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Marcel Mauss and the processes of cultural exchange and transference

In the 1920s, Marcel Mauss conceived a social phenomenon that traveled and surpassed the limits of a singular society. This conception fell within the corpus of ethnographic and anthropological studies, which had evolved since the second half of the nineteenth century, and which was, conversely to degeneration theory and the notion of the “genius of a race”, concerned with the effects of dislocation, displacement, and migration on cultural processes. Mauss also described a “civilization phenomenon”, which extended across a surface much broader than the political geography of individual societies or nations. Its sources were rooted in the history of multiple nations, existing as a family of societies connected by historical, geographical, archaeological, anthropological, and linguistic facets. He understood that these civilizational phenomena were essentially international or extra-national, noting that the individual character of a society would “stand out above the bedrock of international phenomena”. His sensitive and original analysis also included notions such as the “permeability of the modern nation” and the importance of social agents responsible for exchange and transferal processes which formed “transnational communities”.
In 1971, critic George Steiner took up Mauss’s notion of international phenomena, dubbing the linguistic homelessness and erratic features of modernity – which he considered a state of permanent exile – “extraterritoriality”.

By the 1930s, however, the same understanding of extraterritoriality could already be found in the writings of critics and historians who recognized the disciplinary peculiarity of the foreigner and the exiled professional. In this context, one can mention Anna Maria Mazzucchelli’s article on Richard Neutra, for example, which was published in the Italian magazine Casabella in 1935. Mazzucchelli understood Richard Neutra’s restless trajectory in America as an emblem for that generation of modern architects, suggesting that Neutra’s achievements were “evidence of the universality of European taste and a clear instance of stylistic coherence”.

In the same vein, writing on László Moholy-Nagy’s first exhibition in Brno in 1936, Sigfried Giedion evoked Georg Simmel in an inspired account addressing the pioneers of the new vision who hailed from agricultural countries like Russia and Hungary.

“Coming from the outskirts of civilization”, these pioneers “brought fresh energy to the problem of interpreting the realities of today [in] the Berlin artistic circles still fettered by expressionism.”

Le Corbusier himself had the same intuition, recognizing the waves of contemporary dislocation driven by political persecution as a turning point for the development of original architecture and urban experiences in a newly mechanized society.

Modern Brazilian architectural narrative and its cultural context

Conversely to Mauss’s essays and the progressive spirit that guided modern vanguards, Brazilian intellectuals who shaped the cultural perspective of Estado Novo in the 1930s idealized a “fictive ethnicity”. As Etienne Balibar put it, this ethnicity understood race and language as the main manifestations of a national character, and articulated through binomial nationalism and modernity. Lucio Costa (1902–1998), the future planner of Brasília, joined this group of intellectuals that had gathered around the dictator Getúlio Vargas soon after the coup d’Etat in 1937. Influenced by Romantic theory, Costa was responsible for forging the narrative of modern Brazilian architectural historiography, in which Brazilian architectural modernism appeared and developed as the result of a “national genius”, or Geist. This was implied in the figurative relationship between Brazilian colonial architecture and Brazilian modern architecture, or between colonial sculptor and church builder, Antônio Francisco Lisboa (“the Aleijadinho”), and architect Oscar Niemeyer.

Our own national genius that was expressed through the elect personality of this artist [Oscar Niemeyer], in the same way as it had been expressed in the eighteenth century, under very similar circumstances, through the individuality of Antônio Francisco Lisboa, the Aleijadinho...

In the closed space of this construct, Costa addressed the issue of race, stressing that the original bedrock of the society’s Portuguese, African, and indigenous elements was a natural community that endured despite later waves of European and Oriental immigration. This adopted strategy legitimated the work of early, colonial-era Portuguese settlers who established a Brazilian language, considering that “par droit de
conquête” the colonist was in fact at home and that, in speaking Portuguese or giving form to their buildings, they were using their own language rather than imitating someone else. Hence, in tune with other Brazilian nationalist intellectuals, Costa identified Portuguese architectural culture as the first and only source of Brazilian architecture. It is thus to no surprise that, in the state of Minas Gerais – where the country’s first movement against Portuguese colonial power occurred – he pointed to the emergence of a national Brazilian character.

Costa’s historiographic writing, in particular his use of expressions such as “the national genius”, attests to the commitment of his generational and intellectual milieu to a romantic historicism, or the idea of an architectural language that might crystallize the inner history and specific worldview of the Volks, or nation. This same construct informed the main narrative of argumentation for *Brazil Builds*, a MOMA exhibition (1942) curated by Philip L. Goodwin. It included photographs by G. E. Kidder Smith, as well as initiatives of the Department of National Historic and Artistic Heritage (Secretaria do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional, SPHAN), which focused on the preservation of traditional colonial building. The narrative engendered by the nationalist political and intellectual atmosphere of those decades continued to permeate progressive circles and research institutions fed by postcolonial discourses throughout the Latin American continent. This occurred even after the period of military dictatorship from 1964 to 1985, which, for several decades, impoverished and narrowed the spectrum of Brazilian architectural historiography on the contribution of other nationals and architecture produced in Brazil throughout the nineteenth century through the turn of the twentieth century.

The lasting presence of Costa’s historiographical model among Brazilian scholars was noted by Michel Foucault who, in 1967, illustrated his heterotopia with the same colonial space as the one conceived by 1930s intellectuals in asserting their national identity. The French philosopher described the guestroom of a traditional colonial Brazilian farmhouse as follows:

“[A]ny traveler [...] had the right to [...] enter [...] the room, and spend the night there. Now the rooms were arranged in such a way that anyone [...] could never reach the heart of the family: more than ever a passing visitor, never a true guest.”

Ultimately, in the final quarter of the twentieth century, the French postmodernist incredulity toward metanarratives began to be assimilated in the country through the disciplines of social sciences and humanities. This attitude opened the Brazilian historiographical space to new readings, notably to the revaluation of the “dialectic between confrontations with the foreigner and communication between civilizations” not only in the “age of refugee” but even since colonial times.
At the turn of nineteenth century, the massive wave of emigration to America triggered early debates about Americanization and the idea of “the melting pot” versus cultural pluralism. Those discussions were likely responsible for a premature recognition of the major role played by immigrant intellectuals and professionals upon their arrival to the United States during the interwar period and soon after, as they were pressed by political persecution and the rise of fascism. In the field of architecture, that recognition can be traced back to the 1930s through initiatives of the architectural press or the curatorial direction of MOMA’s exhibitions from the 1930s to the 1940s. It can also be found in Sigfried Giedion’s analyses of the specificity of the émigré’s production in the 1950s. Giedion’s discussion of the impact of European modernism in America was followed by a new generation of thinkers in the 1960s, represented by historians like William Jordy (1972).

In the 1980s, the dissemination of modern architectural culture between continents began to be scrutinized more extensively. This renewed scrutiny involved the circulation of not only architecture professionals in a broader geography, but also of ideas and forms that arose through different channels and media. Reyner Banham’s 1986 *A Concrete Atlantis* exemplified this trend, discussing the influence of American industrial buildings on European modernism.

Occurring almost concomitantly to Los Angeles County Museum of Art’s 1997 exhibition, *Exiles and Emigrés: The Flight of European Artists from Hitler*, came a series of studies on the same wave of exiled and émigré professionals that Giedion and Jordy had identified. The studies demonstrated the dissemination of modern architecture and the circulation of architects within Europe and beyond in Latin America, the Middle East, South Africa, and Asia.
In Latin America and Brazil in particular, this new theoretical approach exposed the fictive ethnicity that had framed the architectural historiographical narrative, denying equal recognition to those exiles nurtured in cosmopolitan and modern European circles where some had already achieved professional recognition. Further, as a series of publications has revealed, those architects, urban planners, photographers, and designers, as well as artists and intellectuals, indeed exerted their influence on two generations of professionals. This was done through the hundreds of projects constructed in main urban centers by firms where dozens of newly graduated architects started their careers from the 1940s to the 1960s – the decades of the country’s great industrial development – and through their writing, teaching, and cultural activities.

After deconstructing the old historiographical model of Brazilian architecture as defined by Lucio Costa, I will scrutinize the cultural encounter forged between the foreigner and the national primarily from the 1930s to 1960s. I will then present some examples from within particular trajectories – since one cannot comprehend all the vicissitudes of the hundreds of professionals who arrived on Brazil’s shores during that time period – through a tripartite approach. The first is concerned with the impact of the refugee’s awareness of his own otherness, taking Simmel’s writing on the space and “objectivity” of the foreigner as a theoretical backdrop. The second understands immigrant professionals as modernizing agents or intermediaries between cultures, and therefore sees the dynamics of cultural transference processes between Europe and America according to George Steiner’s formulation of modernity as extraterritoriality. And finally, the third uncovers a chain of associations and articulations of the foreign professional in the city’s cultural space according to the definition of landsmannschaft, or group of origins.

The immigrant’s awareness of their own “otherness”

In his seminal article “The Stranger” (1908), Georg Simmel signaled the peculiar position occupied by the stranger “composed of certain measures of nearness and distance”. The stranger’s “objectivity” made him both practically and theoretically freer, not only to “import qualities” to a space, but also to survey conditions with less prejudice and with more general, objective ideals. The recently discussed reception of Mimesis, the paradigmatic production in exile by German philologist Erich Auerbach, can be read with Simmel’s argument in mind, given Auerbach’s own experiences as a Jew in 1930s Germany, an academic exile in Turkey, and, later on, an intellectual émigré in America. In his “Philologie der Weltliteratur”, the exiled intellectual evoked Goethe’s categories of Weltliteratur and reasserted his humanistic position on the exile’s outlook, which transcended national limits. The exile was therefore endowed with an original vision; and, while most people were mainly aware of one culture, one setting, or one country, the exile was conscious of at least two, making it easier to reconcile the universal with the particular. These two concepts, first put forth by Goethe in his definition of Weltliteratur, were later reassumed by Auerbach, who wrote:

“The most priceless and indispensable part of a philologist’s heritage is still his own nation’s culture and language […] only when he is first separated from this heritage, and then transcends it does it become truly effective […] the spirit [Geist] is not national.”
In Latin America, Russian-born immigrant architect Wladimiro Acosta from Odessa, had a similar idea. After studying and building in Russia, Italy, Germany, and Brazil between 1916 and 1931, Acosta established himself in Argentina, where he became the first Argentinean CIAM representative. There, he reinstated Auerbach’s concept of the exiled intellectual’s original vision, declaring that the exile’s experience "meant the encounter with other cultures [...] the intensifying of all differences [...] and an accentuated sense of evolution". In the same vein, Italian architect Lina Bo Bardi—who settled in Brazil in 1946 with her husband, Pietro Maria Bardi (creator of the Museu de Arte de São Paulo – MASP)—dissected the work of her friend Pierre Verger, a French photographer (who worked in Bahia from 1946 until his death), considering the unique position he occupied within Brazilian cultural space. For Bo Bardi, Verger had never left behind his “European” position, which was "a cultural position that allowed him to fully grasp a city and understand its dwellers as if he were one of them, yet keeping his distance from both dangerous folklore and inane interpretations".

Although in Minima Moralia, Theodor Adorno had pointed out the “damaged” life of the exiled intellectual, Bruno Zevi was nevertheless one of the first architectural historians to locate the modern exiled architect’s estrangement around the issue of émigré production after his own experience as a refugee in the United States during the war. In a specific reference to the Polish-born architect, Lucjan Korngold, from 1957, Zevi described Korngold’s Brazilian work as “emblematic of his being an immigrant”. The Italian historian would return to this question again in his book on Erich Mendelsohn as well as in his writing on Bo Bardi, a lifelong friend who had experienced, as he put it, “the tenacious and afflictive immersion into the enigmatic Brazilian world”.

Two images may therefore be presented as metaphors for the generation of modern refugees in Brazil. The first is the image of the wandering Jew, the secular stranger, who, in Latin America and Brazil in particular, was constrained within an “in-between” space. In the local nationalist atmosphere that emerged from the First World War, this figure was deemed either “internationalist” or “stateless”, as exemplified by the critical fortune of architect Gregori Warchavchik, who was responsible for the foundational 1925 manifesto of modern architecture in Brazil. Indeed, between the 1930s and the beginning of the 1940s, Warchavchik suffered harsh criticism from both the representatives of academicism and the promoters of neo-colonial expression. In the 1950s, his role as a pioneer was called into questioned by Lucio Costa in favor of Oscar Niemeyer, who was considered a “national genius”, and later on, by architect and communist militant João Vilanova Artigas. Artigas justified this criticism by qualifying Warchavchik’s first works as formalist, an assumption that fueled the historiography of modern architecture between architectural historians in São Paulo for over a couple of decades.

The second image can be drawn from one of Saul Steinberg’s passports. If a passport is a public persona, or a mask for a “rootless cosmopolitan”, Steinberg’s series of document drawings that simulate attested identities might as well be a spatial metaphor for the same “in-between” place occupied by the Romanian-Jewish-Italian-educated American artist, who attempted to reconcile the question of difference among his many exiles.

Indeed, during the interwar period and Second World War, when most American countries either closed their doors to immigrants or imposed immigration quotas, a
passport and a visa represented a somewhat unique possibility of survival\textsuperscript{51}. In Brazil, along with the quotas and the country’s racial whitening policies, Getúlio Vargas’s nationalistic government prohibited the professional practice of foreigners until 1946. By 1933, Federal Decree 23.569 had regulated the practice of engineers, architects, and surveyors, and had also produced the Federal Council of Engineering and Architecture. According to article 1 lines c and d, the decree prevented foreign professionals without diplomas that were revalidated or registered by that date from practicing. The subsequent constitution of 1937 would extend these restrictions to all liberal professions, leaving no room for further interpretation. According to article 150, Brazil’s liberal professions were only open to the Brazilian-born and naturalized professionals who had served in the Brazilian military, except in cases of legitimate practice on the date of the constitution and those of international reciprocity admitted by law. The same article decreed that only Brazilian-born people would be allowed to revalidate professional diplomas issued by foreign educational institutions\textsuperscript{52}.

The process of naturalization, followed by diploma revalidation and acceptance into the order of architects, could sometimes take more than ten years, as attested to by the accounts of the Italian Giancarlo Palanti (1906-1977) and the German Adolf Franz Heep (1902-1978). Palanti, one of the representatives of Milan’s rationalist group who had made important contributions to the Milan Triennale and had served as the editor of Domus and Casabella, arrived in the country in 1946 but wasn’t able to sign his own projects until after 1954. Meanwhile, Heep, who had graduated from the École Spéciale d’Architecture in Paris and worked with Le Corbusier and Jean Ginsberg before arriving in Brazil in 1947, just barely received his license in 1958\textsuperscript{53}. In this context, the survival of these refugee professionals relied upon already established firms in São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro that managed to get around the restrictive laws and who could therefore benefit from the services of this highly qualified group\textsuperscript{54}.

**Immigrant professionals as modernizing agents or intermediaries between cultures**

At the end of his life, the abovementioned Russian-born architect Warchavchik (whose role in bringing modern architecture to Brazil was only fully recognized in those final years\textsuperscript{55}) suggested affinities with Richard Neutra. Some decades before the boom of studies on cultural transferences, immigration, and the presence of “other nationals” in peripheral Latin American countries', processes of modernization had acquired major academic status. Warchavchik had sensed that his friendship with Neutra was due to a more profound “ship brotherhood”:

“I arrived in Brazil from Italy in 1923. In the same year my friend Richard Neutra arrived in USA from Austria […] Our affinity was due to the fact that we have both discovered America at the same time, bringing to different places the willingness to work with a new spirit\textsuperscript{56}.”

Warchavchik’s testimony affirms the sense of the immigrant professional’s role as a modernizing agent in the construction of São Paulo’s landscape, or as an intermediary between cultures – as suggested by Pietro Maria Bardi for the first time in the 1970s\textsuperscript{57}. The latter – a major figure in the Italian rationalist scene during the interwar period\textsuperscript{58} – was also responsible for the first exhibition dedicated to Warchavchik’s architectural work at the Museu de Arte de São Paulo, or MASP, in 1971. Bardi described the Russian architect’s trajectory as “another immigrants’ history, as all of them […] always
fascinating and concealed by other particular histories\textsuperscript{a}. His account wisely extended Warchavchik’s experience to that of dozens of other immigrant professionals who disembarked in America during the interwar period, establishing themselves within a complex network of foreign, immigrant, and national elements distributed over the course of at least two continents. Bardi’s own cultural initiatives within the framework of MASP, comprising exhibitions, lectures, courses, and publications, effectively introduced generations of young people to a wide range of art, from photography to design. Against the backdrop of his former position in modern European and Italian circles, Bardi’s achievements can be understood as a crossway between the modern American and European cultural milieu. In the same spirit, Warchavchik had used the strategies of the European vanguard some decades before to expose the “modern spirit” in Brazil. He began in 1925 by publishing a manifesto on modern architecture. Then, between 1927 and 1928, he designed his own modernist house with landscaping done by his wife, Mina Klabin Warchavchik, where he entertained Le Corbusier in 1928. In 1927, he replicated the Weissenhof experience by inaugurating three exhibitions that featured the work of modern artists and intellectuals – the “Casa Modernista” in São Paulo (1930), the “Apartamento Modernista” and the “Casa Modernista” (1931) in Rio de Janeiro. Finally, in 1930, he was invited by Sigfried Giedion to be the first representative of Brazil’s CIAM group, a chair he occupied until the end of war\textsuperscript{a}.

In this context, the multilingualism implied by these professionals’ cosmopolitanism, and inferred in Simmel’s definition of “foreigner,” might have been decisive in their undertakings, including in their role as agents or intermediaries between cultures. It was not by chance that André Bloc, the editor of \textit{L’Architecture d’aujourd’hui}, invited Maria Laura Osser, an immigrant architect of Polish origin and Henri Bergson’s niece, to be his magazine’s first correspondent in Brazil in 1946, and then Bo Bardi in 1955, who was involved in professional editing projects both in Italy and Brazil.

The concept of \textit{Landsmannschaft} and the chain of associations and articulations of foreign professionals in the city’s cultural space

In his essential study \textit{The Ghetto} (1928)\textsuperscript{a}, American scholar Louis Wirth used the traditional European notion of \textit{Landsmannschaft} to point out the importance of social structures in the life of new immigrants in America\textsuperscript{a}. This notion implied the grouping of individuals who shared common origins, as well as a language, either on a national or a European level. The same notion might serve as an instrumental conceptual model for analyzing the achievements of the so-called modernizing agents, by mapping the diverse interrelationships among and beyond immigrant circles. These include relationships between architects, engineers, landscape designers, contractors and real estate investors, the photographers who documented a vital shift in the urban horizon, and the engravers, painters, and sculptors whose production completed those modern spaces. In this context, an examination of those professional networks, from their origins within the \textit{Landsmannschaft}\textsuperscript{a} to their final manifestations within local society, might lead to an understanding of immigrant presence in urban cultural space in a broader sense. This involves not only the distribution of foreign elements in an urban space, but also the understanding of particular building developments in a city body as the result of commitments forged inside the \textit{Landsmannschaft}. Such was the case of the
real estate development agency, Germaine Burchard, and the group of Polish professional refugees led by Korngold who were fleeing from European fascism.

The formulation of the Landsmannschaft helps locate a space from which different discourses may emerge, as well as negotiations between each group of origins and the national or local sphere — as in the case of Warchavchik’s critical fortunes.

**Conclusion**

The tripartite approach described above allows us to distinguish the cultural encounters inside and outside the space that exists among clusters of immigrants and nationals. These encounters presuppose the existence of a dialogue between languages: the mother tongue of each creator and the local language, the *language of the other* as expressed by Derrida, which challenges the foreigner’s own estrangement through language.

In the face of industrial growth in the decades between 1930 and 1960, immigrant architects confronted the urban problems of a developing country with the theoretical instruments produced by the European vanguard. They called upon specific American experiences and developments, as well as postwar debates inside of CIAM. As demonstrated in the work of architect Rino Levi (1901-1965), for example, who studied in Milan and Rome with Piacentini during the 1920s, these architects encountered a diversity of projects: cinemas, theaters, hospitals, schools, universities, new typologies for commercial and residential buildings, and industries. They therefore left their imprint on the urban landscape through their writings and teachings from the 1940s to the 1960s.

Yet if the dialogue between immigrants and nationals on the materiality of city space did have an effect within the cultural and, in particular, historiographical realm, it would take until almost the end of the 1980s to fully recognize their presence in an academic milieu.

The new wave of studies on the subject of architectural cultural exchange in Brazil was advanced and enriched by Michel Espagne and Michel Werner’s 1980s formulation of “*transfert culturel*”, later developed as “*histoire croisée*”, which implied the possibility of interaction on global and local levels simultaneously, illuminating “the synchronic tangle of political, economic, intellectual artistic and human dynamics involved in the cultural exchange”. The additional theoretical apparatus stimulated the deconstruction of the old historiographical discourse, opening a path for recognizing the role of not only immigrant professionals in the forging of a modern cultural landscape, but also of “other” professionals and “other” architectures. Consequently, it prompted the revelation that a national expression is indeed the assemblage of many other-national strands and sedimentations, or as Sigfried Giedion still framed it in the 1950s:

“[…] no single country, no single movement, no single personality can be claimed as the originator of contemporary architecture. Trends shuttle to and fro, from one country one movement, one personality, to another, and become woven into a subtle pattern that portrays the emotional expression of the period […]”
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ABSTRACTS

The role of human displacement and migration in cultural processes as well as in the development of form in art and architecture has long been recognized. Throughout the last two decades, however, with the increase of human exchange and experiences of exile, issues concerning dynamics of cultural transfer have come to guide the course of mainstream architectural history. Bringing together old and new ideas surrounding these issues, this article opens up a discussion about the self-perception of Brazilian modern architectural historiography, addressing the role of foreign and immigrant architects in the spread of architectural modernism.

Le rôle des déplacements de populations et des migrations sur les processus culturels et les développements des formes en art et architecture a été largement reconnu depuis fort longtemps. Cependant, durant les deux dernières décennies, les questions concernant les dynamiques des transferts culturels guident le cours de l’histoire de l’architecture, poussé par l’accélération des échanges et l’expérience de l’exil démultipliée de nos jours. Dans ce contexte, en rassemblant les formulations anciennes et nouvelles concernant ce problème, l’article peut ouvrir un débat sur la perception propre de la construction historiographique de l’architecture moderne brésilienne concernant le rôle des architectes professionnels étrangers et immigrants au regard de la dissémination du modernisme architectural.
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