic and positive support for political actions, with massive government support, makes this topic vital.

Benedict Anderson, in a study about the origins of nationalism, explores the development of the collective concept of nationhood in the American continent (Anderson 1991). He points out that, due to geographical distance from their respective empires – England, France, Spain, and Portugal – American colonies became "[administrative] units [with] a self-contained character" (1991, 52). In Brazil's case, the Portuguese king divided the colony in a dozen large autonomous estates or *capitanias hereditárias* to be explored and governed by his appointees. These appointees not only possessed the land, but also were responsible for exploring its resources, establishing a local government, and defending it from possible invaders – usually French and Dutch conquers. During the 14th and 15th century, the *capitanias hereditárias* had proven to be an effective solution for how a small and poor empire could indirectly control and

[7] Mário de Andrade dealt with this topic in several of his own writtings, speccially *O Banquete* and *Estética da Música Brasileira*. Paulo Prado, a coffee barton and one of the patrons of the Week of Modern Art toyed with the idea of a "common Brazilian traits" in his book *Retrato do Brasil*. Outside the modernist ideology, other contemporary authors were also working with this topic: Gilberto Freire's *Brazil – An Interpretation* is an example of a much deeper analysis into the question of "Brazilianness".

protect a vast amount of unmarked territory on the other side of the Atlantic ocean. Because of their enormous responsibilities and lack of direct command from the Portuguese Empire, these land owners created *capitanias* that were autonomous entities, with their own armies, local government, and economy[8].

Anderson also points out that the Enlightenment had a considerable influence in the "crystallization" of an American identity (1991, 60). As much as geographical distance in between the Portugal and Brazil helped to shape a unique character for the colony, ideas from the Enlightenment filled the Brazilian elite with aspirations to independence from the colonial power. Another relevant factor to consider is timing of such influence. Ideas from the Enlightenment did not flourish in South America until the mid nineteenth century. To be more specific, these ideas came into effect "only after the French Revolution Nationalism came to dominate Europe as a mode of thought and a structure of feeling" (Dahlhaus 1989, 85). By that time, Brazil, as well as other American colonies, already had its own economic agenda and social structure. Therefore, nationalistic ideas from the Enlightenment became relevant not only because they helped Americans to identify their land as a different nation, but also because they provided a theoretical justification for a desired economic separation. It is also important to note that at that time Brazil's elite was

[8] Nowadays, one can observe the legacy of the *Capiatanias Hereditárias* in two simple ways: by looking at the current political map of the Northeast region in Brazil – where border between the states of Rio Grande do Norte, Paraíba, Pernanbuco, Alagoas, and Bahia still reflect the 1500s arbitrary division of the colony; and by observing the political and economic power that traditional Portuguese families, who were granted those *capitanias*, still hold in those regions.

educated in European schools and very aware of the North American independence process[9].

The imperial taxation and control over production made colonial landowners and merchants increasingly unhappy. The French ideals of liberty and equality had a practical meaning among South American elite: independence from the Empire meant that tax system and political control could be managed directly by the colonial elite. It is important to consider that the colonial elite was already the *de facto* power. It controlled the daily activities of the society and it was charge of suppressing all revolts by the lower classes (Smith, 2002). It did not take very long for the Brazilian elite to figure out that the quest for an independent nation had two considerable benefits: (1) It would free the colony from the control and taxation by Portugal giving direct access the international markets; and (2) it would redirect popular frustration, generally expressed by strikes and revolts, towards the Portuguese Empire.

Anderson, when analyzing the independence movements in South America, observes that the colonial elite spearheaded the movement towards independency looking for economical benefits, and anticipating larger revolts from the lower classes. As Anderson explains:

> The evidence clearly suggests that the leadership was held by substantial landowners, allied with a somewhat smaller number of

[9] Moniz Bandeira, a well-published Brazilian political scientist, wrote extensively about Brazilian young intellectuals and their influences in Brazil's independence. Liuz Alberto Vianna Moniz Bandeira *Presença dos Estados Unidos no Brasil (Dois Séculos de História)* (Rio de Janeiro: Editora Civilização Brasileira, 1973; 3ª ed. São Paulo, Editora SENAC 1998).

> merchants, and various types of professional (lawyers, military men, local and provincial functionaries). ... One key factor initially spurring the drive for independence from Madrid, in such important cases as Venezuela, Mexico and Peru, was the fear of 'lower-class' political mobilizations: to wit, Indian or Negro-slave uprisings (1991, 48).

The main difference in between Brazil and the Spanish colonies is that the Brazilian process was relatively calm. This quasi-peaceful process was due to an interesting twist in Brazil's history. In 1807, fearing the imminent invasion of the Napoleonic forces, the entire Portuguese court crossed the Atlantic ocean and established itself in the city of Rio de Janeiro. Although Anderson sees this event as an "ironic case" (1991, 191), Smith clarifies an important point:

> The idea of the royal family residing in the tropics appeared radical but was not entirely new. In the eighteenth century, the veteran diplomat, Luís da Cunha, had predicted that the economic and political importance of Brazil would eventually result in the relocation of the seat of royal government to that New World (2002, 38).

According to Smith, the transport of 15,000 people in "more than forty ships", including the entire "machinery of government" was "remarkable." That single event put an end to "the mercantilist system that had endured for three centuries" (2002, 39). Smith also points out that the transplantation of a Metropolitan elite into the colony not only had "elevated the prestige and status of Brazil but had also provided economic benefits [to] the Brazilian elite" (2002, 41).

Brazilian landowners and merchants were finally able to trade equally with other 'independent' countries.

Once the Portuguese emperor Don João VI returned to Portugal, his son, Pedro I, became the new emperor of Brazil. Pedro I led the Brazilian empire into an independence that "was achieved much more quickly and with considerably less violence and destruction than in Spain America" (2002, 42). Reasons for such a swift independence reside in the basic fact that the Brazilian elite had grown considerably more powerful than its Portuguese counterparts[10]. At that time, Portugal, an impoverished nation with no significant industrial or agricultural production, did not have the minimal capacity to coerce Brazil with political or military power (2002, 43 and Bethell 1989, 37).

The Brazilian oligarchy not only led the movement for independence but also "was pleased that the government and the economy continued to function as before" (Smith 2002, 43). The strong economic and political situation of the Brazilian elite was characterized by a tight control over its own largely illiterate population and a robust position over trade relationship with other countries (Radcliffe 1996, 16-24). The Brazilian elite remained unchallenged for another thirty years. By the 1920s, losses with agriculture exportations – reducing the wealth of the elite, and large influx of European immigrants – fostering a politically active underclass, undermined the economical and political *status quo*.

[10] Richard Graham illustrates that the Portuguese population, oppressed by unemployment, sought the opportunity for a new beginning in Brazil. It is important to note that more than half of the 300,000 immigrants who arrived in Brazil between 1846-75, came from Portugal. (Bethell 1989, 137)

The implementation of the Republic in Brazil is interpreted today as a redistribution of political power inside a governing elite. As Emília Viotti da Costa explains: "The main accomplishment of the Republic was to bring to power a new oligarchy of coffee planters and their clients who promoted only [the] institutional changes that were necessary to satisfy their own needs" (Bethell 1989, 213). Although the First Republic adopted the positivist ideals of Compte and Spencer[11] (1989, 185), the *in facto* division of political power can be interpreted as a "federation of oligarchies" (1989, 267).

Boris Fausto, in an essay about society and politics of the First Republic, presented an interpretation of this "federation of oligarchies" by demonstrating that the First Republic political system was supported by "three nuclei of power" (Bethell 1989, 266). At the local level, large landowners, also commonly know as *coronéis*, controlled the lives of the rural population. The state oligarchies, situated in the state capitals, represented the second level of power. The state oligarchies functioned as a "federation of *coronéis*" (1989, 266). At the top of this three level structure was the federal government, "which was the product of an alliance between the oligarchies of the most important states, and was therefore the expression of a federation of oligarchies" (1989, 267).

[11] As Costa explains, reformists "chose what made sense to them. (...) The Christian socialism of Lammenais, the utopian socialism of Saint-Simon, Proudhon, or Fourier, and the scientific socialism of Marx and Engels were merely matters of speculation for a few eccentric individuals. Men like Spencer and Compte, who had tried to reconcile order and progress and wanted to regenerate society through a moral revolution, had more appeal to Brazilian intellectuals and politicians than those who put their trust in class struggle or in the proletarian" Leslie Bethell *Brazil: Empire & Republic 1822-1930* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 185.

Although this new regime lasted for forty years, popular revolts around the country made evident its frail stability. The main revolts during the First Republic were: the Canudos War (1893-1897) in Bahia state's countryside, the Contestado War (1912-1916) in Paraná and Santa Catarina states, the revolt of the Copacabana Fort (1922) in the city of Rio de Janeiro, and the Paulista revolt (1924) in the city of São Paulo. This last revolt originated the *Prestes Column.* Under the guidance of the disbanded colonel Prestes hundreds of militiamen marched for more than 12,000 miles along Brazil's countryside, promoting a revolution against the federal government. Despite being supported by small farmers and constantly winning battles against federal troops, the *Prestes Column* finally disbanded in 1927.

The oligarchy on the top of the "federation of oligarchies" was abundant with European educated intellectuals. As Camargos illustrates: they "dressed like Europeans, spoke several languages, and had European hobbies" (2000, 30). When observing early 20th century drawings and pictures of the cities of São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro, one cannot avoid noticing a clear desire to replicate European models of style and urban planning. The architecture style of São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro, with its *Belle Époque* buildings and imported Italian marble, followed very closely those of Paris and other European cities[12].

[12] For information on the architectural style in Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo during the early 20th century, check: Sérgio Tabet *O Rio de Janeiro em antigos cartões postais* (Rio de Janeiro: Sérgio Roberto Tabet e Sônia Pumar Bergamini, 1985); Donato Mello Junior *Rio de Janeiro: Planos, Plantas e Aparências* (Rio de Janeiro: João Fortes Engenharia, 1988); Nestor Goulart Reis Filho *São Paulo e Outras Cidades: Produção Social e Degradação dos Espaços Urbanos* (São Paulo: Hucitec, 1994).

Although one could observe Brazilian's elite fascination with European manners in all levels of urban life – from architecture to clothing, perhaps it is in music that one could find a most striking example of national identity and pride being built upon an imported value. Carlos Gomes (1836-1896), a Brazilian composer who enjoyed success in the Italian opera houses, had overwhelming influence over the music composed by native Brazilian composers during the Empire and First Republic. His works, full of Indianism[13] features (e. g. *O Guarani*[14]), became the standard to measure any other composer's output during the First Republic. Carlos Gomes, still considered by some Brazilian historians as "the best nineteenth century American composer" (Mariz 1983, 77), demonstrated the way for all those interested in successfully producing Brazilian national culture: take a folk or popular subject and wrap it with a contemporary accepted European model. As we will see in the following chapters, despite criticism to Carlos Gomes, the 1922 modernists would followed his procedure by putting Brazilian raw material into modern models. (e.g. *Art Deco* would replace the *Belle Époque*).

In the 1930s the Vargas regime brought a change to this procedure to follow European models of cultural identification. The idea to update the Brazilian cultural identity was swiftly mutated into an idea to find and explore unique characteristics already present in the Brazilian culture – "a special local

---

[13] As E. Bradford Burns points out: there was a "full tide of nineteenth-century Indianism sweep in between the years of 1840 and 1875" in Brazil. E. Bradford Burns *Nationalism in Brazil: A Historical Survey* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968), 44.

[14] *O Guarani* is an opera based on José de Alncar's novel with the same title. The main character: *Peri* is a Brazilian native version of a Greek mythical character.

product not to be found in any other market" (Mendonça 1998, 37). This new characteristic would be developed and promoted by official agencies such as the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Culture, and the Department of Press and Marketing (Aquino 1998, 385-434). The goal was to teach pride and unite all generations, especially the youth, towards a common good. As I will explore in Chapter III, this quest for uniqueness gained strength to a point where together with an inherited predilection for carnival and soccer, all Brazilians were led to believe that they had the most diverse folklore in the world, and lived in a blessed land[15].

It is arguable that the main fomenting factor for this massive turn towards patriotism was the growing complexity of the country's social fabric since the 1920s. In other words: in order to keep social control over its population, a unifying patriotic ideal was needed to polarize and isolate all other competing interests (Coutinho, 1990; Sandes 2000; Araujo 2000; Viscardi 2001). Because the previously described "federation of oligarchies" was based on a weak social contract, the ruling elite started to loose control over a rapidly growing population. The general strikes of 1917 and 1922, to cite the two major strikes in that period, were clear signals that the emerging middle and lower classes were able to organize unions and influence politics at a state level (Rose 1998, 141). National instability intensified with the 1924 military coup, which controlled the city of São Paulo for 22 days, and the above previously *Coluna Prestes*, which "captured the

[15] For an interesting reading about the bulding of a national culture in Brazil, please check: Joseph A. Page *The Brazilians* (Reading Mário de Andrade: Perseus Books, 1995)

public's imagination and drew attention to the issues of massive rural poverty and deprivation" (Smith 2002, 107). The 1930s presidential election, executed during a stage of siege in many parts of Brazil and marred by claims of electoral fraud, made evidence the eminent "threat of civil war" (Page 1995, 133).

The fact that Getúlio Vargas himself was a member of the oligarchy, and that the Brazilian elite did not oppose the military coup, showed that, once again, the Brazilian oligarchy was trying to accommodate a broadening political spectrum. The main characteristic of this particular period is that during the Vargas Regime an intensive process of Nationalism took place, transforming the collective imagination of Brazil into something that all classes could identify with, and if necessary, fight for.

Objectification of Culture

The use of culture as an object to be employed by those in positions of power is a not a new topic. Dahlhaus, in a study about the nineteenth century musical aspects of nationalism in Europe, observes the use of folklore as a means of self-identification to the elite. As he points out: "it was not until the age of Nationalism that folk art was regarded as national, rather than a regional or social phenomenon" (1989, 86). He also states: "the appropriation of folk music by the bourgeoisie, in order to reassure themselves that their national feelings

had roots and that their own existence therefore had authentic 'originality', was an appeal across the social barriers" (1989, 93).

Although the creation of a Brazilian artistic identity based in folklore did not cross "social barriers" until Getúlio Vargas's populist cultural programs, the use of folklore as a device for identification became the main argument for the Brazilian modernists since the late 1920s. In a similar fashion to the Nineteenth century European experiment with nationalism, intellectuals belonging to the Brazilian elite built a national culture based on researched rural and peasant traditions. Célia Passoni, in an essay about the modernist movement in Brazil, summarizes the fundamental goals of the Modernism movement: "the right to research, the establishment of a national consciousness, and the actualization of the Brazilian artistic intelligence" (Passoni 1998, 25). Although these goals were purposely vague, they had the clear mission of establishing an idea of national consciousness. Mário de Andrade, the leading figure on Modernism and cultural nationalism in Brazil, justified the creation of a national consciousness with an argument that Brazil, when compared with the mature European cultures, was a "young society" in need of developing its own "national identity" (Andrade 1928 [1962], 18). Andrade's defense of the validity and usefulness of folklore assimilation by the artistic elite has a socio-political component that betrays his particular understanding of nationalism. By unfavorably comparing the early twentieth-century state of Brazilian culture to the one in nineteenth century

western Europe, Andrade argued that Brazilian culture was not as developed and, therefore, nationalism was a necessary step towards cultural maturity.

It is interesting to note the close relationships, based in personal friendship and family ties, between intellectuals, artists, and the top members of government, and how these relationships helped to shape cultural policy. Sergio Miceli, in a comprehensive study about early twentieth century Brazilian intellectuals, clarifies that Brazil's artistic elite was not only closely connected with all means of intellectual production, but also politically engaged in the means of implementation of its own agenda (Miceli 2001, 95). As we will see in details in the next chapters, the articulators of the Modernism were academics, had a substantial role on the press, and were also active agents in government cultural programs. Only after comprehending these connections between intellectuals and government, can one grasp how it was possible for Andrade's nationalistic discourse and research to become a theoretical tool in Vargas's fascist regime. Although Mário de Andrade was trying to 'update' the Brazilian culture at large, his research helped the regime identify specific popular events that would have the biggest populist impact.

By focusing on objectification of Brazilian culture, one cannot avoid observing the tactical use of folklore by the modernists. Rural and lower class culture provided the modernists with a new cultural object clearly different than what was being done by a previous generation of artists and intellectuals. The use of folklore as raw material for a modern proposal in arts generated a rupture

from established academic values making it possible to replace previously assimilated styles. As Robert Levine observes, the modernists use of folklore could be characterized as a "lip service to indigenous culture for its own sake" (Levine 1989, 210). In other words, the elite's sudden interest in folklore and the valorization of cultural manifestation from the lowers classes was not much more than supporting material for the political goals of a new generation of intellectuals.[16] This new generation of intellectuals was using folklore and nationalism to fight and replace the "Frenchified values of the Brazilian *Belle Époque*" (1989, 210).

Levine's study provides a glimpse of how the uneducated were understood in Brazil's early 20th century:

> The view of Brazilian intellectuals was a mix of 'romanticized' [view of] the poor, emphasizing their docility and childlike state [and a view of the] poor as primitive malcontents, potentially disruptive and dangerous to social order. As time passed, a composite view, borrowing from both interpretations, captured the official imagination and became the basis for public policy. (1989, 209)

Levine observes that Andrade's lack of social knowledge on questions about race and class, associated with his close ties to the conservative elite, deprived the Modernism's leading articulator from fully understanding the complexity of this subject. As Levine points out:

---

[16] As Emília Viotti da Costa points out, modernists were not the first group of Brazilian intellectuals to use "'the people' in their subject matter." The First Republic intellectuals also used the expression 'the people' to criticize the Empire and promote their own positivist agendas. Leslie Bethell *Brazil: Empire & Republic 1822-1930* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 161.

> The leading modernist celebrant, was himself a private man whose writings reflect a degree of disorientation about the themes of race and class. His major works, *Paulicéia desvairada* (1922) and *Macunaíma* (1928), shocked and astonished their readers not only for their stylistic chaos but also for their daring descent into the netherworld of race and national origins (1989, 211).

Levine concludes that the modernists' quest to create a Brazilian modern identity based on folklore was "distorted [and] profoundly removed from the daily conflicts and struggles of the people" (1989, 222). Brazilian modernists, rather than pushing the boundaries of art and "testing the limits of aesthetic construction" (Kramer 2000, xi), herd themselves into using popular traditions as a raw material to create a new cultural identity on a national level.

As demonstrated above, the Brazilian modernists went much further than Dahlhaus's concept of "bourgeois phenomenon" of self-identification (1989, 83). More than identifying with the larger society by participating in popular festivities and sharing popular cultural tastes, the modernists viewed folklore as an object, to be used against old cultural values.

The modernists interest in using folklore as basic material for a modern Brazilian art generated systematic research on popular culture starting with Mario de Andrade works in musicology (Vasco Mariz 1983), and fostered, associated with Vargas nationalistic agenda the creation of many government projects devoted to protect national cultural heritage (Williams, 2001).

The interpretation of culture as an object to be manipulated by a group of intellectuals is also seen in other studies about nationalism and culture. Richard Handler, in an anthropological study about nationalism and the politics of culture in Quebec, articulates that culture is "a thing: a natural object or entity made up of objects and entities" (Handler 1988, 14). He observes that nationalism fosters interpretations of nation as a "collective individual" that naturally has boundaries, intrinsic characteristics and a destiny to be fulfilled by its members and subject to destructive influences by alien cultures (1988, 30-51). Handler based his conclusions on a decade long experience doing interviews and fieldwork in Quebec. His observations about how the Québécois intellectual elite has been imagining Quebec as a nation on the verge of maturity and independence is similar to the Brazilian modernistic discourse.

As we have seen previously, Mário de Andrade defended nationalism as a step towards the maturity of Brazil's national identity (1928 [1961], 19). Andrade's argument also betrays the personification component identified by Handler in the nationalistic arguments in Quebec. As Handler explains, "such rhetoric allows nationalists to psychologize history – that is, to discuss the history of the nation as if it were the history of a person" (1988, 42). The importance of this rhetoric tool resides in the fact it allows a government to be the chaperon and tutor of this 'collective person', controlling the growth and maturity of the nation.

A final analysis on the topic of objectification of culture is based on the inherited flexibility of such cultural objects. In a study about nationalism as a

cultural performance, David Guss argues that in the realm of popular manifestations of culture there is an uninterrupted adjustment of meaning according to a change in the context of these manifestations (Guss, 2000). Although Guss's concept of "cultural performance" was envisioned as an analytical tool to observe the transformation of meaning in four Venezuelan popular festivals, it is used here as a theoretical tool to analyze the anniversary celebrations of the 1922 Week of Modern Art.

In his research, Guss notices that there was a complex dispute among the civil society, nationalistic government entities, folklorists and economic interests, in shaping the meaning and the importance of those festivals (Guss 2000). Based on those observations, Guss postulates that tradition and history are constantly being rewritten according to the perspective of those who were in power. Although this conclusion is similar to Trouillot's assertion of history as being the story told by the winners, Guss's conclusion understands "cultural performances" as venues for social contest and expression of opinions. This is a vital distinction regarding the mechanics of this thesis. Despite the fact that the 1922 Week of Modern Art was an art festival that happened only once, its celebrations and anniversaries, usually much larger than the event itself, produced new and contradictory publications based on the event. Although these publications, full of details, will never reach the "truth" about what happened in those days, the study of the context in which these new stories are

produced help us understand not only how a 1922 week long art event became so important, but also why.

CHAPTER II: THE 1922 WEEK OK MODERN ART

Estamos célebres! Enfim! Nossos livros serão comprados! Ganharemos dinheiro! Seremos lindíssimos! Insultadíssimos. Celebérrimos. Teremos nossos nomes eternizados nos jornais e na História da Arte Brasileira.

(We are famous! Finally! Our books will be bought! We will make money! We will be very beautiful! Insulated. Celebrated. We will have our names eternalized in the newspapers and in the History of Brazilian Art.)

Mário de Andrade, 1922

In this chapter the 1922 Week of Modern Art is observed as a single art event that was elaborated by two different groups of people: a wealthy oligarchic elite and an aspiring generation of young intellectuals. São Paulo's oligarchic elite financially supported the 1922 Week of Modern Art was as an entertainment event and as an opportunity to purchase works of art from local upcoming artists. The aspiring generation of young Brazilian artists saw the Week as a way to gain access to Brazil's exclusive patronage system and as a platform to impose a new discourse into Brazil's conservative art market. These distinct, but somewhat complementary agendas, associated with political connections united

these two groups that otherwise belonged to different generations and social classes.

An overview of Brazil's early 20th century political and economic system precedes the analysis of the events surrounding the 1922 Week of Modern Art. This overview provides a perspective on the Brazilian oligarchy, through its control of governmental institutions, and manipulation of the country's art production. It also shades some light on how this particular art event became so important for a new generation of Brazilian intellectuals, who were at the same time trying to please their patrons and create a new artistic discourse.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The twentieth century's first quarter in Brazil belong to the period understood by historians as the First Republic (Smith 2000). This period went from 1889 until 1930 and was comprised in between the *Empire of Brazil* and Getúlio Vargas's *Estado Novo*. Although two military *coups de ête*[17] marked the beginning and the end of this period and this was the first democratic regime in Brazil, the First Republic can hardly be interpreted as a revolutionary period. Furthermore, because the First Republic ended almost four hundred years of monarchy , one would expect a radical change in Brazilian society with its inception. However, during this particular period there were minor revolts within

[17] In the first military coup, Marshal Deodoro da Fonseca ousted Emperor Dom Pedro II, declared the end of the Imperial regime and became Brazil's first President. The second military coup ousted Washington Luís from the presidency and immediately handed it to Getúlio Vargas, Brazil's finance minister.

the general population and little change in the control of the government. The same intellectuals who previously were appointed to work for the Empire were subsequently elected as officials for the new regime.

The historian Emília Viotti da Costa explains that: "The main accomplishment of the Republic was to bring to power a new oligarchy of coffee planters and their clients who promoted only institutional changes that were necessary to satisfy their own needs" (Bethell 1989, 213). In other words, this period's main characteristic was the redistribution of political power inside the governing elite. Claudia Maria Ribeiro Viscardi's insightful book about the First Republic's oligarchy points out that political and economic alliances in between plantation owners and cattle ranchers guided the institutional changes and democratic aspects of Brazil's first experiment with a democratic government. Regarding the electoral process for presidential elections, she observes that the outcome was previously decided by an arrangement in between members of the oligarchy. "Every four years a new alliance had to be forged" (Viscardi 2001, 22).

The First Republic started with a provisional government that was in charge of creating a new constitutional document. The new constitution, finished in 1891 was modeled after the United States of America's constitution and the French positivist ideals of separation of church and state (Smith 2002, 87). Besides the classic division of political power between three government branches, with the legislative branch having a senate and a congress, Brazil's First Republic constitution gave substantial liberty for the provinces – or, as

explained in the previous chapter, the federation of *coronéis* – to have their own armies, state constitution, and taxation system. This particular division of power demonstrates the economic strength of São Paulo and Minas Gerais provinces, against the Federal government situated in Rio de Janeiro (Aquino 2000, 84).

Although the First Republic's political system was theoretically democratic, there was negligible participation from the general population. Votes were open (non secret ballot) and exclusive to literate male Brazilians over the age of 21. From the general election of 1898 to the election in 1930, there was a small increase in general participation in the elections. It went from 2.7 per cent to 5.7 per cent (Bethell 1989, 279). As Faust observes:

> In a country with a low level of popular participation and where political citizenship was almost always used as currency for the unequal exchanges of favors, the federal Republic, though in theory based on the ideal of democratic representation, was in practice no more than an instrument of the regional oligarchies (1989, 279).

R. S. Rose, in a telling book about institutional violence in Brazil's history, shows that participation from the general population, in the form of protests or strikes, was met with strong-handed responses from federal troops (Rose 1998). During the First Republic, the idea of "democratic participation" was narrowly defined.

The First Republic's economic structure was based on a semi-feudal system of coffee plantations geared towards exportation to the European and

North American markets. Powerful coffee grower families such as the Prado[18] family and the Valle family, to site two of the main art sponsors in São Paulo, were able to control, through economic influence, much of the federal government's economic decisions and policies (Viscardi 2001). Although these coffee barons controlled Brazil's government during the First Republic, their economic power was vastly diminished with the crash of the North American Stock Exchange in 1929. With their political monopoly all but vanished, new economic forces came to claim control of Brazil's government. Cattle farmers in the south and factory owners in the southeast regions challenged the balance of economic and political power, and provoked the fall of First Republic. As Michael Conniff points out, "From then on, no single class or elite had sufficient power to rule the country alone" (Conniff 1989, xvi). The rise of Getúlio Vargas's political power, from a southern cattle farmer, to a minister of finance during the First Republic, and later own to become Brazil's first dictator during the *Estado Novo*, is a clear example of such a change in this balance of power.

It is interesting to note that the coffee driven economy, with its extensive demand for manual labor, helped to create the demographic changes that fostered its own decline. Since the late 1800s it was becoming evident to plantation owners that they had to find alternatives to slave work for their fields. Problems with slave insurgencies and low productivity, associated with

[18] Darell E. Levi, in his study about the Prado family, notes that friendship and economic ties in between the Prado family and the Brazilian Government dates back to time when Brazil was still a Portuguese colony and this friendship flourished throughout the entire monarchic period. Darrell E. Levi, *The Prado Family* (São Paulo: Cultura 70 – Livraria e Editora S/A, 1974), 62.

international pressure to end slavery in Brazil, forced plantation owners to recruit European labor. In 1886, after successful experimentations with immigration, a government-supported agency was created to fund and promote European immigration. As Darrell Levi's research points out, the powerful Prado family, with clear pragmatic objectives, single-handedly created the *Sociedade Promotora da Imigração*, and brought hundreds of thousands of European immigrants to work on their properties (Levi 1974, 168-186). By the time the 1888 law that abolished slavery was in effect, a new wave of cheap and "more productive" labor force was in place. R. S. Rose, in a much more combative language, suggests that "European were still being imported into Brazil in large numbers for two reasons: to bleach the country's gene pool, and to keep labor's competition for jobs at a fever pitch (thereby keeping the salaries paid out for them at a starvation level)" (Rose 1998, 141).

Although it is not the focus of this document to address demographic issues of European immigration during the First Republic, it is very important to note that the large influx of European immigrants rapidly changed the social landscape of Brazil's Southwest region. Large numbers of Europeans immigrated to Brazil's largest cities, notably São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Curitiba, and Porto Alegre, promoting a rapid growth of the urban society. The state of São Paulo, Brazil's primary industrial center and destination of two thirds of over three million immigrants, had an extraordinary growth in population. During the First Republic alone, the state of São Paulo experienced a ten-fold growth from a

population of sixty-four thousand people. During the same time period, the Brazilian population more than doubled. It increased from fourteen million people in 1890, to thirty-three million people in 1930 (Smith 2002, 120).

At that time São Paulo, receiving 18 percent of the total number of immigrants, was the main destination for the European immigrants and the main destination for Italian immigrants. They became the largest ethnic group, topping the Portuguese and Spaniards. As Smith notes: "It began to seem quite different from anywhere else in Brazil and it was popularly referred to as 'the city of the Italians" (2002, 121).

The massive immigration movement from Europe to Brazil's South and Southwest regions, providing cheat labor force to both coffee plantations and industries, helped to develop a somewhat cohesive popular force to oppose the dominant elite. As Rose points out, large number of immigrants not only expanded the work force, but also helped to organize it. The increasing number of strikes in the city and in the state of São Paulo during the first quarter of the 20th century had demands that ranged from better salaries to better working condition such as the stop of physical violence against workers (1998, 141).

Claudio H. M. Batalha's well documented study on the dynamics in between labor force, government, and economic elite in Brazil, corroborates the notion that tension in between the rapidly growing immigrant labor force and the elite driven government, had grown to the point of civil unrest by the end of the First Republic (Batalha 2000, 69-72). Organization of new political parties, such

as the Brazilian Communist Party (PCB) in 1922 and the Democratic Party (PD) in 1924, democratically challenged the Paulista Republican Party (PRP) – controlled by São Paulo's oligarchy. Although these new political parties provided a pluralistic reflection of the social conditions of the late 1920s in Brazil, they did address the social tensions caused by labor disputes and economic oppression.

The violence at the end of the First Republic is well understood once one takes a look at its last two presidencies: Arthur Bernardes (1922-1926) and Washington Luís (1926-1930). Both tenures were marked by general strikes and military revolts. Arthur Bernardes[19] took office in 1922, and in July of the same year he had to suppress a military revolt in Rio de Janeiro. Although the 1922 Fort Copacabana lieutenants' revolt was easily dismantled by loyal troops, the five who died, and the thirteen others arrested were considered martyrs and heroes by the lower classes. The Fort Copacabana revolt was an unmistakable demonstration that the lower ranks of the military were willing to take on weapons and force changes in the government.

The clearest evidence that this revolt had left a strong impression in the lower rank military came two years later. The second anniversary of the lieutenants' revolt was marked by an armed revolt inside the city of São Paulo. State troops joined rebel army forces and controlled the city for 22 days. During the revolt more than 500 people died, 5000 were wounded, and more than

[19] Arthur Bernardes was elected President of Brazil from 1922 to 1926 in highly contested election where the candidate chosen by the oligarchy of the states of São Paulo and Minas Gerais was the winner.

200,000 people fled the city. In order to avoid a crushing defeat by loyal troops, the rebels evacuated and joined the troops led by Capitan Luís Carlos Prestes[20]. He created the *Prestes Column*, an independent militia that intended to mobilize the lower rural classes into a revolution. Although he never managed to create a national revolution, his rebel forces were supported by local populations and managed to win several small skirmishes against the federal troops until they disbanded in 1927 (Smith 2000, 105).

Washington Luís became the last elected president during the *First Republic*. The election happened in 1924, a few months after the armed revolt that took the city of São Paulo by storm. During that period several states were still declared under a state of siege and its habitants were not able to vote. Washington Luís, a former governor of São Paulo, was the choice of that state's oligarchy and his campaign, according to Smith, "was conducted against a backdrop of public apathy and cynicism" (2000, 107).

The civil unrest during the 1920s made it clear that a new alliance in between the "federation of oligarchies" had to consider, and possibly assimilate new segments of the population. As Viscardi points out, disputes in between members of the commanding elite in the provinces of São Paulo, Minas Gerais, Rio de Janeiro, and Rio Grande do Sul, were pointing towards a new political realignment. Getúlio Vargas, Washington Luís finance Minister, was being

[20]Luís Carlos Prestes was an army Capitan transferred from Rio de Janeiro to Rio Grande do Sul due to acts of insubordination. During the Vargas Regime, Prestes creates the communist A.L.N. (National Liberation Alliance) and heads the opposition against Vargas's fascist regime. Joseph Smith, *A History of Brazil 1500-2000: Politics, Economic, Society, Diplomacy* (London: Longman, 2002).

discussed among these elites as a possible president capable of pleasing the middle class and avoiding a full fledge revolution (Viscardi 2001, 349-353).

At the end of his term, Washington Luís redirected the small federal resources to cover the losses that the coffee growers suffered with the 1929 New York Stock Exchange Crash (2000, 108). The government rescue of the elite's financial losses brought the First Republic one step away from the 1930 revolution[21]. The final step came in the following year when Getúlio Vargas lost the presidential bid to Júlio Prestes Albuquerque, the candidate supported by Washington Luís, in a highly contested presidential election.

A quick military coup terminated Washington Luís's mandate a few weeks before he could hand power to his successor and pointed Getúlio Vargas as head of a provisional government. Joseph Page points the important role of social control that the military took during that moment, "Faced with the threat of civil war, the military exercised its arbitration function by siding with the insurgents" (Page 1995, 133). The swift change of power successfully avoided a civil war, reflected the preferences of the lower classes for Getúlio Vargas as president[22], and kept the political control under the ruling oligarchy. As it will be discussed in the next chapter, the provisional government eventually becomes

[21] As Boris Fausto points out: "Brazil's revolutionary movement of the 1930s is part of a framework of general instability brought about by the worldwide crisis of 1929." Boris Fausto, *A Concise History of Brazil* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 194.

[22] Fernando Vieira Aquino brings examples of two carnival marches celebrating Getúlio Vargas's popularity among the lower classes. Fernando Vieira Aquino, Gilberto Agostino, and Hiran Roedel, *Sociedade Brasileira: Uma História através dos Movimentos Sociais. Da Crise do Escravismo ao Apogeu do Neoliberalismo* (Rio de Janeiro e São Paulo: Editora Record, 2000), 319-320.

permanent and works on the creation of a national identity that successfully brings all Brazilian classes into one collective image of this divided country.

CULTURAL ASPECTS

As mentioned before, the First Republic's cultural agenda was to continue the Imperial ideal of civilizing the Brazilian lower classes with the implementation of European values, more particularly the French. Since during the early 20th century France enjoyed a dominant position in the Western world, the Brazilian cultural elite, in total disconnection with their surroundings, learned French, played croquet, and dressed according to the latest fashions of Paris.[23]

Brazil's *Belle Époque* period was an exuberant tropical recreation of the late 19th century French model. The Brazilian oligarchy managed to not only live artistic lives, but also to extend it to several government projects. During that period there were massive landscaping projects in city of Rio de Janeiro, including the construction of its luxurious municipal theater and the pavilions for the 1920's world fair (Tabet, 1985). São Paulo, the country's new economic center, inaugurated its luxurious municipal theater in 1911 and several other monuments during the early 1920s (Reis 1994).

[23] For more in this topic see: Ana Maria Daou *A belle époque amazônica* (Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 2000); Marcia Camargos *Villa Kyrial: Crônica da Belle Époque Paulistana* (São Paulo: Editora Senac, 2000); Jeffrey D. Needell *A tropical belle époque: elite culture and society in turn-of-the-century* (Rio de Janeiro and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

São Paulo's oligarchy, in a quest for cultural affirmation and identification with European models of culture, influenced the education and output of several artists by selecting those who would receive scholarships to study abroad and by promoting those who would produce works according to pre-selected European standards. Since the First Republic, the federal and local government implemented artistic and cultural projects in São Paulo, notably the creation of a scholarship program for aspiring artists and the sponsorship of several art events such as expositions and lectures (Chiarelli 1995, 45-67).

These projects had the dual goal of providing education to São Paulo artists and developing the city as a cultural center. The scholarship program was designed to finance a trip to Europe for young artists who had exhausted their educational possibilities in Brazil. This program was funded by the state and controlled by the wealthy coffee baron Freitas Vale (Chiarelli 1995 and Camargos 2000). Expositions and lectures about arts were sponsored by a variety of other members of the São Paulo oligarchy. The expositions were arranged according to themes such as nationality (e.g. Italian, French and Spanish), styles and prominent Brazilian artists (1995, 60-63). Lectures about arts, with themes ranging from painting to architecture and music were hosted several oligarchy members, notably the Freitas Valle and the Prado families (2000, 186-187).

Chiarelli reasons that because the city was away from the support of the established cultural institutions located in Rio de Janeiro, and because São Paulo's elite had direct control over many other government functions, the elites

direct control over cultural production was seen as a matter of practicality (1995, 46). This mingling of personal interests and state money, as noted by many other authors in this document, was very typical of São Paulo's oligarchic regime (Coutinho 1990, Chiarelli 1995, Mendonça 1998, Camargos 2000, Miceli 2001, Viscardi 2001, Smith 2002). It is also important to note that São Paulo's elite saw its control over cultural production as a "duty to bring civility" to an "ignorant mass" as well as well as a way to assert the city as a cultural metropolis (2000, 27-33). Under this perspective it is understood here that The 1922 Week of Modern Art not more than a cultural event supported by São Paulo's First Republic's elite to satisfy its own needs of entertainment and its own cultural agenda.

THE 1922 WEEK OF MODERN ART

The Week of 1922 was already the second large-scale event promoted by Paulo Prado for the eleven years old Municipal Theatre. Two years earlier, Paulo Prado joined forces with of Freitas Valle, the largest art patron of São Paulo at that time, and the consul of France, to create an exposition of impressionist paintings and sculptures by Bourdelle, Rodin, and Laurens (Camargos 2000, 218). The Week of 1922 surpassed the French exposition by adding the fields of literature and music to the festivities.

As mentioned before, two distinct groups joined forces to create this event: the São Paulo oligarchy and a group of relatively young artists and intellectuals[24]. The seasoned diplomat Graça Aranha, also known as a writer and prosperous businessman, and the young and wealthy Oswald de Andrade, who was starting his career as a writer, were the leaders of these two distinct generations into the planning of the art event.

Graça Aranha was a good friend and business partner of Paulo Prado[25] and he also was a perpetual member of the Brazilian Letters Academy. Graça Aranha introduced the idea of the festival to Paulo Prado, took the privilege to give the opening lecture of the event, and participated in the festivities that immediately followed the 3-day festival (Amaral 1972, 118; Martins 1972, 316; Rezende 1993, 30-34; Boaventura 2000, 21-22; Camargos 2000, 218).

Oswald de Andrade was a financially independent writer and a caustic columnist. He was also, according to a very informative observation by Miceli, "... the most perfect incarnation of the lifestyle of the members of the modernist circle" (Miceli 2001, 96)[26]. Oswald de Andrade, the man responsible to gather

---

[24] The age discrepancy in between the two groups can be understood in the following way: The protagonists of the week were young people, on theirs 20s or 30s and the financiers were in theirs 50s or 60s. For example: Sérgio Millet was 23, Emiliano Cavalcanti, or Di Cavalcanti was 24, Guiomar Novaes and Victor Brecheret were 27, Mário de Andrade was 28, Menotti Del Picchia and Ronald de Carvalho were 29, Guilherme de Almeida was 31, Oswald de Andrade and Anita Malfatti were 32, and Heitor Villa-Lobos was 34. Paulo Prado and Graça Aranha, the two supporters who had direct contact with the protagonists were respectively 52 and 53 years old.

[25] During the early 1920s, according to the extensive research done by Martins, Graça Aranha was having an affair with Paulo Prado's sister and the two gentlemen had substantial deals in coffee transactions. Wilson Martins *The Modernist Idea: A Critical Survey of Brazilian Writing in the Twentieth Century* (New York: New York University Press, 1970), 316.

[26] Miceli's observation on Oswald de Andrade is so telling about the fantastic world that the Brazilian wealthy intellectuals lived, that I decide to put an extended quote in here: "The couple formed by the poet Oswald de Andrade and the painter Tarsila do Amaral is the most perfect incarnation of the life style of the members of the modernist circle. [They represented the] obsession for social ascension and the intention

several young intellectuals around this idea, participate in the second night's lecture and strongly supported the event through very aggressive newspaper's articles and columns (Boaventura 2000).

The São Paulo oligarchy was instrumental in helping to finance the rent of the theater, the payment for the musicians, and the expenses for the artists brought from Rio de Janeiro. Paulo Prado and his French wife Marinette shaped the event into a three-day festival mixing painting, architecture, sculpture, lectures on art, and music (Rezende 1993, 30-34).

The event itself happened from February 13th to 19th in São Paulo's Municipal Theater. Besides an exhibition, consisting of 19 architectural projects, 17 sculptures and 64 paintings, there were three night gala concerts, filled with lectures and chamber music performances.

The first festival, dedicated to Painting and Sculpture, took place on February 11 and it started with a lecture by Graça Aranha. His lecture, entitled "Aesthetic Emotion in Modern Art," was a romantic speech about the quality of the artists presented in that event. After Graça Aranha's lecture two chamber pieces composed by Villa-Lobos in 1916 were performed by a professional group of musicians brought from Rio de Janeiro by Villa-Lobos (Wisnik 1977). The

---

for intellectual supremacy. The fact that both of them belonged to wealthy oligarchy families, and could sustain themselves with capital from the São Paulo real state market (...), and the dividends from the coffee export, enabled them enough capital to impose themselves as exquisite models of consumption of both imported luxury items and imported cultural investments. During their successive trips to Europe, during the 1920s, they took to the last consequences an ostensive life-style where it is hard to separate what was intellectual endeavor from what was the adoption of imported symbols of social prestige. They attended shows of vanguard theatre, Russian ballets, nights at the diplomatic circles, conferences in Sorbonne, courses by modern painters, horse and car races, and box matches. They learned to swim, to dance the Charleston. They bought paintings by Léger, *art déco* objects, Perugia shoes, Sulka shirts, "apartment pajamas", Rosine perfumes, Martine furniture, Poiret dresses. [They had] audiences with the Pope, etc" Sergio Miceli *Intelectuais à Brasileira* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2001), 96-97.

Sonata II for violoncello and piano and the Second trio for violin, violoncello, and piano. Both pieces indicated the direct influences of the late Romanticism in Villa-Lobos's compositional style at that point in time. The second half of the first festival started with a lecture by Ronald de Carvalho entitled "The Modern Painting and Sculpture in Brazil". His lecture was also followed by four more pieces by Villa-Lobos. Ernani Braga performed three short works for piano solo, followed by an octet for strings, flute, clarinet, and piano. The newspaper *O Estado de São Paulo* mentioned that the octet, with themes based on traditional African dances, "contributed to the general success of the evening" (Martins 1970, 65-66).

The second festival took place on February 15 and it was dedicated to literature and poetry. It was also divided into two parts. Menotti Del Picchia, with the assistance of several poetry readers, did the opening lecture.[27] After that, Guiomar Novaes performed works by Blanchet, Villa-Lobos, and Debussy on the piano. On the second half, after a lecture done by Mário de Andrade during the intermission, Renato Almeida[28] gave a lecture on the meter of Portuguese poetry and Villa-Lobos had a set of songs and his thirds string quartet performed.

The final night, held on February 17, was called a festival of music and Villa-Lobos's compositions were the only attraction for that night. This particular night demonstrated the breadth and volume of Villa-Lobos's chamber music

[27] Oswaldo de Andrade, Luiz Aranha, Sérgio Milliet, Tácito de Almeida, Ribeiro Couto, Mário de Andrade, Plínio Salgado, and Agenor Barbosa.
[28] Renato Almeida (1895-1981) was the founder of the Brazilian Academy of Music and became one of the most important folklorists in Brazil.

compositions, as well as his transitional style. On the first half of the recital, the chamber group brought from Rio de Janeiro performed the Third Trio for violin, violoncello, and piano, and the Second Sonata for violin and piano. The tenor Mario Emma and Villa-Lobos's wife, Lucília Villa-Lobos, performed three songs based in a text in French by Ronald de Carvalho. All those pieces were composed in a post-Romantic style, with recognizable harmonic and melodic structures, and do not represent Villa-Lobos's mature style. The second half of the program reflected the composer's more advanced musical language. Ernani Braga performed three pieces for solo piano, and performed the piano role during the performance of the Symbolic Quartet for flute, saxophone, celesta, harp, and hidden chorus. Earlier on that day, Ronald de Carvalho had published an enthusiastic article in the *O Estado de São Paulo* defending Villa-Lobos's talent (Batista 1972, 303).

Festivities and social gatherings immediately followed the Week of Modern Art. The participants and the financial supporters wanted to celebrate the success of the event. The participants received substantial coverage in the newspapers and their works had been exhibited to an elite that was avidly seeking for symbols of self-identification. The financial supporters enjoyed a weeklong collage of visual arts, literacy, and music. Pictures from those festivities reveal the close ties between the participants and the supporters (Thiollier 1953, 47 and Camargos 2000, 193). They also reveal the kind of European culture being assimilated by the Brazilian elite, since identification with

the European fashion was considered a demonstration of social status and culture.

On the day after the event, the artists gathered for a banquet, sponsored by their patrons, at the hotel Terminus. On the Sunday after, they attended festivities at *Villa Kyrial*, Freitas Valle's mansion. Paulo Prado also hosted festivities in his mansion and in his field house in celebration of the new Brazilian artists. As a letter by Mário de Andrade to Menotti Del Picchia, published a week after the event in the *Correio Paulistano*, stated: "We finally obtained what we wanted, celebrity" (Bastazin 1992, 54).

Two weeks after the Week of Modern Art, Villa-Lobos and the other musical stars of the event (e.g. Ernani Braga and Guiomar Novaes) were invited to give two recitals under the patronage of the *Cultura Artística* association of São Paulo (Wisnik 1977, 91). Later on that same year, he and other artists, such as Victor Brecheret, Anita Malfatti, Di Cavalcanti, and Sergio Millet, were granted funding for educational and cultural trips to Paris. Those trips would last from one to two years and their renewal would be approved according to Freitas Valle's evaluation of their artistic progress (Camargos 2000, 161).

The celebration of the artists and intellectuals of the Week of Modern Art did not stop with concerts, scholarships to study in Europe, and parties. The artists were also constantly invited by São Paulo oligarchic circle to give lectures and guide symposiums about arts, music, literature, and philosophy. For example: the third cycle of conferences at *Villa Kyrial*, which started a month after

the Week of Modern Art, had a lecture from Mário de Andrade about Modernism and poetry. Miceli brings out some other examples of this relationship specially regarding to book publications:

> The first edition of five hundred books of Juca Mulato by Menotti de Picchia, the first edition of eight hundred books of Losango cáqui by Mário de Andrade, the Paris edition of Pau-brasil by Oswald de Andrade, were editorial publications financed by the own authors or their patrons, and had the ostensive characteristic of a luxury artesanal edition. These editions were clearly excluded from the large market (2001, 97).

This relationship of dependence between the young generation of intellectuals and artists and São Paulo's oligarchy lasted until the end of the First Republic. After that, São Paulo's coffee barons lost their financial supremacy and the intellectuals linked to the Week of Modern Art became participants in Getúlio Vargas regime's cultural and educational programs. A new relationship in between art and economic power was forged during the 1930s, and its consequences to the discourse about the 1922 Week of Modern Art will be explored in the next chapter.

For now, it is important to explore the first instances where the 1922 event became objectified and used to promote a particular agenda. These objectifications happened around the event itself and their effects are still noticeable into contemporary perceptions of that festival.

Thanks to Boaventura's extensive research on newspapers reports, articles, columns, and classified anonymous notes published around the 1922

Week of Modern Art, it is possible to observe the impact that this particular event had in the city of São Paulo's literary circles during those days (Boaventura 2000). It is also possible to observe how the young generation of intellectuals interpreted the importance of this event and used their influence in the newspapers, the only source of mass media until the advent of the radio in 1925, to deliver their point of view.

Several of the young intellectual participating in the event held writing and editorial positions in the local newspapers and magazines. Mário de Andrade had most of his articles published by *A Gazeta*, *O Echo*, and *A Cigarra*[29]. Menotti Del Picchia was the chief editor and had his own column in the *Correio Paulistano*, a pro-government newspaper owned by Antônio Prado Jr. – member of the financial committee of the Week. Oswald de Andrade, who already had previous experiences running satirical and artistic magazines,[30] had his articles published in a special column by the *Jornal do Commercio*, a conservative newspaper owned by Mario Guastini (Amaral 1972, 305).

Oswald de Andrade and Menotti Del Picchia were the first to attach meanings to the 1922 event. From days before the event took place, until the debate in the newspapers faded out, they argued that they were members of a "reactionary group of artists" fighting in a "revolution" or "intellectual war", defending a new version of *Futurismo*. Three days before the event took place

---

[29] During the 1930s Mário de Andrade wrote several musical critiques and articles for the *Diário de S. Paulo*. A collection of the articles published in between 1933 and 1935 reveals Andrade's dry and direct comments towards musicians who did not fit his musical tastes, as well as his agenda towards a Brazilian Nationalism. Paulo Castagna *Mário de Andrade: Música e Jornalismo – Diário de S. Paulo* (São Paulo: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo, 1993).

[30] Oswald de Andrade published a humorous periodical intitled *O Pirralho* that run from 1911 and 1918.

Oswald de Andrade published an article in the *Jornal do Commercio* anticipating that the event would be the "triumph of a revolution". He also mentioned in the same article that "a young and brave generation of artists", under the recent cultural leadership of Graça Aranha, had been together in this revolution since 1917 (Boaventura 2000, 49-52). On the day after the final presentation, he declares that the Week of Modern Art was a "victory" (2000, 107-109). Menotti Del Picchia, who mentioned several times – besides constant protest from his friend and mentor Mário de Andrade[31] – that the young group of intellectuals belonged to a São Paulo's version of the Italian *Futurismo*[32], wrote that the event would be the first "official appearance of the reactionary group of artists" (2000, 57-59). The day after the festival started, he declared that the "*Futurismo* ... will have its triumph in São Paulo" and that "everything is ready to make this Week a definitive mark in the history of thought in Brazil" (2000, 81-82). On the day of his on lecture, Menotti Del Picchia wrote in his column at the *Correio Paulistano* that

[31] Rubens Borba de Moras, a contemporary of Menotti Del Picchia and participant of the 1922 Week of Modern Art, testified about Picchia's lack if sync with the other young intellectuals: "He did not lack intelligence, he lacked culture, if not to say in a simple way, reading. He used to devore Marinetti and some other Italian poets, but he did not know, if not by hearing about, the contemporary French poetry and literature – very important influences in the genesis of the Brazilian Modernism movement. (...) He did not have a minimal critical formation. He used to cite contradictory authors in his articles, express wrong concepts, and crazy ideas. Everything mixed with correct and well-reasoned opinions. All this inflammatory writing used to make real modernists very worried. Mário de Andrade would be shocked, Gulherme de Almeida would laugh, and Sérgio Milliet would be scared. At Mário's house, were the modernist group would get together, a group that knew very well what it wanted and were it had its nose, we would be stunned with the concepts and theories expressed in articles signed by Hélios. (...) We used to appeal to Mário, his friend, to give some lessons about modernism to Menotti. I offered to lend some books, and Sérgio Milliet used to teach him some French. The long conversations that Mário had with him sometimes produced an instant improvement in his articles. But the poet did not have good memory, he would forget everything and kept on confusing Marcel Proust and Marinetti" Aracy Amaral *Artes Plásticas na Semana de 22.* (Brasília: Editora Perspectiva, 1972), 307-308.

[32] It is interesting to note that when René Thiollier rented the São Paulo Municipal Theater for the 1922 Week of Modern Art, he received a receipt for the "Week of Futuristic Art". This ironic fact demonstrates that the confusion about the name of that particular event was widespread among its own organizers. René Thiollier *Depoimento inédito sobre a "Semana de Arte Moderna"* Revista Habitat, no.12 (São Paulo: Habitat Editora LTDA, 1953), 44.

the week was a "battle to be won by the modernists" (2000, 88). On the day after his lecture he declared in the same column: "it was a night of glory and war" (2000, 97-99).

At the same time that these two individuals were generating a combative characteristic to an art festival, they were also antagonizing the cultural establishment in São Paulo. For instance, on February 12 – the day after the opening festival – Oswald de Andrade published an article in the *Jornal do Commercio* stating that Carlos Gomes, the previously mentioned Brazilian composer who wrote operas rivaling Verdi's success in Italy, was a "terrible composer" (2000, 77).

The combination of Oswald de Andrade and Menotti Del Picchia's articles generated an impressive response from several well-established critics and writers such as Oscar Guanabarino, Monteiro Lobato, Galeão Coutinho[33], and Lima Barreto[34] (Chiarelli 1995, 69 and Boaventura 2000, 24, 79, 283-298, 323-324). These literary debates ranged from "militant critique", using a term forged by Chiarelli to describe articles intended to "decisively intervene in the artistic-cultural scene" (Chiarelli 1995, 70), to outright personal insults. They also fostered the impression of a small "revolutionary group" (i.e. two or three young writers) fighting against a defensive cultural establishment.

As discussed in the previous chapter, Trouillot stated that one of the four crucial points were a narrative is changed through time is the making of *sources*.

[33] Galeão Coutinho was a well know literary critic and chief editor at the *A Gazeta*.
[34] Lima Barreto (1881-1922) is considered one of the most significant romance authors about the urban reality in Brazil.

As seen in the above paragraphs, Oswald de Andrade and Menotti Del Picchia were actively producing a 'revolutionary' narrative for the 1922 Week of Modern Art, and therefore creating a new source of information regarding the event. It is important to note that this parallel version of the art event contradicted all important newspaper reports of the time. For instance, four news reports[35] published on February 16, 1922 in the *Folha da Noite*, *Jornal do Commercio*, *O Estado de São Paulo*, and *O Correio Paulistano*, stated very similar accounts regarding minor disruptions during the performances of the previous night. All reports stated that the event was a success thanks to the musical numbers, specially the participation of the famous pianist Guiomar Novaes (Boaventura 2000, 441, 443-444, 446, 447-449). Nonetheless, since these two intellectuals were participating in the event that they were also writing about, their first hand narrative became an uncontested source of information for some later accounts on the event. This 'revolutionary' narrative resonated with some other participants of the event, who created fantastic recounts of their own perceptions of the festival.

Perhaps one of the most interesting recounts based on this parallel reality is the one written by Raul Bopp. He wrote that there were several interruptions from the audience in the first night and that there was an entire orchestra, with several exotic percussion instruments on the second night. On that particular show, according to Bopp, the performances had to be halted for fifteen minutes

[35] These impartial reports were, as explained by Chiarelli, "critiques of services" that, although anonymous, they reflected the opinion of those responsible for the entire newspapers publication. Tadeu Chiarelli *Um Jeca nos Vernissages* (SãoPaulo: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo, 1995), 71.

due to severe disruptions from the "rioting audience" (Bopp 1966, 18-24). Because Raul Bopp became an active participant in the Brazilian literary Modernism (e. g. he was the main editor of the *Revista de Atropofagia* – a literary magazine that promoted the assimilation of any literary idea into a Brazilian style) and because he had substantial political influence among the literary circles (i. e. he was appointed diplomat in 1932 and ambassador in 1954 – both appointments happening during the Vargas regime), his descriptions of the facts and his weight on the importance of the 1922 event caused a change in the historical narrative in two different points: the "making of source" and the "making of history". In other words: Raul Bopp's 1966 version of the 1922 event became a primary source and a retrospective interpretation at the same time. As we will explore in the next chapters, the 'revolutionary' narrative will prevail for several decades on all recounts on the importance of the 1922 Week of Modern Art. We will also explore the fact that Bopp's narrative was not the first one to revisit that moment in Brazilian art history and change its significance. Mário de Andrade, who during the period surrounding the 1922 event, spent most of his time writing articles defending the week of modern art as an event separated from the aesthetics proposed by the Italian *Futurismo*, would twenty years later come back to that same topic and create a new significance to be attached to it. In 1942, The Week of Modern Art, by the power of one of its main participants transform itself again, from an eclectic art festival that became a revolution, to the event that gave birth of nationalism in Brazil.

CHAPTER III: THE IDEAL HISTORY

Todo artista brasileiro que no momento atual fizer arte brasileira é um ser eficiente com valor humano. O que fizer arte internacional ou estrangeira, se não for gênio, é um inútil, um nulo. E é uma reverendíssima besta.

(Every Brazilian artist who, during the actual moment, makes Brazilian art is an efficient being with human value. Any other who makes international or foreign art, if not a genius, is useless, a null. And he is also a solemn ass.)

Mário de Andrade, 1928

Chapter III focus on the crystallization process of a nationalistic narrative about the 1922 Week of Modern Art. As we have observed in the previous chapter, the 1922 event was transformed from a weeklong festival of modern art into a 'revolutionary' event. That transformation was done largely by two of its own participants: Menotti Del Picchia and Oswald de Andrade. In this chapter however, we will observe that the same 1922 event was transformed again. From the 1940s on the weeklong festival was regarded as the pivot point of the nationalism in Brazilian art. This new transformation was due largely to the influence of another of the participants of the original festival: Mário de Andrade.

This chapter is divide into three main parts: the first part is an overview of the period in between Getúlio Vargas and Juscelino Kubitschek's presidencies; the second part is an analysis of Villa-Lobos's and Mário de Andrade's direct participation in Brazil's cultural and educational policies; the final part is an analysis of the transformation of the 1922 event's significance.

Historical Perspective

During the thirty-year that followed the 1930 revolution, Brazil was governed by two of its most famous presidents: Getúlio Vargas (1930-1945 and 1951-1954) and Juscelino Kubitschek (1956-1961). The Vargas days were characterized by the organization of the work force, nationalization of industry, and a valorization of a Brazilian ethnicity.[36] The Kubitschek government was characterized by economic prosperity and urban development. As Marcelo Ridenti states about 1958: "Those were the *golden years"* (Ridenti 2000, 370).

Vargas came into power by a revolution that ended the previously observed First Republic. According to Boris Fausto: "Brazil's revolutionary movement of the 1930's is part of a framework of general instability brought about by the worldwide crisis of 1929". (Fausto 1999, 194). Although the dynamics of the revolution are not the focus of this text, the social changes are relevant.

[36] For more information about the industrial development during that period, check Boris Faust *A Concise History of Brazil* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 234-235.

> Beginning in 1930, an exchange of elites took place. The traditional oligarchies fell from power. Their place was taken by military men, technocrats, young politicians, and, a little later, by industrialists". The 1930 victors early on attended to the problem of education. Their main objective was to create a wider, better-trained elite. Attempts at educational reform had begun during the 1920s. They were carried out on the state level, which was consistent with the image of a federal republic. Beginning in the 1930s, measures intended to create a system of schools and to support education took a different direction and emanated from the center toward the periphery. Education was also brought into line with the leader's centralizing vision. The first manifesto of educational centralization was the creation of the Ministry of Education and Health, in November 1930 (1999, 202).

The Vargas regime not only promoted, but also kept the popular music manifestations under constant control. As Fausto points out:

> The authorities set the criteria for judging the annual contests and placed limitations on the themes that costumes, songs, and floats could convey. One of the early regulations limited presentations to events or personalities drawn from Brazilian history. In 1939 a school that had selected "Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs" for its theme suffered the indignity of disqualification (1999, 476-477).

Vargas was also using popular music like *samba* and *chôro* as a tool for international promotion of the new Brazilian identity. A clear example of this political strategy was the use of Carmen Miranda, and her group, as artistic members of the presidential committee during his trips in South America in 1935 (Tinhorão 1998, 300).

Control over cultural and popular manifestations is also noted in the 1937 Constitution, the document that started the *Estado Novo*. That document, created by Vargas to overcome political unrest, allowed state censorship of the press, cinema, and radio. It also had ideological positions like the indissolubility of marriage and compulsory elementary education (Bello 1966, 299).

The *Estado Novo*, with its fascist propaganda machine, and its strong social and labor programs was well supported by the general population. This autocratic government was also able to fence of the "federation of oligarchies" until the end of the World War II. After that, due to mounting pressures from the United States government and dissatisfaction from the Brazilian elite with a government that was leaning towards establishment of agreements with the USSR, the *Estado Novo* quickly lost its viability. In 1945 Vargas, the so-called "father of the poor", was overthrown by his own cabinet. Later on the same year elections were held and Eurico Gaspar Dutra, a general who was Vargas's Minister of War from 1934 and who supported the 1937 *Estado Novo*, won the general elections for president (Page 2000, 205-207).

Dutra's term was marked by a more liberal constitution, with provisions like the right and obligation to vote, direct elections for president every five years, and equal political rights for men and women.[37] His change of economic policy, from a state intervention model to a liberal model, guided by a group of economic experts from Brazil and the United States, was a social and economic disaster.

[37] Pressures from the Catholic church and conservative segments of the society still kept marriage indissoluble.

He slowed down the process of industrialization and opened Brazil to a flood of manufactured goods imported from abroad. As a result, the country's gold and foreign exchange reserves dwindled and prices rose. Labor unrest, inevitable under the circumstances, was severely repressed, and the government ousted a number of militant union officials (Page 1995, 207).

As part of its strategy to weaken the voice of the opposition, Dutra's government reversed the state support to workers' unions, and outlawed the Communist Party. It is important to note that both the unions and the Communist Party, which at that time was the fourth largest party with almost 200,000 members, were strongly against the new liberal policies (Faust 1999, 240).

In a cultural level, these changes brought an influence of expressions into the Brazilian society. As Tinhorão explains, *The Office of Coordination of Inter-American Affairs*, under the control of Nelson Rockefeller, spent U$140,000,000 to promote the "American way of life" in South America. This promotion consisted of Hollywood movies with Latin American themes or actors and the association of *foxtrot, blues, swing,* and *boogie-woogie* with the Latin rhythms of *rumba, conga, bolero,* and *samba* (Tinhorão 1998, 301).

This influence is also noticed the state owned national radio, or *Rádio Nacional.* By the late 1940s it had more than 150 musicians, 90 singers, and 15 conductors on its payroll, and the ratio of broadcasting international music versus Brazilian music was 3 to 1. Ruy Castro, in a captivating book about the birth of

the *Bossa Nova*[38], asserts that the *Rádio Nacional* was the "biggest rhythmic democracy in the world" (Castro 1999, 61).

Due to the disastrous economic and social policies of Dutra's regime, Vargas was elected to the presidency in 1951. He brought back his ideals of industrial nationalization and a state controlled economy, but encountered strong opposition from sections of the military, congress, and the new industrial elite. At the same time, Vargas was receiving constant pressure from the labor associations who helped him win the elections.

A political magician adept at compromise and balancing the demands of various constituencies, Vargas found himself unable to make headway against the country's economic ills. The real wages of workers had actually dropped during the Dutra years, and now spiraling inflation served to exacerbate social tensions. The president had to loosen the government's hold on the unions, but this permitted Communists and left-wing radicals to assume positions of leadership within the labor movement, and intensified agitation for wage increases (1995, 207). The political conflict reached a climax with Vargas's suicide near the end of his term. Café Filho, his vice president, took office until the next elections. Juscelino Kubitschek, also known as JK, was elected as the new president and took office in 1956.

---

[38] The bossa-nova movement as a Rio de Janeiro urban phenomenon is the topic of several studies about Brazilian popular music. Augusto Campos *Balanço da Bossa e outras bossas* (São Paulo: Editora Perspectiva, 1968); Claus Schreiner *Música Brasileira, A History of Popular Music and the people of Brasil* (London: Marion Boyars, 1993); James Woodall *A Simple Brazilian Song, Journeys Through the Rio Sound* (London: Little, Brown and Company, 1997); José Ramos Tinhorão *História Social da Música Popular Brasileira* (São Paulo: Editora 34, 1998); Ruy Castro *Chega de Saudade, A História e Histórias da Bossa-Nova* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1999)

Kubitscheck's economic development platform, with the slogan: "Fifty years in five," set him apart from his predecessor. He was elected by a small margin of votes and had João Goulart, Vargas's Minister of Labor, elected as his vice-president.[39] A series of exceptional measures involving an unsuccessful military coup and a Congress intervention guaranteed Kubitschek and Goulart's inauguration.

The JK administration promoted widespread state intervention in infrastructure and in supplying direct aid to industry. But it also sought to attract foreign capital, offering it special incentives as well. Nationalist ideology lost ground to development. Kubitschek's Program of Goals produced impressive results, especially in the industrial sector. Between 1955 and 1961, revenue from industrial production, in inflation-adjusted terms, increased by 80 percent. Steel production increased 100 percent, the production of machinery 125 percent, electricity and communications 380 percent, and transportation material 600 percent. Between 1957 and 1961, Brazil's GDP grew at a yearly rate of 7 percent, which corresponded to a per capita rate of almost 4 percent. Considering the 1950s as a whole, the GDP per capita growth in Brazil was approximately three times larger than the rest of Latin American countries combined (1995, 256).

The culmination of Kubitscheck's golden years was the construction of Brasília. The airplane shaped new Federal Capital was designed by Oscar Niemeyer and built on a plateau in the geographic center of Brazil. Kubitschek

[39] During that period, president and vice-president were elected separately.

commissioned a new symphony to be performed on the day of the capital's inauguration, April 21st, 1960; Antonio Carlos Jobim was chosen to be the composer. The five-movement work has been performed only twice, and it was his last "classical" composition (Jobim 2000, 58). The choice of Jobim, author of phenomenal *Bossa Novas* successes like *Chega de Saudade* and *Garota de Ipanema*, reveals that JK, like his predecessors, was very aware of the importance of popular icons.

The social and political climate at the end of the JK period was very positive. As James Woodall describes: "Bossa nova now hummed as a background noise to nationwide experimentation: the daring films of Brazilian *cinema novo* and the unfolding adventure of Oscar Niemeyer's Brasília were emblems of inspiration for any young artist at the time" (Woodwall 1997, 88).

Political Connections

After Vargas's regime stabilized in power and took control of the economic and cultural institutions, some artists previously involved in the 1922 Week of Modern Art became active agents of the government cultural machine. For instance, Mário de Andrade and Villa-Lobos had an instrumental participation in giving the cultural and musical face to some of the Brazilian nationalistic programs, and Menotti Del Picchia, working in Vargas's cabinet, set the political patriotic tone for government actions.

Villa-Lobos had the significant participation in the newly centralized educational system. He was the most well known composer from South America, and according to studies about Brazilian Music done during that period, he was "counted among the half-dozen leading creative musicians of the Western Hemisphere" (Luper 1943, 9). Tinhorão recognizes a conversion of ideals in between Getúlio Vargas and Villa-Lobos: they shared a similar vision of nationalism based on the use of folklore as a seed to foster cultural mass identification (Tinhorão 1998, 290 and 302). Vargas and Villa-Lobos also had a symbiotic relationship: with Villa-Lobos's participation the *Vargas Regime* gained a much needed artistic depth, and thanks to the national exposure and government commissions, the brilliant self-taught nationalistic composer was able to produce an enormous output of music.

In 1932 Vargas appointed Villa-Lobos as National Supervisor for Music Education. During that period the composer worked on four fronts. He 1) wrote a practical guide to harmonizing folkloric tunes, edited a book about the nationalistic music of the Vargas government, and composed a substantial amount of choir music based on Brazilian themes; 2) organized massive patriotic choir demonstrations that reached a peak when there was a gathering of forty thousand singers in 1940; 3) represented Brazil in international musical education symposiums; and 4) created music conservatories and the *Brazilian Academy of Music* (Béhague 1979, 203; Horta 1987, 83-84; Tinhorão 1998, 302). Although it seems, from the above descriptions of Villa-Lobos activities, that the

Vargas regime's educational plan was a copy of Franco and Mussolini's experiments in Spain and Italy, Boris Fausto points that the Vargas educational plan "never became an instrument of fascist indoctrination [but it was] imbued with a mixture of hierarchical values and Catholic conservatism" (Fausto 1999, 202).

Vargas's populist and conservative regime was not limited by the musical visions of Villa-Lobos. As Joseph A. Page observes:

> At a time when modern technology, in the forms of radio, phonograph, and phonograph record, was rescuing the samba from disrepute and was converting it into a national craze, the regime of President Getúlio Vargas decided to promote the samba schools from their position on the fringes of Carnival and to make them bona fide participants in the annual affair, a decision consistent with the myth of racial democracy that the government was promoting. In 1932 the first official samba-school competition was one of the events of the Carnival celebration. This was the beginning of a tradition that continues to the present day" (1995, 476).

Vargas was using popular music like *samba* and *chôro* as a tool for international promotion of a new Brazilian identity. A clear example of this political strategy was the use of Carmen Miranda, and her group, as artistic members of the presidential committee during his trips in South America in 1935 (Tinhorão 1998, 300).

If Villa-Lobos was not the only producer of a national musical identity for the Vargas regime, the regime was not Villa-Lobos's sole source of income. Although the brilliant composer received important commissions and support

from the Brazilian Federal Government, he was also enjoying a successful career as an internationally sought conductor and composer. From 1944, until the end of his life, Villa-Lobos did yearly tours in France and The United States, where he premiered and conducted recordings of his major works, with ensembles such as the French National Radio Orchestra and the Boston Symphony (Horta 1987, 75-87).

Mário de Andrade, labeled by Miceli as "the poor cousin" of the intellectuals because of his middle class background, exercised an important cultural leadership during the Vargas regime. Andrade joined the *Partido Democratico* in 1928 and he was considered no more than a "prestigious intellectual advisor" with no political ambitions (2001, 102-104). Perhaps indirect participation in the contorted political process of the 1930s allowed Mário de Andrade to successfully contribute to the Vargas regime massive cultural projects. His participation in Vargas's cultural plans was shorter than Villa-Lobos's engagement; nonetheless it had long lasting repercussions.

In 1935 Andrade became director of São Paulo's Municipal Cultural Department, and for three years he conducted an "enormous volume of ethnographic work" (Mariz 1983, 34-35). As Miceli explains, the creation of this cultural department was part the São Paulo's oligarchic participation, mainly those associated with the *Partido Democratico*, in the new regime. Their goal

was to educate a new specialized work force in politics and cultural programs[40] (Miceli 2001, 100-102). In 1937, when Getúlio Vargas instated the totalitarian *Estado Novo*, many positions of cultural leadership were replaced, including the director of São Paulo's Municipal Cultural Department. According to Mariz, shortly after Mário de Andrade was fired from his post, researches on Brazilian folklore were put on hold (Mariz 1983, 35). Although Andrade's tenure was short lived, his ethnographic work, which included videos, recordings, and transcriptions, became the main source of melodic and rhythmic ideas used by the nationalistic school of composition led by Camargo Guarnieri (Verhaalen 2001).

In 1936 Gustavo Capanema, Vargas's young and energetic Minister of Culture, requested that his friend Mário de Andrade "draft a preliminary study for a federal agency responsible for the classification, protection, and administration of Brazil's historical and artistic heritage" (Williams 2001, 98-99). Andrade's draft, after minor revisions by Capanema and the Brazilian congress, eventually became law in 1937 by force of the *Estado Novo* totalitarian constitution. The *Serviço do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional* or *SPHAN* was the "brainchild of modernists and their allies," reflecting a preference towards "Luso-Catholic" traditions. It also enabled the state to "[fortify] its claim to managing the

[40] This plan also included the creation of the *School of Sociology and Politics*, *The College of Philosophy, Science, and Arts* inside the already existent *University of São Paulo*. Sergio Miceli *Intelectuais à Brasileira* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2001), 101.

nation's identity by managing the national heritage" (Williams 2001, 103, 105, and 134).[41]

For the argument of in this thesis, Mário de Andrade's most relevant contribution to the Vargas regime was the creation of a new Art Curriculum for the *Universidade do Distrito Federal*.[42] In this task, also requested by the Minister Capanema, Mário de Andrade developed a new curriculum that attempted to educate artists on their "social purpose" according to a new "Brazilian reality". Andrade's new curriculum also discouraged "artistic virtuosity", for considering it a "residue from Romanticism" (Moraes 1999, 42). This particular contribution is important here because it exemplifies how the intellectual pianist would put in practice his thinking about Brazilian art as a cultural activity to engage the artists and audience around the topic Brazilian culture and nationalism rather than art as entertainment.

Despite the fact Mário de Andrade lost his position as director of São Paulo's Municipal Cultural Department, he still used his intellectual dominance and political connections to push his agenda on all cultural activities sponsored by the Vargas regime. Since the 1920s Andrade frequented periodical cultural meetings hosted by members of São Paulo's oligarchy, and through out most the 1930s he to hosted his own version of those intellectual gatherings. During a conference given at the library of the Ministry of International Relations in 1942,

---

[41] Williams has an extensive and very interesting explanation on how the *SPHAN* came to life and how it was used by the Vargas's regime. Daryle Williams *Culture Wars in Brazil: The First Vargas Regime, 1930-1945* (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2001), 97-134.

[42] The University of the Federal District was created in 1935.

Andrade described some of these lavish meetings and highlighted their importance in spreading the "modernistic movement's destructive spirit" (Andrade 1942, 34-39). It is important to notice that Mário de Andrade tried to strength the combative and rebellious aura around the 1920s modernistic movement by mentioning that no wealthy patron had hosted the modernists (1942, 41). In fact, as Camargos demonstrated in her research, Mário de Andrade and several of the self-titled modernists gave lectures and frequently attended the highly elaborated cultural meetings hosted by conservative oligarchic members such as Freitas Valle (Camargos 2000). Mário de Andrade's cultural meetings, although less pompous than his predecessors, were important to a young generation of intellectuals. Camargo Guarnieri, a composer who was strongly influenced by Mário de Andrade,[43] described those meetings on the following way: "The little house at Lopes Chaves' street was as much agitated as a beehive. There were discussions about sociology, philosophy, art, and the devil! For me, that was the same as attending lectures in a university" (Guarnieri 1935, 15).

Mário de Andrade's close connection to the First Republic oligarchy and later own to the top levels of the *Estado Novo* was politically useful to promote his agenda and endured by the intellectual as a necessary burden. As Pedro Nava illustrated in his memoirs about the modernists' trip to the state of Minas Gerais, Mário de Andrade constantly complained to his closest friends about

[43] The correspondence in between Mário de Andrade and Camargo Guarnieri exemplify instances where the intellectual makes extensive critiques on the young composer's style, guiding him towards a modern take on nationalism. It also exemplify Mário de Andrade's political influence in helping Guarnieri obtain commissions and financial support from the government. Flávio Silva *Camargo Guarnieri: O Tempo e a Música* (Rio de Janeiro: Funarte, 2001), 197-314.

having to be surrounded by extremely wealthy people (Nava 1978, 203-204). Camargos brings another example from a letter written by Mário de Andrade to Anita Malfatti. In that letter Andrade instructs Malfatti to accept a scholarship provided by Freitas Valle and release from his influence of money only when possible (Camargos 2000, 189). This uncomfortable relationship in between Mário de Andrade and his wealthy patrons lasted throughout the transitional period in between the First Republic and the *Estado Novo*. Later on, it was replaced by indirect participation inside the Vargas totalitarian regime and extensive activities as newspaper critic and academic. As it was clearly described by Williams, the intellectuals who shared the same view as Mário de Andrade "used the state apparatus to manage culture and guarantee a certain degree of institutional patronage and aesthetic freedom (...) they used the authoritarian *Estado Novo* to transform a regional variant of the modernist movement into a national project" (Williams 2001, 81).

The 1922 Week of Modern Art as The Birth Place of Nationalism

Eduardo Jardim de Moraes, in a study about the aesthetic limitations on the Brazilian Modernism, noticed that Mário de Andrade had been writing about art and its role in society since the early 1920s (Moraes 1999, 45). He also noticed the infiltration of a nationalistic agenda into Andrade's writings since the late 1920s (Moraes 1999, 116). In fact, one of the first documents where Mário

de Andrade articulates a strong and consistent defense towards nationalism is his 1928 *Ensaio sobre a Música Brasileira*. In that particular essay Andrade proposed the direct observation, research, and assimilation of the folk and popular genres of music into a new form of Brazilian classical music (Andrade 1962, 17 and 24). As Béhague summarizes:

> Perhaps one of the most crucial principles of Andrade's ideology for musical nationalism as an aesthetic system, comprised not only of the advocacy of proper utilization (i.e. without intention of "exoticism") of authentic folk and popular musical sources, but also the natural assimilation of these sources. Thus, the created works result from the free invention of the composer, endowed with the character and quality of national music, in a sort of unconscious nationalism (Béhague 1994, 15).

Béhague's characterization of Andrade's idea to create an "unconscious nationalism" required the treatment of folklore as an object to be developed into something else. This process is understood here, as discussed in Chapter I, as objectification of culture, and I believe that it was a tactical move by the modernists to promote nationalism in Brazil.

Mário de Andrade's interest in the question of nationalism can be attributed to many factors, including the spread of 20th century nationalistic fervor in Europe (e.g. Italy, Germany, and Spain), and the influence of other contemporary writers who, according to Franklin de Oliveira, had been doing serious works about Brazilian culture for several years (Franklyn 1993 29-31).[44]

[44] Franklin cites works on Brazilian black population by Nina Rodrigues, on the *sertanejo* (Northeast countryman) by Euclydes da Cunha, on the native population by Roquette-Pinto, on the marginalized

It is interesting to notice that Mário de Andrade and other modernists referred their sudden devotion to Brazilian culture to the influence of a specific individual: the Swiss-French poet Blaise Cendrars (Amaral 1997, Martins 1992, Nava 1978, and Broca 1952).

Blaise Cendrars was a "poet of vanguard" who was living in Paris and was admired by the Brazilian intellectuals linked to the 1922 Week of Modern Art (Martins 1992, 980). In 1923 Oswald de Andrade visited the Cendrars in Paris. Andrade introduced the Swiss-French poet to Paulo Prado, who developed a close friendship to the poet and became the main sponsor of Cendrars's trips to Brazil. As Amaral stated in a study about Cendrars's trips to Brazil and his relationships with the "modernists", Prado's mansion became Cendrars "house" in São Paulo (Amaral 1997, 107).

Cendrars came to Brazil three times: in 1924, 1926, and 1927 (Martins 1992, 980). During those visits Cendrars presented lectures about Modern French Art, visited the coffee barons urban palaces in São Paulo and plantation homes in the countryside, had audiences with government representatives, had articles about his stay published in the magazines and newspapers, and did some tourism around Brazil. It is important to notice that all those diverse activities had the direct participation of a small group of individuals: members of

---

countrymen by Monteiro Lobato, and on the marginalized urban population by Lima Barreto and Enéas Ferras. Contemporary to the modernists, Franklin cites the following significant writers: José Américo de Almeida, Rachel de Queiroz, José Lins do Rego, Graciliano Ramos, Amando Fontes, José Geraldo Vieira. Finally, Franklin cites the following authors of human sciences: Arthur Ramos, Edson Carneiro, Manuel Diegues Junior, Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Octávio Ianni, Luís Vianna Filho, Maurício Goulart, Rogr Bastide, Perre Verger, Florestan Fernandes, L. A. Costa Pinto, Nunes Pereira, Hermes Lima, and Porto Carrero. Franklin de Oliveira *A Semana de Arte Moderna na contramão da História e Outros Ensaios* (Rio de Janeiro: Topbooks, 1993), 30.

the São Paulo oligarchy, notably Paulo Prado and Olívia Guedes Penteado, and some of the intellectuals who participated in the 1922 Week of Modern Art, notably Mário de Andrade and Oswald de Andrade. As mentioned in the previous chapters, during the First Republic the coffee barons controlled the Brazilian government, owned the newspapers, and hosted art related events in their periodical social gatherings.

Since the first meeting with the group of young intellectuals Blaise Cendrars was taken by their European manners (i.e. dressed according to the latest fashions in Europe, fluent in several languages), and their eagerness to be up to date with the newest artistic trends elsewhere (Martins 1992, 983-984). Cendrars was equally impressed about Brazil's diverse culture and beautiful geography. His curiosity towards Brazil was so intense that his hosts took him, and a select group of intellectuals, on a tour around the country. In 1924, he saw Rio de Janeiro during the carnival and São João Del Rei during Easter (Eulalio 1978, 97-115).

Cendrars curiosity and amazement towards all he was seeing had inspiring and everlasting effects around those who followed him. Brito Broca, in an article of significant influence on studies about this particular trip, noticed that Cendrars was not the only person to be amazed. Broca pointed out that the modernists lived in a world so disconnected to the Brazilian reality that the Baroque scenery of the historic sites in Minas Gerais was something "new and original" not only to the French poet, but also to the young intellectuals (Broca

1952, 198). Martins asserted that during the trip to historical cities in Minas Gerais, "Cendrars legitimized, to the eyes of the Modernists, an interest to the traditional Brazil, an interest that had been rejected. Cendrars offered a Parisian endorsement to feelings and values that the Brazilians have been trying to hide or openly deject" (Martins 1992, 984). Thus, a seed of nationalism had been successfully planted in Brazilian modernism.

Blaise Cendrars's influence was so significant that immediately after the trip to Rio de Janeiro, Oswald de Andrade created the movement *Pau-Brasil*,[45] and two years later he created the *Movimento Antropófago*. Mário de Andrade wrote his romance *Macunaíma* in 1926, started a substantial ethnographic work on Brazilian folklore, and in 1928 he published *Ensaio Sobre a Música Brasileira*, where he declared that nationalism is part of a natural progression in Brazilian music (Andrade, 1928). At this point it is possible to observe that the modernists, especially Mário de Andrade, changed their perspectives on modern art in Brazil – from a proposition to update Brazilian art according the latest European models, to nationalism. This embracement towards nationalism had profound effects on how Mário de Andrade reviewed the significance of the 1922 Week of Modern Art.

Because Mário de Andrade was one of the participants in the 1922 event, his historical revision is considered here as a "making of a source" (cf. Trouillot 1995). Andrade created two new facts to be attached to that event when he, in

[45] Brazil-wood, is red color hard-wood that became Brazil's first export. The color of that wood, similar to is the color of burning coals, or braise, originated the name Brazil.

the previously mentioned 1942 conference held at the library of the Ministry of International Relations, portrayed the 1922 Week of Modern Art as (1) the starting point of Brazilian consciousness and (2) its members as the precursors of the 1930s revolution (Andrade 1942, 13-14 and 42-44).

Although Mário de Andrade's claims were clearly exaggerated, they were made at a particular moment in Brazilian history when nationalism and patriotism were in full force. The *Estado Novo*, with the conviction that the management of culture was a state duty, had been directly administrating libraries and museums, controlling the airwaves and press through the secretary of press and propaganda, and creating a national patrimony through the possession and restoration of selected historical sites. Williams pointed out that the *Estado Novo* was also exporting, through its participation in international expositions and world fairs, the idea of a "hegemonic national culture in full possession of its facilities" (Williams 2001, 192). Andrade's historical revision on the importance of the 1922 Week of Modern Art had an audience very willing to accept such 'positive' and glorious perspective.

As it is explored in the following chapter, both new 'facts' (the Week as birth of nationalism and its members as precursors of the 1930s revolution) had profound resonance in future writings about Brazilian art and political history. Other actors entered the process in the "making of narratives" stage and their narratives interpreted the 1930s revolution as an intellectual revolution rather than an oligarchic reaction to popular revolts, and boosted the profile of several

of the young intellectuals who participated in the 1922, as creators of a nationalistic Modernism. For example: in 1952, in a government sponsored 30th anniversary celebration of the 1922 Week of Modern Art, Getúlio Vargas, now a democratically elected president, gave a speech completely adopting Mário de Andrade's historical revision regarding the 1930s revolution (Duclós 1989). It was the establishment's approval of a historical reconstruction created by the intellectual elite. As it is explored in the next chapter, this new version of the event receives its "consecration" in the 1970s, during the "most perverse military dictatorship" period in Brazil history (Oliveira 1993, 11).

CHAPTER IV: THE WEEK OF MODERN ART ON CONTESTED GROUND

Eu creio que os modernistas da Semana de Arte Moderna não devemos servir de exemplo a ninguém. Mas podemos servir de lição. [...] E apesar da nossa atualidade, da nossa nacionalidade, da nossa universalidade, duma coisa não participamos: o amilhoramento político-social do homem. E esta é a essência mesma da nossa idade.

(I believe that we, as the Week of Modern Art modernists, cannot be used as a guide to anyone. But we can be used as a lesson. [...] Despite our contemporarily, our Nationalism, and our universality, we did not participate in one thing: in the socio-political improvement of mankind. And this is the essence of our time)

Mário de Andrade, 1942

This chapter is focused in the study of the "making of history" regarding the 1922 Week of Modern Art.[46] The "making of history" stage happened during the period in between 1964 and 1985, when Brazil was governed by the military. During that period several retrospective materials regarding the 1922 art event were published solidifying the changes in narrative done at the source by Menotti Del Picchia, Oswald de Andrade, and Mário de Andrade. During those years,

[46] As explained in chapter 1, "making of history" is a change of historical narrative that happens during the process of "retrospective significance." Michel-Rolph Trouillot *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1995), 26.

notably in 1972 – the year the "Week" celebrated its 50-year anniversary, the Brazilian academia seemed to be settled on the notion that nationalism in Brazil had a exact starting point in 1922, and that those modernists were also political revolutionaries.

An overview of Brazil's experience with military regime proceeds an analysis of some of the narratives published during that period. This overview explores how the military took control over the government after eighteen years of democracy, and how interested the military regime was in reinstating the *Estado Novo*'s plans on cultural management. The analysis of narratives published during that period focuses on the meanings attached to the 1922 art event. The goal of this analyses is to bring out the 'silences' produced by the transformation of a particular event in Brazilian history.

Historical Overview

In 1964 a military coup, with the support of the United States, toppled João Goulart's presidency. João Goulart, a fomer Minister of Labor during Vargas's last presidency, had a socialist agenda that did not agreed with the US division of the world against the communist block. Goulart's search for a Third World alliance, ignoring the cold war power struggle, caused a loss of financial support from the US and was an eventual catalyst for a military intervention (Smith 2000, 193-194). Goulart's plans, including proposals to do "nationalize all private oil

refineries, expropriate vast amounts of underutilized land," and give amnesty to militaries who were on strike caused major concerns among the Brazilian elite and the top brass (Page 1995, 212). As Sonny Davis research on military relationship in between Brazil and the US points out, conservative Brazilian politicians and sections of the military had met with American CIA representatives since 1963 to discuss plans to overthrow Goulart's presidency (Davis 1996, 179-180).

Massive demonstrations took place in March of 1964. Goulart himself, with support from labor unions and left wing politicians, called for the pro-government demonstrations. Conservative sectors of the society such as the Catholic Church, landowners, the armed forces, and the *IBAD*,[47] called for the anti-government rallies. Finally, a military government replaced Goulart in March 31st 1964.

Besides the fact that during the 1960s the Europeans considered Brazil as a "racial democracy", favorably comparing it against the segregated United States, the economy was suffering from rising inflation and lack of financial support from foreign banks (Smith 2000, 189). The new military regime, with strong backing from the US and no ambitions to reinstate democracy, quickly put in place an economic development plan, to bring financial stability.

[47] *IBAD* or Brazilian Institute for Democratic Action was created in 1960s was an anti-Goulart movement. According to Peter Gribbin's report on CIA activities in Brazil, the *IBAD* was a "front group [through where] the CIA channeled money into local politics." Peter Gribbin *Brazil and CIA* (CounterSpy, April - May 1979) 4-23 in http://www.namebase.org/brazil.html

As Davis points out, the Johnson administration showed its joy over the success of the military coup by recognizing the new Brazilian government in less than twenty-four hours after the military took control. U.S. dollars followed Washington's happiness over the ouster of Goulart. Shortly after the installation of the military government the United States provided $453 million in loans and agreed to a repayment schedule for Brazil's creditors. The following year the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development supplied Brazil with loans and credits worth $204.5 million (Davis 1996, 182).

Besides projects in infrastructure and industry, the military plans for economic development included wage cuts and strong control over labor unions. In 1968 major strikes, combined with student demonstrations against the military government, "gave the military hard-liners the pretext they needed to persuade the regime to tighten its authoritarian grip on the country" (Page 1995, 214). In 1969, the government created a series of *Atos Institucionais*[48] that imposed censorship on the media, arrested and tortured opponents to the government, expelled political figures from the country, and severely limited the powers of congress and the judicial system. The 'police state' that began in 1969 was in force until the late 1970s. "Security and development" were the post-1964 version of "order and progress" (Koonings 2001, 131; Sanders 1975, 149-150).

[48] The most famous of these *AIs* was the *AI-5*. In that executive act the military president Costa e Silva had the power to dissolve Congress, intervene in any local government, and revoke all civil rights. The judicial practice of *Habeas Corpus* was forbidden in political crimes and total censorship was imposed all the media.

General Emílio Médici became president in 1969, replacing Costa e Silva. His presidency went until 1974 and it was considered the most violent phase of the military dictatorship in Brazil (2001, 134). As Koonings summarized:

> The Médici government signified the consolidation of the hard-line predominance within the regime. From 1969 to 1974, the political priority of the military was to crush the threat of communist subversion; while at the same time the supervision of the economy was left entirely to a group of ambitious civilian technocrats headed by Finance Minister Antônio Delfim Neto (2001, 134).

Koonings reasons that the armed resistance against the military regime was "small, fragmented and of short duration." Nonetheless, the counter insurgency efforts used by the Brazilian military against any perceived resistance were on the level of a "war" against an internal and unknown enemy (2001,141-143). Although studies compared the repression in Brazil to have been much less violent than Argentina and Uruguay (Stepan 1988, 70), it important to note that the degree of political repression and violence against those who opposed the new regime is still not fully understood. In 2002, during the presidency of Fernando Henrique Cardoso some documents about the military repression were released, but other documents were deemed "ultra-secret" and not to be publicly disclosed in perpetuity. In 2005, President Luis Ignácio da Silva, a victim of torture by the military regime himself, signed a new decree revoking the "perpetuity clause." These documents are sealed for another thirty years.[49]

[49] Presidential decree number 11.111 of May 5, 2005. Signed by President Lula Inácio da Silva.

Despite the brutality of the military regime, Médici enjoyed popular support through his term as president. As Koonings pointed out, the brutal military repression "coincided with the so-called economic 'miracle'" (2001, 143). The economy, run by technocrats appointed by the military, was growing at a rapid and steady rate of 10%.[50] This sense of forward economic progress was fueled by international investments, an industry devoted to exportation, and a military sponsored propaganda machine (Alves 1988, 109). The economic 'miracle' lasted until the worldwide crises of petroleum in 1974. After that, the country continued to grow, at a slower pace, but with rising inflation and fixed salaries. Social inequality in between those with income depending on labor only and those with income depending on financial assets was becoming more evident. Using data provided by Brazilian government institutes, Maria Alves observes that: "government policies between 1960 and 1976, accordingly, sharply increased the income share of the richest members of the population and diminished that of the poorest 80 percent" (Alves 1988, 109-111).

The economic situation grew significantly worse during the late 1970s and 1980s. According to José Ramos Tinhorão, in a book about the social history of Brazilian popular music, the economic 'miracle' was a false idea sold by the

[50] Frances Hagopian noted that the use of politically insulated technical experts was not a new idea in Brazil. "Technocrats served in high office in the 1930s under Getúlio Vargas and again in the 1950s under both Vargas and Juscelino Kubitschek." Hagopian also pointed out that at this particular time, the participation of technocrats in the military regime had two diverse effects in the Brazilian elite: it presented benefits, but it also presented a challenge. The benefits were a denial of political rights to those who challenged the elite hegemony, and the dismantlement of organized labor. The challenge was that "by empowering civilian and military technocrats" (...) "the regime threatened to exclude the traditional political elite from arenas of power" Frances Hagopian *Traditional Politics and Regime Change in Brazil* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 111.

military regime in association with the conservative elite. Tinhorão argument is based in the facts that by the 1980s inflation was rampant, foreign debt reached an "un-payable level", and the top five percent of the population earned at least five times more than the bottom seventy seven per cent (Tinhorão 1998, 329-330).

Since the days of the Brazilian Empire and the First Republic governmental institutions controlled cultural entities such as orchestras, museums, and art schools. With the *Estado Novo* the government expanded its cultural responsibilities by producing and protecting a cultural heritage and controlling all mass communications. Although the military regime of 1964-1985 did not change the state claim of 'Brazilian culture stewardship,' it changed a fundamental characteristic: it took the control away from the elite. If during the previous periods governmental cultural institutions either followed the desires of the Emperor or they 'belonged' to a particular sector of the oligarchy (e. g. Freitas Valle controlled the artists scholarship program during the First Republic), during the 1964-1985 military regime technocrats controlled gigantic institutions such as the Ministry of Education and Culture. The main result of this change is that government expenditures in the area of education and culture were subject to the economic development policies. As Alves demonstrates, resources allocated to the Ministry of Education went from eleven per cent of the national budget in 1965 to less than five percent in 1974 (Alves 1988, 116).

The change in cultural support had drastic results in education alone. By the end of the *Estado Novo* more than thirty five percent of the population attended high school, and increase of almost three fold from the previous regime (Smith 2001, 181). By contrast, in 1980 a study by the *Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE)* concludes that less than fourteen percent of the population attended high school (Alves 1988, 273).[51]

The Contested Ground

As previously mentioned, the 1922 Week of Modern Art was much more than a simple weeklong art festival. Since its inception, the event was used by its celebrants to (1) mark the beginning of a new phase in Brazilian arts (i.e. Modernism), (2) celebrate a particular group of artists and their sponsors, and (3) diminish the significance of anyone who choose not to support it. Historical retrospectives kept these three objectives in place and used the 1922 event as a tool to promote a nationalistic discourse about Brazilian arts. These historical retrospectives are understood here as "Nationalistic Discourses about the 1922 Week of Modern Art." We will also observe historical retrospectives that challenged the 'ideal history' created by the Nationalistic Discourses. These contesting retrospectives are understood here as "Critical Discourses."

[51] This drop rate would be even bigger if one considers the issue of social class and education in Brazil. The *IBGE* numbers are not segregated by school system attended but by race, and a great majority of the students who attended private schools are white. Since the upper class in Brazil at that time was around five per cent of the population and almost one hundred percent white, the percentage of students who attended public schools (supported by the Ministry of Education) is lower than twelve per cent.

Although the Nationalistic Discourses represent the majority of the books analyzed in this section, the Critical Discourses offer different perspectives about the 1922 event's importance. These retrospectives question facts and assumptions taken for granted by the established academia and challenge the historical importance given to the group of intellectuals who participated and promoted the 1922 art event. Because the Critical Discourses bring into consideration the close ties in between Modernists and the governing elite, as well as their political connections, they give a much deeper understanding of the event itself as well as its historical significance.

It is important to remark that the 1922 art event has always been used as a contested object, and that debates around this particular event are not polarized into any particular number of factions. The Critical Discourses are generally focused in particular issues surrounding the event, its participants, and/or its celebrations. Therefore, they offer no complete alternative narrative to the Nationalistic Discourses. The main contribution of these Critical Discourses is that they contest the importance given to the 1922 event, offer an understanding about arts and politics in Brazil, and give a 'voice' to artists that had been silenced by the historical division created by the Modernists. The main goal of this chapter is to give a perspective on how historians have been, through an asymmetrical dialectic process, reformulating the collective imagination of a particular moment in Brazilian art history.

Nationalistic Discourses

Since the 1960s, retrospective literature about the Brazilian experience with nationalism and Modernism started to appear. Many of these works make direct reference to the 1922 Week of Modern Art as a point of transition between a romantic and European influenced period to a modern and nationalistic period in Brazilian art history (Cunha 1960; Bopp 1966; Nist 1967; Burns 1968; Picchia 1968; Amaral 1972; Batista 1972; Picchia 1972; Place 1972; Brito 1974; Inojosa 1975; Neves 1981; Appleby 1983; Mariz 1983; Helena 1985; Bastazin 1992; Picchia 1992; Rezende 1993; Passoni 1998; Boaventura 2000; Travassos 2000; and Schwartz 2003).

In this section, I focus on a few of these works in particular (Bopp 1966, Nist 1967, Burns 1968, Brito 1974; Inojosa 1975; Appleby 1983; Mariz 1983; and Schwartz 2003). They have been chosen due to the vivid portrait that is given to the 1922 event by their authors, and by their emphasis in attaching a nationalistic and revolutionary discourse to that moment in history.

Raul Bopp, John Nist, and E. Bradford Burns share the same perceptions about the 1922 art event when they wrote about modernism and nationalism in Brazil. Although Bopp and Nist write about the literary aspects of the movement and Burns gives a broader overview of the subject, the three authors observed that the art works presented in the hall of São Paulo's Municipal Theater shocked the public and the performances on its stage caused a riot among the audience.

As mentioned before, Bopp, a poet and a career diplomat, describes the 1922 festival with vivid details (Bopp 1966, 18-24). Claiming to be present at the event, he cited works that were exposed in the halls, gave a synopsis of the lectures and concerts, and also gave a first hand account of the violent public reaction to the performers. A cross reference of Bopp's account with the transcriptions of the event's program (Apendix I), newspapers' reports on the event (Boaventura 2000), and reproductions of the exposition catalog (Batista 1972 and Boaventura 2000) reveals that Bopp's recount is filled with exaggerations and contradictory information. One could argue that Bopp, by being a witness and close friend to those on stage, might have taken some romantic license in his descriptions of the event and exaggerated the reaction of the public. However, a closer look reveals that Bopp did not only take a literary license, he also created facts[52]. Perhaps the most interesting example of his historical reconstruction is the description an alleged orchestra used in the event:

> When the tide of spectators came back to their seats, the orchestra members also started to find their places on the stage. The string section was aligned, than the wind and the percussion instruments. After that, the material of congadas: tamburim, puíta, ganzá, reco-reco, adufos, and the arengueiro. The string instruments were tuning their strings. Some musicians were adjusting their seats. The audience was whispering (1966, 20).

[52] Bopp produced a list of paintings and sculptures with works that Di Cavalcanti would not create until 1929 (*Carnaval* and *Janela do Mangue*). Bopp also mentioned, contrary to any evidence, that Oswald Goeldi had works exposed during the 1922 event. Raul Bopp *Movimentos Modernistas no Brasil: 1922-1928* (Rio de Janeiro: Livraria São José, 1966).

This particular description of an orchestra being supplemented with Brazilian folk percussion instruments is not corroborated by any reproductions of the programs printed regarding the performances (Batista 1972, 395-401). As mentioned in the previous chapters, only chamber and solo works were performed during the three concerts (Wisnik 1977, 74). Bopp's creative version of an orchestral performance with exotic musical instruments responded by loud protests from the audience, helped him to support the argument that the artists participating in the 1922 event were presenting mature nationalistic artwork, integrating popular musical instruments into a new musical style, and fighting against a hostile and conservative society.

This 'revolutionary argument' resonated with two other authors: John Nist (1967) and Bradford Burns (1968). Nist, in a book about the modernist literary movement in Brazil, asserts that all performances during the event caused "public scandal and attitude of near riot in the offended sensibility of a nation" (1967, 3). Regarding the musical portion of the event, Nist mentions "the Music of Villa-Lobos had to compete against a concert of goose-tongued hisses from *vox populi*" (1967, 88). Burns, in a book about the development of nationalism in Brazil, understands that the 1922 Week of Modern was a "manifesto of independence" from São Paulo's intellectuals in a country being taken by nationalism. Regarding to the musical portion of the event, Burns informs that: "Villa-Lobos conducted his own compositions, based on folk themes and employing indigenous instruments." He goes on to conclude that the immediate

enthusiasm on the new movement was so great that "new nationalistic literary journals sprang up wherever the dedicated revolutionaries sowed their intellectual seeds" (1968, 61).

A sense of grandiose, folklore based exoticism, and revolution towards a culturally conservative establishment became the prevalent theme of subsequent discourses that used the 1922 event as a point of historical reference. These discourses ignored the modernists' intimate connections to their patrons, and their unawareness towards local manifestations of culture. As seen in the previous chapter, the modernists would not 'discover' their own country until a few years after the 1922 event. This inflated historical review of the 1922 Week of Modern Art, associated with the glorification of its participants is noted in four other referential books about Brazilian Art history: Brito 1974, Inojosa 1975, Appleby 1983, and Mariz 1983.

Mario da Silva Brito, in a book dedicated to examine the development of the Modernist movement in Brazil, separates Brazilian art history into historical periods using the 1922 Week of Modern as a pivotal moment. By doing that, he reduces the importance of works produced by authors who did not fit into this classification. For instance, Brito classifies Monteiro Lobato as "regionalist" and incapable of following the nationalistic leadership set by Mário de Andrade (Brito 1974, 201-206). In fact, Monteiro Lobato, whose writings ranged from books in a variety of styles such as novels based in folk characters and children's books to articles on art and national economic politics, was the most influential and

financially successful writer during the first half of the 20th century in Brazil (Laenders 1988, Chiarelli 1995, Miceli 2001).

Following a similar discourse set by Brito, Joaquim Inojosa claims that in literature the term "Modernism" was a direct byproduct of the 1922 event. According to Inojosa this term was created to "substitute Marinetti's futurism and to declare Brazil's cultural independence" (Inojosa 1975, 250). Inojosa compares Oswald de Andrade, Menotti Del Picchia, and Mário de Andrade to the legendary figure of the "Three Musketeers." He also informs that the 1922 Week of Modern Art was created by these intellectuals and received by a "rioting audience" (1975, 243-249).

Inojosa's description helped to strength a particular understanding that the modernists were part of a united group of artists and intellectual who were departing from any European artistic influence. It is important to note that this particular point of view, although supported by many later authors, ignores evidence that a group of modernists leaded by Mário de Andrade was being heavily influenced by the ideas of the French poet Blaise Cendrars. As demonstrated in Chapter II, after the 1922 event, the French Symbolist Poet came a few times to Brazil to visit with Paulo Prado, Oswald de Andrade and Mário de Andrade. It is also important to consider the fact that Menotti Del Picchia helped to articulate another group of modernists, against Mário de Andrade's will, to host an support Marinetti's extensive visit to Brazil in 1926. Jeffrey Schnapp and João Cezar de Castro Rocha, in a telling research on

Marinetti's visit to Brazil, observed that the Italian futurist was also very admired and followed by the 1920s Brazilian intellectuals (Schnapp 1996).

Historical narratives portraying the 1922 event and its participants as center point in Brazilian art history are also found in books dedicated to music. Vasco Mariz, a musicologist and diplomat, wrote a book on Brazilian music history that divides composers and styles according to a nationalistic point of view (Mariz 1983). This book puts Villa-Lobos as Brazil's first nationalistic composer and a dividing icon in Brazilian music history. Before him, Mariz classifies composers as either European influenced or pre-nationalists. After Villa-Lobos, Mariz classifies composers as post-nationalists or independents. This classification glorified Villa-Lobos as a libertarian composer who freed generations of composers who followed him from external influences, and reduced the historical importance of composer who did not fit into Mariz's nationalistic point of view. Mariz sustains that the 1922 event brought to surface an "underground movement of artists" who were in fact "heroes to be consecrated by time" (1983, 148). David Appleby follows Mariz's interpretation of the 1922 and concludes that "the kin mind of Mário de Andrade provided the needed philosophical and aesthetic foundation for what became known as modernist movement and a young composer, Heitor Villa-Lobos, provided the musical expression for the ideals of the movement" (Appleby 1983, 90-91).

Since the 1922 Week of Modern Art's 50th anniversary, several books have been published as part of retrospective celebrations (Batista 1972; Picchia 1972;

Place 1972; Brito 1974; Ávila 1975; Inojosa 1975; Mota 1977; Wisnik 1977, Neves 1981; Appleby 1983; Mariz 1983; Helena 1985; Landers 1988, Bastazin 1992; Picchia 1992; Oliveira 1993; Rezende 1993; Chiarelli 1995, Passoni 1998; Moraes 1999; Boaventura 2000; Camargos 2000; Travassos 2000; Miceli 2001; and Schwartz 2003). Although these particular publications tended to have strong nationalistic discourse, they also used the 1922 event as a focal point to either celebrate the advent of Modernism in Brazil or to discuss its impact in Brazilian arts. Thanks to these publications much inedited material became available to broad research such as this one.

Perhaps the most significant of these publications was the one organized by Batista, Lopez, and Lima (Batista 1972). The book, entitled *Tempos Modernistas* was conceived as a literary component to a series of expositions held in France, Portugal, and Latin America promoting Brazilian Modernism abroad (Batista 1972, 1). *Tempos Modernistas* published for the first time several letters by Mário de Andrade, a reproduction of the 1922 event's program, as well as pictures of social gatherings and celebrations that followed the original event. This particular book puts the 1922 Week of Modern Art as the center event to a cohesive modernist movement that had been gathering momentum since 1917. With its chapters divided by art subjects such as Architecture, Painting and Sculpture, Literature, and Music, *Tempos Modernistas* gives a chronological survey of the cultural happenings that had direct impact in the life and works of the artists who had direct participation the 1922 event. By

arranging documents and letters in a chronological fashion and reducing any narrative to a minimum, the book's organizers create an impersonal narrative that attempts to provide a "self-portrait" to an imagined cohesive modernistic movement.

Even though *Tempos Modernistas* has a historical understanding of Brazil's early experiences with Modernism that is warped by its editors and contested by several important subsequent researches (e.g. Lenders 1988, Chiarelli 1995, and Camargos 2000), and it is a byproduct of military government more interested in promoting Brazil's artistic image abroad than supporting cultural and educational programs at home, this particular book brings a deeper understanding of the intimate relationship in between the modernists and São Paulo's oligarchy. It also gives an important insight on how the group leaded by Mário de Andrade understood its on participation in Brazilian history.

The Nationalistic Discourse gained strength with Mário da Silva Brito's popular publication on the historical antecedents of the 1922 Week of Modern Art (Brito 1974). In his book, Brito portrays the 1922 event as the culmination point to a long battle to give independence to Brazilian art. He also argues that Mário de Andrade guided the modernists to surpass the Monteiro Lobato's "rationalistic style" (Brito 1974, 201). It is important to notice here that Brito's argument enhanced the historical misperception that Monteiro Lobato was a writer with regional characteristics and could not represent the Brazilian Modernism in the same level as Mário de Andrade, Oswald de Andrade, and Menotti Del Picchia.

Although Lobato's participation in the Brazilian Modernism, and his absence from the 1922 event will be explored in the next section, it crucial to bring out the fact that Lobato's name and actions are constantly used by those engaged in the Nationalistic Discourse to support a logical story behind the events of the 1922 Week of Modern Art. In other words, Mario Lobato is used as a 'villain' character in this particular version of Brazilian art history.

In 1992 São Paulo's Catholic University hosted a series of conferences and concerts to celebrate the 70th anniversary of the 1922 Week of Modern Art. Several events, happening from April to June, dealt with topics centered on the importance of the 1922 festival and on Brazilian Modernism and post-Modernism. Vera Bastazin organized some of the articles and conferences presented during this celebratory event into a book (Bastazin 1992). Although the 1992 celebratory event had the clear intention to revive and expand the importance of the original festival, its conferences also used the 1922 event as a referential point to discussions around the phenomenon of modernism in Brazil. One of the most interesting articles in this commemorative book is Annateresa Fabris's study on the 1922 modernists strategies to obtain successful attention towards their event (Bastazin 1992, 49-56).

Fabris observes that the young intellectuals who created in the original event did have a clear idea of the meaning of term modern art. The eclectic selections of paintings presented at the Municipal Theater ranged from neo-impressionistic to expressionism, without any clear guidance towards any new

directions. Fabris links this observation to the fact that the Menotti Del Picchia and Oswald de Andrade started a "campaign on behalf of the new art during 1921, frequently using arguments of *futuristic* connotations" (Bastazin 1992, 51). As mentioned before, these two intellectuals had their own columns in two large newspapers in São Paulo, and were regular contributors in other periodicals. Fabris notes that although the Brazilian intellectuals did not share Marinetti's artistic proposal, they completely adopted his tactics of advertisement. As an example of the use of polemic as a tactic to bring a topic to the forefront, Fabris cites Oswald de Andrade's article insulting the Brazilian composer Carlos Gomes. In that particular article, published a day before the opening event, Oswald de Andrade "used defamation [towards a representative of the establishment] to exalt, by contrast, Villa-Lobos's modernity" (1992, 52).

By observing newspapers' critiques printed after the 1922 Week of Modern Art, Fabris concludes that the public attending the event did not find any of the works or performances present in that festival particularly innovative. In fact, all reaction from the public or rash criticism was directed towards the writers who were propelling their vague platform with offensive vigor and sarcasm in the newspapers. Finally, Fabris observes that the reaction from other writers and critics helped to sustain the interest around the modernists for several months.

The most recent example of a publication that uses The Week of Modern Art to promote a Nationalistic Discourse is Schwartz's *Caixa Modernista*. This particular publication is very interesting because it does not attempt to address

values or facts around the Week of Modern Art. It is an appeal to nostalgia. The *Caixa Modernista* or *Modernist Box* is a package made of recycled cardboard containing exact reproductions of books by Mário de Andrade and Oswald de Andrade (*Paulicéia Desvairada* and *Pau Brasil*), a copy of a draft on the Week of Modern Art typed by Paulo Prado, a copy of the program given during the second night of the event, several postcard size reproductions of Tarcilia do Amaral and Di Cavalcanti's paintings, and a CD containing Brazilian music composed during the early part of the 20th century (Schwartz 2003). This nostalgic tribute to Brazilian Modernism gives to its reader, without any kind of warning, a packaged interpretation of events that is plagued by omissions and filtered information. For instance, there is only a reproduction of the program presented during the second night of festival, the night when Oswald de Andrade, Menotti Del Picchia, and Mário de Andrade were on stage. *Modernist Box* uses the Week of Modern Art as symbol where names and works of art are attached to it in order to enhance their historical significance. Never mind that Oswald de Andrade would not write *Pau Brasil* until he visited Brazil's countryside with the French poet Blaise Cendrars, or that Tarcilia do Amaral was not present at the 1922 festival.

Critical Discourses

Critical Discourses about The Week of Modern Art focus on topics that have been contested since the inception of the original event. These Critical

Discourses give voice to some of the 'silences' generated by Nationalistic Discourses and help one have a better understanding of the historical significance of the 1922 event and its participants.

Perhaps the most important topic dealt by these Critical Discourses is the complex influence of the writer Monteiro Lobato in the life of the 1922 modernists. This topic is discussed in great length both by Vasda Bonafini Laenders (1988) and Tadeu Chiarelli (1995). Although these two authors did not focus their works on the Week of Modern Art, their works change one's perception of the 1922 festival and its importance by reinstating the importance of Monteiro Lobato's activities as writer, art critic, publisher, and international correspondent. The omissions and misrepresentations generated by the Nationalistic Discourses are confronted with extensive research and powerful arguments by these two authors.

Laenders puts Monteiro Lobato as the single most important figure in the Brazilian Modernism. He supported this argument by analyzing Lobato's literary success with *Urupês* and other writings. This book was initially published in 1917 and the first edition was sold out in a month. Demand for *Urupês* followed pace with incrementally larger subsequent publications. As Laenders states: "it was the best selling book during the modernist period, and it is still considered a bestseller" (Laenders 1988, 26-29). Laenders examines the similarities in between Lobato's *Jeca Tatu* and Mário de Andrade's *Macunaíma*. The author makes a convincing case the Andrade's 1928 'revolutionary' romance, exploring

the Brazilian anti-hero who has no character or will to evolve into the urban civilization, follows ideas and a language previously explored by Lobato's 1917 'regional' romance. In *Urupês* Lobato portrays the fictional character of *Jeca Tatu* as a countryman with a primitive mind "impenetrable to progress" (1988, 37-59).

Lobato's success as a writer enabled him to purchase the literary magazine *A Revista do Brasil* and create his own literary publishing company. This is an important fact to consider because by the 1920s Monteiro Lobato's literary magazine and publishing company was a vital outlet to the modernists writings. As Laenders' research shows, Lobato edited and published several of the most important authors of that period and before the modernists attempted to launch their own short lived literary magazines (e.g. *Klaxon* and *Estética*) they would publish articles and do internships in *A Revista do Brasil* (1988, 89-109).

Laenders observations that the modernists had a resentful relationship with the success and support coming from Monteiro Lobato, explain their silence in accepting him as one of their main influences. Perhaps Lobato's independent mind and financial stability enabled him to stay away from the 1922 festival and its unclear claims of modernity. As Laenders explains: "In 1922 Monteiro Lobato belonged to a different world, not less intellectual or scholarly important as it is generally understood. He was working alone, starting his career as children's writer – with a [still] unmatched success – and fostering and book industry that

would enable the publication of Brazilian modernists, from sociology to literature" (1988, 28).

Tadeu Chiarelli, in book about São Paulo's art scene and Lobato's activities as critic, dealt with the topic about the characterization of Monteiro Lobato as an amateur painter who, by criticizing Anita Malfatti's works presented in a collective 1917 paint exhibition, inadvertently put himself against a modernist movement. Chiarelli's research points out that, contrary to the "an ideal history about modernism" presented by authors engaged in a Nationalist Discourse, Monteiro Lobato was an active art critic, being read and followed by a segment of readers and collectors who were familiar with European styles and eager to invest in the art market. Chiarelli's work also brings to the surface the fact that Lobato was a very desired figure by the Modernists to lead the 1922 event, a place eventually taken the diplomat/writer Graça Aranha. By slowly dismantling a historical reconstruction started by Menotti Del Picchia and Mário de Andrade, Chiarelli managed to give the reader a more complete understanding of how Brazilian Modernism was being shaped by political alliances and strategies (Chiarelli 1995, 20 - 44).

Regarding the Nationalistic Discourse's claim that the 1922 Week of Modern Art was a revolutionary and subversive event that chocked its audience, Chiarelli's research about the art scene in São Paulo demonstrates that "The Week was neither the first, nor the last event to count with [large elite] financial support." The research also pointed out that several members of São Paulo's

elite participated in the event and were familiar with the works presented in it, therefore "removing any subversive argument" (1995, 46).

As mentioned before, the symbiotic relationship in between the 1922 modernists and São Paulo's elite is a topic closely studied by Marcia Camargos (2001) and Sergio Miceli (2001). Marcia Camargos brings out an important observation that contrary to Mario Lobato, who never participated and constantly criticized the conferences about arts hosted by Freitas Valle, the 1922 modernists gravitated around the wealthy coffee baron's generous art extravaganzas (2001, 188). Camargos observes that the modernists, following Mário de Andrade's advisement, kept a subservient relationship to São Paulo's oligarchy until it was no longer necessary. There was a never a rupture. As the Vargas regime slowly gained control over Brazil's cultural production, the modernists started to assert their independence and write their 'ideal story about the Modernism.' As Camargos concludes: The concept that "the Week of 22 constitutes a mark zero in the Brazilian modern culture is a historical reconstruction resulting from the hegemonic position that a group, captained by Mário de Andrade, enjoyed in the national scene" (2001, 193).

The political ascent of the modernists during the end of the First Republic and beginning of the Vargas Regime is well observed in Miceli's study about Brazilian intellectuals. Regarding the artists who participated in the 1922 Week of Modern Art, Miceli notes that their dismemberment as a modernist group is due more to their different socio-economic backgrounds and political connections

then their artistic differences (Miceli 2001, 96-109). For example, in 1924 Menotti Del Picchia joined forces with Cassiano Ricardo and Plínio Salgado – a writer who strongly criticized the 1922 event – to start the right wing nationalistic movement *Verde e Amarelo* in a reaction to Oswald de Andrade's nationalistic manifesto *Pau Brasil*. Meanwhile, Mário de Andrade joined the *Partido Democrático* and supported Vargas provisional government, working in several cultural projects. When Vargas established the 1937 new constitution and became a dictator, Menotti Del Picchia became the writer for the new cultural propaganda machine. In that same year, as mentioned in Chapter III, Mário de Andrade lost his post as director of São Paulo's Municipal Cultural Department.

Miceli also observes that, despite their political disagreements, the 1922 modernists were able to use the revolt of 1930s and the social changes brought by the industrialization in Brazil to attach a literary school to a large political cause. The result of this tactic was the creation of a *pre-modernist* school with 'minor names' such as Augusto dos Anjos, José Albano Adelino Magalhães, Monteiro Lobato, Raul de Leoni, and Lima Barreto. Other authors, whose works would not fit in this new category, were passed into "a common grave" (2001, 16).

Some of the above-mentioned authors were fully aware of the political strategies behind the 1922 Week of Modern Art, and they reacted to it. During the period around the event, a debate in between the modernists and established writers developed through the printed media. Maria Eugenia Boaventura,

through innovative research that collected several dozen articles and pieces of advertisement published about the 1922 event, documented this public debate. Boaventura organized the articles in two camps: those written by the proponents of the week and those who critiqued it. Boaventura's republication of these writings gives the reader an opportunity to survey the public exchange of ideas and insults without the "distortions and fantasies commonly observed on interviews done during the successive anniversaries [of the 1922 Week of Modern Art]" (Boaventura 2000, 17).

A reading of these articles helps us to contest some other misconceptions perpetuated by the Nationalistic Discourses. For instance, the idea that the 1922 represented a cohesive group is betrayed by the fact Mário de Andrade's aversion to the term Futurism is matched only by Menotti Del Picchia and Oswald de Andrade's constant use of the same term. While Mário de Andrade went to great lengths to create a theoretical distance in between the terms futurism and Modernism, engaging on a long and confusing debates with the writer Galeão Coutinho, Menotti Del Picchia was advertising that the Week of Modern Art would show a new futuristic generation. (2000, 187-400).

It is interesting to note that the debate in between Andrade and Coutinho (using the pen name *Cândido* – in a reference to Voltaire's character) was being published in the newspaper *A Gazeta*. At the same time Picchia was publishing his columns promoting a futuristic event in the *Correio Paulistano*. Meanwhile, Oswald de Andrade was publishing attacks to established artists such as the

composer Carlos Gomes in the *Jornal do Commercio*. During the event, Picchia changed his rhetoric and wrote articles proclaiming that the modernists were winning a 'war' against the conservative establishment. Other newspapers and periodicals, (e.g. *O Estado de São Paulo*, *A Cigarra*, *Il Piccolo*, *Deutsche Zeitung*, *Folha da Noite*) were publishing transcriptions of the lectures and lists of the artists and celebrities participating in the event. Finally, all above-mentioned newspapers were publishing classified ads containing sarcastic anonymous messages about the Week and its participants.

Although Boaventura does not deal with this particular issue, the many articles collected by her show that the 1922 modernists had ample access to the printed media – the main media existing at that time, and that they promoted the Week of Modern Art by shocking the readers and confusing their opponents. Her work also puts in evidence the notion that what was being discussed in the papers was just as important to what was happening in São Paulo's municipal theater. Four days after the final event Mário de Andrade published in the *Correio Paulistano* a public note to Menotti Del Picchia with the following statement: "We are famous! Finally! Our books will be bought! We will make money! We will be very beautiful! Insulated. Celebrated. We will have our names eternalized in the newspapers and in the History of Brazilian Art" (2000, 80).

Other Critical Discourses dealt with issues regarding the modernists' faulty philosophical base and their use of celebrations on the Week of Modern Art as a

tool to perpetuate a particular version of history. In 1977 Carlos Guilherme Mota pointed the necessity to a revision in Brazilian art and social histories. By analyzing Mário de Andrade's 1930s and 1940s construction of a historical argument linking his nationalistic agenda to the 1922 event, Mota pointed out Andrade's political confusion when Andrade used the Week of Modern Art as a symbol to associate the 1922 modernists with the popular revolts that culminated with the 1930s revolution (Mota 1977, 105 – 109).

Franklin de Oliveira, in a book containing the essay entitled: "The Week of Modern Art in the Wrong Lane of History," built a much stronger case towards a revision of the importance of the 1922 event (Oliveira 1993). In his essay Oliveira made serious observations regarding the modernist complete dependency on São Paulo's perverse oligarchy and they lack of awareness regarding the social problems in Brazil. Oliveira also pointed out that the artificial division of history caused by the over evaluation of the modernists weak philosophical base and the glorification of The Week of Modern Art, has eclipsed important works that dealt with real social and political issues at the time (1993, 11-38).

Regarding the music presented at the Week of Modern Art, three authors managed to shed light on the Nationalistic Discourse that Villa-Lobos's music shocked São Paulo's audience, and that the modernist agenda positively reshaped the music scenario in Brazil. José Wisnik (1977) and José Maria Neves (1981) explore issues regarding the specific music presented in the Week

of Modern Art, while Gilberto Mendes (Ávila 1975) deals with the modernistic agenda towards Brazilian music.

By doing an extensive research on the music presented during The Week of Modern Art, Wisnik was able to enlist all pieces performed during that event, as well as all the performers. As Wisnik explains, Villa-Lobos brought several musicians from Rio de Janeiro to perform his chamber works. He also notes that many of these works represented Villa-Lobos's impressionistic phase, a style very familiar to São Paulo's audiences. Wisnik points out that Villa-Lobos would not change into a modern style until his trip to Paris in the following year (Wisnik 1977). Neves shares the same point of view, and he offers a possible explanation to the contradictory reports that the audience was hostile to Villa-Lobos's Music. According to Neves, the audience's behavior could only be a result from the lectures previously presented by the modernist, who induced them to negatively react to any work presented to them (1977, 37).

Gilberto Mendes, in an article exploring the Week of Modern Art's influence on Brazilian Music, observes that nationalistic issues explored after the 1922 event helped to polarize positions around the use of folklore as a raw material for art music. Mendes charges that the folkloristic attitude of the composers such as Mignnone and Guarnieri, who used outdated harmonic structures over folk themes betrayed Mário de Andrade's strong influence and delayed the structural and harmonic progress of these composers (Ávila 1975, 127-137).

As seen in this chapter, the Week of Modern Art's historical importance has generated a significant amount of specialized literature and research. Some revealed new documents and facts about the original festival, while others offered variations on an 'ideal story' about the Modernism in Brazil, putting the 1922 festival as central piece. Variations were toned according to authorship (e.g. Picchia's persistence in interpreting the festival as an heroic act that helped to bring the First Republic to an end) and literary goals (e. g. Passoni, and Travassos' pedagogical publications).

The celebratory exposition of 1972, and the sequential publication of supplemental literature about the original event, helped to inflate the importance of an art event – that had been all but forgotten – to extraordinary levels. It is unclear if this phenomenon, initially financed by the Brazilian military government, was caused by misperception and sense of grandiose, or was part of a plan to alter the historical focus around the 1920s. As seen in the previous chapters, the final years of the First Republic was marred by popular revolts. The Week of Modern Art was not much more than a minor artistic extravaganza financed by a powerful oligarchy. And yet the literature promoting the 1922 event portrayed it as a revolution in arts that anticipated the revolution in the streets.

It is interesting to note that the fame of The Week generated so much attention from scholars that all aspects of this event became subject to intense scrutiny. As seen in this chapter, Critical Discourses started to erode the 'ideal story' about the 1920s Modernism in several fronts. The Week of Modern Art is

thus not only an important moment in the history of the arts in Brazil but is also an example of how art and culture can be important shaping influences on Brazilian art and political history.

CONCLUSION

The 1922 Week of Modern Art is today more important to Brazilian art history than any other event. This importance is largely attributed to values attached to the 1922 event by constant revisions and reinterpretations of its historical significance.

The fact that there is an overwhelming amount of literature about the Week of Modern Art signifies that this particular event has its original meaning and purpose constantly reformulated according to new discourses. It is important to remember that the Week was practically forgotten until Mário de Andrade re-labeled the event as the birthplace Brazilian nationalism. Andrade's influential legacy as researcher, writer, and critic created a legion of intellectuals and government officials who promptly adopted his interpretation of the 1922 event as gospel. The 1970s military government also adopted Andrade's interpretation with its own agenda: to celebrate a positive art event as a Nationalistic symbol, using it as a tool to diminish the reality to the 1920s popular violence against an oppressing government.

The Week's own glorification caused its revisions and critical questioning. With each celebration new documents about the political connections between

the 1922 artists and their patrons surfaced. These documents provide a deeper understanding of how that art event came to life.

The 1922 Week of Modern Art an important focus for discussions about modernism in Brazil and its ramifications. Although some contemporary publications have a nostalgic approach to the described 'ideal history' of the original event, many others have used that moment in history to explore the factors that originated it. These new studies provide a deeper understanding of the complex dynamics between arts and politics in Brazil. They also give voice to many artists and intellectuals who had been silenced by the historical division created by placing the 1922 Week of Modern Art as a mark in Brazilian art history. By understanding the 1922 event and its celebrations as a whole phenomenon one can observe how Brazilian art history is counted and recounted according to social and political factors.

APPENDIX

The 1922 Week of Modern Art

The official program had a cover drawing by Di Cavalcanti and presented the following information:

Program for the First Festival
Monday, February 13th

1st part:
Lecture by Graça Aranha:
The aesthetic emotion in the modern art, with musical illustrations executed by Ernani Braga and poetry by Guilherme de Almeida and Ronald de Carvalho.

Chamber Music:

Villa-Lobos
1. *Sonata II for cello and piano* - (1916)
a) Allegro moderato
b) Andante
c) Scherzo
d) Allegro Vivace sostenuto e finale
Alfredo Gomes and Lucília Villa-Lobos

2. *Trio Segundo:* violino, violoncelo e piano – (1916)
a) Allegro moderato
b) Andantino calmo (Berceuse-Barcarola)
c) Scherzo-Spiritoso
d) Molto allegro e finale
Paulina d'Ambrósio, Alfredo Gomes e Fructuoso de Lima Vianna

2nd part:

Lecture by Ronald de Carvalho:
The painting and the modern sculpture in Brazil.

3. Piano solo by Ernani Braga
   a) (1917): "Valsa mística" (from *Simple Colection)*
   b) (1919): Rondante (from *Simple Colection)*
   c) (1921): *A fiandeira*

4. Otteto – (*Three African Dances*):
a) "Farrapos" – (Dance of the youngster) – 1914
b) "Kankukus" – (Dance of the elderly) – 1915
c) "Kankikis" – (Dance of the boys) – 1916
Violins: Paulina d'Ambrósio, George Marinuzzi
Viola: Orlando Frederico
Celli: Alfredo Gomes, Basso, Alfredo Carazza
Flauta: Pedro Vieira, Clarinet: Antão Soares
Piano: Fructuoso de Lima Vianna

Program of the Second Festival
Wednesday, 15th of February

1st Part:
1. Lecture of Menotti Del Picchia
Illustrated with poems and excerpts of texts by Oswaldo de Andrade, Luiz Aranha, Sérgio Milliet, Tácito de Almeida, Ribeiro Couto, Mário de Andrade, Plínio Salgado, Agenor Barbosa, and dance by the lady Yvonne Daumerie.

2. Piano solos by Guiomar Novaes:

a) E. R. Blanchet: *Au jardin du vieux Serail*
b) H. Villa-Lobos: *O Ginête do Pierrozinho*
c) C. Debussy: *La soirée dans granade*
d) C. Debussy: *Minstrels*

Lecture of Mário de Andrade in the lobby of Theater.

2nd Part:
1. Renato Almeida
Perennis Poesia

2. Canto and piano
Frederico Nascimendo and Lucília Villa-Lobos

1919 – a) Festim Pagão
1920 – b) Solidão
1917 – c) Cascavel

3. *Third Quartet* (Strings 1916)
a) Allegro giusto
b) Scherzo satirico (pipocas e patócas)
c) Adagio
d) Allegro con fuoco e finale
Violins: Paulina d'Ambrósio – George Marinuzzi
Viola: Orlando Frederico
Cello: Alfredo Gomes

Program of the Third Festival
Friday, 17th of February

1st Part

Villa-Lobos

1. *Third Trio* – violin, cello, and piano – (1918)

a) Allegro com moto
b) Moderato
c) Allegretto spiritoso
d) Allegro animato

Paulina d'Ambrósio, Alfredo Gomes, e Lucília Villa-Lobos

2. Voice and piano: Mario Emma and Lucília Villa-Lobos

Historietas from Ronald de Carvalho (1920)

a) "Lune d'octobre"
b) "Voilà la vie"
c) "Jouis sans retard, car vite s'ecoule la vie"

3. *Second Sonata* – violin and piano – (1914)

a) Allegro non troppo
b) Largo
c) Allegro rondó – Prestísimo finale

Paulina d'Ambrósio and Fructuoso Lima

2nd Part

Villa-Lobos:

4. Solo piano: Ernani Braga:

a) "Camponesa Cantadeira" – (from *Floral Suíte*) – 1916
b) "Num berço encantado" – (from *Simple Colection*) – 1919
c) *Dança Infernal* – 1920

5. *Simbolic Quartet* – (Impressions of a mundane life) – flute, saxophone, celesta, and harp or piano with hidden feminine choir – (1921)

a) Allegro non troppo
b) Andantino
c) Allegro, finale

Pedro Vieira, Antão Soares, Ernani Braga, and Fructuoso de Lima Vianna

The expositions had a catalog with the same cover as the program of the festivals. The catalog had the following information regarding the expositions:

Architecture:

Antonio Moya:

1. Entrada de Templo
2. Templo
3. Templo
4. Monumento
5. Panteon
6. Templo
7. Casa do poeta
8. Residência (planta e fachada)
9. Residência (planta e fachada)
10. Residência (planta e fachada)
11. Residência (planta e fachada)
12. Residência (planta e fachada)
13. Volume arquitetônico
14. Entrada
15. Cariátide
16. Fonte
17. Túmulo
18. Túmulo

Georg Przirembel:

19. Tamperinha na praia grande (maquete e plantas)

Sculpture:

Victor Brecheret:

1. Gênio
2. Angelus
3. Soror Dolorosa
4. Ídolo
5. O regresso
6. Pietá
7. Cabeça de Mulher
8. Cabeça de Cristo
9. Safo
10. Torso
11. Baixo relevo

12. Vitória

W. Haarberg:

13. Nossa Senhora (madeira)
14. Mãe e filho (madeira)
15. Mãe e filho (madeira)
16. Grupo (madeira)
17. Pequenas esculturas decorativas

Painting:

Anita Malfatti:

1. A Estudante russa
2. O Homem amarelo
3. O Fauno
4. O Japonês
5. A mulher de cabelos verdes
6. A onda
7. A ventania
8. Rochedos
9. Casa de chá
10. Pedras preciosas
11. Penhascos
12. Flores amarelas
13. Impressão divisionista
14. O Homem das sete cores
15. Árvores japonesas
16. Bahianas
17. Capa de livro
18. Cristo
19. S. Sebastião
20. Moemas

DiCavalcanti:

21. Ao pé da cruz (pianel para capela)
22. O Homem do Mar (1920)
23. Café Turco (1917)
24. Café Turco (1921)
25. Retrato
26. A dúvida
27. Intimidade
28. Intimidade
29. Ilustrações para um livro
30. Coqueteira

31. Boêmios
32. A piedade da inerte

John Graz:

33. Missa no túmulo
34. S. Francisco falando aos pássaros
35. Retrato do Ministro G.
36. Natureza morta
37. Natureza morta
38. Paisagem suíça
39. Paisagem de Espanha
40. Paisagem de Espanha

Martins Ribeiro:

41. Tédio
42. Tédio
43. Desenho
44. Desenho

Zina Aita:

45. A sombra
46. Estudo de cabeça
47. Paisagem decorativa
48. Máscaras Siamesas
49. Aquarium
50. Figura
51. Painel decorativo
52. 25 Impressões
53. Dois desenhos

Ferrignac:

54. Natureza dadaísta

Vicente do Rego Monteiro:

55. Retrato de Ronald de Carvalho
56. Retrato
57. Retrato
58. Cabeças de negras
59. Cabeça verde
60. Baile no Assírio
61. Lenda brasileira
62. Lenda brasileira
63. Cubismo
64. Cubismo

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albuquerque, Roberto Cavalcanti de. *Gilberto Freire e a invenção do Brasil.* Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio Editora, 2000.

Almeida, Renato de. *História da Música Brasileira.* Rio de Janeiro: F Briguiet & Cia, 2ª edição, 1942.

Alves, Maria Helena Moreira. *State and Opposition in Military Brazil.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1988.

Amaral, Aracy. *Artes Plásticas na Semana de 22.* Brasília: Editora Perspectiva, 1972.

Amaral, Aracy. *Blaise Cendrars no Brasil e os modernistas.* São Paulo: Fapesp/Editora 34, 1997.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities.* London & New York: Verso, 1991.

Andrade, Mário de. *O Movimento Modernista: Confêrencia lida no Salão de Conferências da Biblioteca do Ministério das Relações Exteriores do Brasil, no dia 30 de abril de 1942.* Rio de Janeiro: Jornal do Commercio, 1942.

Andrade, Mário de. *O Banquete.* São Paulo: Livraria Duas Cidades, 1977.

Andrade, Mário de. *Ensaio sobre a música brasileira.* São Paulo: Livraria Martins Editora, 1928 and 1962.

Andrade, Mário de. *Dicionário Musical Brasileiro.* Belo Horizonte: Editora Itatiaia Limitada, 1989.

Andrade, Mário de. *Aspectos da Música Brasileira.* São Paulo: Livraria Martins Editora, 1965.

Andrade, Mário de. *Macunaíma.* São Paulo: Livraria Martins Editora, 1962.

Appleby, David P. *The Music of Brazil.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1983.

Aquino, V F, Gilberto Agostino, and Hiran Roedel. *Sociedade Brasileira: Uma História através dos Movimentos Sociais Da Crise do Escravismo ao Apogeu do Neoliberalismo.* Rio de Janeiro e São Paulo: Editora Record, 2000.

Araújo, Maria Cecília. D' *O Estado Novo.* Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor, 2000.

Ávila, Affonso. *O Modernismo.* São Paulo: Editora Perspectiva, 1975.

Bandeira, Liuz Alberto Vianna Moniz. *Presença dos Estados Unidos no Brasil – Dois Séculos de História.* Rio de Janeiro: Editora Civilização Brasileira, 1973; 3ª ed São Paulo, Editora SENAC 1998.

Batalha, Claudio H M. *O Movimento Operário na Primeira República.* Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor, 2000.

Batista, M R, Telê Porto Ancona Lopez, and Yone Soares Lima, org. *Brasil: 1º Tempo Modernista – 1917/29: Documentação.* São Paulo: Instituto de Estudos Brasileiros, 1972.

Bastazin, Vera. *A Semana de Arte Moderna: Desdobramentos 1922-1992.* São Paulo: Editora da PUC-São Paulo, 1992.

Béhague, Gerard. *Heitor Villa-Lobos: The Search for Brazil's Musical Soul.* Austin: Institute of Latin American Studies University of Texas at Austin, 1994.

Béhague, Gerard. *Music in Latin America, an introduction.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1979.

Bellman, Johnathan. *The Exotic in Western Music.* Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1998.

Bello, José Maria. *A History of Modern Brazil 1889-1964.* Translated by James L Taylor. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press, 1966.

Bennet, Andy. *Cultures of Popular Music.* Buckingham – Philadelphia: Open University Press, 2001.

Bethell, Leslie. *Brazil: Empire & Republic 1822-1930.* London: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Boaventura, Maria Eugenia. *22 por22: A Semana de Arte Moderna Vista pelos seus Contemporâneos.* São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo, 2000.

Bomfim, Manoel. *O Brasil na América: Caracterização da Formação Brasileira.* Rio de Janeiro: Tobooks, 1997.

Bopp, Raul. *Movimentos Modernistas no Brasil: 1922-1928.* Rio de Janeiro: Livraria São José, 1966.

Brito, Mário da Silva. *Histórica do Modernismo Brasileiro: Antecedentes da Semana de Arte Moderna.* Rio de Janeiro, Civilização Brasileira, 1974.

Broca, Brito. *Blaise Cendrars no Brasil em 1924 - A Manhã.* Rio de Janeiro. 4 May 1952 in *A aventura brasileira de Blaise Cendrars,* ed Alexandre Eulálio. Brasília: Quíron/Instituto Nacional do Livro, 1978.

Burns, E Bradford. *Nationalism in Brazil: A Historical Survey.* New York: Frederick A Praeger, 1968.

Camargos, Márcia. *Villa Kyrial: Crónica da Belle Époque Paulistana.* São Paulo: Editora Senac, 2000.

Camêu, Helza. *Introdução ao Estudo da Música Indígena Brasileira.* Brasília: Departamento de Imprensa Nacional, 1977.

Campos, Augusto. *Balanço da Bossa e outras bossas.* São Paulo: Editora Perspectiva, 1968.

Cascudo, Luís da Câmara. *Dicionário do Folclore Brasileiro.* Belo Horizonte: Editora Itatiaia Limitada, 1988.

Castro, Ruy. *Chega de Saudade, A História e Histórias da Bossa-Nova.* São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1999.

Chiarelli, Tadeu. *Um Jeca nos Vernissages.* SãoPaulo: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo, 1995.

Cicco, Cláudio de. *Hollywood na Cultura Brasileira.* São Paulo: Editora Convívio, 1979.

Coelho, João Marcos. "Camargo Guarnieri recuperado em vida e obra." *O Estado de São Paulo,* July 23, 2001.

Coelho, Lauro Machado "Canções de câmara, com açucar e afeto." *O Estado de São Paulo,* February 14, 2002.

Conniff, Michael L and McCann, Frank D. *Modern Brazil: Elites and Masses in Historical Perspective.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989.

Coutinho, Carlos Nelson. *Cultura e sociedade no Brasil: Ensaios sobre idéias e formas.* Belo Horizonte: Oficina de Livros, 1990.

Crunden, Robert M. *Body and Soul: The Making of American Modernism.* New York: Basic Books, 2000.

Cunha, Luiz de Almeida. *Art in Latin América Today: Brasil I.* Washington: Pan American Union, 1960.

Dahlhaus, Carl. *Between Romanticism and Modernism.* Berkley: University of California Press, 1989.

Daou, Ana Maria. *A belle époque amazônica.* Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 2000.

Davis, Sonny B. *A Brotherhood of Arms: Brazil–United States Military Relations, 1945–1977.* Niwot: University Press of Colorado, 1996.

Di Cavalcanti. *Reminiscências Líricas de um Perfeito Carioca: com ilustrações do autor.* Rio de Janeiro: Editôra Civilização Brasileira, 1964.

Dias, Lucy and Gambini. Roberto *Outros 500: Uma Conversa Sobre a Alma Brasileira.* São Paulo: SENAC, 1999.

Duclós, Nei. "Menotti Del Picchia: As Muitas Faces do Poeta." *Revista Santista* No 18 – March, 1989.

Etter, Brian K. *From Classicism to Modernism: Western Musical Culture and the Methaphysics.* Burlington VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2001.

Fausto, Boris. *A Concise History of Brazil.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Freire, Gilberto. *Brazil: An Interpretation.* New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1945.

Gomes, Laura Graziela, Lívia Barbosa, and José Augusto Drummond. *O Brasil não é para Principiantes: Carnavais, Malandros e Heróis 20 Anos Depois.* Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Getúlio Vargas, 2001.

Gribbin, Peter. "Brazil and CIA." *CounterSpy*, April - May 1979, http://wwwnamebaseorg/brazilhtml

Grun, Bernard. *The Timetables of History.* New York: Simon & Schuster/Touchstone, 1991.

Guarnieri, Camargo. "Interview." *Revista Brasileira de Música* IX (1934).

Guss, David M. *The Festive State: Race, Etnhicity, and Nationalism as Cultural Performance.* Berkley: University of California Press, 2000.

Hagopian, Frances. *Traditional Politics and Regime Change in Brazil.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Handler, Richard. *Nationalism and the Politics of Culture in Quebec.* Madison: The University of Quebec Press, 1988.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. *Império.* Rio de Janeiro & São Paulo: Editora Record, 2001.

Helena, Lucia. *Totens e Tabus da Modernidade Brasileira.* Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro, 1985.

Homem de Mello, José. Eduardo *Música Popular Brasileira.* São Paulo: Edições Melhoramentos, 1976.

Hobsbawm, Eric and Terence Ranger. *The Invention of Tradition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Horta, Luiz Paulo. *Villa-Lobos, uma introdução.* Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 1987.

Inojosa, Joaquim. *Os Andrades e outros aspectos do Modernismo.* Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1975.

Jobim, Paulo. *Cancioneiro Jobim.* Rio de Janeiro: Casa da Palavra, 2000.

Kiefer, Bruno. *História da Música Brasileira: Dos Primórdios ao Início do Século XX.* Porto Alegre, RS: Editora Movimento, 1977.

Koonings, Kees. "Political Orientation and Factionalism in the Brazilian Armed Forces, 1964-85." In *The Soldier and the State in South America: Essays in Civil-Military Relations*, edited by Patricio Silva, 127-150. New York: Palgrave, 2001.

Kramer, Lawrence. *Walt Whitman and Modern Music: War, Desire, and the Trials of Nationhood.* New York: Garland Publishing, 2000.

Laenders, Vasda Bonafini. *De Jeca a Macunaima, Monteiro Lobato e o modernismo brasileiro.* Rio de Janeiro: Editora civilização Brasileira, 1988.

Lara, Cecilia de. *KLAXON & TERRA ROXA e outras terras: dois periódicos modernistas de São Paulo.* São Paulo: Institutos de Estudos Brasileiros, 1972.

Levi, Darrell E. *A Família Prado.* São Paulo: Cultura 70 – Livraria e Editora S/A, 1974.

Lochhead, Judy and Joseph Auner. *Postmodern Music / Postmodern Thought.* New York and London: Routledge, 2002.

Luper, Albert T. *The Music of Brazil.* Washington: Pan American Union, 1943.

Mariz, Vasco. *História da Música no Brasil.* Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1983.

Mariz, Vasco. *Três Musicólogos Brasileiros: Mário de Andrade, Renato Almeida, Luiz Heitor Correa de Azevedo.* Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1983.

Marcondes, Marcos Antônio. *Enciclopédia da Música Brasileira: Erudita, Folclórica, Popular.* São Paulo: Art Editora, 1977.

Martins, Wilson. *The Modernist Idea: A Critical Survey of Brazilian Writing in the Twentieth Century.* New York: New York University Press, 1970.

Martins, Wilson. "Cendrars e o Brasil." *Hispania*, Vol 75, No 4, (1992): 979-87.

McGowan, Chris and Ricardo Pessanha. *The Brazilian Sound: samba, bossa nova, and the popular music of Brazil.* New York: Billboard Books, 1991.

Mello Junior, Donato. *Rio de Janeiro: Planos, Plantas e Aparências.* Rio de Janeiro: João Fortes Engenharia, 1988.

Mendonça, Sônia and Márcia Motta. *Nação e Poder: As Dimensões da História.* Niterói, Rio de Janeiro: Editora da Universidade Federal Fluminense, 1998.

Miceli, Sergio. *Intelectuais à Brasileira.* São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2001.

Miller, Simon. *The Last Post: Music After Modernism.* Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1993.

Moraes, Eduardo Jardim de. *Limites do Moderno: O Pensamento Estético de Mário de Andrade.* Rio de Janeiro: Relume Dumrá, 1999.

Mota, Carlos Guilherme. *Ideologia da Cultura Brasileira: Pontos de partida para uma revisão histórica.* São Paulo: Editora Ática, 1977.

Nava, Pedro. *Beira-Mar 4.* Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio, 1978.

Needell, Jeffrey D. *A tropical belle epoque: elite culture and society in turn-of-the-century.* Rio de Janeiro and New York : Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Neves, José Maria. *Música Contemporânea Brasileira.* São Paulo: Ricordi Brasileira, 1981.

Nist, John. *The Modernist Movement in Brazil: A Literary Study.* Austin & London: University of Texas Press, 1967.

Oliveira, Franklin de. *A Semana de Arte Moderna na contramão da História e Outros Ensaios.* Rio de Janeiro: Topbooks, 1993.

Page, Joseph. A *The Brazilians.* Reading Mário de Andrade: Perseus Books, 1995.

Passoni, Cecília A N. *Modernismo no Brasil 1922 a 1930.* São Paulo: Editora Núcleo, 1998.

Pereira, Miguel Alves. *Arquitetura, Texto e Contexto: O Discurso de Oscar Niemeyer.* Brasília: Editora Universidade de Brasília, 1997.

Picchia, Menotti Del. *A Revolução Brasileira: Através de um Testemunho do Gabinete do Governador.* São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, 1932.

Placer, Xavier. *Modernismo Brasileiro: Bibliografia. 1918-1971..* Rio de Janeiro: Biblioteca Nacional, 1972.

Prado, Paulo. *Província & Nação – Paulística – Retrato do Brasil.* Rio de Janeiro: José Olympico, 1972.

Radcliffe, Sarah and Sallie Westwood. *Remaking the Nation: Place, Identity and Politics in Latin America.* London: Routledge, 1996.

Rambali, Paul. *In The Cities and Jungles of Brazil.* New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1993.

Reily, Suzel Ana. *Voices of the Magi: Enchanted Journeys in Southeast Brazil.* Chicago & London: The University Press of Chicago Press, 2002.

Reis, Daniel Aarão. *Ditadura militar, esquerdas e sociedade.* Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor, 2000.

Reis, Paulo. *República das Etnias.* Rio de Janeiro: Gryphus, 2000.

Reis Filho, Nestor Goulart. *São Paulo e Outras Cidades: Produção Social e Degradação dos Espaços Urbanos.* São Paulo: Hucitec, 1994.

Rezende, Neide. *A Semana de Arte Moderna.* São Paulo: Editora Ática, 1993.

Ribeiro, Wagner. *Antologia de cantos orfeônicos e folclóricos.* São Paulo: Editora Coleção FDT, 1965.

Ribeiro, Wagner. *História da Música na América.* São Paulo: Editora Coleção FDT, 1965.

Ridenti, Marcelo. *Em busca do povo brasileiro.* Rio de Janeiro e São Paulo: Record, 2000.

Rose, R S. *Beyond the Pale of Pity: Key Episodes of Elite Violence in Brazil to 1930.* San Francisco: Austin & Winfield, 1998.

Rostand, Claude. *Darius Milhaud: Em Pauta.* Brasília: Editora Perspectiva, 1992.

Sampaio, João Luiz "A importância do compositor." *O Estado de São Paulo*, February 14, 2002.

Sandes, Noé Freire. *A Invenção da Bação: Entre a Monarquia e a República.* Goiânia: Editora da UFG, 2000.

Schreiner, Claus. *Música Brasileira: A History of Popular Music and the people of Brasil.* London: Marion Boyars, 1993.

Schnapp, Jeffrey T and João Cezar de Castro Rocha. "Brazilian Velocities: On Marinetti's 1926 Trip to South America." *South Central Review* Vol. 13, no. 2/3, Futurism and the Avant-Garde (1996): 105-56.

Schwartz, Jorge org. *Caixa Modernista.* São Paulo/Belo Horizonte: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo/Imprensa Oficial do Estado de São Paulo/Editora UFMG, 2003.

Shaw, Lisa. *The Social History of the Brazilian Samba.* London: Ashgate, 1999.

Silva, Flávio. *Camargo Guarnieri: O Tempo e a Música*. Rio de Janeiro: Funarte, 2001.

Siqueira, Batista. *Influência Ameríndia na Música Folclórica do Nordeste*. Rio de Janeiro: Universidade do Brasil, 1951.

Smith, Anthony D. *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001.

Smith, Joseph. *A History of Brazil 1500-2000: Politics, Economic, Society, Diplomacy*. London: Longman, 2002.

Souza, Jessé. *A modernizção seletiva: Uma reinterpretação do dilema brasileiro*. Brasília: Universidade de Brasília, 2000.

Sposati, Aldaíza. *A Cidade em Pedaços*. São Paulo: Editora Brasiliense, 2001.

Stepan, Alfred. *Rethinking Military Politics: Brazil and the Southern Cone*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Tabet, Sérgio. *O Rio de Janeiro em antigos cartões postais*. Rio de Janeiro: Sérgio Roberto Tabet e Sônia Pumar Bergamini, 1985.

Tinhorão, José Ramos. *História Social da Música Popular Brasileira*. São Paulo: Editora 34, 1998.

Tragtenberg, Lívio. *Artigos Muscais*. Brasília: Editora Perspectiva, 1991.

Travassos, Elizabeth. *Modernismo e Música Brasileira*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 2000.

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. *Silencong the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1995.

Vasconcelos, Ary. *Panorama da Música Popular Brasileira*. São Paulo: Marins, 1961.

Verhaalen, Marion. *Camargo Guarnieri: Expressões de uma Vida*. São Paulo: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo, 2001.

Vianna, Hermano. *The Mystery of Samba*. Chapel Hill & London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1999.

Viscardi, Cláudia Maria Ribeiro. *O Teatro das Oligarquias: Uma Revisão da "Política do Café com Leite"*. Belo Horizonte: Editora C/ Arte 2001.

Vivacqua, Renato. *Música Popular Brasileira, cantos e encantos.* São Paulo: João Escortecci Editora, 1992.

White, Harry and Michael Murphy, edit. *Musical Constructions of Nationalism: Essays on the History and Ideology of European Musical Culture 1800-1945.* Cork, Ireland: Cork University Press, 2001.

Williams, Daryle. *Culture Wars in Brazil: The First Vargas Regime, 1930-1945.* Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2001.

Wisnik, José Miguel. *O Coro dos Contrários: A música em torno da semana de 22.* São Paulo: Livraria Duas Cidades, 1977.

Woodall, James. *A Simple Brazilian Song, Journeys Through the Rio Sound.* London: Little, Brown and Company, 1997.