

• Vol. 1, No. 2 • 2021 • (272-287) •
www.istp-irtp.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7146/irtp.v1i2.128023>

“Every human action is anthropophagic”: Oswald's Cultural Anthropophagy and Theoretical Psychology

Dr. Renato Silva Guimaraes

Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg Lateinamerikanistik Literatur- und
Kulturwissenschaften

Erlangen, Bavaria, Germany

Abstract

The Freudian theory and the era of acceleration announced by the Futurist Manifesto arrived in Brazil in 1899 and 1909, respectively. Afterwards the concrete reception of these two significant events became more than the symptomatic revelation of the shocks provoked by industrial modernity and its powerful undercurrent of anxieties. The poet, „clown“, writer and major figure of the Brazilian modernist avant-garde, Oswald de Andrade (1890-1954) absorbed Freud and the Futurist Manifesto at once, re-pragmatized and re-semantized them. Oswald's concept of Cultural Anthropophagy (1928) as a central interpretative strategy, to be exact, an hermeneutic approach is defined by Haroldo de Campos aptly: “Oswald's ‘Anthropophagy’ [...] is the thought of critical devoration of the universal cultural heritage” (Campos,1986). The introduction of the anthropophagic trope inspired by Native Americans' metaphysics leads the poet to a subversion of the Gestalt/Behavior psychological theories: “The anthropophagic function of the psychological behavior is reduced to two parts: 1) totemiser the external taboos; 2) create a new taboo in exogamic function” (Andrade,1929). From 1928 to 1950 the Anthropophagy approach on the interaction between the individual and the environment gained philosophical consistency. Oswald's thesis is a conceptual alternative that attempted to bring answers through the amplification of our ethical becoming. As an epistemological perspective attentive to the different modes of existence, the proposition of Oswald is a field of transformative practices having the power to overcome the techno-industrial paradigms. I will examine the contribution of Oswald de Andrade to theoretical psychology and to the issues that arise in an “Era of Acceleration” where the symbolic field is replaced by a cybernetic field.

Keywords: Cultural Anthropophagy, Cultural Psychology, Modernism, Oswald de Andrade, Philosophy

Elements for Historical contextualization

Despite being a central intellectual figure of the 20th century in Brazil Oswald de Andrade alias Oswald does not have the space that he deserves. On one hand it was his full time role as iconoclast that contributed to that situation on the other hand the difficulty to penetrate his work on academic terms, after all, his thought can hardly be accommodated “successionisms”.

The oswaldian project didn't seek a heroic rupture with the rational values of modernity, but tried to find, in a past/present destroyed by Brazilian civilization, the possibility of restoring a non-hostile relationship between culture and nature through the pleasures of nudity, the defense of oral culture, and the demystification of death and power. At once Oswald reverts the “deviation and falsification of the Native American” and surmounts the crisis of man-to-nature relations. Oswald's concept of Cultural Anthropophagy (1928) is the central interpretative strategy to reach this project, to be exact, it is an hermeneutic approach defined by Haroldo de Campos aptly: “Oswald's ‘Anthropophagy’ [...] is the thought of critical devoration of the universal cultural heritage” (Campos,1986). Benedito Nunes, one of the best interpreters of the poet, demonstrated that Oswald points towards a diagnostic and a therapeutic (Nunes:1978). We should add Oswald's thesis is a conceptual alternative that attempted to bring answers through the amplification of our ethical becoming. As an epistemological perspective attentive to the different modes of existence, the proposition of Oswald is a field of transformative practices having the power to overcome techno-industrial paradigms. I will examine the contribution of Oswald de Andrade to theoretical psychology and to the issues that arise in an “Era of Acceleration” where the symbolic field is replaced by a cybernetic field because

Oswald's Cultural Anthropophagy

In the beginning of the 20th century Brazil underwent an economic transformation marked by the rapid expansion of agribusiness and the rise of the large scale industry of coffee and growth of the industry of consumer goods. A modernisation that fueled the headlong pursuit of a new Art. This growth and prosperity was visible at the city of Sao Paulo now in between cosmopolitanism and provincialism. Part of the elite began to challenge the traditional peripheral position not only from an economical level but also from a cultural one. Poets and intellectuals are interested in local questions, of course, embracing externals. The tradition of elliptical prose inaugurated by Machado de Assis (1839-1908) is the writings of Euclides da Cunha (1866-1909), “the sun orbited by planets” (Oswald, 2009 p.256) indicates the path. It is Euclides da Cunha that has played a founding role in the discursive regime of literary history in the twentieth century in Brazil. It is important to remember that there is a long tradition in Portuguese literature in which life prevails in reality combining idealism and empiricism (Cochrane, 2001, p.134). At the Renaissance the Luis de Camões' epic *The Lusians* (1572), a text in which Vasco da Gama's discovery of a route to India is celebrated, is the major example.

Euclides de Cunha, influenced by positivism and social Darwinism, from the end of the 19th century framed the modernist worldview in Brazil. It is fair to say that his book, [Os Sertões](#) (Rebellion in the Backlands) published in 1902 is a cornerstone of brazilian literature. Mixing science (Henry Maudsley and Cesare Lombroso) and literature the book describes each part of the Sertao, brazilian backlands located in the Northwest of the country, where the messianic leader Antônio Conselheiro was facing a war (1893–1897) in the city of

Canudos (Bahia) against poverty and the young Brazilian republic. This war is a central event in Brazil's historical consciousness. Following the same path Euclides da Cunha, was writing another seminal text touching the cultural, social boundaries of the Brazilian society. On 14 November of 1898 a text appeared in the Newspaper that was to become an unfinished work developing the idea of *Amazônia* as *locus mediterraneus* and revealing the conflict related to the boundary between Brazil and Peru (Bolle: 2005, pp. 140-155) bringing to the areas of the nascent modern Brazil his vision of the "green hell". Da Cunha again used scientific literature (F. Katzer, or from Harvard Louis Agassiz and Charles Frederik Hartt) adapting his research to European concepts. The progress of anthropological research and a new literature introduced to urban Brazilians a certain vision of the native and the Brazilian North dominated by the forest. Without any doubt the new elite from Sao Paulo was interested by the introduction of the national questions in a non exotical way confronting the Romantic version giving rise to new ones. It is clear that the exploration of the green continent should not be reduced to a few names. From Francisco de Orellana in the 16th century to Louis Agassiz (1807-1873) trying to open the Amazonas to American interests (having student William James as an intern) while challenging Darwin's new thesis, we can still cite names like Henrique A. Santa Rosa (1860-1933), Raymundo Moraes (1872-1941), Marshal Candido Rondon (1865-1958) among many others. The avantgarde of 1920, the so-called Week of 22 represented by Oswald de Andrade has prolonged the "intimate adventure of the land" (Oswald, 2009, p.13) of Euclides da Cunha strategizing a mythopoetic thought. Da Cunha travelled inside of Brazil awakened the transformative cognitive and imaginative capacities to broader horizons of the Brazilian literature despite using scientific references that did not resist the criticism of the 20th century (Nogueira, 1974, pp.30-31). In its multiple aspects the Cultural Cannibalism is born under analog imaginative geography, firstly as a poetical Manifest (1928) secondly as an American concept (1950).

What is Anthropophagy? Who is the Cannibal?

Anthropophagy is a constant in the history of mankind. In ancient Greece this practice defined the state of savagery and bestiality (Vernant, 2007, p. 956). In Roman times when Seneca and Tacitus referred to Germans they said, beyond the *limes* we found the anthropophages (De Clercq, 2003).

The first mention of the word cannibal is found in Columbus' diaries on the 23rd of November of 1492. Following a phonetic misunderstanding, *Canima* or *Cariba*, the name of the local people was linked to the soldiers of the Great Khan the word cannibal and the myth of cannibalism emerged as pure imagination combining two cultural spaces, stretching from Antiquity to the Middle Ages, linking the direct experience of the contact with the indigenous population to the medieval imagination. The testimonies of Amerigo Vespucci, Christopher Columbus and Bartolomé de las Casas emphasized the ferocity and the warrior spirit of the Natives of the so-called New World. Paradoxically, the European banquet was also "tasty". In Europe, there was medicinal cannibalism (popular), and in the market parts of the human body were sold. As said the anthropologist Beth A. Conklin: "Ironically, although this argument that cannibalism never existed is based in a critique colonialist mentalities, it seems to reflect some of the same ethnocentrism that lay behind European colonizers' horrified reactions to cannibalism" (Conklin, 2011, p. 6). According to Carlos A. Jáuregui: "The extreme manifestation of the otherness of those wild and liminal peoples was cannibalism" (2008, p. 53). Today cannibalism persists: L'historien Patrick Boucheron,

demonstrates that we “still indebted (whether we like it or not, and whether we know it or not) to this long history that turned the Eucharistic sacrament into the active metaphor of an entire social organization” (Boucheron, 2015). He exposes the thesis of the cannibalistic character of power (Boucheron, 2019). Our modern and contemporary morals continue to be challenged, hence the importance of the question raised by the psychiatrist Thomas Szasz: “In short, our ancestors were, and we remain, existential or spiritual cannibals. As a rule, we live off the meaning others give their lives, validating our humanity by invalidating theirs.¹ If this is true, the most important question for man as a moral being becomes: Can we overcome our existential cannibalism? Can we create meaning for our lives without demeaning the lives of others?...”

Forms of Cannibalism: The “Real” and the Cultural

There are different forms of what we call cannibalism. In the catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation, after the conversion of the substance of the Eucharistic into the body and blood of Christ at consecration only the appearance of bread and wine still remains. Lutherans reject this doctrine and teach the Real Presence, for them the body and blood are received orally, they are not received in a “natural” manner, but in a supernatural, “incomprehensible manner”. From Congo, we can consider the exploitation (body and souls) of the child labour to extract the elements from earth to produce our batteries as a form of cannibalism. Oswald concluded before Szasz cited above: “The man stopped devouring War's prisoners to make him work” (Oswald, 2009, p.215).

In the 16th century the cannibalism of the Tupinambá people (native ethnic group that lived in the whole Eastern coast of Brazil) differed from the European in function and meaning. In Europe the cannibalism was medicinal, motivated by wars, by hunger or as a cultural system a trope for civilizing mission either Christian and Colonial domination, it was unique because commodified human bodies (for example: Boucher, 1992; Conklin, 1997, 2011; Sugg, 2016). The Brazilian Natives' practice could vary even inside of the same group. The war and the cannibalism ritual are the two greatest rituals of the Tupi Natives that contribute to social stability. According to the anthropologist Viveiros de Castro the cannibalism ritual can be: “...defined as a process for the transmutation of perspectives whereby the ‘I’ is determined as other through the act of incorporating this other, who in turn becomes an ‘I’ . . . but only ever in the other-literally, that is, through the other” (Viveiros de Castro, 2014, p.142). The Tupinambás eat their enemy during a ritual not for greed or for anger, they eat to inherit the qualities of his enemy. The human body was not commodified or demeaned. They eat an enemy that is not afraid to be eaten and who has been captivated for several months and has not tried to flee. The killer of the victim is not allowed to eat and must remain in withdrawal in order to “digest” his act. One victim is eaten by hundreds, or even thousand members of the tribe. Cannibalism exists as a process of subjectivation, as metaphysics, even if we choose the denial position of William Arens that considers it merely as a myth and a simple part of the 'we-they' dichotomy of the hostile-other (Arens, W.1980). Patrick Tort points out “anthropology does not digest cannibalism” (Guille-Escuret, 2010, p. xv.), the “civilized man” of the nations that commodified all beings, refused to see in indigenous peoples the characteristics used by Darwin to define civilisation, in other words,

¹ This is no doubt one of the reasons why the creative person—the truly innovative artist or scientist—is admired and valued: transcending symbolic cannibalism, he learns to give his life meaning without robbing others of the meaning they have given theirs. He "produces" more meaning than he "consumes" (Szasz, [1970] (1997), pp. 286-287).

a triple development of solidarity: Extensions indefinies but graduals of, 1) sympathy sentiment; 2) recognition of the other as fellow and 3) assistance to the weak. Ironically, it is the natives who recognize the human “presence” in the living and non-living beings (Tort, 2010, p. xv.). The native despite the ritual anthropophage correspond somehow to the final degree of civilization described by Darwin’s *Descent of the Man* (1871). Because they live in a radical austerity associated with a rich mythopoetic knowledge in deep alliance with the environment. An ethical point of view arises. There is no place for the logic of dehumanization as the Native way of life refuses the “gluttonous anthropophagy”. Garcia de Rezende in the article “Anthropophagic Education” (1929) argued: “ Anthropophagic Education relies on the direct and necessary relations between humanity and the physical environment. That is why it does not recognize or accept the old pedagogy that pleads for the uniformity of the human soul through a model of collective soul organized by this old pedagogy...” (Campos, 1975).

In order to understand Oswald’s concept of cultural cannibalism we need to take into account his references and discourse in a given situation. The poet uses references on the nascent anthropology of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century. Some of them are dominated by what today is well known as obsolete, positivism and Social Darwinism (epistemologies of social progress that heavily influenced Euclides da Cunha). Without having the new archeological/genetical, anthropological resources, Oswald also mixes figures whose intellectual production and discipline are still attached to a colonialist mindset to justify his own arguments. Paradoxically, the vast bibliography explicit that he is well informed. Another important point that should be clarified is the fact that Oswald does not deepen the definitions and does not produce systematic and scientific study, one can say he lacks rigor. The poet is not interested in a scientific elaboration, the departure of his ideology, as an *avant-garde Manifest* (1928), is what would be the speech of the native interpreted by the white man at least in the last 500 years of contact with the people of America in to whom Oswald lends the terminology and will elaborate his concept of cultural cannibalism. It is towards the end of the 1940s that Oswald started to develop a more concrete and philosophical definition of his project through different levels of meaning. We shall give in full below the extract of his doctoral dissertation *The Crisis of Messianic Philosophy* (1950) where he exposes his philosophical-existential vision of the anthropophagic cosmology:

“Considered as well as a *Weltanschauung*, Cannibalism can hardly be understood with the materialistic and immoral interpretations of the Jesuits and Colonizers. Rather is a religious act that belongs to the rich spiritual world of the primitive man. And it is opposed to cannibalism in its harmonious and communal sense, which becomes gluttonous anthropophagy or anthropophagy motivated by hunger, known through the chronicle of besieged cities and lost travelers.”

The metaphysical operation that is linked with the anthropophagic rite is the transformation of the taboo into a totem. From the opposite value to the favorable value. Life is pure devouration. In this devour that threatens human existence every minute, it is up to man to totemize the taboo. What is the taboo if not the untouchable, the limit? While on his fundamental axiological scale, the man of the West raised the categories of his knowledge to God, supreme good, the primitive instituted his value scale to God, supreme evil. There is in this a radical opposition of concepts that gives a radical opposition of conduct. It is all

about the existence of two cultural hemispheres that divided history into Matriarchy, the World of the primitive man. And Patriarchate the World of the civilized one. The first produces an anthropophagic culture, the second a messianic culture” (Andrade: 2011, pp.138-139).

As early as 1928, following the publication of *Cannibal Manifesto* in an interview Oswald attributed to the native a philosophical view of the world: “I can only speak about my intentions. Rehabilitate the non-catechized Indian and his extraordinary Edenic spirit” (Oswald, 2009 p. 61). His perspective enlarging our imagination of the human from the 1920s and to the 1950s is coherent. Refusing the cervical nerve of the civilizing mission, the political order and its subjective base, Oswald found his affinities with those oppressed by them also in Europe: “On the other hand, activate the racial connection with our external elements taking away the General- Governor and the catechist, I consider all of them appreciable and alike” (Oswald, 2009 p. 61). We can see echoes of Paul Radin’s *Primitive Man as Philosopher* (1927) that bearing from literature poems, tales, myths, rejected the romantic view and the idea that the primitive mind is underdeveloped. Harold de Campos remarked about Oswald: “...he gave us what I call "anthropophagic reason," the logic or antilogic of the excluded” (1986, p.45).

The cultural cannibalism of Oswald de Andrade was first of all a literary, artistic movement positioned in the radical critique of Western culture. In 1928 *Cannibal Manifesto* appeared at the same time as the avant-garde in Europe who positioned themselves in the radical critique of modernity. In Brazil we found a deeper conceptualization of these critics aiming to deconstruct dichotomies: Colonizer/colonized, civilized/barbarian, nature/technology appropriating metaphorically the ritual Tupi. One of the crucial points in Oswald’s thought is the inclusion in its modernist ethics of the struggle against the legacy of patriarchy as the foundation of modern rationality where the paternal rule is the cornerstone of culture. A poetic program synthesizing technology and matriarchalism. Incongruously, Oswald adopts the dialectical movement where the Patriarchalism (Civilized Man) that is located in a socio-historical schema and Matriarchalism (Natural Man) in a mythical schema are found at the same plan. Notwithstanding his teleological scheme gave us a picture of his “Concret Utopia”:

“1° term: thesis -- Natural Man

2° term: antithesis -- Civilized Man

3° term: synthesis -- Natural Man technicized” (Andrade, 2011, p.141).

For Oswald we are all cannibals because every human action is anthropophagic. Whether it can be said that living and eating are thus metaphorically equivalent, the struggle for food is a fact and demarcates power. The Western civilization is a cannibal (for example: Andrade, Conklin, Forbes, MacCannell, etc.) and that the cannibal is a conceptual figure having a central role in the history of our thought. So, what does it mean that every human action is anthropophagic if what is consumed are not bodies, human bodies? The pure cannibalism—by hunger or by greed characteristic of the colonisers is distinct from anthropophagy of the Native. It is possible to say that more than a metaphor Anthropophagy as a *Weltanschauung* is a phenomena of action, of experience, of evaluation and adjustment, it is an existential movement in order to achieve the unity of the living, the communion and the dialogical attachment between exteriority and interiority. That means that every human action is a praxis that transforms an opposite value into a favorable value. Anthropophagy

as a culture is also a theoretical detournement and a new hermeneutical approach, that is the antipodes of psychological reductionism. Its ethical and aesthetical imperatifs deal with the relation between interiority and exteriority introducing in the idea of the individual as the locus of culture the necessity to consider the difference, with its disruptions in a dialogical manner. This metaphysical operation that transforms the totem in taboo eschews disciplinary boundaries, because it is important to position itself, as said one of the aphorisms of the Manifest, in the multiplicity: “I am only concerned with what is not mine. Law of Man. Law of the cannibal.” Mário Chamie made explicit some paradoxes inside of Oswald’s poetical discourse of appropriation which he situated in Oswald's 1924 (Manifesto of Pau-Brasil) reading the first chronicle about the Brazilian land dated May 1, 1500, The Letter of Pero Vaz de Caminha. According to Chamie the oswaldian hermeneutics operates as follows:

- “a) the written word of the invader contains engraved the speech invaded;
- b) the properties of the written word disguised the observed reality that can only be rediscovered through the empowerment of the indigenous speech, embedded in the text of Pero Vaz;
- c) the reciprocity between invader and invaded is the same that occurs between seducer and seduced, between conqueror and conquered or between colonizer and colonized” (2002, p.15).

The inclusion of different voices implies that the written text includes the unwritten speech. For that reason, the resumption of the Native speech inside of the text would lead us to a sort of complementary symmetry allowing the “reality” to be reached and/or rediscovered. Rhetoric plays ironically in a dynamic of hiding and revealing some units or parts of the discourse, where ignorance reveals important power stakes (Chamie, 2002). Incorporating the results of the Western heritage Oswald deconstructs disciplinary holy lands, his political, expansive and barbaric anthropology advocates that the error is a value in and of itself.

On one hand Anthropophagy describes and analyzes. On the other hand it can be understood as a method aiming transformation.

Futurisms, Physicist turned Philosophers and Cybernetics

Futurism, an artistic and social movement, arrived in Brazil a few months after being launched in *La gazzetta dell'Emilia* on 5 February of 1909 by Filippo Tommaso Marinetti (1876-1944). The reception of the movement was almost always negative (Fabris, 2011) and did not change with the arrival of Marinetti, father of the movement, who made several presentations in the theaters of Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo in 1926. It was rejected as a pathological aesthetic by conservatives and booed by the left as a fascist ideology (Schnapp, J., and Castro Rocha, 1996). If on the one hand Oswald saw in the Futurist movement an example of artistic practice and public staging, on the other hand he totally refused identification with fascism as Marinetti did. Oswald's futuristic utopia as we have partially described it above is quite different.

To understand Oswald’s thought one may undermine the common ideas that his perspective is just a literary and artistic perspective (avant-gardiste). My research aims to bring new perspectives to the texts and contexts and a relevant point must be mentioned: The connection between scientific theories as the “devenir” Machine of Nature following the

Newtonian revolution to the crisis in physics after the Quantum shift and its influence in philosophy and contribution to our actual era of acceleration where the symbolic field is replaced by a cybernetic field. Oswald was attentive to the transformations in philosophy of science. Three important authors at the crossroads of the revolution in science that contribute to the actual velocity are part of Oswald's bibliographical references without being explicitly quoted by him. Despite their distinct epistemological positions, the poet and marxist Christopher Caudwell (1907-1937) (*The Crisis in Physics*, 1939), the logical positivist Philipp Frank (1884-1966) (*Between Physics and Philosophy*, 1941) and the non aristotelian logician Stéphane Lupasco (1900-1988) (*L'expérience microphysique et la pensée humaine*, 1941 and *Logique et contradiction*, 1947), all three have build their conceptualisation through the link between science and philosophy.

Caudwell's social analysis of physical theories against a passive reflection of the world combines social and scientific understanding. His interactionist epistemology by exploring the subject-object dichotomy revealed that pure subjects or objects do not exist. As marxist Caudwell “had explained the ways in which physical theories were shadows of economic realities” (1993). Stéphane Lupasco's philosophy resulted from a quantic vision of the world. His dialectic of dilatation of the doubt are close to the physicists turned philosopher like Wolfgang Pauli (major influence on Lupasco's work). Lupasco's découpage of reality is done through an antagonist dynamique. For him the principle of contradiction is at the very heart of knowledge. Philip Frank called philosophy of science his attempt to understand the link between philosophy, science and humanities in general. (1957: xiv-xv.) aiming “to avoid metaphysical obscurities” (1941).

Without any doubt these three authors helped Oswald develop his own attempt with anthropophagy by the inclusion of his interpretation of indigenous metaphysics (non aristotelian logic). Therefore it was studying and quoting Kierkegaard, Marx, and Nietzsche that he exposed a point of vue endeavoring to extend and actualize what he called the humanisation of philosophy. Being aware of philosophy always being dependent of social and historical contexts Oswald was eager to liberate us from the bondage of theology (*Philosophia ancilla theologiae*) and science (*Philosophia ancilla sotiologiae*). The last was qualified by Oswald as a “barbarismo de boa hora” literary “in good time barbarism” but still attached to its “messianic compromise” (1978, p.78). It is important to understand the introduction of the anthropophagic worldview to confront these epistemological contexts. Otherwise, one can not make Oswald's work intelligible by an unfair reading of his proposition of expansion of our civilization that corresponds to an exit of our techno-industrial paradigmas. Instead of eliminating psychic, anthropomorphic elements, he uncompromisingly recognized and integrated the “old metaphysics of science”.

Oswald thought emerged in a period where the scientific revolutions of the Western World achieved his progressive substitution of «natural things», its transformation and substitution of the natural order in a human order (Ferreira da Silva, 2009). The burgeoning technico-epistemic revolution called cybernetic was contemporary to Oswald's Anthropophagy and has led us and our current paradigms and renewed our "anthropological models". Norbert Wiener originated Cybernetics while developing computers and automated anti-aircraft artillery during World War II, his anthropological model is based on aerial warfare (Heidegger, 1987, p.118-119) and revolutionized our mode of existence being at the core of

the actual destruction and replacement of the our symbolic sphere while desanthropologisant, concretely giving to us the opportunity to explore and realize the myth of Pygmalion: The transformation of the matter (being) into a perfection of which it is the bearer, the contempt for the women by replacing her with the progenitor of generations absent from errors. Errors are too human. Cybernetics combines narrow areas of physics and biology deconstruct dichotomies like nature/culture, human/machines Paul Galison affirmed: “Where Darwin had assiduously tracked the similarities between human and animal in order to blur the boundary between them, Wiener's efforts were devoted to effacing the distinction between human and machine” (1994, pp.245-246).

Anthropophagy and Cybernetics are two ontologies of the enemy: For the first, “we absorb the Taboo to transform it into a Totem: the sacred enemy that must be transformed into a friend” (Andrade, 1928). For the second, its manichean vision reduces the intention to a relation input-output where “ally and enemy begin to resemble each other in a war of human-machine hybrids”, moreover Paul Galison:

“...there is a relentless cycle in which one conceives of the enemy a certain way, and then that conception begins to work back on us. The enemy as a human-machine black box becomes us as a human-machine black box. The enemy city targeted, bombed, dispersed becomes our city dispersed in preventive anticipation” (Galison & Najafi, 2003, p.64).

The dualisms Anthropophages and Cybernetics point to different horizons. They both think the relations between knowledge/communication, power/control, ethic/religion (magic) and the way how they conceived these dualisms leads us to think their radical opposition of concepts gives a radical opposition of conduct: The devil for cybernetics is the supreme angel for anthropophagy. Oswald's boutade “we want the savage in the Marx's city” is an exemplary demonstration of Oswald's naivety for Vicente Ferreira da Silva for whom the: “...culture is an organic unit and that in the hyper-organized and hyper-technical city can only thrive the synthetic and pre-determined man of the future” (Ferreira da Silva, 2009, p.367).

Psychology, Humanization of Science

Vicente Ferreira da Silva misinterpreted Oswald's proposal, thinking that he was looking for authenticity or a return to the “Golden Age” trying to separate us from the devouring process represented precisely by the other form of cannibalism that is activated by the “organic unit of the hyper-organized and hyper-technical city where only the synthetic and pre-determined man of the future can survive”. In short, cultural anthropophagy is in our Liberal world of asymmetric capitalism a theoretical and creative strategy allowing a creative/ethical appropriation/inclusion of the otherness. It is an imaginative strategy of social inclusion that confronts the rigid structures of power of our actual cybernetic society. Farias de Brito, precursor of phenomenology and existentialist philosophy in Brazil, praised the importance of a new methodology in 1887, which amplified the history of mankind that now should be investigated beyond the natural sciences of Darwin, Ludwig or Haeckel. The anthropological method which makes the man his exclusive object coincides with a succession of experimental doctrines, positivism and the accumulation of other explorations. “Psychological ethnology” arised in the midst of this dazzle, opening the possibility of studying the formation of social groups as an objective form, as "the consensus of a sum of individuals". This doctrine is for Farias de Brito the extension of phrenology to

society which makes “the individual the sum of the distinct activities that can be determined by the brain. “Psychological ethnology” makes individuals, considered psychologically, constituent elements of society, that is to say, it makes individual psychological activities constituent elements of the objective mind.” Notions that are subject to different definitions, but have in common the fact that they group rules as “law, morals, religion” give birth to a finite society. Each individual motivated by its own organization in a common agreement is also bound by these rules building the collectivity. However, Farias de Brito refuses to believe that this sum as an objective element is a substance "from the psychological point of view" which can be intelligible beyond the individual organization. This reflection which may have been known by Oswald, once he knew the importance and the thought of Farias de Brito, reveals some power stake: Brazil at the beginning of the twentieth century enthusiastically welcomed eugenics as a science and ideology, social Darwinism and positivism was well accepted. What would be the impact of these doctrines in a predominantly mixed-race country? What would be the impact if the “psychological ethnology” is detached from its colonial mindset? It is not a coincidence that Oswald chooses the provocative image of the “bad savage” those for whom the “law is movement. And exogamy is his destiny” (Oswald, 1991, p.242).

Whoever wants to rehabilitate the primitive and develop an American philosophy should tackle all the doctrines unable to recognize the “Indian knowledge”. Oswald would agree with Vygotsky: “Psychological anthropology is the most important source for the philosophy of reality and scientific construction of politics” (Vygotsky, 1994, p.330). The series of attacks against Freud is justified. “Anthropophagic culture” undermines the Freudian model that views human condition essentially tragic, a model based in a-priori preconceptions intrinsically related with the civilizational discourse present in the European version and vision of the cannibal. For Freud we are all attached to the Primitive Man by phylogenetic guilt. This misinterpretation leads Oswald to call Freud a catholic and to refuse the oedipus complex, he said: “The Anthropophagy can only have strategic relations with Freud” (Oswald, 2009, p.78). In *The Anthropophagic psychology* Oswald summarizes the anthropophagic function psychic behaviour: “1°) to totemize external taboos; 2°) to create the new taboo according to exogamous function” (Oswald, 2009, p.82). The humanity in his finite reality forms a fragile unity with his environment, because if his action, every action, is anthropophagic we tend towards the exogamous movement and for that reason refuting ideologies that produce separations, repressing the constructivist ethical imperative: Diversity.

The American Affairs, the colonization of the Americas, or the advent that “create” modernity and its politics of generalized commodification of all beings model our actual *Weltanschauung* (Anthropophagy by greed). However, the transition from Medieval to Modern Times (15th and 16th century) was influenced by Native speech and at the same time created a speech about them (savages, underdeveloped). The contagion of Indian knowledge is real. Two cultures met, the Indian forced the European to explore his fantasies. Oswald entails a new beginning.

Benedito Nunes saw Anthropophagy simultaneously as an organic metaphor, a diagnostic and a therapeutic. So a type of knowledge that is both intuitive and empirical. As we have seen, breaking boundaries including its own by taking in different fields of knowledge but also in different ways of feeling, behaving, thinking or acting the possibility to project different ways of becoming. It is therefore possible to derive a psychology from Oswald's thought. The organic trope resulting from the Tupinamba ritual would aim to achieve

intellectual autonomy in a reality traumatized, despised, exploited by colonial repression (diagnosis) hence art, criticism, etc., “using the anthropophagous instinct previously repressed” will liberate the Brazilian Nation (Oswald, 1978, pp. xxv-xxvi).

Once again Oswald is reduced to Brazil, and not thought of as an American or more like a Westerner, it must be remembered that he is on the border between the Old and New Worlds.

Nunes endend by reducing Anthropophagy to a Brazilian national project refusing to see that the oswaldian vision extrapolates the national boundary. The Tupi is the European Barbare, according to Oswald that “for eight centuries presided over the Europe matriarchal institutions” (Oswald, 1991, p.274). As we have already seen, matriarchalism is not a historical category but a mythical one, it also represents all the “moments” where life approaches an egalitarian, magical, creative, liberating or even anguish stage. This point of time is in opposition to patriarchalism, an historical category for division, control and domination. Without exaggeration, it is possible to say that Oswald paved the way for Pierre Clastres' political anthropology which distinguished the so-called primitive societies, societies against the state and the societies of the emergence of the state, no longer primitive but divided between dominant and dominated. The contribution of Oswald confronts us with an epistemic de-linking.

Conclusion

Oswald's contribution expressing both mythical and direct knowledge about the relationship between Europe and the Americas interprets what is today called the Western World and proposes a praxis. The mythical and direct forms of knowledge that he introduces is also a hermeneutic approach called Cultural Anthropophagy or Cultural Cannibalism. Its discourse of de-hierarchization, deconstruction, points to an horizon constructivist and dialogic. This thought, mythologizing our existence, reveals that our habits are intrinsically influenced by the environment in which a constant exogamic movement reminds us of the finitude of life and the necessity of overcoming its destructive aspects through innovative strategies. The loss of the symbolic field in favor of the generalized commodification promoted by our cybernetic society has accelerated the processes of control and domination. The thought of Oswald aiming to overcome our techno-industrial paradigme invites us to reconnect with our ancestral position where nature is not seen as an object. That is to say, the metaphysical foundations of our understanding are crucial to approach and behave in the world. But what makes the distinction between a destructive or productive mode? It is our ability to integrate adversity and inclusion. “Every human action is anthropophagic.”

It is possible to affirm that beyond the presence of conceptualization of cannibalism in the Contemporary Cultural Critique the legacy, the fecundity and applicability of Oswald de Andrade's thought is still not fully recognized. Acknowledging Oswald's thought will help us to pave the way for synthesis seeking reconciliation with nature. In other words the image of the “Natural Man technicized” is a synthesis between an animistic and mechanistic and mathematical conceptions. The “Natural Human technicized” - as we would call it today - enables us to re-pragmatize and re-semanticize our actual era of acceleration. Reconciliation with nature leads to no longer being subordinated to the shocks provoked by industrial modernity and its powerful undercurrent of anxieties. Anthropophagy denounces the reduction of our reality to a purely process of calculation/commodification and aims to introduce a worldview that humanizes computers and intelligent machines and its

cybernetics applications introducing a human pace to the techniques that are today’s reason for the ever-increasing velocity of our lives.

References

- Andrade, O. de. (1928) Entretien à Nino Frank [Interview between Oswald de Andrade and Nino Frank]. *Les Nouvelles Littéraires*, Malles et Valises, Paris, France, July 14, 1928.
- Andrade, O. de. (1978) Do Pau-Brasil à Antropofagia e às Utopias – Manifestos, teses de concurso e ensaios [From Pau Brasil to Anthropophagy and the Utopies]. Rio de Janeiro, Brasil: Civilização Brasileira.
- Andrade, O. de. (1991) “Cannibalist Manifesto.” 1928. *Latin American Literary Review* 19: 38–47.
- Andrade, O. de. (1991) *Estética e Política [Aesthetics and Politics]*. São Paulo, Brasil: Globo.
- Andrade, O. de. (2009) *Os Dentes do Dragão [The Teeth of the Dragon]*. São Paulo, Brasil: Globo.
- Andrade, O. de. (2011) *A Utopia Antropofágica [The Anthropophagic Utopia]* São Paulo, Brasil: Globo.
- Arens, W. (1980) *The Man-Eating Myth: Anthropology & Anthropophagy: Anthropology and Anthropophagy*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bolle, W. (2005), *REVISTA USP*, São Paulo, n. 66, p. 140-155, junho/agosto.
- Boucher, P. (1992). *Cannibal Encounters: Europeans and Island Caribs, 1492–1763*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Boucheron, P. (2015) *Of what is History capable? Inaugural Lecture delivered on Thursday 17 December 2015*. New edition [online]. Paris: Collège de France, 2018 (generated 01 octobre 2020). Available on the Internet: <<http://books.openedition.org/cdf/5852>>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.cdf.5852>.
- Boucheron, P. (2019) “Histoire des pouvoirs en Europe occidentale, XIII^e-XVI^e siècle” [History of Power in Occidental Europe XIII^e-XVI^e], *L’annuaire du Collège de France* [En ligne], 117, mis en ligne le 04 juin 2020, consulté le 23 septembre 2020. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/annuaire-cdf/14228>. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.4000/annuaire-cdf.14228>
- Brenner, J. (2010). The philosophical logic of Stéphane Lupasco (1900–1988). *Logic And Logical Philosophy*, 19(3), 243-285. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/LLP.2010.009>
- Campos, A. de. (1975) “Revistas re-vistas: os antropófagos”, in: *Revista de Antropofagia [Magazine of Anthropophagy]*, Sao Paulo, Brasil: Abril.
- Campos, H. de (1986) “The Rule of Anthropophagy: Europe under the Sign of Devoration”. *Latin American Literary Review*, Vol. 14, No. 27, Brazilian Literature (Jan. - Jun.), pp. 42-60.

- Campos, H. de (1986) Concrete poetry and beyond: A conversation between Julio Ortega and Haroldo de Campos, *Review: Literature and Arts of the Americas*, 19:36, 38-45, DOI: 10.1080/08905768608594219
- Castro-Klarén, S. (2000) “A Genealogy for the "Manifesto Antropofago," or the Struggle between Socrates and the Caraibe”, *Nepantla: Views from South*, Volume 1, Issue 2, pp. 295-322.
- Caudwell, C. [1939] (2017), *The Crisis in Physics*. London: Verso Books.
- Célestin, R. (1996) *From Cannibals to Radicals: Figures and Limits of Exoticism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Chamie, M. (2002) *Caminhos da Carta, uma leitura antropofágica da Carta de Pero Vaz de Caminha*, Ribeirão Preto, Brasil: FUNPEC.
- Cochrane, T. (2001) *Twilight of the Literary: Figures of Thought in the Age of Print*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Conklin, B. (1997) “Consuming Images: Representations of Cannibalism on the Amazonian Frontier.” *Anthropological Quarterly* 70: 68–77.
- Conklin, B. (2011) *Consuming Grief – Compassionate cannibalism in amazonian society*, Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.
- Corbey, R. H. A. (1991) Freud's phylogenetic narrative. In R. H. A. Corbey, & J. T. L. Leerssen (Eds.), *Alterity, identity, image*. (pp. 37-56). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- De Clercq, D. (2003) “Introduction”, in: Tacite, *Origine et territoire des Germains, dit La Germanie*, Bruxelles, [En ligne] consulté le 14 Octobre 2020. URL : http://bcs.fltr.ucl.ac.be/GERM/g_preface.htm
- Fabris, A. (2011). “O futurismo como estética patológica: alguns aspectos de sua recepção no Brasil” [Futurism as pathologic aesthetics: Aspects of its reception in Brazil]. Dossier thématique: Brésil, questions sur le modernisme. n°1 Septembre 2011. URL: <http://cral.in2p3.fr/artelogie/spip.php?article67>
- Farias de Brito, R. (1887) “Duas palavras sobre a psicologia etnográfica[Two words about ethnographic psychology]. *A Quinzena*, n°3.
- Ferreira da Silva, V. (2009) *Transcendência do mundo [Transcendence of the World]*. São Paulo, Brasil: É Realizações Editoras.
- Forbes, J. (1992) *Columbus and Other Cannibals: The Wétiko Disease of Exploitation, Imperialism and Terrorism*. New York: Autonomedia.
- Freud, S. [1913] (1950) (2001) (2004). *Totem and Taboo*. Translated by y Routledge & Kegan Paul. London: Routledge.
- Frank, P. (1941). *Between Physics and Philosophy*. Cambridge, Massacgusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Frank, P. (1957). *Philosophy of science: The link between science and philosophy*. New York: Dover Publications.

- Galison, P. (1994) “The Ontology of the Enemy: Norbert Wiener and the Cybernetic Vision”. *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 21, No. 1. Autumn, pp. 228-266.
- Galison, P., and Najafi, S. (2003). “The Ontology of the Enemy: An Interview with Peter Galison.” *Cabinet*, no. 12.
- Heidegger, M. (1987) *Zollikoner Seminare: Protokolle - Gespräche - Briefe Martin Heidegger*, Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Klostermann.
- Hsu, Francis L. K. (1961). “*Psychological Anthropology in the Behavioral Science*” in: *Psychological Anthropology - Approaches to Culture and Society*. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, INC.
- Jáuregui, C. A. (2008) *Canibalia – Canibalismo, calibanismo, antropofagia cultural y consumo en América Latina* [Canibalia – Canibalism, Calibanism, cultural anthropophagy and consumerism in Latin America]. Madrid: Iberoamericana – Veuvert, 2008.
- Jáuregui, C. A. (2015) “Oswaldo Costa, Antropofagia, and the *Cannibal Critique of Colonial Modernity*”. *Culture & History Digital Journal*, 4 (2): e017. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3989/chdj.2015.017>.
- Lupasco, S. [1941] (1989) *L'Expérience microphysique et la Pensée humaine* [Microphysics Experience and human thought] Paris: Éditions du Rocher.
- Lupasco, S. (1947) *Logique et contradiction* [Logic and Contradiction]. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- MacCannell, D. (1992) “Cannibalism Today”. *Empty Meeting Grounds: The Tourist Papers*. New York: Routledge. pp. 17–73.
- Nogueira, A. (1974) *Antônio Conselheiro e Canudos*, São Paulo, Brasil: Companhia Editora Nacional. pp. 30-31. (Traduit par nos soins)
- Nunes, B. (1979). *Oswald canibal*. São Paulo: Perspectivas.
- Nunes, B. (2011) “A Antropofagia ao alcance de Todos” in: Oswald de Andrade, *A Utopia Antropofágica [The Anthropophagic Utopia]*, São Paulo, Brasil: Globo.
- Petrey, D. (2005) “Concerning Cannibalism Revisionism”. *Chasqui*, 2005, Vol. 34, Special Issue No. 1: Brazilian and Spanish American Literary and Cultural Encounters, pp. 113-123.
- Radin, P. [1927] (2017) *Primitive Man as Philosopher*. New York, NY: New York Review of Books.
- Ruffinelli, J. and Castro Rocha, J.– C. de, org. (2011) *Antropofagia Hoje? Oswald de Andrade em Cena [Anthropophagy Today? Oswald de Andrade at the scene]*. São Paulo, Brasil: É Realizações Editoras.
- Schnapp, J., and Castro Rocha, J.– C. (1996). Brazilian Velocities: On Marinetti's 1926 Trip to South America. *South Central Review*, 13(2/3), 105-156. doi:10.2307/3190374
- Sheehan, H. [1985] (1993). *Marxism and the Philosophy of Science: A Critical History*. Humanities Press.

- Sugg, R. (2016) *Mummies, Cannibals and Vampires - The History of Corpse Medicine from Renaissance to the Victorians*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Szasz, T. S. [1970] (1997) *The Manufacture of Madness: A Comparative Study of the Inquisition and the Mental Health Movement*. Syracuse University Press. New York.
- Tort, P. (2010) "Préface" in: Guille-Escuret, Georges, *Cannibalism 1 - Proies et captifs en Afrique*, Paris: Presse Universitaire de France.
- Vernant, J. P. (2007) *Œuvres*, Paris, France: Opus Seuil. p. 956.
- Viveiros de Castro, E. (2014) Translated by Peter Skafish, *Cannibal Metaphysics*, First Edition, Minneapolis, Univocal Publishing.
- Viveiros de Castro, E. (2002) *A Inconstância da Alma Selvagem – e outros ensaios de antropologia [The Inconstancy of Savage Soul]*. São Paulo, Brasil: Cosac & Naify.
- Vygotsky, L. S., & van der Veer, R., & Valsiner, J. (Eds.). (1994). *The Vygotsky reader*. (T. Prout, Trans.). Basil Blackwell.
- Wiener, N. (1964) *God and Golem: A Comment on Certain Points where Cybernetics Impinges on Religion*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Wiener, N. (1989) *The human use of human beings: cybernetics and society*, London, England: Free Associations Books.

About the authors

Dr. Renato Silva Guimarães is based at the Department of Latin American Literature and Cultural Sciences at the Friedrich-Alexander-University in Erlangen-Nürnberg. I'm interested in different approaches to the troublesome cultural situations that emerge in the Global South today and the last 100 years, where the Western view (without Ibero-America) for a far too long time has been the norm. My research tries to unravel the strands of the aesthetic through a series of meditations, dispersed discourses. They are neither a simple procedure aiming at describing the practice nor pure theory, because of its both implicit and explicit derivations from social reality, a poetic experience guided by the metaphoric locus. During my academic life I have participated on various panels, spoken throughout, workshops, at conferences, universities.

To mention just a few examples:

- 10th World Congress of Semiotics, Septembre 2009 (Spain)
- 6th International Conference on Dialogical Self, Octobre 2010 (Greece)
- 9. Deutscher Lusitanistentag, September 2011 (Austria)
- International Lisbon Conference on Philosophy and Film, 2014. (Portugal)
- 8th International Conference on Dialogical Self, 2014 (Netherlands)
- The Society for European Philosophy and Forum for European Philosophy Joint Annual Conference: Philosophy After Nature. Utrecht University, 2014 (Netherlands)
- INHA (Institut National de l'Histoire de l'Art), Fondation Gulbenkian. Université Sorbonne Nouvelle, 2015. École d'été 2016: Philosophies européennes et décolonisation de la pensée, Université de Toulouse Jean Jaurès, 2016, (France)
- Decolonizing Knowledge, Gothenburg University, 2018 (Sweden)

- Decolonial perspectives on education, NTNU Trondheim/Trondheim, 2019 (Norway).

Contact: Lateinamerikanistik Literatur- und Kulturwissenschaften, Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Germany. Email: resgui@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3423-9306>