# Introduction to The Forest and The School —Pedro Neves Marques

Anthropophagy, the chronicled ritual of cannibalism practiced by many Amerindian tribes, permeates the history of Brazil. As a paradigmatic image of the region, it is deeply rooted in the psyche of the people and in the wildness of the land, tying nature and culture together in an original trauma revealed on October 11, 1492, "the last day of a free America; the following day, Columbus arrived…"[1] In Brazil, nature and culture have never been effectively set apart, neither for the indigenous, for whose cosmologies the divide is foreign (though not necessarily inexistent) or for colonizers past or present, for whom the savage soul and the land tend to mirror one another. In the sixteenth century, period of first encounters, the image of the Amerindian was projected on the forest by Jesuits and chroniclers, and inversely, the land projected back on them. A multistable image, the inconstant, anthropophagic Indian and the forest were the reciprocal, environmentally produced figure–ground of one another: "A people receptive to any shape but impossible to keep in one shape, the Indians … were like the forest that sheltered them, always ready to regain the spaces precariously conquered by cultivation.

1 Raul Bopp, "The Life and Death of Antropofagia" (1965–66), 135–50 in this volume.

They were like their land, deceptively fertile, a place where it appeared that nothing could be planted, but were no shoot sprouted without getting suffocated forthwith by weeds."[2] The Indians were "conceived, at best, as a species more natural than cultural, a kind of anthropomorphized emanation of a particularly 'natural' nature that constitutes an intermediary, or an avatar, between the Good 'Savage' of the eighteenth century and the 'Universal Adaptor' of twentieth century cultural ecology."[3] They were, simultaneously, the preferred wild men and the most incomprehensible of savages, open to conversion and avid for mercantile exchange yet paradoxically bent on perpetuating their wars and their anthropophagic rituals hidden among the tropical foliage—they were, as Eduardo Viveiros de Castro reminds us, *inconstant*: "Inconstancy is a constant in the savage equation."[4]

Credulous about the other's philosophy, technology, and religion, yet incapable of conversion and invested in a vengeful, predatory culture, the anthropophagic Indian

2 Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, *The Inconstancy of the Indian Soul: The Encounter of Catholics and Cannibals in 16th-Century Brazil*, trans. Gregory Duff Morton (Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press, 2011), 3.

3 Anne-Christine Taylor, "O Americanismo tropical: Uma fronteira fóssil da antropologia," in *Histoires de l'anthropologie (XVIe – XXe siècles)* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1984), 8.—Trans. Ed.

4 Viveiros de Castro, *The Inconstancy of the Indian Soul*, 5. "Some nations are naturally hard, tenacious, and constant, and with difficulty they receive the faith and leave behind the errors of their ancestors; they resist with arms, they doubt with their understanding, they repel with their will, they close themselves, they fear, they argue, they object, they take up much effort before they give themselves over; but, once before they give themselves over, once they have received the faith, they stay firm and constant in it, like statues of *marble*: it is no longer necessary to work with them. There are other nations, however—such as those of Brazil—that receive everything that is taught them with great docility and ease, without arguing, without objecting, without doubting, without resisting. But they are statues of *myrtle* that if the gardener lifts his hand and his scissor, will soon lose their new form, and return to the old natural brutishness, becoming a ticket as they were before." Father António Vieira quoted by Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, *The Inconstancy of the Indian Soul,* 2.—Ed., italics added.

could only be *naturalized* and later negated or exploited—just like the land and its resources. By the time of Shaftesbury and Rousseau in the eighteenth century, the Indian already appears as an image, or a symbol, to be projected upon. In Brazil, when it reappears in the nineteenth-century Romanticism of the royal and academic Indianism professed by Emperor Dom Pedro II, the indigenous is simply an illustration—of good intentions, or worse, nationalism. Unsurprisingly, to this day this too is the fate of the land, negated by the illustration of its tropical pristineness: wild, luxurious, diverse, unique, yet acknowledged only for its promotional, capitalist value; a backdrop for operas. This is why the state celebration of the tropical landscape and its destruction by the industrial development of the nation—the Trans-Amazonian highway, the Belo Monte hydroelectric power plant, the monoculture, and the logging—are able to coexist. This is also why the biopatenting of biodiversity—again, the intertwinement of nature with the indigenous in the commodification of their knowledge—may very well be the end result of the naturalist inventories of American flora during the Enlightenment.

Antropofagia, the political and aesthetic movement "discovered" in the 1920s by a faction of the modernist vanguard of São Paulo, is the only Brazilian movement that consciously faced modernity's naturalizing negation.[5] They even had a name for it: in the article "Anthropophagy and Culture," published in *Revista de Antropofagia*, the editorial vehicle for the

5 "This new philosophy, 'which was not invented, nor imported, but discovered right here,' predominant, the hunger of an imagination marching in search of new forms." Soquilles Vivacqua, *Revista de Antropofagia*, 2nd "dentition," N. 7 (May 8, 1929).—Trans. Ed.

ideas of the movement, the anthropophagic movement termed it, "Ptolemaic Capsule."[6] Against it, Antropofagia brought forth the Amerindian, but also nature, more specifically, an Indian nature radically other to ours. Antropofagia, however, wished not only to denounce and refuse modernity in order to expropriate it of its philosophical or political logic—the "physical *capsule* of which the radius of action cannot go beyond an horizon of lynching"—but also to devour it in the way of anthropophagic Amerindian rituals.[7] In their own words, "Those who think we are against the abuses of Western civilization are mistaken. What we are is against its uses."[8]

Since its inception with the modernist vanguards, Antropofagia has been mostly understood as a purely aesthetic movement, undeniably influential for the twentieth-century Brazilian arts and literature—including the 1960s Tropicália, and the globalist multiculturalism of the 1990s. This artistic success, however, has unfortunately trapped and simplified it, reducing it to the role, and at worse a style, of artistic acculturation and hybridity. And yet, Antropofagia was also, or foremost, a veritable anthropology. The movement's reading of the chronicles of Jesuits and travelers in the sixteenth-century America, as well as of modernist anthropologists such as Karl von den Steinen or James Frazer, is surprisingly perspicacious. More urgently, however, I would say that this was not only an anthropology of the other, but also a proto-symmetrical anthropology, wherein the examination of Amerindian predation promises the cosmopolitical

6 Oswald de Andrade "Anthropophagy and Culture," *Revista de Antropofagia*, 2nd "dentition," N. 9, (May 15, 1929), 125-27 in this volume. Evidently, the cosmological counter-intuitiveness of Umbanda, Candomblé, and many other local belief systems throughout Brazil should also be considered, though not perhaps in the programmatic form of Antropofagia. In any case, they too were cannibalized.

7 Ibid.

8 Oswald Costa, "De Antropofagia," *Revista de Antropofagia*, 2nd "dentition", N. 9 (May 15, 1929).

transformation of our own *capitalist predation* and modern sterilization of the world by reason, the Ptolemaic capsule.

Oswald de Andrade, Flávio de Carvalho, even Glauber Rocha, are anthropologists of otherness, but first and foremost of ourselves—anthropology by way of the other thought. A great inversion, but also a double iconoclasm: anthropology neither as the study of others or the study of oneself, but the study of *our* world through the other; and the rupture with the Indian as the pure (purified), natural (naturalized) other. In Antropofagia, the Indian is not strictly Indian; it is also the poor and the oppressed, and thus any other living being, the Earth system itself. To quote Alexandre Nodari, "Antropofagia is not only a *theory of culture*, but also and simultaneously a *philosophy of nature*."[9] Though the modernist anthropophagi certainly knew their French literature, they did not praise the Amerindian state of nature, but rather the Indians' *vision* of nature. Antropofagia then, as the paradigmatic image of *an other* philosophy, cosmopolitical, perhaps even nonhuman.

In reaffirming Amerindian natural cosmologies, however, the modernist anthropophagi ultimately cannibalized it beyond any anthropological essentialism:

> "From yesterday, today, and tomorrow. From here and abroad. The anthropophagous eats the Indian and eats the so-called civilized; only he licks his fingers. Ready to swallow his brothers … The Indian is, solely, a reference point in the apparent chaos."[10]

9 See Alexandre Nodari, "'The Transformation of the Taboo into Totem': Notes on an Anthropophagic Formula," (2014), 409–54 in this volume.

10 Antônio de Alcântara Machado, "Give Way," *Revista de Antropofagia*, 1st "dentition," N. 1 (May 1928).

The affirmation, or intrusion to paraphrase Isabelle Stengers, of a difference radically other to ours, paradigmatically expressed in anthropophagy, may very well be the source of Antropofagia's psychoanalytical imaginary. The trauma of eating the same and being devoured by the other—the anthropophagic descent. A cannibal metaphysics, as Eduardo Viveiros de Castro has named it, repressed since modernity's primeval moment of division in the Discoveries: humanity apart from nature. One can say that Antropofagia is the conceptualization of the irruption, the confrontation of the divide between nature and culture, or the possibility of a theory for its negotiation or possible collapse.

The collective of anthropophagic modernists advocated not only a return to the Indian soul and its most irresolvable of rituals, but the *continuation* of the "savage mind" in a transformed and digested form. For Oswald de Andrade, the Indian is a misconception waiting resolution for the past five hundred years. The primitive is yet to arrive—*for us*. Anthropophagy is thus the point from which time "in the land of Brazil" flows back to the untold, the negated history of the continent prior to the arrival of the Europeans. It is also the point from which a time beyond capital and the messianism of Western philosophy can be generated: "Anthropophagy is the production of time; one eats not to avenge the past but to produce the future."[11]

In the current economic boom, what is at stake is either the constitution of Brazil and South America as simply a simulacrum of Western capitalism—reproduced by industrial determinism and the silencing of the continent's multiplicity,

11 Eduardo Viveiros de Castro and Manuela Carneiro da Cunha, "Vingança e temporalidade: Os Tupinambá," *Journal de la Société des Américanistes*, Vol. 71 (1985).

or, in contrast, the production of a new, multinaturalist, communalist, Earth-bound economics. In this respect, Antropofagia may be either dropped and forgotten as a commodified strategy, or expanded beyond its current frontiers. As Alexandre Nodari has suggested, "perhaps only today has anthropophagy, understood as a philosophy, reached a degree of legibility, even if its scope (art, myth, the savage mind) has long been established. Perhaps this spatial territorialization (an artistic philosophy) and temporal anachronism (almost a century of delay) are accidents constituting anthropophagy as a proper political concept."[12] An anthropophagic anthropology— "the permanent decolonization of thought."[13] But also an anthropological anthropophagy—an "odontology" to paraphrase Oswald's own pun.

Cannibalism was a vital sixteenth and seventeenth century theme, divided between, on the one hand, the vision of cannibalism as savage primitivism, and on the other, as a ritual dispositive. While certain travelers saw in it the Indians' *nature*, others saw in anthropophagy the Indians' religion, that is to say, their culture. "Here is the difference: cannibals are people who *feed* on human flesh; but it is a different case with the Tupi, who eat their enemies for *vengeance*."[14] This is a distinction Oswald de Andrade also insists on:

> "Considered as a *Weltanschauung*, [anthropophagy] barely complies to the materialist and immoral interpretation made by Jesuits and colonizers. Rather, it belongs as a religious rite to the rich spiritual world of primitive man.

12 Alexandre Nodari, personal exchange with author, 2012.

13 Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, *Métaphysiques cannibales* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2009), 92.

14 Manuela Carneiro da Cunha, "Images of Indians of Brazil: The Sixteenth Century," *Estudos Avançados*, Vol. 4, N. 10 (1990), 81–87 in this volume.

> In its harmonious and communal character, it is the opposite of cannibalism—anthropophagy by gluttony and also by hunger."[15]

The predation, capture, and digestion of the other, their opposite, for the Tupinambá of the Brazilian coast only ate their enemies, allowed for the substantiation of the self and of the community at large: "Cannibalism coincided with the entire social body: men, women, children, all should eat from the contrary."[16] For the Tupinambá, however, the self may have meant something altogether different to our "encapsulated" self. The process of substantiation which finds anthropophagy as its "institution" is, strangely to our Cartesian-Freudian philosophical complex, the negation of a stabilizing, differentiating psychology:

> "The warrior exocannibalism complex, projected a form in which the socius was constructed through relationship with the other, in which the incorporation of the other required an exit from oneself—the exterior was constantly engaged in a process of interiorization, and the interior was nothing but movement towards the outside. [...] The other was not a mirror, but a destination. [...] Tupinambá philosophy affirmed an *essential ontological incompleteness*: the incompleteness of sociality, and, in general, of humanity. It was, in other words, an order where interiority and identity were encompassed by exteriority and difference, where becoming and relationship prevailed

15 Oswald de Andrade, "The Crisis of Messianic Philosophy" (1950), 151–77 in this volume. Originally published in *Obras completas VI: Do Pau-Brasil à Antropofagia e às utopias*, ed. Benedito Nunes (São Paulo: Civilização Brasileira, 1970).

16 Viveiros de Castro, *The Inconstancy of the Indian Soul*, 100.

> over being and substance. For this type of cosmology, others are a solution, before being—as they were for the European invaders—a problem."[17]

The ferocity of the Tupinambá warriors shocked missionaries and colonizers, yet the Indians' anthropophagy was also compared to the cases of religious disembowelment, penitence, and even cannibalism, occurring in Europe at the time of the Reformation. For Montaigne, the Indians' wars were valorous and not pious like the europeans, and their cannibalism simply a shadow of discriminatory violence. Predatory war would have its starting point in capture, followed by a long period of captivity that entailed a period of socialization, wherein the prisoner would live among the community, be granted wives, share in hunting and other rituals. Only to find his death in the anthropophagic ritual. At this point, yet another distinction between cannibalism and anthropophagy appears, which qualifies the prisoner in his behavior: the Indians only ate those worthy of value, which is the same as saying they only ate the best parts, metaphysically as well as literally, of their enemies. This selective or *high* anthropophagy is also emphasized by Oswald de Andrade. Hélene Clastres, however, criticizes this perspective as having fallen, anthropopologically, out of view, proposing anthropophagy instead as a process of relational affinity:

> "Inside, brothers-in-law; outside, enemies. There was only one Tupi word to designate both relations: *tovaja* … Instead of exocannibalism, a strangely twisted endocannibalism."[18]

17 Ibid., 46–47. Author's italics.

18 Héléne Clastres, "Enemy Brothers-in-Law: On Tupinambá Cannibalism," in this volume. Originally published in *Destins du cannibalisme, Nouvelle revue de Psychanalyse*, N. 6 (Paris: Gallimard, 1972), 71–82.

In other words, instead of unity, dispersal; instead of an obsession with identity, relation. The idea has proven influential, allowing for Eduardo Viveiros de Castro and Manuela Carneiro da Cunha to not only view digestive vengeance as a form of retrieving the past and keep ancestry alive, but also a production of future; a digestive exchange between enemies, in which the horizon is always receding and being renewed.[19] In this process instead of pacifying the collective body, anthropophagy multiplies its subjectivity in an openness to the outside: "Heteronomy was the condition of autonomy; what is vengeance, if not a mode of recognizing that the 'truth of society' lies in the hands of others?"[20]

The arrival of the Europeans perhaps only exacerbated this alterity—and "it was perhaps the Amerindians, not the Europeans, who saw the 'vision of paradise' in the American (mis)(sed)encounter."[21] The anthropophagic ritual was not necessarily epistemic but it was certainly a process of familiarity with the outside—literally, in how the captive was offered women and food, became a partner in war and trading, and in how ultimately, only through the enemy's digestion would he become metaphysically human. In a wider cosmopolitical context, "the *socius* is a margin or a boundary,

19 "With due respects to the theory of Florestan Fernandes, I do not think that warrior vengeance was an *instrumentum religionis* that restored the integrity of the social body when it was threatened by the death of a member, thus making society once again coincide with itself, relinking it to the ancestors through the sacrifice of a victim. Neither do I believe that cannibalism was a process of 'recuperating the substance' of the society's dead members, through the intermediation of the devoured body of the enemy. For the point was not to take vengeance because people died and needed to be rescued from the destructive flow of becoming; the point was to die (preferably in enemy hands) in order to bring vengeance into being, and thus bring into being a future." Viveiros de Castro, *The Inconstancy of the Indian Soul*, 71.

20 Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, *From the Enemy's Point of View: Humanity and Divinity in an Amazonian Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 287.

21 Viveiros de Castro, *The Inconstancy of the Indian Soul*, 30.

an unstable and precarious space between nature (animality) and supernature (divinity)."[22] Thus, in captivity, the enemy would perhaps be better addressed according to the dummy pronoun "it"—his or her ontological ambiguity remaining an open question. Only through cohabitation could the community verify the humanity and personhood of the captive: "Their hatred of their enemies and the entire captivity/ ritual execution/cannibalism complex, were founded on an integral recognition of the opponent's humanity—which has nothing to do, of course, with any sort of 'humanism.'"[23] This transformation of the alien "it" of the prisoner could only be processed through the killer's own humanity, that is, through an "exchange of exchange of perspectives." The killer could not eat from his victim:

> "While the community transformed itself into a ferocious and bloody mob, while it staged a becoming-animal (recall the jaguar Cunhambebe) and a becoming-enemy, the killer was the one who carried the burden of rules and the symbolic. Immediately after killing his opponent he entered into a rigorous seclusion, a classic liminal state, preparing himself to receive a new name and a new personality. He and his dead enemy were, in a certain sense, the only proper human figures in the entire ceremony. Cannibalism was possible because one did not eat."[24]

Anthropophagy was a veritable *epistemology from the other side*, rather than a syncretic accumulation of identities or values. Following Claude Lévi-Strauss, one can say that both the Europeans and the Amerindians were intent on verifying the

22 Ibid., 29.

23 Ibid., 82.

24 Ibid., 100–101.

humanity of the other—of course, each according to their characteristic "sciences."[25] It was just that "humanity" had very different meanings for one and the other.

Oswald de Andrade's 1928 *Anthropophagic Manifesto*, published in the first issue of the Magazine, practically seems to contain the movement's full complexity, albeit coded and in confused form, veiled by puns and aphorisms—in large part, Antropofagia is a theory made in verses. Other writings by Oswald de Andrade, as well as Oswald Costa, Raul Bopp, or Garcia de Rezende, contribute to an elucidation of Antropofagia's main theses. In Bopp's "The Life and Death of Antropofagia," one can read about the alleged poor results of the *Semana de Arte Moderna* (The Week of Modern Art), the inaugural event of Brazilian modernism in 1922, and the tension it generated among the modernists. Thus it was that, as the decade progressed, several modernists fell into a reactionary, bourgeois nationalism, represented by the Verde-Amarelo group and its elected symbol of the "primitive" Indian.

In 1924, Oswald too takes the path of the forest in search of the valorous Indian in his "Manifesto Pau-Brasil," only to later cook it into the "only truly revolutionary philosophy of Brazil."[26] For the Verde-Amarelo, the Indians were simply restyled with a modernist twist, and maintained "the same fundamental equivocations"[27] of nineteenth-century Indianism. The Indians, "after contributing to the ethnic composition of Brazil," would "lose their objective life while

25 Claude Lévi-Strauss quoted in Bruno Latour "Perspectivism: 'Type' or 'Bomb'?" (2009), 266–72 in this volume.

26 This is a paraphrase of Augusto de Campos's words in "Revistas revistas: Os antropófagos," in *Revista de Antropofagia*, facsimile reedition, 1st and 2nd "dentition" (São Paulo: Editora Abril Ltda./Metal Leve S/A, 1975), 1.

27 Raul Bopp, "Vida e morte da Antropofagia," in *Vida e morte da Antropofagia* (Rio de Janeiro: José Olympo Editora, 2006). Originally published in 1965–66. Passage not included in this volume.

being interiorized as part of the national spirit," being reduced to the "biological, psychic, and spiritual substratum of nationality."[28] In the words of the state, they were pacified. In contrast, and even if at certain moments the modernist anthropophagi also happen to fall into similar praise, they "interiorized the Indian, but as an image of the primitive living in an *other* society, moving in a ethnographically unlimited space confused with the unconscious of the species." Again, "his primitivism reproduced the critical distance of the modern anthropologist in relation to the patterns of society. […] On the other hand, it allied itself, by a return to the savage mind, to the baring of man pursued by psychoanalysis."[29]

"Tell me what you eat, and I'll tell you who you are," said the gastronomist Brillat-Savarin in the eighteenth century. The dictum would be true for the anthropophagous, were it not for the emphasis on *being*. Why did the anthropophagi eat the Indians—neither their friends nor foes, neither allies nor enemies—and only through the Indian's cosmological appetite devour their enemies? Perhaps because "the Indian did not have the verb *to be*," thus escaping "the metaphysical dangers that turn, daily, the Paleolithic man into a devout Christian, a Muslim, a Buddhist, a moralized animal. A miserable, wise man filled with diseases."[30] The anthropophagic "descent," as the modernists termed it, was both geographic and temporal, a return to a worldview prior to discovery of the Americas. It was the rediscovery of inner Brazil, somewhere between the piousness of Minas Gerais, built on slave labor and that of Bahia,

28 Benedito Nunes "Antropofagia ao alcance de todos" in Oswald de Andrade, *Obras completas IV: Do Pau-Brasil à Antropofagia e às utopias* (Rio de Janeiro: Editora Civilização Brasileira, 1972), xxxvii.

29 Ibid, xxxviii.—Ed., italics added.

30 Freuderico (possibly Oswald de Andrade), "Of Anthropophagy," 117–21 in this volume. Originally published in *Revista de Antropofagia*, 2nd "dentition," N. 1 (March 24, 1929).

where the multiplicity of African deities inhabited the autonomy of the settlements of the freed slaves, the *quilombos*. But it was also the "descent" to an inverse worldview to that of the moderns. Contrary to Indianism, the modernist anthropophagi desired the Indians in the fullest extension of their alterity. For this reason, the goal was not the return of the repressed but the ingestion of the Superego—in order to inhabit the trauma of excision.

The first issue of the Magazine stated: "[Antropofagia] has no orientation or any kind of thought: it has only stomach."[31] By the 1920s, the problem was not with the Brazilian stomach, diverse in nature and culture. The problem was found in the customs of the mind, the mild habits of taste, and four hundred years of prejudice and catechism—"Four centuries of beef! What horror!"[32] Despite the hegemony of European culture in Brazil, its reality, rather than the dream, was simultaneously present and forever out of reach—it is not much different today. Nonetheless, overwhelming as Europe was, its reality was simultaneously present and forever out of reach. For colonized—now "developing"—countries, the West is merely a mirage, a horizon that at each successful stage—of development, in other words assimilation—recedes back into the distance, canceling the possibility of either success, meaning acceptance, or any singular self-realization. Neo-colonization dominates in terms of infinite economic debts and of the domesticating power of ideas. The anthropophagus knew better: "What we have is not European culture: it is its experience. Four centuries of experience. Painfully and by force."[33]

31 A de A. M. R. B., "Nota insistente," *Revista de Antropofagia*, 1st "dentition," (May 1928).

32 Oswald Costa, "The Anthropophagic Descent," 114–16 in this volume. Originally published in *Revista de Antropofagia*, 1st "dentition," N. 1, (May 1928).

33 Ibid.

First and foremost, Antropofagia appeared as a political idea, an open war against the experience of domestication by the European colonization. In the *Anthropophagic Manifesto* the declaration is clear, "We want the Carib revolution. Bigger than the French Revolution. The unification of all effective revolts in the direction of man. Without us, Europe wouldn't even have its poor declaration of the rights of man."[34] Followed by, "Filiation. The contact with Carib Brazil. *Où Villegaignon print terre*. Montaigne. The natural man. Rousseau. From the French Revolution to Romanticism, to the Bolshevik Revolution, the Surrealist Revolution, and Keyserling's technicized barbarian."[35] The Carib revolution, with anthropophagy as its revolutionary method, is both the origin of modernity and its future. While "all effective revolts in the direction of man" may descend from the Carib revolution, they also carry the seeds for the *matriarchy of Pindorama*, examined in Flávio de Carvalho and Oswald de Andrade's later writings.

For Oswald, the concepts "man" and "humanity" were rather defined in the encounter with the radical difference of the Native Americans—from this perspective, both concepts are anthropophagic throughout. In brief, even though humanity may have been invented on the shores of South America and the Caribbean, its subsumption under the civilizing, universalist figure of man is historically "a sham." All the revolutions of Western modernity are unimaginable without their origins in America, and yet the Manifesto proceeds: "We walk on."

From a geophilosophical perspective, wherein being, territory, and environment reciprocate the plasticity of thought, there is little difference between the partition of the world

34 Oswald de Andrade, *Anthropophagic Manifesto*, 99–107 in this volume. Originally published in *Revista de Antropofagia*, 1st "dentition," N. 1, (May 1928).

35 Ibid.

into colonial empires and the regulation of life under the ideas of man and humanity. The centrality of this affirmation is close to that of the Grupo Modernidad/Colonialidad, which finds the material and metaphysical origins of modernity in the South—*The Darker Side of the Renaissance*. Antropofagia was a proto-critique of humanism that aligns with the Grupo M/C's tripartite character of coloniality—coloniality of power, of knowledge, and of being—understanding "mankind," in reality, as the epistemic exterminator of multiplicity, of other epistemes. Man "is still encapsulated by the Ptolemaic system; [he] remains imprisoned within *a horizontal and static vision of the Earth*. [He] is capable only of lynching. This is the reason behind all the errors of dualism, and the meaning of Antropofagia's Critique of the Spirit."[36]

Against the ontological determinism of Western modernity, where differences cannot live but by regimentation, anthropophagy stands for a process of decolonization of self and the world that can only result in that original and "fundamental ontological *inconstancy*." The refusal of essentialism. Of purity. This is perhaps what most distinguishes Antropofagia from Éduard Glissant's theory of the Archipelago, or from the Negritude of Frantz Fanon and Amílcar Cabral for that matter. In the end, Antropofagia eats it all, just like it eats Western Prometheanism. Despite its praise of difference, Antropofagia is a critique of the *determinism* of difference, in other words, of that *other* difference resulting from modern processes of purification, fundamentalist excisions, or capitalist divisions:

> "Not that we have any system at all. Yet we must find a solution to all problems to the West and East. The Equator too—

36 Andrade, "Anthropophagy and Culture," 125-27 in this volume. Originally published in *Revista de Antropofagia*, 2nd "dentition," N. 9 (May 15, 1929).

> in the anthropophagic descent we are announcing—will arm itself with its mechanisms of inquiry."[37]

## An ecosophy *made in Brazil*?

The rumor surrounding the discovery of Antropofagia, compels an exploration of its inter-speciesist roots. The movement's cosmogony is, evidently, culinary yet it does not originate in the cannibalist dinner table but rather from eating man's repressed other—the animal. In "The Restaurant of Frogs," a section of Bopp's memoirs, the poet narrates humorously how anthropophagy came about over a dinner among friends in São Paulo. "The [restaurant's] specialty: frogs." Seeing the poor frogs on the table, Oswald embarks on a speech about the theory of evolution, tracing the descent of man not only to the monkey but also farther back in time to his pre-anthropoid, Precambrian common gene pool. Tarsila do Amaral, the famous Brazilian painter of the movement—then wife to Oswald—replies, "Given such argument, we arrive theoretically to the conclusion that we are now being… almost anthropophagous."[38] And so Hans Staden's famous adage upon entering the village as a prisoner, "I, your food, have come" immediately became a pun "here comes our food hopping!"—hopping like a frog.[39]

Furthermore, one can extrapolate that the anthropophagic "descent," meant not only the rediscovery of Amerindian cosmopolitical thought but also a confrontation with the "oceanic feeling" proclaimed by Freud, and which has since

37 Freuderico (possibly Oswald de Andrade), "Of Anthropophagy" (1929).

38 Bopp, "The Life and Death of Antropofagia" (2006).

39 In what respects symmetrical anthropology, the inversion of interlocutors, from Staden's "I" to the native's voice, is worthy of note here.

haunted mankind with the consciousness of its species' mutability, of his bodily decay within the Earth system, of which he is only but another evolutionary result, and the environment nothing but the cannibalization of its children. That the protozoa—the first animals: "proto"–"zoa"—are the original heterotrophic life forms, beings that consume and transform food into energy, that eat from one another, mustn't have been strange to Oswald. This anthropophagic evolutionary theory does not comply that simply with primate evolution—a genealogy that despite identifying in primates a humanity by extension, simultaneously fences off other species by repressing its far reaching implications: humanity's phylogenic nightmare. In Alexandre Nodari's words, "Speciesism is the first form of racism."[40]

This anthropophagic prehistory runs throughout Flávio de Carvalho's writings.[41] This translates for example in the author's moral and gendered class theory determining an evolution for the forms of dress in a series of articles and drawings for the newspaper *O Diário de São Paulo*.[42] Class inequality continuously generates the appropriation of the other's habits and dress. Yet in Carvalho's thought, sublimation is a bottom-up affair,

> "fashion is presented by the philosopher and historian as having its origins in aristocracy and evolving from the top to bottom. It is precisely the opposite: fashion is born among the people, it is born among the humble layers of

40 Nodari, "'The Transformation of the Taboo into Totem.'"

41 Flávio de Carvalho's cosmopolitical ecology is prevalent, if not the main subject, of his books *Os Ossos do Mundo* (1936), *A Dialética da Moda* (1956), *Notas para a Reconstrução de um Mundo Perdido* (1957–58) and *A Origem Animal de Deus* (1967).

42 Compiled in Flávio de Carvalho, *A Moda e o Novo Homem*, ed. Sergio Cohn e Heyk Pimenta (Rio de Janeiro: Azougue Editorial, 2010). A selection of drawings by Carvalho on the theme can be found on 192–201 in this volume.

> society, from those underneath, and in passing through the slave, the prisoner, the soldier, it follows up to the throne."[43]

Similarly to Glauber Rocha's aesthetics of hunger, for Carvalho the poor are the locus of a creativity resulting from the environment and labor; creativity that the upper classes transform into courtly or bourgeois decorative forms, only to "after having taken possession of such ornamentation, forbid its use to those below so as to preserve the hierarchical ladder."[44] These writings are from the same period as Carvalho's famous performance *Experiência número 3*, where he walked the streets of São Paulo wearing his self-designed *New Look*, his proposed clothing for the tropics, which would substitute the weather-incompatible business suit with leather sandals, skirt and airy shirt and collar.[45] The *New Look* answered to environmental adaptation, while also breaking with social, and even ontological, divisions imposed by the Western philosophy of morals. For Carvalho, labor and business represent a late division of society, being only the technical evolution of speciesism.

This environmentalist anthropophagy finds its highest point in Carvalho's geophilosophy or geotheology of *The Animal Origin of God*, an ecological history of the origins of God and religion, wherein the making of God in man's image, rather than the opposite, would have been the negation of a primordial communion with life's diversity, the

43 Carvalho, *A Moda e o Novo Homem*, 45.

44 Ibid., 267, 47.

45 Both projects followed from his proposal, "Cidade do Homen Nu" (The City of Naked Man), presented at the 1930s IV Pan-American Congress of Architects in Rio de Janeiro, which composed an anthropophagic masterplan for the tropics. "The city of today exhibits an heterogeneous and ridiculous aspect: it is the ethical image of bourgeois patriarchy, decadent and incapable of integrity." An antagonistic precursor to Niemeyer's Brasilia—the bureaucratic and hygienic capital—for the anthropophagic modernists The City of Naked Man stood against the morality of labor, in its indistiguishability from the biopolitical stratification of roles and experiences, of division at the core of society.

repression of a "a trans-speciesist egalitarianism" still very much alive in many indigenous economies.[46] In that initial stage, God was a problem of nutrition, and devoration the first religious act of man: "Slowly, man becomes eminently racist, repudiating his conviviality with his grazing companions; developing a feeling of superiority, he starts to consider the rest of the animal world as inferior beings."[47] The discovery of the species establishes that "the radical (ontological) discontinuity between man and his fellow animals implies (or makes possible) the discontinuity internal to men, that is, political hierarchy."[48] What then of the dispossessed? Carvalho's answer: "The ethnological fact that the gods of previous religions become the demons of new religions proves that those underneath are the eternally discontented who mean to disturb, undo, or overturn those on top: the new gods."[49]

In the end, anthropophagy is the eating of the animal-God, which is in fact the eating of the environment or the cosmos. This critique is best summarized by Oswald de Andrade:

> "The gravest absurd is, for example, to judge as unconscious the part most enlightened by man's consciousness: the sex and the stomach. I call this *anthropophagic consciousness*. Its other, resulting from the always flexible struggle with exterior resistances, once transformed into a strategic norm, I call 'ethical consciousness.'"[50]

46 Nodari, "'The Transformation of the Taboo into Totem.'"

47 Flávio de Carvalho, *The Animal Origin of God*, 178–91 in this volume. Originally published as *A origem animal de deus* (São Paulo: Difusão Europeia do Livro, 1973), 73.

48 Nodari, "'The Transformation of the Taboo into Totem.'"

49 Carvalho, *The Animal Origin of God*, 19.

50 Oswald de Andrade, *Os Dentes do Dragão: Entrevistas* (São Paulo: Globo, 2009), 80.

Referring to Bachofen and Engels's theory of Mother Right, in *The Crisis of Messianic Philosophy*, Oswald de Andrade writes that the discontinuity (between men *and* between species) can be

> "traced down to the existence of two cultural hemispheres that have divided history into *matriarchy* and *patriarchy*. The former is the world of primitive man, the latter that of the civilized. The former produced an anthropophagic culture, the latter a messianic culture."[51]

For Oswald, messianism is the movement that severs itself from the social through a transcendence in which the aim is an exterior regulation of life—imposing on society the belief that "the ends justify the means; that demands from its followers, forcibly or not, an *inert* obedience."[52]

Yet how does messianism detach from society, rupturing with the commonality of anthropophagic ecosystems of exchange and transmutation? From the matriarchy where children are everyone's offspring, property is inexistent, and thus class divisions held at bay? "The historical rupture with the matriarchal world," he says "was produced when man ceased to *devour* man, and instead made him a slave."[53] Messianism ruptures society with the patriarchal forms of inheritance, property, and class. But for these to be operational, at its origin messianism, its articulation in the form of law or "natural law" must be created:

> "With the institution of the class state, as a consequence of the patriarchal revolution, a single class took power and began to rule over all others. The rights that defended

51 Andrade, "The Crisis of Messianic Philosophy."

52 Ibid.

53 Ibid.

> this class became, therefore, legal, creating an opposition between such rights, positive law, and natural law. Given that these rights were legislated, they demand obedience. The state, the personification of law, was thus established as a coercive organization."[54]

From this perspective, civilization is simply a degree of violence, with the partitioned worlds of nature and of man regulated by the law of the state, and by its embodiment in the power of the ruling class. The naturalization of discontinuity is the operative fiction of messianism.

It is unsurprising then that in his memoirs Raul Bopp would presage Pierre Clastres's anthropology of power in "primitive" societies, where society is organized against the state:

> "The chief of a tribe, given his supernatural attributes, had sovereign powers, clearly legitimate within a circumscribed area (for example, between two converging rivers). However, once the group became unhappy with the chief (for reason of a tyrannical conduct or for not having kept his promises) the members of the clan would not stage a revolution or usurp power. Nothing of the sort. The tribe would simply move somewhere else, outside the limits of the chief's jurisdiction, leaving him alone."[55]

Clastres's account is not so benevolent, for the Guarani the chief can very well be executed. Undivided and vigilant, these societies exist on the verge of dissolution, permanently prescient of the potential intrusion of power in social relations. Recalling the inconstancy of savages "without faith, without law, without King," Clastres claims,

54 Ibid.

55 Bopp, "The Life and Death of Antropofagia."

> "The refusal of power relations, the refusal to obey, is not in any way, as the missionaries and travellers thought, a character trait of savages, but the effect of the functioning of social machines on an individual level, the result of collective action and decision."[56]

These societies preempt the state form through strategic organization. The powerlessness of the chief is the negation of a power *separate* to society. It is the refusal and control of any possibility of detachment and establishment of an exterior politics ready to preside or even represent society. Politics, as the exercise of power, is immanent to the social body, organizing it so as "to maintain its undivided being, to ward off the appearance in its breast of the inequality between masters and subjects, between chief and tribe."[57] Undividable and unexploitable, Clastres concludes.

Clastres's denunciation of the instrumentality of the ethnographic division between "primitive" societies without a state and "civilized" state societies is at the same time the refusal of the anthropological projection of the moderns on other peoples; and, inversely, the affirmation of other peoples' thoughts about us (*what others are, and what we are, according to them*). What is at stake in Clastres's anthropology of power is the collective vigilance over the seeds of discontinuity, "the implicit but crucial assertion that division is not an ontological structure of society."[58] Followed by a sentence that is a blow to many of the postmodern interpretations of Antropofagia, including that of Tropicália:

56 Pierre Clastres, "Freedom, Misfortune, the Unnameable," in *Archeology Of Violence* (New York: Semiotext(e), 1994), 99.

57 Ibid., 100.

58 Ibid.

> "the logic of primitive society, which is a logic of difference, would contradict the logic of generalized exchange, which is the logic of identity … identification is a movement toward death."[59]

Against any expectation of a Luddite mentality, Oswald's answer in *The Crisis* is not a nostalgic refusal of technology as the civilizing engine of oppression. Technology is anthropophagically put to use and the cannibal is the inverse of primitivism. More than a primitivism, Antropofagia would then better be understood as a futurism. Oswald offers the formula:

> "1st term: thesis—natural man
> 2nd term: antithesis—civilized man
> 3rd term: synthesis—technological natural man."[60]

The dynamics between labor and leisure at the center of Oswald's history of messianism are also his clearest example of the anthropophagic use of technology. What is leisure? Borrowing from Ortega y Gasset, he says,

> "Sacerdotalism means leisure consecrated to the gods. […] Against sacerdotalism, which is the sacred leisure, appears, with virulence, *business*, which is the negation of leisure."[61]

To which he adds,

> "The word leisure (*ócio*) in Greek is *sxolé*, from which 'school' is derived. So much so that we can easily identify

59 Pierre Clastres, "Archeology of Violence: War in Primitive Societies" in *Archeology of Violence*(New York: Semiotext(e), 1994), 157.

60 Andrade, "The Crisis of Messianic Philosophy."

61 See footnote 15 to "The Crisis of Messianic Philosophy", 166 in this volume.

> the idlers in ancient society as those men who escaped manual labor in order to dedicate themselves to speculation and the pursuits of the spirit."[62]

In other words, not idleness but the refusal of exploitation. Leisure is "not the negation of work but rather the occupation of that which is human in man."[63] In the 1950s, Oswald's "homo ludens" may have been the subject of a futuristic narrative; but today, "in the over-technological world that is arriving"—that has arrived—his prescient words have come true and technology is now able to offer such conditions, that is to say, for leisure independent from extraction and labor as the process of common sharing.

After half a century, it is as if Glauber Rocha is still there at the crossroads, as he appeared in Jean Luc Godard's *Le vent d'est* (1970), pointing the way of decolonization. Yet the route hardly leads to just Third Worldism. As the transition from his iconic manifesto "The Aesthetics of Hunger" to the later "The Aesthetics of Dreaming" exemplifies, for Glauber Rocha we are in need of a project ready to search for a body/environment ecology suppressed by modern reason, that is, the inseparability—the porosity—between body and land found most alive in the voice of the dispossessed. "Sub altern carrying his task of covering the present *with earth*," writes Hélio Oiticica in his subterranean poems, as if answering to Glauber's mythology. His *Penetrables*, starting with the *Tropicália* installation that gave the movement a name, should be read inversely: it is not the body that penetrates the environment, but the world that penetrates the illusion of an enclosed body. From the first to

62 Andrade, "The Crisis of Messianic Philosophy."

63 José Ortega y Gasset, *Meditação sobre a técnica* (Rio de Janeiro: Livro Ibero Americano, 1933), 46.

the second of Oiticica's poems, all human semblance is lost, absorbed by images of land and sea, by a climatic relation.

But what to say of Tropicália, the paradigmatic and long-lasting image of the 1960s counter-culture that irrupted just when the Brazilian military dictatorship was being implemented? "To abolish xenophobic prejudice," writes Rogério Duarte, key designer and writer of the movement, in his book *Tropicaos*. "A major consequence of the tropicalist cultural revolution was the taking over of all mediums and the decompartmentalization of those mediums"; Tropicália "threatened the division of intellectual work. [...] Questioning all sorts of values and *modes of earning money*."[64]

Hélio Oiticica's writings on desire and leisure are perhaps compromised by this swallowing and being swallowed by the environment. In them the artist hardly acknowledges Oswald's late theories of leisure. Tropicália broke with the puritanism of the Brazilian elite and the nationalist project of the Communist Left, and imagined a future of contradiction, where the traditional and the new, mass production and the artisanal, remain irresolvable and yet in motion. Shameless and forward looking, Tropicália may have been the affirmation of the technological primitive man dreamed of by Oswald. In his last interview Oswald de Andrade said:

> "Due to my health, it is impossible for me to proceed with this communication, which I deem essential for the revision of concepts about the American man. Thus, I make a plea to all researchers of that biggest of subjects to take into consideration the grandiosity of the primitive, his solid concept of life as devoration, and to carry on the task of a philosophy yet to be made."[65]

64 Rogério Duarte, *Tropicaos* (Rio de Janeiro: Azougue Editorial, 2003), 140.

65 N. p.: Oswald de Andrade, 1954.

The transition from the poetic and artistic experiments of *Neoconcretismo*—in which the poets Augusto and Haroldo de Campos and Décio Pignatari rediscovered Oswald de Andrade's writings[66]—to Tropicália and the political poor of Cinema Novo, and later Marginália, took upon themselves this task. And yet, as Suely Rolnik painfully reminds her own generation in this volume, Tropicália too has been officialized by state power and incorporated into the nationalistic narrative of Brazil: the tropical land of hybridity and syncretism are the necessary qualities of products for exportation "made in Brazil," as the song by *Os Mutantes* goes. Tropicália too has found its place on the supermarket shelves it sang about. Its problem is the paradox of an identity built on the affirmation that the Brazilian identity is *that it has no identity*. Tropicália has become exemplary of a paradoxical loop whereupon difference is again subsumed under identity, not as the lived sign of a frontier of conflict and negotiation but simply as a token of capital exchange and of the reproduction of capitalist alternatives.

Sequestered by the capitalization of Tropicália, Antropofagia too has become a caricature of multiculturality and acculturation. "Pacified," Antropofagia in Brazil has been mostly reduced to autophagy. From this perspective, anthropophagy is simply what, following a warning left in the *Anthropophagic Manifesto*, Suely Rolnik has termed a "low anthropophagy." Low anthropophagy, rather than "the permanent decolonization of thought," only contributes to the replication of a colonized mentality—as if politics could be enacted simply by the logic of hybridity, and, worse, as if the acceptance of difference were true for the poor rather than brutally suppressed within the confines of its instrumental illusion. Commodified,

66 See Caetano Veloso, *Verdade Tropical* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1997).

it becomes synonymous with a neo-Darwinist mode of predation, precarious and individualistic. Society is a jungle; nature a wildness tamed by bourgeois reason, and predation the social logic of capitalistic growth. And yet the "cannibal" must continuously be demonized as inhuman, "the only one that could not be tolerated," the taboo. It is as if we are back in the colonizers mind of the sixteenth century. Thus the cycle of oppression is completed, and Antropofagia too is again naturalized.

When Félix Guattari, speaking to a Brazilian audience in 1985, insists on distinguishing between identity and singularity, he is at first met with opposition by those who would be expected to give the philosopher support. Identity is political affirmation, but it is also capitalist categorization. You are this but not that. Interestingly, Guattari does not oppose identity with multiplicity but with singularity. Contemporary capitalism grows on hybridity, on the creation and accumulation of difference; and yet this hybridity is a farce. Contemporary capitalism creates schizophrenia, while simultaneously encapsulating individuals in the social (naturalized) hierarchy. You are many and multiple, plural in your identity, and yet you keep on being *the poor*. For Guattari, however, singularity is the inexpressible experience of living at the intersection of ecosystemic agency, the chaosmic environment, a process prior to circumscription to "the modes of identification of the dominant [capitalist] subjectivity"—"What interests capitalist subjectivity … is not the process of singularization, but precisely this result of the process." Yes, you are black but also… you are homosexual but also… you are human but also… animal.

"Tupi or not tupi." The iconic Shakesperean pun of the Manifesto is misleading in its dualism. Yes, Tupi or not tupi—a becoming Indian, in other words, becoming resistance: opening oneself, and one's world, to the metaphysics of the other. But the pun should also read "Tupi

*and* not tupi."[67] To be Indian but also to be boundless and unconstrained by what "Indian" should mean—as if white anthropologists, could ever really be the other that moderns have cast out of the earth's limits. Anthropophagy then, as the accumulation of identities—the appropriation of the other—but also, and fundamentally, as a process of becoming human, of *touching* the other's humanity, another humanity that we would otherwise be incapable of recognizing and relating to. Anthropophagy as the cosmopolitics of ontological frontiers.

In the end, the issue is not the co-option of difference by capital—that is, the differences it generates so as to open up an outside for growth and profit—but rather, what is important is how capitalism must always and by necessity open up differences within the structure of society. For capital to exist, produce, and accumulate, it must by necessity institute difference, and partition society between the rich and the dispossessed, those who appropriate and those disenfranchised, those with a voice and those silenced—class, race, gender, species. This is the only difference that matters. And yes, although alterity may be at the core of Antropofagia, as Clastres reminds us, its actually enmity, predation, and violence that puts its politics in motion, irresolvably for the well-intentioned.

Despite the "erratic" irruption of matriarchy throughout time, we are continuously withheld from the time of synthesis, negated by the perpetuation of a coercive economics. How is economics operative in this respect? Economics is the discipline par excellence of naturalization; of falsifying the purity of a "natural" law where there is only culture, conflict negotiation, endless possibilities instead of one

67 I owe this distinction to Brazilian sociologist Laymert Garcia dos Santos, who brought it to my attention in a private conversation in São Paulo, 2011.

continuous, given nature in the order of things.[68] Thus, one would do well to recall Marshall Sahlins equation that "the amount of hunger increases relatively and absolutely with the evolution of culture. [...] This is the era of hunger unprecedented. Now, in the time of the greatest technical power, starvation is an institution."[69] In societies of the state, hoarding and surplus value are useless not because of scarcity or a rudimentary economy but because the goods of production are shared. Clastres says, "The man who has become rich by the strength of his own hand will see his wealth disappear in the blink of an eye into his neighbors' hands or stomachs."[70]

Antropofagia is not only a matter of appropriation but of expropriation. Exchange is the opposite of hoarding. The economic problem is not one of scarcity but of hoarding; not of production but of distribution. It is for this reason that Antropofagia does not conform to theories of harmony and ecosystemic balance. Thus, the social usefulness of anthropophagic technology is, precisely, the double of the theory of "use against property" annunciated in the Magazine.[71] A theory, one should not forget, accompanied by a sentence from Oswald's matriarchal utopia, "Love is the individual act par excellence, but its fruit belongs to the tribe."[72]

*continues on page 297*

68 To be precise, today, as economics is absolutely future oriented by the application of statistics, the formula is actually the opposite: endless possibilities for the maintenance of the given order of things.

69 Marshall Sahlins, *Stone Age Economics* (Chicago: Aldine Atherton, 1972), 36.

70 Clastres, "Archeology of Violence: War in Primitive Societies," 155.

71 "The antagonism of social interests would be solved in the frontier between economics and politics. In brief, our 'anthropophagi' saw, on the way to utopia, politics at the service of the distribution of social goods, giving back power, now divested of authoritarianism, to society. [...] the free communion of all." Benedito Nunes in Andrade, *Obras completas VI*, xxxv.

72 Andrade, "The Crisis of Messianic Philosophy."

# Introduction to Where to Sit at the Dinner Table? —Pedro Neves Marques

*continued from page 56*

Antropofagia is a war philosophy, and not simply the model for the acculturated resolution of differences. This does not mean that Antropofagia is circumscribed by a theory of war; rather, it means that the violence at the heart of anthropophagic Amerindian societies cannot be simply resolved by multiculturalist hybridity. War, predation, and cannibalism are three distinct yet correlated movements of anthropophagy, to the extent that the isolation of any one movement from any other is perhaps an impossible purification. At its center, there is violence, possibly irresolvable and expressed in distinct gradients, each dependent on the breadth of a given society and the intensity of its relations with what is exterior to itself. On the topic of war, Pierre Clastres described the Tupinambá as simultaneously societies of dispersal and of unity—the other was the mirror that allowed for the reflection of unity, a double movement looping outside and inside as if a Möbius strip. And yet, for Clastres it would be misleading to see in this a system of contrasts allowing for social stability, for societies closed onto themselves. Rather, the system was "dynamic," and difference affirmative rather than negative.[1] It is thus that Viveiros de Castro asks:

> "What was truly devoured of the enemy? It couldn't be his matter or his 'substance,' for the case was one of ritual cannibalism, where consumption of the victim's flesh, in quantitative terms, was insignificant; furthermore, the evidence of any physical or metaphysical virtue attributed to the bodies of the enemies is rare and inconclusive, at least in the sources available to us. Thus, the 'thing' eaten couldn't be a 'thing,' unless it were a sign, a purely positional value; what one ate was the relation of the enemy to the devourers, put differently, its condition of enemy. What one assimilated of the victim were the signs of his alterity; the goal being the other's alterity understood as a point of view on the self."[2]

What one eats is not the other's substance but its perspective. What one eats is the other's position. But what do these words "perspective" and "position" mean within an anthropophagic thought? One could say that every position in a given ecosystem is political, for everything is interconnected. Yet they are not really, at least not intrinsically. Ecologically, positions may imply connectivity, even agency, and yet this does not imply by necessity a will. And the fact is that a position without a will is reduced solely to geography rather than a geopolitical force. One could say that, from a political perspective, it does not even suffice to be called a position.

The act of anthropophagy however, disrupts the landscape of a pacifying ecology—as if the networks connecting beings to other beings would flow endlessly uninterrupted, without breaks or turmoil or oscillation. To eat the other's position is to negotiate these cuts, these differences, abysmal at times; to change and be changed by the transgression and the encounter with being on the other side, and doing so through the incorporation of the other's positional perspective. The immanence of the enemy—to confront what is alien to oneself *in oneself*.

> "Amerindian thought can be described as a *political ontology of the sensible*, a radical materialist panpsychism that manifests itself as an immanent perspectivism: an ontological and topological perspectivism, in contrast to the epistemological and geometrical perspectivism dominant in our tradition. This thought thus thinks a dense universe, saturated with intentionalities hungry for difference, and which feed reciprocally from each other's respective perspectivist differences."[3]

Anthropophagic epistemology: not ontology (fixed and stable essences) but "odontology" (beings that are open and inconstant, predatory and mutable beings). The politics of anthropophagic violence are not in the act of eating itself, but in the ontological transgression eating implies, the "exchange of perspectives." One is, that is to say one becomes, what one eats.

Openness to the outside and the inconstancy of being, together with trans-speciesist transversality and the variability of the human—although not necessarily the universality of humanity—are both central, albeit potentially counterintuitive, ideas of what Viveiros de Castro has termed "cannibal metaphysics." This other metaphysics is defined by Viveiros de Castro along three vectors that, together, propose a reversal of Western anthropology:

*interspecific perspectivism*
*ontological multinaturalism*
*cannibal alterity*

"Whatever is activated or 'agented' by the point of view will be a subject."[4] This is the main premise behind perspectivism, the anthropological theory proposed by Viveiros de Castro

and Tânia Stolze Lima that has reignited the anthropology of predation in Brazil.[5] In contrast to Western epistemology, where the subject creates the point of view, and objects are created by the point of view, in Amerindian perspectivism it is the point of view, the perspective, that creates the subject.

> "[Perspectivism] is part of an indigenous theory according to which the different sorts of persons—human and nonhuman (animals, spirits, the dead, denizens of other cosmic layers, plants, occasionally even objects or artifacts)—apprehend reality from distinct points of view. The way that humans perceive animals and other subjectivities that inhabit the world differs profoundly from the way in which these beings see humans (and see themselves). Under normal conditions, humans see humans as humans; they see animals as animals; plants as plants. As for spirits, to see these usually invisible beings is a sure sign that conditions are not normal. On the other hand, animals (predators) and spirits see humans as animals (a game or prey) to the same extent that game animals see humans as spirits or as predator animals. By the same token, animals and spirits see themselves as humans: they perceive themselves (or they become) anthropomorphic beings when they are in their own houses or villages; and, most importantly, they experience their own habits in the form of culture."[6]

Thus, in Stolze Lima's example of Juruna hunting, "what humans perceive to be a hunt, peccaries perceive to be a war."[7] Things are both/and, rather than complying with the logic of either/or. In spite of that, it is not necessarily as if the thing *sees itself as this* and *is seen by the other as that*. It is not a simple case of the same reality seen from distinct points of view. Rather, it is both *this and that*—depending on the perspective.

Being is many—to the quantity of perspectives invested in the situation, subject, or object. It is relational and contingent, with the supposed rigidity of ontologies dependent on relational affinity with the outside: "'To me, it rained' is not 'it was raining there, where I was.' Point of view implies a particular conception according to which the world only exists for someone. More precisely, whether it is a being or an event … what exists, exists for someone."[8] Subjects (what is) and actions (what occurs) inhabit parallel yet correlated universes that maintain a unity regardless of an external referent to keep them in place. As Stolze Lima refers, this is not a case of multiplicity—at least not as Western metaphysics portrays it—but a binary system of multiplicity: the two and its *many*. Multiplicity in perspectivism is attached to binary relations or the crossing of perspectives, that is, of two things looking at each other, and finding each other across a great divide—blurring what nature and culture might mean from the point of view of each position. Ontological duplicity ad infinitum.

From the perspective of cannibal metaphysics, multinaturalism is the reverse of naturalization. In contrast with the multiculturalism of the moderns, for whom there is one nature and a multiplicity of cultures, multinaturalism states inversely the multiplicity of nature and the universality of culture—each possible nature being singular to itself. There is one culture and many natures, instead of one unifying nature and many diverse cultures. In each *and every* one of these multinaturalist worlds there is humanity, differently for each specific being because experienced through the idiosyncrasy of each human embodiment. Bodies and affects, that is, sensorial intelligence, is what defines both the limits and the breath of each social world, that is to say, of the same world experienced (defined) differently. Passing the redundancy, from a perspectivist point of view, "each living

species is human in its own position, human for itself, or better … *everything is human for itself*."[9] And yet this is not a different vision of our world, as if a reflection or a simple mirroring effect. What perspectivism proposes is that "every species see the world in the same way. There is only *one* point of view, the point of view of humanity. What changes is the point of view of *this point of view*."[10] This is another, different world that is seen in the same way. Multinaturalism, not multiculturalism.

This is not to say that everything is human, or that the nature–culture divide is inexistent in Amerindian cosmologies, "The nature/culture distinction needs to be criticized, but not in order to conclude that such a thing does not exist (there are already too many things that do not exist)."[11] On the opposite side of the spectrum, it would also be a misreading to see relativism in cannibal metaphysics—even if on this point we find certain disagreements. While Viveiros de Castro has emphatically refused to see relativism in his multinaturalist and perpectivist theories, stressing that "because representations are a property of the mind or spirit, whereas the point of view is located in the body,"[12] perspectives cannot be simply reduced to a dispute between different, or relative, representations, Stolze Lima, for her part, has perfected her answer in an exemplary perspectivist tone: "Indigenous perspectivism could be considered a variant form of relativism, since, after all, nothing dictates that there cannot exist other ways of thinking relativism very different from those conceived by Western thought."[13]

Here, mankind does not represent the universality of the human, (re)discovered in the Renaissance, but rather the reverse: humanity not as the definition of man but of the world's diversity. Humankind is different to mankind—with the latter being best understood as the principle of the moral species, separating the "human" from other species by the

unfathomable attribute of supposed conscious, self-reflexive morality that operates extinction through the creation of the *unbridgeable* (from the standpoint of an anthropophagic philosophy this is the important word) ontological divide between life forms. Mankind is the reactionary idea that arrives in order to suppress difference and the plurality of cosmologies built on the variability of what the human is or may mean. A complete inversion to modern thought, and in particular to how our sciences are structured, to how our epistemology captures and classifies—predates—the outside world.

"If everything is human then everything is dangerous … above all when all may be people, and we might not be."[14] If the subjectivation of otherness lies in the point of view, could one say that subjectivity is the result of investments? From the standpoint of a cannibal metaphysics, relations are established out of dedication, but also due to predatory selection. There is always something that stays beyond the scope of a given perspective, at bay, or more precisely, something that occupies the position—which is no position—of an individual's (or society's) blind spot.

> "The Indians say that jaguars are human, that they too are human, but also that they and the jaguars cannot be human at the same time. If I am human, then at this moment the jaguar is only a jaguar. If the jaguar is a human, then in that case I would no longer be human."[15]

Even Amerindian tribes make a distinction between who or what participates as an equal and who or what doesn't–which is not the same as saying between what is human or not, for that is a basic premise of those cosmologies. One can suggest that perspectives determine the form and extension of society, or more accurately perhaps, of sociocosmologies.

Perspectives set boundaries, and distribute, as well as disrupt roles and positions within and outside of those boundaries—the inside being always in need of the outside. In this context, anthropophagy is an ontological exchange of perspectives—extending well beyond the human. It is at the frontiers, the limits, where subjectivation and objectivation, exclusion and inclusion, find a threshold, that anthropophagy defines its instrumental, (cosmo)political role. Perspectivist multinaturalism as a theory of the social?

The verification of the universality of culture (humanity) may erupt from an awareness of extension, but it is always also the attribution of a place (a position) to things—precisely by the act or realization of the other subject as such. Throughout, perspectives are material; they are the agreement between an eye (who sees) and a body (who is perceived: in its coordinates and materiality). Beyond matter nonetheless, it is precisely the realization of this possibility (others as subjects) that constitutes the relationality of perspectivist multinaturalism as intensive. Perspectivist multinaturalism may define the extension of society and the boundaries of participation, but the shape of perspectives is defined by the intensity of the investment, the type of alliance. Intensive relations are dedicated inclusions. Cannibal metaphysics intensifies subjects—one could say all of life—through an openness to the outside, wherein, in contrast to us, inclusion is not accomplished through constant reduction and classification, that is, through the pacification of the other, its dehumanization, but rather through agentifying the other, or more precisely, experiencing the humanity in the other.

Recalling Clastres's societies of both dispersal and unity, social and ontological frontiers may exist and be fundamental for the organization of society, and yet beings are not defined to themselves, "*individuals* of each species are able to 'leap' from one species to another with relative ease,

a process that is schematized principally in the imagery of alimentary predation: the incorporation by another species is frequently conceived as the integral transformation of the prey into a member of the predator's own species."[16] These anthropophagic "leaps," however can only be traumatic. The trans-speciesist egalitarianism proposed by Antropofagia—the cannibal metaphysics—may be both extensive and intensive, but there wouldn't be any way for it to be smooth. Whoever enters into another's perspective, eats it or is eaten by it, risks losing one's ontological consistency. Just like with the jaguar, "these encounters tend to be lethal for the interlocutor who, overpowered by the nonhuman subjectivity, passes over to its side, transforming himself into a being of the same species as the speaker: dead, spirit or animal. He who responds to a *you* spoken by a nonhuman accepts the condition of being its 'second person,' and when assuming in his turn the position of *I* does so already as a nonhuman."[17] One would do well not to forget the seclusion of the killer in the anthropophagic ritual. Or that it is only shamans who can cross to the other side, wear animal skins, talk to the spirits. Or as in Cunhambebe's words: "Jauára Ichê." To cross the divide is to risk not returning. To eat the other implies, in the end, a gargantuan ontological leap, for to touch the other's nature is to transform one's own society, "The transformation of the Taboo into totem."

Is this humanity then? Perhaps a strange humanity no longer controlled by speciesism, and no longer bound to what we formerly thought of as human. Reciprocity: one agentifies the other and is agentified in reverse; one gives oneself to the relation, losing something of oneself—a parcel of stability—for the world to gain one more subject. In addition, one might risk the affirmation that the openness of a given society is the result of its self-awareness of this possibility, that is, of externalities (objects as non-active

and non-participative) being so due to a selection. This is "a world many would call anthropomorphic, but one that nobody could call anthropocentric, given that what man provides here is the *un*measurability of all things, at the same time as he is measured and mediated by all of them. A world, then, that is *metaphysically* anthropophagic, where alterity is anterior to identity, relation superior to the terms it relates, and transformation interior to form."[18]

Anthropophagy as anthropology, but also as sociology, and, in the end, also as diplomacy? If perspectivist anthropophagy is a theory of "communicational equivocation" defined by the encounters and missed encounters between agents within the same common stratum—humanity—but varying in their point of view on that same stratum, is not anthropophagy then, as that which sets agency in motion, also negotiation? Could this be part of the anthropophagic law the Magazine only managed to draft? For, following Alexandre Nodari's steps, we can perhaps now read one of Antropofagia's central formulas more concretely: "From opposing value to a favorable value. Life is pure devoration. In this devoration that threatens human existence at every minute, it is up to man to make a totem out of the taboo. What is the taboo if not the untouchable, the limit?"[19] Anthrophagy as the negotiation of cosmopolitical frontiers.

In 1931, Oswald de Andrade adheres to the Communist Party, beginning a phase usually, though wrongly, portrayed as a long philosophical detour from Antropofagia—a pause ending only with his writings on messianic philosophy. However, from the cosmopolitical ecology proposed here, Antropofagia cannot be understood without a communism that is the inverse of Western epistemology, and thus also of Marx's own communism—as for state communism, with its productive and extractive ambitions, it was dismissed well in advance by Andrade.[20]

> "The proletariat has evolved. It is no longer what Marx wrote in the lancinating pages of *Capital* … What is the proletariat today? A revolted *humanity* is gathering on its *blurry frontiers*, reclaiming the redistribution of surplus value."[21]

Is it fair to see in these blurred frontiers of humanity a communism beyond man? No longer confined to it, Antropofagia would thus propose instead the communism of species, the possibility—for it is impossible to access totality—of a trans-speciesist egalitarianism, which is the same as saying of the dispossessed, of those beyond the limits. "Given that our attitude towards the 'Primacy of the Spiritual' can only be disrespectful, our attitude before a sectarian Marxism will also be one of combat."[22] Le Diderot, Cunhambebinho, Poronominare, Menelik, Marxilar, Freuderico, all names consumed, digested, transformed, and repurposed, that author the articles of the Magazine. "An actualized Marx" then, digested into the cosmopolitical negotiations that traverse South America.[23]

This is an animist communality, no doubt, and purposely so.

> "By rejecting or marginalizing certain relations, animism provides a negative template of that which it rejects. Throughout its territory there will be no sign of any exclusive livestock raisers, no castes of specialized craftsmen, no ancestor cults, no lineages that function as moral persons, no creative demiurges, no taste for material patrimonies, no obsession with heredity, no arrow of time, no excessively wide-ranging filiation, and no deliberative assemblies. Some perspicacious observers who have noticed those absences have interpreted them as lacks, But they are, of course, nothing of the kind."[24]

Is this not, precisely, the matriarchy of Pindorama? Not the time, that is messianism, but the space when "the spindles will work by themselves"? The time of leisure, when man and environment may finally establish the creative relation Hélio Oiticica termed Creleisure—man devoured by the environment instead of extracting from it, denying it at each consumption? Yes, but one would do well to thread carefully and keep an attentive eye on the appropriations majestically performed by capital.

If modern philosophy is the mirror of labor, to surpass labor is to enter into a new epistemology—reciprocally, to acknowledge other epistemologies is to see labor redefined. At the time man finds the conditions to free himself from labor, other agents are beginning to work for man. Instead of man's labor, an other labor—technological, molecular, mathematical. At the edge of automated, intelligent technology, amidst the biochemical mutation man has unleashed on Earth systems; when algorithms (de)regulate the economy and new life forms are emerging out of what we thought of as dead and unproductive, beings that feed on plastic, ancestor viruses that are able to inhabit inhospitable niches of life or that reawaken from the melting permafrost—capitalism too is pushing for hybridity and the corruption of the segregationist, philosophical, walls it built itself upon four centuries ago. Incapable of compensation—we have had already too many years of environmentalist struggles fail, and worse, capitalized on—capitalism accelerates beyond Earth's limits, growing towards inhumanity, "recalling the idea of capitalism as an immanent system ever expanding its own limits, ever in need of opening new markets so as not to perish," even if life on Earth does so in the process.[25]

What is the difference then, between anthropophagic predation and capitalist predation? Here is the difference: capitalist, that is, naturalist destruction

> "is a negation of what a human embodies, and not, as in animism, a recognition of the position of exteriority that must be assimilated if one is to be fully oneself. Naturalism is thus *destructive* rather than *predatory* in its behavior toward certain categories of both humans and nonhumans."[26]

Thus, "despite appearances, what we may hastily call capitalist," predation is simply a unilateral view of consumption, of experiencing and producing difference, that is unable to find a place

> "at the heart of multinaturalism, at least not if predation is regarded as an incorporation of 'others' that is indispensable for the definition of the self. The thoughtless ransacking of the planet's resources and the destruction of its biotic diversity may well contribute to increasing the wealth of the rich, but they result from our forgetting the belief that prevailed in the first ages of modernity, namely the splendid otherness of nature is necessary for the manifestation of the specific qualities of humanity."[27]

Perspectivist, anthropophagic cosmologies presuppose the variability of possible relations between nature and culture—which implies a correlate variation in the meaning of animality and humanity, object and subject, passivity and activity, participation and exclusion. In Amerindian socio-cosmologies, perspectivist multinaturalism is the conceptual engine behind a relational theory of ontological *dynamics*; a dynamics that, in introducing an anthropophagic exchange of perspectives, cannot but rupture with modern discontinuity. What does this mean, *to us*—knowing fully well in advance how our meaning of anything affects everything else? With multinaturalism what goes out the window is modern economics as the science of naturalization, that is to say, the

economic organization of society—according to expenditures and investments, consumption values and energetic stocks, "natural" devoration between quantifiable commodities—as well as nature understood as the unified backdrop from which economic laws, in other words, power, can be "scientifically" extracted, justified—made natural—and imposed back on earthly societies and back on Earth itself. Perspectivist multinaturalism is a general economy of alterity, a whole different "market." Without a single, unified nature from which to justify the reason of why culture is what it is, what remains then of our, suddenly exploded, economics?

Thus, it may be that cannibal metaphysics points neither to inhumanism nor to the return of the humanist project—precisely at the moment when, due to technological acceleration and the complexity of information and biochemical systems, modern societies seem ready to abandon the concept, and the dissolution between formerly rigid ontological frontiers, between what is agented or not in society, begins to find a place in our thought.[28] Have no illusion, as the Yanomami shaman Davi Kopenawa suggests,

> "[the] distant lands of the ancient white people are spirits' lands. […] The vast dazzling mirror had suddenly vanished behind me and a different ground already replaced it before my eyes. Instead of losing consciousness and dying, I only felt a deep drowsiness. [I]t makes no sense to think that the *xapiri* do not exist on the white people's land. In this distant place as in our forest, the wind does not blow without a reason and the rain does not fall all by itself. But the beings of darkness and chaos are closer there. It is very cold. The night falls very fast and lasts a long time."[29]

If there is any "humanist" project in Antropofagia, it is one ready to decouple mankind from the human, allowing us to experience the human from the other side, and thus ourselves differently. It is a matter of "placing back into the world what had been placed into the Self."[30] The end of discontinuity is possible only with the end of capitalism; the liberation from division and exploitation, the difference capitalism must forcibly implant in society. "Man (I mean the European man, heaven forbid!) was searching for man outside of man. And with lantern in hand: philosophy. We want man without the doubt, without even the presumption of the existence of doubt: naked, natural, anthropophagic."[31]

Notes

1 Pierre Clastres, "Archeology of Violence: War in Primitive Societies," in *Archeology of Violence* (New York; Semiotext(e), 1994), 156.

2 Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, *Métaphysiques cannibales* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2011), 112–113.—Trans. Ed; italics added.

3 Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, "Transformation in Anthropology, Transformation of Anthropology," 555–83 in this volume. Originally published in *Mana*, Vol. 18, N. 1 (2012): 151–71.

4 Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, "Exchanging Perspectives: The Transformation of Objects into Subjects in Amerindian Ontologies" in *Animism*, ed. Anselm Franke and Chiara Marchini Camia (New York/Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2010), 229.

5 Several other authors are of note, such as Aparecida Vilaça and her book, *Strange Enemies: Indigenous Agency and Scenes of Encounters in Amazonia* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2010), as well as Carlos Fausto, *Warfare and Shamanism in Amazonia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

6 Viveiros de Castro, "Exchanging Perspectives," 228–229.

7 Tânia Stolze Lima, "The Two and its Many: Reflections on Perspectivism in a Tupi Cosmology," 373–408 in this volume. Originally published in *Ethnos: Journal of Anthropology*, Vol. 64, N. 1 (1999): 107–31.

8 Ibid.

9 Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, "Some Reflections on the Notion of Species in History and Anthropology," interview with Álvaro Fernández Bravol, *emisférica*, Vol. 10, N. 1 (2013).

10 Ibid.

11 Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, "Perspectivism and Multinaturalism in Indigenous America," 313–72 in this volume. Previously published in *The Land Within: Indigenous Territory*

*and Perception of the Environment*, ed. Alexandre Surrallés and Pedro García Hierro (Copenhagen: IWGIA, 2005), 36–75.

12 Ibid.

13 Stolze Lima, "The Two and its Many."

14 Viveiros de Castro, "Perspectivism and Multinaturalism in Indigenous America."

15 Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, "Se tudo é humano, tudo é perigoso," interview with Jean-Christophe Royoux in *Encontros* (Rio de Janeiro: Azougue Editorial, 2007), 110.

16 Viveiros de Castro, "Some Reflections on the Notion of Species in History and Anthropology."

17 Viveiros de Castro, "Perspectivism and Multinaturalism in Indigenous America."

18 Viveiros de Castro, "Transformation in Anthropology, Transformation of Anthropology."

19 Oswald de Andrade, "The Crisis of Messianic Philosophy," 151–77 in this volume. Published in *Obras completas VI: Do Pau-Brasil à Antropofagia e às utopias*, ed. Benedito Nunes (São Paulo: Civilização Brasileira, 1970).

20 Ibid.

21 Ibid.

22 Freuderico (possibly Oswald de Andrade), "Of Anthropophagy," 117–21 in this volume. Originally published in *Revista de Antropofagia*, 2nd "dentition," N. 1 (March 24, 1929).

23 Jean Tible, "Marx and Anthropophagy: Notes for a Dialogue Between Marx and Viveiros de Castro," 455–85 in this volume.

24 Philippe Descola, *Beyond Nature and Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013), 395.

25 Jean Tible, "Marx and Anthropophagy."

26 Descola, *Beyond Nature and Culture*, 395.

27 Ibid., 397.

28 Again, think of climate change, or of Isabelle Stengers cosmopolitical examples from physics: the invisibility of the quark implies not only the existence of "life" beyond our sensorial capacity—only induction can prove it—but also the confirmation of an exterior, exact technological agency, human in origin but not human bound, and "spirited" not with greater but other epistemological mechanisms, other logics, different affects.

29 Davi Kopenawa and Bruce Albert, *The Falling Sky: Words of a Yanomami Shaman*, trans. Nicholas Elliott and Alison Dundy (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013), 321.

30 Viveiros de Castro, "Transformation in Anthropology, Transformation of Anthropology."

31 Oswald Costa, "The Anthropophagic Descent," 114–16 in this volume. Originally published in *Revista de Antropofagia*, 1st "dentition," N. 1 (May 1928).