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Abstract

This article uses two photographs to reveal a set of fundamental arguments about Brazilian architecture that were forged in the late 1930s and consolidated in the 1940s and 1950s. These arguments can be summarized as the Corbusian matrix (the vertical prism), the pretense of the adaption of buildings to the local climate (the use of the cobogó and the glass curtain), the coexistence of the past and present (a photographic overlap of buildings from different periods) and – what interests us more in this article – the association with the state (which either sponsored or utilized the buildings in question). The second section of the article gives an overview of the relationship between architecture and the public sector with the support of other photographs.
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Resumen

Este texto pretende revelar por medio de dos fotografías un conjunto de argumentos fundamentales sobre la arquitectura moderna brasileña que fueron forjados a partir de la segunda mitad de los años 1930 y se consolidaron en las décadas de 1940 y 1950. Estos argumentos pueden ser sintetizados aquí por la matriz Corbusiana (el prisma vertical), la pretensión de adaptación al clima local (con la utilización de celosías y de la cortina de vidrio), la convivencia con el pasado y el presente (yuxtaposición - fotográfica - entre edificios de tiempos distintos), y, lo que nos interesa más específicamente en este artículo, - la asociación con el Estado (vinculada a la función ejercida por el y/o el patrocinio del edificio). En la segunda parte, apoyado en otras imágenes se persigue en términos panorámicos las relaciones entre arquitectura y sector público.
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A Single Representation

In this photograph, the small old church with its two bell towers is in the foreground, while towards the back and to the left there stands a tall, rectangular prism, isolated and framed by the sky on a sunny tropical day. The church’s main façade is marked by a symmetric ornamental system, oriented around the pediment, while the prism, with its narrow, solid walls, has a primary façade characterized by a flat surface with a homogeneous, repetitive design. On the right side of the photograph, a tree gives us an idea of scale. As a black and white photograph, the image makes use of shades of grey and creates unity among a group of structures built several centuries apart.

The description above – somewhat mischievous' – refers to the photograph by George Everard Kidder Smith, published for the first time in the book Brazil Builds: Architecture New and Old (1943). In this image, the Water Tower interacts with the Olinda Cathedral. However, it could also describe Marcel Gautherot’s photograph published by Henrique Mindlin in Modern Architecture in Brazil in 1956.

In the image by the French photographer, the Ministry of Education and Health appears alongside the Church of Santa Luzia in downtown Rio de Janeiro, at that time the nation’s capital. The approach used by Siegfried Gideon, Alberto Sartoris and Nikolaus Pevsner when comparing contemporary and older buildings evokes a Wölfflinian historiographical tradition. In these cases from Brazil, however, both past and present overlap in a single image.
It was through these and other, similar photographs that Brazilian architecture became internationally known. Through black and white images, modern buildings showed themselves to be in perfect harmony with baroque settings. This is how the narrative of modern Brazilian architecture in communication with the country’s colonial past was created and repeated for decades.

The Image as Narrative

This juxtaposition, which we have forced in the description of Images 1 and 2, reveals a set of fundamental arguments about modern Brazilian architecture that were forged in the late 1930s and consolidated in the 1940s and 1950s—the period in which both images were photographed and published. These arguments can be summarized as the corbusian matrix (the vertical prism), the coexistence of the past and present (photographic overlap of buildings from different periods), and—what interests us most in this article—the association with the state (linked to both the program and/or the sponsorship of the buildings in question).

These four arguments are not new; they have been part of the architectural historiography debate since the late 1980s and early 1990s. However, what interests us in this article is how images narrate the connections between these arguments without the need for any support texts, and how they highlight aspects related to the fourth point: a State-Architecture relationship that transcends the federal level and is revealed in many spheres of the public sector. Lauro Cavalcanti has indicated the importance of this relationship and the battle between architectural groups for spaces for legitimization in the 1930s and 1940s. “The conquest of the state market was absolutely fundamental in a country where the private elite only adopts a style once it has been experimented and approved in public works.”


It is possible that “approval in public works” was the key element for the diffusion of modern architecture in Brazil, not only for elites but also for the middle class, which, as we have noted elsewhere, is an “exceptional” phenomenon. Apart from the plastic-formal exception represented by the Carioca School, twentieth century Brazilian architecture was marked by two other exceptions: its relationship with the state and the voracious adoption of modern architecture by the middle and upper classes. One can notice this by casually walking around any neighborhood built in the 1950s in any large Brazilian city and recognizing the modern language used in apartment buildings and/or the detached or semidetached houses built during that decade. To understand the fine exceptions, it is necessary to enlarge the visual field and examine the relationship between modern architecture and the state throughout the twentieth century. In Brazil, the state took on modern architecture as its own in a way unlike anywhere else in the world.

It is likely that parallels to the Brazilian case—on a similar scale—occurred only in Latin America, specifically in Mexico and in Venezuela. In the latter, as in the case of Brazil, this phenomenon was associated with a military dictatorship. It is worth remembering that one of the slogans of the Pinochet government (1973–1990) was “We progress because we build!” According to Adrian Gorelik, referring generally to Latin America in the 1940s, “the state will bring together the entire construction tradition, incorporating the avant-garde drive: the state institutionalizes the modern avant-garde and the city, its modernizing bulwarks.”

This juxtaposition, which we have forced in the description of Images 1 and 2, reveals a set of fundamental arguments about modern Brazilian architecture that were forged in the late 1930s and consolidated in the 1940s and 1950s—the period in which both images were photographed and published. These arguments can be summarized as the corbusian matrix (the vertical prism), the coexistence of the past and present (photographic overlap of buildings from different periods), and—what interests us most in this article—the association with the state (linked to both the program and/or the sponsorship of the buildings in question).

These four arguments are not new; they have been part of the architectural historiography debate since the late 1980s and early 1990s. However, what interests us in this article is how images narrate the connections between these arguments without the need for any support texts, and how they highlight aspects related to the fourth point: a State-Architecture relationship that transcends the federal level and is revealed in many spheres of the public sector. Lauro Cavalcanti has indicated the importance of this relationship and the battle between architectural groups for spaces for legitimization in the 1930s and 1940s. “The conquest of the state market was absolutely fundamental in a country where the private elite only adopts a style once it has been experimented and approved in public works.”


It is possible that “approval in public works” was the key element for the diffusion of modern architecture in Brazil, not only for elites but also for the middle class, which, as we have noted elsewhere, is an “exceptional” phenomenon. Apart from the plastic-formal exception represented by the Carioca School, twentieth century Brazilian architecture was marked by two other exceptions: its relationship with the state and the voracious adoption of modern architecture by the middle and upper classes. One can notice this by casually walking around any neighborhood built in the 1950s in any large Brazilian city and recognizing the modern language used in apartment buildings and/or the detached or semidetached houses built during that decade. To understand the fine exceptions, it is necessary to enlarge the visual field and examine the relationship between modern architecture and the state throughout the twentieth century. In Brazil, the state took on modern architecture as its own in a way unlike anywhere else in the world.

It is likely that parallels to the Brazilian case—on a similar scale—occurred only in Latin America, specifically in Mexico and in Venezuela. In the latter, as in the case of Brazil, this phenomenon was associated with a military dictatorship. It is worth remembering that one of the slogans of the Pinochet government (1973–1990) was “We progress because we build!” According to Adrian Gorelik, referring generally to Latin America in the 1940s, “the state will bring together the entire construction tradition, incorporating the avant-garde drive: the state institutionalizes the modern avant-garde and the city, its modernizing bulwarks.”

This juxtaposition, which we have forced in the description of Images 1 and 2, reveals a set of fundamental arguments about modern Brazilian architecture that were forged in the late 1930s and consolidated in the 1940s and 1950s—the period in which both images were photographed and published. These arguments can be summarized as the corbusian matrix (the vertical prism), the coexistence of the past and present (photographic overlap of buildings from different periods), and—what interests us most in this article—the association with the state (linked to both the program and/or the sponsorship of the buildings in question).

These four arguments are not new; they have been part of the architectural historiography debate since the late 1980s and early 1990s. However, what interests us in this article is how images narrate the connections between these arguments without the need for any support texts, and how they highlight aspects related to the fourth point: a State-Architecture relationship that transcends the federal level and is revealed in many spheres of the public sector. Lauro Cavalcanti has indicated the importance of this relationship and the battle between architectural groups for spaces for legitimization in the 1930s and 1940s. “The conquest of the state market was absolutely fundamental in a country where the private elite only adopts a style once it has been experimented and approved in public works.”


It is possible that “approval in public works” was the key element for the diffusion of modern architecture in Brazil, not only for elites but also for the middle class, which, as we have noted elsewhere, is an “exceptional” phenomenon. Apart from the plastic-formal exception represented by the Carioca School, twentieth century Brazilian architecture was marked by two other exceptions: its relationship with the state and the voracious adoption of modern architecture by the middle and upper classes. One can notice this by casually walking around any neighborhood built in the 1950s in any large Brazilian city and recognizing the modern language used in apartment buildings and/or the detached or semidetached houses built during that decade. To understand the fine exceptions, it is necessary to enlarge the visual field and examine the relationship between modern architecture and the state throughout the twentieth century. In Brazil, the state took on modern architecture as its own in a way unlike anywhere else in the world.

It is likely that parallels to the Brazilian case—on a similar scale—occurred only in Latin America, specifically in Mexico and in Venezuela. In the latter, as in the case of Brazil, this phenomenon was associated with a military dictatorship. It is worth remembering that one of the slogans of the Pinochet government (1973–1990) was “We progress because we build!” According to Adrian Gorelik, referring generally to Latin America in the 1940s, “the state will bring together the entire construction tradition, incorporating the avant-garde drive: the state institutionalizes the modern avant-garde and the city, its modernizing bulwarks.”
Laboratory (1937). On the other hand, the Education and Health Ministry represents the reconfiguration of a political and administrative system that was modernized by the actions of the Estado Novo. Here it is worth recalling the work of Francisco Salomone on the outskirts of Buenos Aires, which did not exactly utilize a modern vocabulary but was extremely prolific and fully funded by the state, an effort that did not have continuity in that country.45

If we keep in mind that the Water Tower in Olinda was built before the inauguration of the Education and Health Ministry, and if we mention the enormous assortment of projects at the municipal and state levels from the 1930s and early 1940s, we can argue that the State-Architecture relationship began within the sphere of local government. Furthermore, the State-Architecture relationship linked the supposed constructive rationality−economy and speed−of modern architecture to other modernizing efforts in the spheres of education and public health, much like Juan O’Gorman’s elementary schools. Modern public buildings in Brazil from the late 1930s and early 1940s are many, but are dispersed throughout the country. Besides the previously mentioned buildings designed by the Department of Architecture and Urbanism led by Luís Nunes in Pernambuco, we can mention the Hospital for Public Workers in Rio de Janeiro (1934) and the following year it won the support of Education Secretary Dr. Luis Cavalcanti de Barros Benevides and Department of Education Director Dr. Agripino Barbosa. [...] the whole building complex reflects the then-contemporary proposal to modernize the curriculum based on the ideas of Anísio Teixeira. It was an innovative plan for promoting fraternization through the use of space and the promotion of activities that included art, sports and science, as well as an experimental school.51

The oldest surviving iconography – archived by the Bahia chapter of Docomomo Brazil – reveals the use of a more universal language, often an orthodox rationalism, that is, a style less associated with the regionalism captured in the pages of the books Brazil Builds Modern Architecture in Brazil (1934). The same may be said of the nursery. The two most famous iconographies reverse the logic of the ones by Kidd Smirh and Gautherot mentioned above. In these images, we can see the building in the foreground—the present—with the past, the colonial Santo Antônio Além do Carmo church, located in the distant background.

In 1951, the director of the Bahia Normal School, Dr. Álvaro Augusto da Silva, based on the reforms to the national curriculum proposed by the Bahia educationalist Anísio Teixeira, promoted a campaign to build the Barbalho headquarters. The construction plan for the new headquarters was brought from Rio de Janeiro by Professor Aluízio Augusto da Silva in 1935, and the following year it won the support of Education Secretary Dr. Luis Cavalcanti de Barros Benevides and Department of Education Director Dr. Agripino Barbosa. [...] the whole building complex reflects the then-contemporary proposal to modernize the curriculum based on the ideas of Anísio Teixeira. It was an innovative plan for promoting fraternization through the use of space and the promotion of activities that included art, sports and science, as well as an experimental school.51

The oldest surviving iconography – archived by the Bahia chapter of Docomomo Brazil – reveals the use of a more universal language, often an orthodox rationalism, that is, a style less associated with the regionalism captured in the pages of the books Brazil Builds Modern Architecture in Brazil (1934). The same may be said of the nursery. The two most famous iconographies reverse the logic of the ones by Kidd Smirh and Gautherot mentioned above. In these images, we can see the building in the foreground—the present—with the past, the colonial Santo Antônio Além do Carmo church, located in the distant background.

We can show other examples from the same perspective, in which architectural design sought to solve pedagogical problems as part of proposed reforms at the federal level. This was the case with the Classe and Platon schools built in Rio de Janeiro in the 1930s by Enio Silva. It was also the case with the public schools built between 1936 and 1939 in São Paulo, designed by José Maria da Silva Naves.52 According to Naves, in his article published in Novos Prédios para Grupo Escolar (1936), the motivation was to distance school buildings from historicist architectural solutions.

The architecture of schools is almost always of a grand scale. It is a type of architecture that admits no symmetries, with the sacrifice of the forced placement of doors or windows. [...] Let us be aware of our time and we will accomplish a noble mission. Today we cannot accept an architecture that is not rational because schools must take advantage of all the comforts of modern construction, of all the achievements of science in order to achieve perfection from the point of view of pedagogical hygiene (São Paulo, 1936).53

The Education Institute (1936-1939) in João Pessoa, designed by the technicians of the Public Road Works Division of the State of Paraíba, deserves special mention here. This building is contemporary to those built in the federal capital and the city of São Paulo and is linked to the ideas of the Modernismo movement, as Marina Goldfarb54 indicates, and was part of important transformations of the state capital of Paraíba.

This photograph, taken from the top of the garden terrace of the Education Institute’s central building, shows the towers of the barracks churches of colonial João Pessoa, left behind by the technical progress.
that allowed for the creation of Lagoa Park, where Ceará Vargas Avenue heads towards the sea.

There would, therefore, be two kinds of relationships between architecture and the public sector at play in this interpretation of one of a more operational character and another that is more symbolic. Within the scope of municipal and state power, these projects would play a role in the transformation of the structure of the Brazilian state as they were used to support the proposed modernization of certain public services, such as education and health. While the Ministry of Education and Health coordinated these modernizing policies at the federal level, they also functioned as a symbol of the new Brazilian architecture.

This powerful relationship operated deeply on the level of the technical and bureaucratic demands of the Brazilian state at the same time as it constructed its symbolic image. This relationship had its climax in Brasília as a decisive historical moment in the elaboration of a national project, in which the construction of the new capital not only symbolized technical sovereignity, but also the geographical domination of the country.

It is also in the photographs of the federal capital that the ambiguities and contradictions of the relationship between architecture and the state became more evident. We can see this in Pierre Verger’s photographs, for example, in which the isolated tower of the federal congress appears alongside a family of recent arrivals to a city that embodied all their hopes for a better life.

After the construction of the new capital, the relationship between power and architecture examined here constituted itself in a less optimistic fashion, although equally developmental.

New Forces Take Over Modernism

In the following years, the close relationship between architecture and the state began to change. During the late 1960s and 1970s, the state represented modern architecture in a different way. Modern architecture in Brazil would become the background for government propaganda, or advertise itself as a mutating being, as the symbol of commercial power.

In 1967, after the 1964 military coup in Brazil, the Rio de Janeiro magazine Manchete (issue 797), in competition with its São Paulo counterpart Vajá, published the article “O Grande Espetáculo da Arquitetura Moderna – O Brasil no século XX” (“The Great Spectacle of Modern Architecture – Brazil in the twenty-first century”). Its title referred to the article of the twenty-three-page report that the country was moving towards the twenty-first century by means of an architectural style it considered “spectacular.” From the perspective of Manchete’s editors, Brazilian architecture showed signs of renewing its capacity to forge an image in a country that was taking back its course of development towards an unquestionable destination. Brasilia still functioned as an inexorable part of this process. The article’s opening words, occupying less than two pages, said that, with the inauguration of the Arcos Palace – the new headquarters of Itamaraty (the Brazilian diplomacy institute), designed by Oscar Niemeyer and Milton Ramos – “Brazilian architecture reaches the apex of a marvelous evolution begun just over thirty years ago.” The article’s cover image was from Brasilia, but it did not depict the desire of hope, future and opportunity captured by Verger’s lenses. Until 1974, the country grew at an impressive pace through the phenomenon known as the “economic miracle,” represented by the construction of hydroelectric power plants, roads and bridges. On the one hand, the economic costs of this miraculous adventure had repercussions on the country’s external debt for years to come; on the other, the social costs – assassinations and restrictions of human rights through torture and the lack of the freedom of speech – indirectly affected 100,000 people, according to data from the Comissão da Verdade (Truth Commission).

A good example of the official propaganda that synthesizes the perplexingly contradictory character of that period is the image used by Filo Gaspari in the book A Ditadura Econômica (2002), which depicts state propaganda and images of political violence placed side by side. In an empty room, posters with pictures of students, politicians and intellectuals treated as wanted “terrorists” share a wall with posters celebrating that “You build Brasilia” ("You Build Brazil"), depicting workers in oil refineries, or building roads that would integrate the most distant areas of the country.

In 1973, Manchete 1130 published ten more articles under the title “As Novas Formas da Arquitetura Brasileira” (“New Forms of Brazilian Architecture”) with the subtitle “Across the country come bold buildings that are an impressive demonstration of national vitality and growth.” The cover image on this issue was not of Brasilia, as it had been before, but instead showed downtown Rio de Janeiro. Rather than the mythical image of the Ministry of Education and Health building interacting with the Santa Luzia church, it showed a new city in which commercial towers marked the skyline. The opening text stated:

In Rio, in São Paulo, but also in Curitiba, Porto Alegre and other Brazilian cities, not to mention Brasilia, a new urban landscape is arising [...] they [the commercial skyscrapers] appear as a visual sign that Brazil is starting to undergo a major change.4

Such a change from state-induced architecture to private/corporate architecture follows a general Western trend made visible in Brazil during the so-called “economic miracle” that facilitated foreign capital investments in real estate as much as in the agricultural, mining and industrial sectors. Corporations became the new representation of modernity, while state enterprises were depicted as archaic and inefficient.

Contemporary Architecture

Starting in the mid-1980s, perhaps as a reflection of the neoliberal wave that overtook the world but especially affecting Latin America, the operational role of architecture-in-the-way we interpret it in this text-became gradually but significantly restricted, either because the image of the state sector (whether democratic or authoritarian) was diffused, or because private initiatives were gaining more visibility. Following this logic, big corporate buildings, symbols of the financialization of the economy, were emphasized and seen to be the most representative architecture from this period. The architectural magazines that celebrated the buildings on Benim Avenue in São Paulo in the 1980s and 1990s (Veja and AIU), would today publish articles about the Moinhos Sesc Institute, the Japan House, the Inhotim Institute and the state’s (Serviço Social do Comércio) centers.

During the 1990s and 2000s, we see the reestablishment of a more positive relationship between architecture and state power. This was made possible through open debates and public participation in urban planning processes led by specialists working for municipal governments. Examples of these practices were seen in the cities of São Paulo, Porto Alegre and Belo Horizonte, for example. Law No. 8666 on Public Acquisitions and Service Contracts (1993) set the tone for all public construction done in the country since its passing. Designed to curb corruption and make the best use of public funds, this law requires that the lowest bidder be awarded the contract, assuming that all bidders meet the technical requirements. There is no evaluation of the proposed design; spreadsheets and numbers are the only tools used in the selection process. Nevertheless, intelligent administrators and elected officials have found ways to commission the best architecture possible. We would like to highlight the Centros de Atendimento Integrado à Criança e ao Adolescente (CAICs – Centers for the Comprehensive Care...

of Children and Adolescents) designed by João Filgueiras Lima (also known as Lelé) for the federal government during the 1990s, as well as the Centros Educativos Unificados (ceu—Unified Educational Centers) built on the outskirts of the city of São Paulo by the Municipal Department of Education during the 2000s. The ceu program began under Mayor Marta Suplicy (2001-2005) and was directly connected to the participatory budget process. According to Nivaldo Andrade, the ceus can be seen as representing continuity with the proposals of Anísio Teixeira and Diógenes Rebozuça, initially made in Salvador during the 1940s.

Brazil carried out huge public works and construction projects between 2010 and 2015 for the fifa World Cup (2014) and the Olympic Games (2016). What was left of this for Brazilians as an inheritance of this massive investment? What image marks the role of architecture in this process, and its relationship with state power? A demolition. The disappearance of the Perimetral Overpass that wandered through the port district of downtown Rio de Janeiro, along Guanabara Bay, is the best we have in terms of the architectural legacy of these two mega-events.

In the case of public works, which received a significant injection of resources from 2007 to 2012, it is worth asking the role of architecture in a process in which the design and construction process are supplanted by spreadsheets. Examples of this are the Regime Diferenciado de Contratação (rdc—Differentiated Contracting Regimen), a contracting modality in which architectural design is no longer a requirement in calls for bids that was created to speed up the bidding processes for these two mega-events. Other examples are the thousands of designs in the Minha Casa Minha Vida program, in which cheap land (located on the far outskirts of cities) has been made much more expensive without any care taken to integrate it with the metropolitan area. As Leandro Krause put it in 2013, Minha Casa Minha Vida was a program to stimulate industry and employment, not an urban inclusion program.

The cases mentioned above were attempts to simplify the public acquisition process, as established and regulated by Law No. 8666. With regard to architectural contracts, this law has been inadequately applied in both its design and construction. It is up to the state, in its various forms, to decide on the bidding modality. Relying on the justification of speeding up the process, bidding committees choose not to publish a price and technical competition or a design competition. By doing this, the potential for discussing architecture and good architectural production is lost.

Not a Promise, Anymore

The political and institutional crises that suffocates the country today, fueled by the parliamentary coup of 2016, puts in check the image—although ambiguous at many times throughout the twentieth century—of the connection between modern architecture, social progress and the Brazilian state at the federal, state and municipal levels. The image of protesters occupying on the Brazilian National Congress (June 2013) may as well have been the last breath of the country’s moribund democracy.

The very Manchete magazine that celebrated Brazilian architecture in 1967 had declared one decade earlier (in 1958) that Brazil was the country of music, soccer and architecture. Sixty years later, we have very little architecture to celebrate, and our World Cup ended with the pathetic score of seven to one when Germany beat Brazil in the semifinals on July 7, 2014. Only music remains as the image of a country that has lost its way.
NOTES
This absence reveals some of the narrative ambiguities stressed by the presence of the single bourgeois family home as an exception to this exceptionality of modernism, which is the result of technological and social change. The perspective fools us in the picture from Olinda: the Water Tower is actually much bigger than it actually is.


11. The federal hospitals built in Rio de Janeiro during the 1920s and 1930s are necro- logical. Their exterior features start to change in the late 1930s, when Art Deco was in vogue, with modernism coming to the end by the end of the 1940s.


13. José Maria da Silva Neves was the head of the School Technical Design Department, organized with the cooperation of the Public Works and the Teaching Directorate. For more information on these schools in São Paulo, see Fabiana Vêra de Oliveira, Arquitetura escolar paulista nas obras de J. M. M. dos Santos (São Paulo: Master’s dissertation (São Paulo: Faculdade de Arquitetura e Urbanismo da Universidade da São Paulo, 2007).


16. It is worth highlighting that the Pampulha buildings designed by Oscar Niemeyer are often improperly attributed to the examples listed here, responding to nineteenth century programs: a chapel, a casino and a ballroom, as well as a yacht club.


18. Comission Nacional da Verde (CNV) was a commission created by the government of former President Costa e Silva in November 1977. For three years, the Truth Commission investigated human rights violations committed between 1960 and 1988 in Brazil and those committed abroad, with the support of or in the face of the Brazilian State during that time. The Truth Commission published its final report in December 2014.
