Discussion Questions (09/25)

Discussion Questions on de Andrade: (submitted by Monica)

1. As Mario de Andrade looks back at the outcomes and trajectory of the Modernist Movement between 1910-1930, he highlights the characteristics of the "reality of the Modernist movement as the merger of three basic principles: the permanent right to aesthetic research, the updating of the Brazilian artistic intelligentsia and the stabilisation of a national creative consciousness." (603)

2. "We 'Modernists'...were, but for some not very convincing exceptions, victims of our pleasure in life and in the binge we demolished our manhood. Although we changed everything in us, we forgot to change something: the interest we had in contemporary life. And this was the main thing!"(606)
What are some of the criticisms Mario de Andrade shares on the movement? Does de Andrade's self-criticism and "erring" give less validity to the Modernist Movement, considering he was one of the organizers, and in the Grupo dos Cinco? (see 607, 608)
What does he suggest would have made the Movement more "effective"?

3. Mario de Andrade responds to critics who say that events would have unfolded despite the Movement by saying that "That all of it would would happen, even without the Modernist Movement would be purely and simply,...the Modernist Movement" (599)
What purpose did the salons and the Semana de Arte Moderna provide for the evolvement of the Movement? What significance did this have for the growth of Sao Paulo?

4. What are the biggest differences between the Movement (Anthropophagics/cannibalists) and the Nationalists or artistic intelligentsia? (see 606) In your opinion, are academia and the arts still in the same state from which the Movement tried to push away, or has the Movement affected a change, and if so how?

Discussion Questions on Oswald de Andrade: (submitted by Alexandra)

1. Oswald de Andrade in Cannibalist Manifesto writes for the purpose of a radical social reform in the arts and humanities. Why does he start off by saying that “cannibalism alone unites us,” and why use the term cannibalism? From the readings, the term cannibalism and its meaning is key to this movement and especially to Andrade’s point in the Manifesto.

2. Andrade throughout the manifesto tries to declare and in a way convince his readers of what needs to be done in order to create a more Brazilian and modern point of view, especially in the arts and literature. He alludes to living “in a somnambulistic law”(paragraph 14) and to the need of “transforming Taboo into totem.” What are some of the taboos and characteristics he is proclaiming against and what methods of rhetoric does he use to illustrate them.
3. Semana Moderna appears to be a bourgeois, intellectual, artistic movement with a nationalist intent at the same time. As we know from the readings and what has been discussed in class, Rio de Janeiro, the capital at the time, played a more important cultural role, however the semana took place in São Paulo. Could this be in relation to the different political and economic tendencies dividing these two cities and what circumstances changed the location and the importance of São Paulo back to Rio de Janeiro with the creation of Carnaval, Samba and other cultural elements that appear later on?

**Discussion Questions on Philippou: (submitted by Zofi)**

1. Page 254 and 255 Philippou discusses how culture-building and the definition of “brasilidade” became an official concern for the nation state. Would the modernization and identity/culture building have been different if the state would not have been involved? If so how?

2. Numerous instances Philippou describes the fascination and almost obsession with afro-brazilian culture and the “mulatto” beauty. What does this mean for the modernization of Brazil and the embracement of afro-brazilian culture? Since the ideas of the culture-building and modernization came from the white elites, was this modernization actually implementing the afro-brazilian culture or was it merely looking at it to try and understand/valorize it?

3. I am interested in discussing the idea that “In this land we are all foreigners…” and that “Nothing is foreign” in Brazil. Was this true before these ideas of modernization and national identity came into play? Is it true after and even today?