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ABSTRACT This article repositions Mário de Andrade’s ethnographic journals of his two trips within a larger cultural context by shifting the focus from an established text to the process through which two media, the archive and the newspaper, shaped their content and differences. I argue that reading the first journal through Mário’s editing of the manuscript exposes a mocking and experimental approach to ethnographic practices. It also exposes his careful attention to the creation of archives and collections as a way to create cultural memory in Brazil. The journal of his second trip is aligned with the political and cultural agenda of the Diário Nacional and O Partido Democrático, in which ethnography is practiced in a less experimental way and aims to assert a collective voice.

Mário de Andrade, acknowledged by the press as the “Pope of Brazilian modernism,” very seldom traveled from his hometown, São Paulo. Whereas other Latin American intellectuals took predictable tours of Europe, in particular Paris, his few trips were to underexplored territories of Brazil. Between May and August of 1927, Mário traveled by boat to the western part of the Brazilian territory and visited the Amazon, including its Peruvian and Bolivian parts, before returning to São Paulo by train. From November 1928 to February 1929, he traveled to different states and cities in Brazil such as Natal, Recife, Manaus, Paraiba, Rio Grande, and Pernambuco. During both trips, Mário accumulated extensive documentation about indigenous and
Afro-Brazilian cultures and people: he took more than four hundred photographs, made extensive musical notations, transcribed lyrics, made drawings, and kept two journals, one for each trip. Approximately 70 of the journal entries, mostly from the second trip, were published over the course of several months in the Diário Nacional, the newspaper which partially sponsored his trip. Mário kept both of the journals in his archive, and in 1942 he revisited and edited the journal from the first trip. We know from his correspondence that he wanted both of the journals to be published. His death in 1945 forestalled this desire, but three decades later, his longtime archivist Telê Porto Ancona Lopez published them in a posthumous edition.1 This volume also includes the contents of a small notepad, a “Diário manuscrito em 28 páginas de agenda de bolso de folhas destacáveis” (341), which consists of a series of brief notes Mário wrote during his second trip and were found in the same folder he reviewed in the 1940s.

Thanks to this posthumous publication, O turista aprendiz has conventionally been seen and read as a homogenous text. Recently, scholars such as Esther Gabara (2008), Karina Ruth–Esther Palau (2013), and Joel Birman (2009) have focused on this text as a way to reevaluate the figure of Mário as an intellectual whose reach extended beyond his canonical works of poetry and fiction. Although these critics have contributed to reassessing the importance of Mário’s ethnographic enterprises, they have based their interpretations on his own vision for the manuscripts and therefore have considered O turista aprendiz as an established text. But what happens when it is understood as two separate entities? The two journals, in fact, are driven by different media of circulation, which created differences in style and the fashioning of the self. When medium is understood as the means of transmission—a medium of circulation, and as a force that affected both the form and the content of his journals—then reading the two texts against each other reveals how Mário’s edition of the manuscript of the journal from the first trip was based on the premise that his personal archive could itself be used as a medium. Thus, his archival revision of the first journal created a nontraditional ethnographic text in which the “I” and the object of observation are decontextualized by the irreverent use of modernist techniques, which allowed him to experiment with the practice of ethnography. In the journal

---

1. The biographical details reported here come from Telê’s introduction sections (15–40) to the posthumous edition of Mário’s journals.
from his second trip, Mário’s ideological involvement and production in *Diário Nacional* as a weekly columnist and treasurer shaped a more collective voice and less fragmented style.

In what follows, I reposition Mário’s ethnographic practice within a larger cultural context. I do so by shifting the focus from an established text (Telê’s edition of *O turista aprendiz*) to the process through which the two media (the archive and the newspaper) shaped the content of the journals. From this perspective, reading the first journal (*O turista*) through the lens of the archive as medium exposes Mário’s obsessive attention to the creation of archives and collections as a way to create the cultural institutions necessary to make Brazil into a unified modern country. Furthermore, the journal of the second trip (*Viagem*) is partially inscribed into the political and cultural agenda undertaken by a group of liberal intellectuals through the publication of *Diário Nacional* between 1928 and 1932. As a whole, this approach to *O turista aprendiz* contributes to the ongoing reevaluation of Latin American modernisms and avant-gardes that has taken place in the last two decades. In particular, it provides a path to rethink the Latin American historical avant-garde’s stimulating relationship with media, in this case the newspaper and the archive.

**Understanding the Apprentice Tourist**

To begin, it is important to examine the ethnographic categorization of the journal from Mário’s first trip (*O turista*) and the one from his second trip (*Viagem*).² Noting that “modern ethnography appears in several forms” (9), James Clifford differentiates between two broad tendencies: (1) the institutional practice of ethnography, associated with anthropology as a field and the modern development of academia as a social institution; and (2) ethnography as a general practice. Clifford understands the latter as “diverse ways of thinking and writing about culture from a standpoint of participant observation” (9). Accordingly, Mário’s *O turista aprendiz* should be conceptualized as a cultural and ethnographic production that exists between the practices of general and academic ethnography.

---

² In order to facilitate this analysis, I refer to the journal from Mário’s first trip as *O turista*, to the journal from his second as *Viagem*, and to the notes added at the end of the edition as *Notas*. I use *O turista aprendiz* to talk about all of them together as a single work as published by Telê.
On the one hand, Mario’s texts are structured by the pathway of the traveler-observer, one who simultaneously studies and documents the places and the culture(s) he visits. Márió never saw himself as an actual ethnographer, though he did use some techniques akin to modern ethnographic methodology, especially participant-observer fieldwork, in order to collect information and to produce ethnographic texts. On the other hand, Mário’s knowledge of contemporary ethnographic production related to the anthropological field has been documented. It is well known that one of the sources for his famous novel *Macunaima* was the writings of German ethnographer Theodor Koch-Grünberg, who embarked on four expeditions to the Amazon in 1899, 1903–1905, 1911–1913, and 1924.

Márió’s position as an intellectual and as a cultural figure had a direct influence on the establishment of ethnography as an institutional practice in Brazil as well. From 1935 to 1938 he served as the founding director of São Paulo’s Department of Culture, where he undertook a central role in the recording and archiving of Afro-Brazilian, Amerindian, and general popular cultural productions. Although he never was an official member of the University of São Paulo, as a cultural and public figure he promoted the foundation of the ethnology program alongside Dina Lévi-Strauss, wife of the famous French anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss. In *O turista aprendiz* and through his efforts as a public figure, Mário contributed to modern ethnography in the two ways defined by Clifford.

The “in-betweenness” of his modern ethnographic enterprise is visible in the use of the word “turista” in the title that Mário chose when he projected both journals as a single text. By exploring the common use of the word *turista* (tourist), Mário pictured himself as an outsider, as a traveling observer who did not belong to the parts of Brazil he visited, as a person traveling for fun or entertainment. At the same time, he playfully presents himself as an *aprendiz* (apprentice) while contradictorily fashioning himself as an ethnographic authority. Finally, the use of the noun *turista* makes a sly comment about the practice of ethnography, in which every ethnographer acts simultaneously as a tourist, albeit as one who is learning (an “apprentice tourist”).

Palau has stressed the unstable and plurisignifying aspects of the words “tourist” and “apprentice” to ground her theory of “ethnography otherwise.” Drawing on similar assessments about Mário’s *O turista aprendiz*, she
proposes a type of ethnography in which the subjects doing it create an alternative practice that shapes an ethical dimension. Unlike traditional ethnography, she argues, ethnography otherwise problematizes the very process of representation, allowing the ethnographer to show ethically how ethnographic objects are constructed by the observer (v–vii). In this way, Palau distinguishes this ethical dimension in the way Brazilian and Mexican writers such as Mário, Darcy Ribeiro, and Gertrude Duby Bloom made explicit the interplay of gazes and presences that enact relations of power between the objects and subjects of ethnography. This ethical dimension, I would argue, is shot through with a sense of playfulness, too. The word “tourist,” for instance, acquires a multiplicity of meanings, thanks to the tongue-in-cheek gesture of introducing it as part of the title for his ethnographic enterprises. Such a mocking gesture is not out of place in Mário’s textual production, since he often resorted to mockery and playfulness in his works. Consequently, the text repositions itself in a mocking fashion by using the term “tourist” in the title. Despite the fact that O turista aprendiz is articulated from the perspective of the traveler-observer, the mocking gesture inserts the text into a new dimension beyond institutionalized ethnography.

Disrupting Homogeneity: Differences between O turista and Viagem

Although they were published together as a single text, O turista and Viagem are not homogenous. Rather, they differ in three principal areas. The style of O turista is more fragmentary and decontextualized and makes use of modernist techniques more liberally, while Viagem is more discursive and argumentative in style. The fashioning of the self, or the “I,” of each text is also different: in O turista the focus is primarily on the personal and the individual, whereas in Viagem the self is mostly a collective one.

The tone of mockery and playfulness present in O turista is almost entirely absent in Viagem, which takes more seriously the project of recording these ethnographic observations. These differences are further highlighted, and their motivation is uncovered, when the two texts are read alongside Notas, which was written at the same time as Viagem but was not intended for widespread publication in the Diário Nacional.

In O turista, for instance, the entry dated July 13th includes a sign with instructions for the use of the latrine at the Guaporé Rubber Corporation
The decontextualization and juxtaposition of seemingly incongruous objects is often seen as a typically avant-garde (and surreal) procedure. Here, the sign is reminiscent of a Dadaist “found object,” in which the manufactured or existing object (the sign) is detached from its natural context in order to be used in O turista, which arguably can be seen as a work of art. The fragment’s mocking tone can be considered irreverent, too—and not just because of its decontextualization, but also because of the topic and the comic hand-written annotation at the end.

In addition, the passage seems to have an irreverent ethnographic value, which challenges the usual focus of ethnography. Typically, ethnographic objects have been people or “Others,” and the emphasis has been on documenting their traditional ways of life. In the 1920s this practice of “salvage ethnography” was common and revolved around attempts to salvage or save
ways of cultures and peoples regarded as dying in the face of modernity (conceived in teleological terms). In an interesting twist, Mário shifts his focus from documenting a culture or people to offering his reader an ethnography of the rubber industry’s practices. He is located in the core region of rubber exploitation in the Amazon, and it is obvious that the sign belongs to one of the companies that participated in the Amazonian rubber boom of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The sign depicts its aims in terms of “sanitation” and the “moral education” of the users of the latrine, who presumably were company laborers. What are supposed to be recommendations or work rules are phrased as commandments, or “mandamentos,” reminding us (the readers and the users of the latrine) of a divine order that must be followed by everyone. Alongside these commandments, an anonymous handwritten note, “A lápis,” challenges the divine sign and demands a reciprocal hygienic action, namely the application of creolin to the latrine once a week. In this counteraction, the unofficial handwriting requests that the company comply with the same high levels of hygiene and “moral values” that it demands of the workers.

What I have called the irreverent ethnographic tone in Mário’s O turista can be associated with what Clifford has called “surrealist ethnography.” Reconstructing the different alliances between surrealism and ethnography in Europe during the 1920s and 1930s, he states that ethnography always has moments of surrealism embedded within it. Such a moment happens when “the possibility of comparison exists in unmediated tension with sheer incongruity. This moment is repeatedly produced and smoothed over in the process of ethnographic comprehension” (146). He proposes that ethnographers should take these surrealist moments a step further and write following a collage model in order to avoid the representation of cultures as organic and unified wholes. This intersection between art and anthropology proposed by Clifford has been critiqued by Hal Foster, who argues that ethnographers such as Clifford see culture as a text, and that such a perspective is a privilege afforded to the artist, who is used to working with texts and can manipulate a culture as a text (180–81).

3. To look at the development of the salvage ethnography in the USA, see Brian Hochman’s Savage Preservation.
4. The rubber boom is the name given to the period of rubber exploitation and colonization of the Amazon territories at the turn of the twentieth century. It happened mainly in Brazil, but also on a smaller scale in the Amazonian regions of Peru, Bolivia, and Colombia.
In Mário’s case, he was able to reposition traditional ethnography in *O turista* by adopting modernist techniques, a process which was completed when he edited his manuscripts. Due to this revision, *O turista* became a text that breaks with a more traditional mode of representation. In addition to the decontextualization of the entries, some passages resemble modernist writing techniques, such as stream of consciousness and surrealist automatic writing. For example, the “I” of *O turista* characterizes himself as someone who does not enjoy traveling, and throughout the journal his complaints about it are constant. In one of the notes added at the end of the entries, his fatigue even disrupts the ethnographic enterprise of the trip:

*Sintaxe*—. Quando íamos em busca do marco de limites, perguntei ao descalcinho que ia a meu lado, cansado de me olhar:
—É longe?
—É não.
—Você mora aqui?
—Moro não.
—Então nasceu no estado do Amazonas?
—Nasci não.
Me deu uma canseira. (150)

Noting that the boy strangely answers “no” to all of his questions, even those he clearly knows to be true (e.g., that the boy is from the Amazon), Mário gives up, drawing attention to his own status as an outsider in a self-conscious style. The passage also points to the fact that ethnographic fieldwork depends on the compliance and participation of the observed subjects, which in this case the boy declines to give. The inclusion of this passage suggests that the ethnographic subjects are active subjects rather than passive objects.

The perspective of a disjointed “I” in *O turista* is used with the aim of breaking down any kind of objectivity or impartiality within the ethnographic practice. Both Gabara and Palau have called attention to the several entries about “Os Índios DO-MI-SOL” (Andrade, *O turista* 158, 161, 164). In these entries, Mário describes the social and cultural characteristics of an indigenous tribe that he dreamed about earlier in his trip, in the entry “Sonho” (56). For both Palau and Gabara, the insertion of the tribe he dreamed about in *O turista* represents a critique of and a challenge to the common practice of ethnography. Instead of an authoritarian ethnographic
text that depicts and classifies a culture and its inhabitants, then, O turista fashions itself as an ethnography of conjectures and visions. Moreover, the observer represents himself as a displaced and fragmentary subject who engages in uncommon practices within the field of ethnography—such as the critique of the rubber industry, the attribution of agency to the boy he questioned, and the depiction of the tribe.

Analyzing the journals and photographs that he produced during both of his trips, Gabara states that Mário’s portrait of himself is always conjectural. According to her, the authority of the “I” fashioned in O turista aprendiz lies in the way he selects and portrays the subjects of his writing, which is embedded with different modernist techniques. Furthermore, she sees his textual and photographic work as a cultural practice “that does not impose aesthetic expectations from other modernist sites, and an ethics that understands the histories of modernity and photography embedded in that of colonialism” (3). The disjointedness of O turista may also be seen as a consequence of the fact that the audience for ethnographic writings was not established in advance at all. This sometimes unobjective and fragmentary style of ethnographic writing was common among ethnographers during the 1920s because they did not have formal training and methodologies which they all employed for their work, nor did they all write for the same intended audience. These texts consequently sometimes more closely resembled travel memoirs or novels. Mário’s use of modernist techniques increased the “otherwise” ethnographic value in O turista, resulting in a fragmentary style and a disjointed “I.”

Gabara’s and Palau’s arguments, however, overlook the differences between the two journals. Their reading follows Telê Porto Ancona Lopez’s edition of both journals as a cohesive and singular text. That edition also includes the small notepad (Notas) that Mário carried with him during his second trip (341–69). Notas’s style more closely resembles that of O turista than the style of Viagem, the journal from the second trip. In fact, the frenetic and fragmentary style of O turista seems to be taken to the limits in Notas. In the first entry of the latter, for instance, Mário quotes a poem from a matuto (a term used to depict a provincial countryman) and asserts, “Graças

5. At the beginning of the 20th century, ethnography as a discipline was still in the process of being established, so most observer-researchers learned the method through their own practice. For a discussion of the state of anthropology as a discipline and its audience in the 1920s, see Thomas Beebee’s “Cultural Entanglements” and Clifford’s The Predicament of Culture.
a Deus eu posso morrer. Já vi uma coisa bonita neste mundo” (341). As in *O turista*, the entry is decontextualized and framed in such a way that the reader must fill in the gaps and infer the meaning of the annotation. In this case, the fragment reverses the common conception of the *matuto* as a rustic and uneducated person, since the recitation of this popular poem makes the narrator thankful because he was able to witness “something beautiful in this world.” Like the journal from his first trip, in *Notas* ethnography undergoes a sort of inversion, and the objects of study become subjects with agency and the ability to produce an aesthetic object (e.g., the *matuto*). Thus, *Notas’s* style increases the visibility of the difference between *Viagem* and *O turista* and shows how *Viagem* was written and structured with Mário’s duties as a newspaper columnist in mind, while his “ethnography otherwise” was recorded separately in the small notebook that accompanied his journal.6

In contrast to *O turista* and *Notas*, the journal of the second trip, *Viagem*, follows a more traditional narrative structure. In general, the entries in *O turista* are shorter and more fragmented that the ones in *Viagem*. Its entries are framed more smoothly, and readers are able to find contextualization for most of the actions described and the places that Mário visited. In this case, playfulness is limited to several complaints about the lack of free time that the narrator finds for himself during his visits to other cities and towns. In *Viagem* there is also a more evident emphasis on depicting the local customs of the places he visited; these depictions typically involve comparisons with other places in Brazil. For example, in the entry for December 7, Mário describes his arrival in “S. Salvador” and describes the place and its streets. Among his observations there is an annotation about the use of cars: “É uma cidade justamente o contrário do Rio de Janeiro que se goza mais de automóvel. S. Salvador não” (213). The depiction of S. Salvador’s qualities is constructed upon its differences from Rio. This mode of comparison is more evident in the first pages of his journal at the beginning of his trip when he traveled through the major cities of the Brazilian Atlantic coast (e.g., Rio de Janeiro) towards the Northeast. While he makes these contrasts, a thread of commonality also runs throughout the entire text: he attends to the common cultural, religious, and aesthetic aspects shared by the diverse locations of

---

6. This argument is further supported by the fact that Telê also mentions another small pad of annotations, a “segundo livrinho de notas,” that was written by Mário during his second trip and that was subsequently lost (357).
Brazil through which he travels. In a way, all the elements that Mário highlights are used to map out a cultural commonality, an identity, of the territories.

In the entry dated December 26 at Natal (248), Mário analyzes how feitiçaria can be considered as a ritualistic practice that grounds several cultural manifestations dispersed throughout the Brazilian territory. In a previous entry he had already examined how it was influenced by Amerindian and African-American traditions; now he examines how it is influenced by Catholic traditions. “Era muito curioso estudar as maneiras com que a religião católica se misturou a essas manifestações . . . Principalmente a feitiçaria nortista, Pará, Amazonas, inda é muito ignorada” (248). In the entry about Natal, the tone of the writing and the framing of the documentation change in comparison with O turista. He goes into depth in his analysis of the way Catholic imagery feeds feitiçaria, using examples from several regions and making a comparative examination. In this same entry, surprisingly, the “I” of the narration still fashions himself in a nonconjectural way: “E eu não posso porque não sei bem do assunto” (248). Yet his self-fashioning remains contradictory since he depicted himself first as a nonexpert, albeit in a modest tone, to later display an erudite knowledge about the northern feitiçaria.

This entry was also published as one of the many chronicles in Mário’s column in the Diário Nacional. Moreover, he incorporated it into a conference presentation entitled “Música de feitiçaria no Brasil: conferência literária” (1967), in which he tried to talk about the topic in a manner that, according to Juliana Araújo Silva, resembled a scientific style (122). As happened with many of the texts that he wrote during the 1920s, he would reuse them later during the 1930s and 1940s. He wrote this conference paper in 1933 for the Associação Brasileira de Música, and years later he read it in public in the Conservatório Dramático e Musical de São Paulo (Música 11). In the conference presentation, he analyzed the union between music and the feitiçaria as a religious ritual (27); he traced how in different zones of Brazil (e.g., Bahia, Amazon, Rio, South, etc.) the different kinds of feitiçarias are embedded into Afro-Brazilian or indigenous music. Halfway through his analysis, he incorporated the entry from Natal that depicts his encounter with two “feiticeiros de catimbó” (33) as an example of a religious practice in which dance and music acquire the status of ceremonial objects. For Araújo, the feitiçaria conference is part of a series of texts written during the 1930s in which Mário undertook a systematic study of Brazilian popular
culture. In order to ground his observations, Araújo argues, Mário made a scientific description of his object of study that incorporated the characteristics of a literary text (122–23).

The incorporation of the Natal entry in the conference presentation shows how the style of Viagem is closer to an argumentative discourse. It also highlights the gap between the fragmentary and modernist style of O turista and the more discursive style of Viagem. In the latter, there is an obvious anxiety to be more precise in the documentation process—an anxiety which can be seen in the way the entries are dated. Unlike O turista, the dates in Viagem follow a more specific and consistent format in which the place, the month, the day, and the hour of the entry are all indicated. Furthermore, Viagem attempts to approximate scientific accuracy, with multiple entries (observations) added in a single day.

In the essays collected in The Predicament of the Culture, Clifford attempts to deconstruct “the authority constructed in ethnographic research and texts” (Marcus 51) by shifting the focus from the methodology and function of modern ethnography towards the “character of representation and context in the writing of ethnography” (51). By doing so, he outlines the predicament of ethnographic practice as a “state of being in culture while looking at culture, a form of personal and collective self-fashioning” (9). In this regard, it is possible to associate Clifford’s assertion with O turista aprendiz. The main difference between O turista and Viagem is that in the first, the writing emphasizes a “personal self-fashioning,” while in the second, the writing emphasizes a “collective self-fashioning.” This does not mean that in O turista there is no such thing as collective self-fashioning; rather, it is just that the image of the collective is less scrutinized because the narration (and the narrator) is focused on the “I,” as a conjectural and errant construction.7 Likewise, the journey—and its ethnographic component—becomes a part of the exploration of a perpetually displaced “I.”

In Viagem, the process is the opposite. The imperative self-fashioning is the collective one; it is shaped through a perpetual search for the characteristics of the brasileiro spirit. Such a difference is not casual; it can be read as a

---

7. Errant is the adjective used by Gabara to conceptualize the artistic practice of modernism in Brazil and Mexico that engaged in a confrontational and deconstructive dynamic with colonialism and western modernist practices.
consequence of the differing circulation media of the texts. Unlike Viagem, O turista was not produced with a newspaper in mind as a circulation format. In O turista the ethnographic observations are subject to the exploration of the perpetually displaced “I.” In contrast, in Viagem the documentary project emphasizes a collective fashioning—a search for the characteristics of a Brazilian spirit within the differences of the regions is one of the main aspects of the text.

Circulating Differences: Media of Circulation

The differences between O turista and Viagem are not accidental; they are driven by the different media of circulation that Mário’s two journals had. Mário envisioned his personal archive itself as a medium. Such a conception of the archive is related to its function within the fields of anthropology and ethnography. Moreover, his conception of the archive as medium is grounded in his broader preoccupation with generating a physical space in which to store the collective Brazilian cultural memory. Yet for Mário, the archive is not just about storing something that already exists; the archive as a symbolic space has an active role in creating a collective Brazilian memory. At the same time, his involvement in the Diário Nacional shaped Viagem to have a more collective voice because it had, in the liberal intellectuals who had created the newspaper, a more concrete audience with an explicit political agenda.

In 1942, Mário revisited the diaries and reorganized them so as to publish some parts of the text in the academic journal titled Os Pacaás (Machado Sirino 203). In editing the manuscripts of O turista he included a preface, written in 1943, which Telê in turn added as the preface of her edition in 1976. In this “Prefácio,” he sums up his vision of the manuscript as “um livro modernista,” composed of “muitas notas,” characterizing them as a series of “Notas rápidas, telegráficas muitas vezes” (Andrade, O turista aprendiz 49) to point out the fragmentation of its style. The inclusion of this preface is Mário’s way of mocking the filiation of O turista with a modernist aesthetic. In fact, he sarcastically depicts the use of modernist techniques as an aged enterprise: “O conjunto cheira a modernismo e envelheceu bem” (49). By 1943 some of the modernist techniques were no longer quite so new,
and the *Modernista* movement of the 1920s had been institutionalized as the foundational moment in modern Brazilian art and literature.⁸

According to the traditional classification offered by Eduardo Jardim de Moraes (*A brasilidade modernista*), Brazilian modernism emerged in two phases: the “heroic” phase (1917–1924), characterized by the use of experimental aesthetics, and the nationalist phase (1924–1942), characterized by the display of a critical nationalism. Because Moraes’s approach relies on a traditional conceptualization between political avant-garde and formalist modernism,⁹ his approach has been questioned by several critics—among them Gabara (27)—because it sets up nationalism and experimental aesthetics as binaries rather than seeing them as phenomena that were intrinsically related during the two decades. Whatever Moraes’s theoretical failures, his classification shows how modernism—as a cultural and aesthetic movement—was already aged and canonized by 1943.

In February of 1942, Mário published four articles in the newspaper *O Estado de São Paulo* to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the Week of Modern Art in São Paulo (“O movimento”). In the four texts, he reevaluated the events that took place in February 1922 at the Teatro Municipal (e.g., art exhibitions, readings of poems, concerts, etc.). The Week of Modern Art, he asserts, was a catalyst that gathered together a group of artists that were already doing experimental (Modernist) art. The event was relatively spontaneous and gathered so many artists that it produced a controversial and divisive state within Brazil’s art establishment, in particular with the Brazilian Academy of Letters. Mário pointed out that this event was led by the intellectual elite and bourgeoisie of São Paulo, who acquired their political and social relevance through the boom of the coffee economy and the fact that São Paulo was fast becoming the most industrialized city in Brazil. He summarized three central accomplishments of the Week of Modern Art: it served as an aesthetic exploration; it updated the artistic intelligentsia; and it was the starting point for a creative national consciousness. Before 1922, he argues, there was a lack of national mindfulness in the aesthetic expressions of Brazil. Likewise, Brazilian art was a colonial expression, because all of the country’s aesthetics were imported expressions that had been adapted.

---

⁸. For an in-depth analysis of the historical process of Brazilian modernism’s canonization see Saúlo Gouveia’s *The Triumph of Brazilian Modernism.*
⁹. It is worth noting, however, that Moraes has changed some of his initial approaches to Brazilian Modernism, in particular to Mário’s works. For instance, see his 1999 work, *Limites do Moderno.*
Modernism, however, was the first step, “um preparador,” towards a revolutionary spirit that would create a national expression (“O movimento”).

Machado asserts that Mário’s trajectory as an intellectual was shaped by his actions as a cultural politician. Comparing him to international figures of the avant-garde such as Brecht and Maikovski, Machado notes that “a política como o propósito de organização, precisaria criar mecanismos com vistas à promoção tanto das manifestações artísticas e culturais quanto da democratização de acesso destas” (203). In this regard, Mário’s balanced critique of the Week of Modern Art can be related to his view of a national art that should be entrenched between the popular culture (understood as the cultural production of the people) and the production of a high culture, “cultura de elite” (206). According to Machado, Mário acted not just as a writer, but as a cultural organizer in order to create a national consciousness beyond high and low culture. Likewise, Machado thinks that O turista aprendiz should be read as one of several ways in which Mário attempted to bring together the “cultura de elite” and popular culture. Yet I argue that Mário not only envisioned external institutions as a way to support his position as a cultural organizer, he also embedded the development of a national expression and the dialectic between high and low culture into his own personal archive. He was obsessive in his attention to detail in his archive, keeping every draft, journal, manuscript, personal note, and copies of all correspondence between him and intellectuals around the world. That he kept his ethnographic journals in his personal archive and that he revisited even the ones that were not published further demonstrates how he envisioned his archive as a means to establish a cultural memory for his work—and by extension for Brazil. The archive, then, materializes as a medium of circulation because Mário knew that what he kept in the archive, including O turista aprendiz and the revised manuscripts, would later be circulated. Because the archive included his 1942–1943 edition and the addition of the preface, he established a way for O turista to be read. The self-conscious inclusion of modernist techniques in the revision of the manuscripts produced an ethnographic text in which relationships of power are enacted, what Palau has called the “ethnography otherwise.”

The relationship between archive and ethnographic production has been masterfully studied by George Marcus. Reflecting upon discussions about the future of cultural ethnography in the 1980s, Marcus stated that, in the realm of ethnography, there is a literal and a metaphorical dimension to the
archive. On the one hand, the literal makes reference to how the accumulation of ethnographic knowledge can be considered as an archive of the discipline (49). On the other hand, the metaphorical archive ponders the possibility that the ethnographic knowledge will become a historical document in the future. That is, the accumulation of ethnographic works and knowledge might be used as a document in order to understand and rebuild the past of the discipline. For Marcus, the two possibilities of the archive that were under discussion during the 1980s were questioned in that “there is both a basic truth to ethnography in its own time and a relative truth to it in its historic perspective” (50).

Marcus counterposes these two possibilities for the personal archive of the anthropologist or ethnographer in order to propose a “more complex and unwieldy sense of archive” (55). For him, the personal archive has a subversive tone because it contains evidence of the “struggle,” the messiness, and the “diverse” nature of making anthropology. Moreover, this personal archive has the marks of human shortcoming, “of the inability of any fieldworker to be a reliable scope of observation or a perfect translator or interpreter” (54). Marcus, then, proposes that cultural anthropology should adopt this type of archive instead of the literal and metaphorical ones. In doing so, the discipline and its scholarship would become heterogeneous and unpredictable, and would shape a discipline in which “the identity and the contours of the thing studied remain in question: its identity is the question” (57).

Marcus attempted to create this new vision of the archive in ethnography with the purpose of reorganizing “the discursive space of ethnographic representation” (55). The reorganization would create a new type of ethnography with the ethical issues of cultural and individual representations at its core. In fact, Mário had already done exactly this, using his own personal archive and his re-editing of the O turista manuscript, written during his first trip in 1927, to confront the nascent practice of ethnography with a modernist aesthetic, which was already institutionalized in Brazil by the 1940s. He did this not with the purpose of reshaping the field of ethnography, but rather with the intention of shaping a national tradition. As Birman has stated, the problematic of the Brazilian tradition was the “problemática fundamental da ampla pesquisa empreendida por Mário de Andrade” (197), and so, in O turista aprendiz, Mário created a cultural and symbolic cartography in which the disbursed Brazilian memory was conjugated throughout its
singularity (196). But this cartography was created not only through his literary texts but also through his personal archive, since it was the medium by which we received O turista. Mário’s edition of the latter in his archive also shaped the text’s style (the “ethnography otherwise”) and contextualized it within his attempt to establish a Brazilian memory of cultural production.

In 1927, Mário started collaborating with the Diário Nacional, which became the official newspaper of the Partido Democrático that same year. The Partido Democrático de São Paulo (PD), founded in 1926, was established to gather all Paulistas together in order to improve Brazil. The PD’s foundational charter also states that the party would follow the first republican constitution of Brazil, in which individual rights are granted (Prado 9). The main reason for the establishment of the party, as Carlos Sandroni points out, was to fight for the same right to the representational vote as was granted in the Brazilian constitution. In particular, the founders of the party advocated for the existence of one or more parties and the open debate of diverse opinions (9–10). Though the constitution of 1891 had granted citizens the right to vote, political power in Brazil at this time was concentrated in the regional elites. The dominant oligarchies in São Paulo and Minas Gerais would alternate the control of presidential power between them. This political state was structured by the economic situation in the country, which was based on the production of coffee in São Paulo and milk in Minas Gerais. The foundation of the PD was a reaction to this economic and political scenario, which earned the name of a política do café com leite.

Although Mário was never an official member of the PD, he actively participated in its meetings and was close to most of the founders of the party. As a collaborator of the group and the newspaper, he served as the treasurer of Diário Nacional and wrote a weekly column, “Taxi,” from 1927 until 1930. He never saw himself as a politician. In fact, in one of his letters to Murilo Miranda he describes himself as a “sujeito visceralmente apolítico, incapaz de atitudes políticas, covarde diante de qualquer ação política” (Andrade, Cartas 37). Yet despite his personal opinion of himself, he was closely related to the group and the actions of the founders of the PD. His intellectual production of these years was linked to the political dynamic of this party as well. In this regard, the ethnographic writings of Viagem, which were sponsored by and appeared in the Diário Nacional, were informed by the liberal ideology of the party, influencing the creation of a collective voice which was in contrast with the disjointed “I” of O turista.

Processes of interaction between mass media and ethnography have come
under study recently. Brian Hochman, for instance, has examined the way in which the efforts of American ethnographers to improve ethnographic methodologies provoked the development of new techniques of audiovisual media. Hochman analyzes various cases in which the ethnographer’s demands for a more accurate mode of representation had a direct repercussion on the improvement of modern media. Among these, he traced the development of commercial color photography in relation to a mass media publication, such as the *National Geographic Magazine*. During the 1910s the color process was unreliable, until the magazine imported the European technique of autochrome to improve the quality of color pictures taken by ethnographers in places such as the Grand Canyon and New Mexico. Hochman sees this process as a confluence of factors among ethnography, technology, and racial ideology. He contends that the development and sophistication of autochrome was motivated by ethnographic imperatives for accurate representations, which were also motivated by a color fetish developed to satisfy an increasingly popular racialized thinking in American society during the first decades of the twentieth century (145–48).

As in the cases studied by Hochman, Mário’s ethnographic products were in direct dialogue with the media and political ideology. Unlike Hochman’s examples, the ideological involvement of the media in *Viagem* is explicit. Mário’s ethnographic production was directly related to the *Diário Nacional*, which was a tool created by the PD to spread its political thought in Brazil. The newspaper as medium shaped *Viagem* stylistically, because its publication in a newspaper required a more argumentative and less experimental writing style. It also encouraged the construction of an “I” that constantly attempted to reconstruct the heterogeneity of Brazil as a unified voice. In keeping with the alignments of the PD and its newspaper, in *Viagem* Mário created an image of Brazil as a united country, but one shaped by a confluence of heterogeneous elements, which is exemplified by his description of *feitiçaria*, a practice composed of Catholic, indigenous, and Afro-Brazilian elements.

Given the close relationship between writers and cultural institutions in Latin America, especially during the historical modernisms and avant-gardes, treating the personal archive as a medium related to ideological and cultural enterprises allows us to see canonical figures (like Mário) in a new light, beyond their more traditionally studied works. Revisiting this dynamic of personal archives can also contribute to the ongoing reassessment of the stimulating exchange between politics, mass media, modernism, and the
avant-garde during the first decades of the twentieth century in Latin America. In this case, focusing on the component texts of Mário de Andrade’s *O turista aprendiz* demonstrates how the circulation media of these texts shaped their styles and their relationship with ethnography as a cultural practice. Furthermore, in looking at the Latin American avant-gardes and their relationship to the media, it is not possible to think of communications media as transparent or simply as passive modes of transmission. On the contrary, traditional (e.g., newspaper) and nontraditional (e.g., archive) media actively shape what they transmit. Thus, looking at the media from this perspective underscores the ways in which the avant-garde was implicated in broader social and political processes. For example, Mário’s re-editing of *O turista* established a disjointed “I” and a playful tone that produced a nontraditional ethnographic text. That Mário stored these texts (along with the personal *Notas* which were written as an accompanying text during his second trip) in his personal archive and that in 1942 he revisited and re-edited them exposes the way in which he viewed his personal archive as a medium of transmission—a way to communicate these ethnographic writings to future generations. At the same time, it shows how his personal archive was conceived as part of his greater purpose of storing and establishing a collective cultural memory for Brazil. By reading *Viagem* as part of a broader political and cultural landscape, it is possible to observe how the journal of the second trip reveals a far more collective voice and a more traditional discursive style. Given his political ties to the PD, this style is seen as an active voice (member) of the political and cultural agenda of the newspaper as well as the party.
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