IMMANENT RHYTHM, READYMAD E DANCE: APPROPRIATION IN HÉLIO OITICICA'S PARANGOLÉS

Dance is the search, par excellence, for a direct and expressive act, for the immanence of action—not dance like ballet, with its excessive intellectualization via the insertion of "choreography" and the search for transcendent action, but "Dionysiac" dance, that arises from the rhythm of the collective, that externalizes characteristics of popular groups, nations, etc.

HELIO OITICICA

In his November 1965 text "A dança na minha experiência" [Dance in My Experience], Hélio Oiticica identified movement and bodily presence as central conditions for artistic production. In Oiticica’s own practice, this was epitomized by his mid-1960s Parangolés: multimedia sculptural works resembling garments or banners, comprised of draped and layered fabric and worn or waved while dancing samba, what Oiticica called "sensorial sculpture[s] to be worn." Oiticica’s assertions about dance are broadly in keeping with prevailing aesthetic concerns of the 1960s, as artists in the US, Europe, Latin America, and Japan took the body as a focal point for performative, transmedial practices that broke with conventions of high art. In 1950s artworks by Gutai Bijutsu Kyokai [Art Association of Gutai] (1954-1972) in Japan, Yves Klein (1928-1962) in France, and Allan Kaprow (1927-2006) in the US, and early 1960s works by US artist Carolee Schneemann (1939-2019) and the Viennese Actionists, human bodies were both the force behind, and material of, artistic creation. In most of these cases, the activation of the body operated as an outgrowth of painterly practice, performing a fervent physical relationship between paint and matter, pigment and flesh—or, as in Kaprow’s fanciful genealogy from Jackson Pollock (1912-1956) to the happening, “the paintings’ skin [...] drenching and assaulting the visitor.” But Oiticica’s works sit uneasily among this highly theatrical strain of performance art, works that display the frank and unmediated expressivity of the human body as brute matter, sometimes sexualized and often violent. For one, Oiticica’s works did not foreground the “corporeal action of performance of the artist,” but actions that “stimulated the creativity of another group.” Moreover, Oiticica invoked rhythm and improvisatory bodily gesture as disruptive forces against the
traditional iconicity of the visual arts. Rather than raw and inchoate matter, the body was a reservoir of shared patterns.

It is thus *dance*, rather than *performance*, that animates the logic of the *Parangolés*, with the further clarification that Oiticica did not conceive of dance as the conventionalized performance of a choreography. Dance, in Oiticica’s experience, is something social, convivial, and typically embedded in ritual. And for Oiticica, who famously “discovered” the Estação Primeira de Mangueira in 1964, dance was, above all, the samba of Carnaval. As Aracy Amaral has noted of the ephemeral and “non-objectivist” art of the 1960s, “In Brazil such collective, festive corporeal actions were influential on certain expressive forms that emerged at an artistic level in the mid-1960s [...] particularly in the work of Hélio Oiticica.”

Today, in the context of a globalized contemporary art world, samba is taken as emblematic of Oiticica’s spontaneity, his embodiment of a corporeal Brazilian ethos. But in the 1960s, samba was itself transitioning from being “spontaneous and linearly melodic,” toward “stylized choreographies, brief *flirts*” and other tonal variations, with increasingly formal dance sequences.

Oiticica’s relationship to samba was that of appropriation, a set of rhythms plucked from the world.

**INTENTIONAL BODIES**

Oiticica’s rejection of choreography and his praise of the Dionysiac resonate with broader questions of the intentionality of composition in postwar art. As Yve-Alain Bois has described with regard to avant-garde musician John Cage (1912–1992) and painter François Morellet (1926–2016),

[The simultaneous and independent use of chance as a method of organization by an American composer and a French painter does tell us something about the state of avant-garde culture in the West in the decade or so following the Second World War. [...] Chance [...] is one of the most efficient ways of producing non-intentional results and of absencing the self.]

In this period, from the late 1950s through mid-1960s, aleatory modes of composition became prevalent in works by composer John Cage, painter Ellsworth Kelly
(1923–2015), and dancers and choreographers Merce Cunningham (1919–2009), Trisha Brown (1936–2017), and Simone Forti. As Bois explains, the postwar recourse to chance was a reaction to the earlier dominance of two compositional modes. One, artists refused the dead-end irrationality or exacerbated subjectivity of tachisme, Art Informel, and Abstract Expressionist successors of Surrealist automatism, those reactions to Cold War rationalism. Two, chance opposed the excesses of scientific rationality or instrumentalized “discovery” in the Atomic Age, aesthetically exemplified in the rigid geometries of orthodox Concrete Art prevalent in 1950s Brazil. In “A dança na minha experiência,” Oiticica’s distaste for excessive intellectualization and his resistance to choreography can be seen to parallel these practitioners’ postwar rejections of artist intentionality, individual authorship, and composition via a priori systems. But Oiticica did not deploy coins, dice, or other “utterly impersonal, chance-generating mechanisms,” as did Merce Cunningham or John Cage."

The particular history of aesthetic avant-gardes in Brazil led Oiticica not to chance procedures but to other strategies that avoided both overly rational compositional techniques and unchecked subjectivity. In Brazil, Concrete Art was always already tempered by its context, with the nation’s precarious economic underdevelopment reframing the 1950s Brazilian Concrete project as something futuristic and utopian rather than regressive. And, more crucially, the innovative misreadings of Concretism proposed by Neoconcretism, with which Oiticica was involved from 1959 through 1964, undermined Concretist rationality from its very start in Brazil. Neoconcretism was never simply a way to eliminate subjectivity or efface the presence of the artist, but a way to acknowledge the embodied presence of viewers as constitutive of aesthetic experience.

Oiticica’s parangolés should, then, be understood as a transitional work between the postwar (despite the seeming irrelevance of the term postwar to Brazilian history), and the contemporary. The Parangolés continue the work of the interwar avant-gardes, through the devices of the monochrome and the readymade. Like Oiticica’s Núcleos [Nuclei],
Penetráveis [Penetrables], and Bôlides, the Parangolés' colorful fabric swaths continue to assert the centrality of the monochrome, fitting what Hal Foster has explained as the work of the original avant-gardes, "the critique of the conventions of the traditional mediums." Beyond their obvious activation in performance, the Parangolés are carefully constructed objects. The Parangolés' complex arrangements of looped, layered, and twisted fabric are related to Neoconcretist explorations of interior/exterior relations and spatial boundaries. Still, the Parangolés take up the Neoconcretist monochrome, dependent upon the human body for its form, just as the Penetráveis take the human body as their basic unit of measurement and proportion. And like the Bôlides, those variously shaped containers for exploring pigment and the materiality of color, the Parangolés play with the dissolution of borders between interior and exterior, between matter and form [imgs. 39, 41].

The Parangolés thus demonstrate the legacy of interwar Concrete Art for postwar Brazilian art, the continued relevance of aesthetic procedures looking back to the interwar period. To simplify Megan Sullivan's argument, artists in postwar Latin America aspired to create a seamless continuation of the interwar European avant-gardes. At the same time, the initial presentation of the Parangolés at the margins of the Museu de Arte Moderna do Rio de Janeiro (MAM Rio), a major Brazilian art institution, points forward to the globalized and perhaps post-medium contemporary art of Oiticica's 1967 environment Tropicália and 1969 environment Eden [Eden]. First with the Parangolés and resolutely with these environments, Oiticica's critique extended to the spaces of the museum-gallery nexus, to develop into what Hal Foster identifies as the key maneuver of the neo-avant-gardes: "An investigation of the institution of art, its perceptual and cognitive, structural and discursive parameters." Returning to earlier avant-garde tactics, Oiticica's Parangolés invoke not only the monochrome, but also the readymade.

For Oiticica, seeking to avoid the dead ends of artistic subjectivity and traditional compositional modes, the lived experience of Brazilian modernity—specifically,
the seeming spontaneity of samba by predominantly Afro-Brazilian *passistas* [carnival dancers]—was itself a ready-made ripe for appropriation. Oiticica was explicit that the material or object parts of the *Parangolés* should not be understood as readymades. “[The] construction method is popular and primitive, referring to flags, tents, capes, etc. [...] [but] the use or non-use [...] of prefabricated elements [...] is important only as details that contribute to the meaning of the whole. [...] The work may take the form of a flag, but it does not represent a flag.” Instead, Oiticica described appropriating “things of the world that I come across in the wastelands, fields, the environment [...] things to which I would call the public to participate.” In the *Parangolés*’ initial presentation, tucked under the cantilevered roof of the MAM Rio after being rejected as Oiticica’s contribution to the *Opinião 65* [Opinion 65] exhibition at that institution, the *Parangolés*’ form was constituted by the socio-spatial segregation of Rio de Janeiro. For Carlos Zilio, Oiticica’s staged collision between Estação Primeira de Mangueria *passistas* and Brazilian museumgoers can be described as an artistic “appropriation” of collective manifestations understood to be quintessentially Brazilian, i.e., samba schools. From dance, Oiticica appropriated patterns of embodiment, samba as readymade.

Dance thus occupied an ambivalent position within Oiticica’s practice, with samba as a found structure that simultaneously exemplified spontaneous embodiment. In his essay “A dança na minha experiência,” Oiticica highlighted the possibility of discovering immanence [“a descoberta da imanência”] in dance, then pinpointed samba as providing “the exact idea of what creation by means of a corporeal act could be.” Oiticica was not the only one who recognized the potential for samba to be a bridge between art and the everyday in Brazil. As one commentator wrote in 1970, “The *desfile* [parade] of the samba schools is a spectacle new in the world, a creation of the people of Rio de Janeiro. [...] We speak of integrating art and life, that art should not be something apart from life [...]. But for participants in the schools of samba their art is mixed with their life and the life of the city.” In looking for a “direct and expressive act, for the immanence of action,” Oiticica
would find in the dance movements of Rio de Janeiro’s *passistas* the potential for spontaneous and unscripted performance, composed from movements that were already part of the habits of the average *cariocas*. And while commentators have bemoaned Oiticica’s lack of stylistic fluency in samba, this is precisely the point: as a corporeal practice that comes with familiar built-in patterns that do not need to be skillful. Oiticica’s mid-1960s *Parangolés* exhibit neither the excessive subjectivity, solitary authorship, and expressive gestures of Abstract Expressionism and its descendants, nor the coolly detached consumer crowd and mechanical reproducibility of Pop. Instead, the *Parangolés* participate in explorations of the unstudied, the non-composed, as an appropriation of deeply familiar bodily comportment.

**READYMADE DANCE**

Oiticica’s approach to dance has some parallels to both the chance procedures and balletic lexicon of figures like Merce Cunningham, and the use of everyday movements by artists such as Yvonne Rainer and Simone Forti. Just as Cunningham relied upon the ballet lexicon as “a pre-existing body of movement considerably more impersonal than the vocabularies of earlier modern dance choreographers,” Oiticica took samba as a readymade.22 Yet while Cunningham sought “to break through the resistance of his rational mind in order to tap unconscious, ‘natural’ or primitive impulses that lie waiting to be unleashed,” Oiticica rejected the “intellectualized” and “transcendent” patterns of ballet in order to reach for an “internal mythic force,” which emerged from a Nietzschean “Dionysian intoxication.”23 The difference between Oiticica and Cunningham is not simply the contrast between an erudite genre of dance (ballet) and a popular one (samba), but between divergent approaches to choreography. For Cunningham, chance was a procedure that can deny the rationality and authorship of the choreographer.

In contrast, Oiticica sought to eliminate the choreographer as such in favor of unearthing what his “A dança na minha experiência” text called the “rhythm of the collective,” manifested as “characteristics of popular groups, nations, etc.”24

42. Unidentified person wearing P 20 Parangolé capa 16 “Guavâico” [P 20 Parangolé capa 16 “Guavâico”] (1968), during the filming of *H.C.*, by Ivan Cardoso

In this sense, Oiticica’s appropriation of samba parallels slightly later avant-garde dance and choreography, those 1960s practices informed by Anna Halprin’s San Francisco Bay Area workshops that took improvisation and “movement generated by everyday tasks” as the basis for modern dance. In 1960s Brazil, basic samba movements could be regarded as everyday tasks, in the sense that Carnaval blocos (though perhaps not the more spectacularized desfiles) might be understood as part of the habitus of cariocas—or at least part of the habitus for the Mangueira samba school members who were indispensable for Oiticica’s earliest presentations of the Parangolés. For Aracy Amaral, this recourse to popular festival was one way that “non-objectualistic” Brazilian art could avoid collapsing into an esoteric art isolated from the community. Oiticica’s work did not, then, take up the conceptu-alist application of systems or seriality—he did not record a syntax of samba motions he could assemble into new dance compositions. Oiticica simply provided objects as an experiential framework in which samba would happen, treating samba as a found object, a readymade.

In comparing Oiticica to followers of Halprin, this question of nation, collectivity, and belonging becomes fraught. Why do 1960s photographs of the Parangolés almost invariably show them worn by Afro-descendent Brazilians [imgs. 42, 43]? It suggests that the Afro-Brazilian body was necessary to sanction the Parangolé, beyond even the appropriation of samba movements typically associated with largely Afro-Brazilian samba schools. To give one comparison that sheds an uneasy light on Oiticica’s practice, Simone Forti’s 1960s “body syntax” appropriated the movements of zoo animals in Rome as a way to achieve “immersion in the kinesthetic sense. A return to movement as a means of enchantment.” Where “elder statesmen” like Merce Cunningham sought the impersonal, Oiticica sought the collective, problematically pinpointed in the habitus of poorer Afro-descendent Brazilians whose dances had long been made into spectacle and consumed by wealthier, whiter Brazilians. In the context of avant-garde artists seeking non-composed, deskilled, or fundamental building blocks with which to compose, we should be attentive to whose movements...
fit these categories. While samba could be regarded as everyday in the sense of being popular rather than learned, it is not something natural, like the instinctive movements of animals Forti observed at the Rome zoo. In the context of 1960s Brazil, Aracy Amaral has written that the Brazilian "tradition of the expressive use of the body" was inflicted by Carnaval, rituals of folk religion, and rural festivals reaching back to the folklore of medieval Iberia—folk practices all. Samba is ultimately framed by Carnaval as a collective ritual, as something cultural rather than instinctive, a set of movements with their own compositional logic according to the demands of the Catholic ritual and accommodations to the urban terrain.

The late-20th-century crisis in compositional modes came at a time when, as Jacques Rancière has explained, "liberty and equality would no longer be represented in the institutions of law and State but embodied in the very forms of concrete life and sensible experience." This new recognition and appreciation of the popular found form in the 1960s practices of radical Brazilian pedagogue Paulo Freire (1921–1997), Brazilian dramatist Augusto Boal (1931–2009), and Italo-Brazilian architect-curateur Lina Bo Bardi (1914–1992). But in this context, we should not ignore the intentionality of the body—more specifically, the intentionality of the Afro-Brazilian bodies that Oiticica deployed to activate the Parangolés—as it is appropriated by artists seeking to reinvigorate their practices with "an internal mythic force."

**IMMANENT RHYTHM**

Oiticica's Parangolés remained a central facet of his late-1960s ambiental [environmental] works, though their intelligibility was pressured by the change from Brazilian to international audiences. Setting a convention of display for Oiticica's recent posthumous solo exhibitions, his 1969 exhibition at the Whitechapel Gallery in London included a rack of Parangolés. The rack took up only a small space at the Whitechapel Gallery, and remarks by the British press on the exhibition's lively atmosphere were less attentive to the Parangolés—described as "coloured capes" or "gaudy costumes"—than to the click of billiard balls, bare feet

---

treading upon wet and dry sand, "grumpy parrots," and "a pleasant feeling of indolence and heat." Yet, that Oiticica regarded the Parangolés as central for the Whitechapel exhibition is evident in the accompanying catalog. The Parangolés occupy two full two-page spreads in the thirty-two-page Whitechapel catalog. In those pages, the Parangolés were newly viewed through the lens of an anthropological take on dance.

Oiticica's catalog for the Whitechapel exhibition contextualized the Parangolés within collective forms of dance and ritual. Surprisingly, this was a new iconographic mode for the Parangolés as of 1969. Prior photographs of the Parangolés, published in Brazilian newspapers and magazines from 1964 through 1969, depicted individual passistas, most from Estação Primeira de Manguela, each wearing or demonstrating a single Parangolé and often interacting with a patch of plant life in urban Rio de Janeiro. For example, an August 1966 Jornal do Brasil article depicted "O Mascote de parangolé" [Parangolé Mascot] [img. 40] as a young Afro-descendent boy in a Parangolé standing alone with legs crossed with what appear to be banana leaves fanned out behind his head.

Similarly, a May 1967 Jornal do Brasil article publicizing an espetáculo [spectacle/performance] of Oiticica's Parangolés on the Atero do Flamengo was illustrated by an image of China da Manguela wearing Oiticica and Rubens Gerchman's (1942–2008) collaborative Parangolé Capa da Liberdade [Parangolé Liberty Cape], while bracing himself against a tree trunk. A single isolated figure in a Parangolé—Oiticica himself—was the opening illustration for his writings on Parangolés and appropriation published in the May 1967 issue of the Rio de Janeiro journal GAM: Galeria de Arte Moderna.

Likewise, in the 1969 Whitechapel catalog, there are four photographs showing a single passista in a Parangolé. However, these lone passista images are set alongside photographs of dancers in groups [imgs. 44, 45]. In one two-page spread, a lone Estação Primeira de Manguela passista in a Parangolé, "Roberto with capa 2 (1964)," is printed beside (1) a photograph showing Afro-descendent Brazilians, mostly children, at a "Mangueria Samba rehearsal playground" and (2) a
photograph labeled as a “Funeral dance of the Paiwe clan, Caduveo, Brazil (from ‘Tristes Tropiques’ by Claude Lévi-Strauss).”

Here, Mangueira stands for Brazil’s urban favelas, represented as predominantly Afro-descendent, while the Paiwe represents the nation’s rural indigenous aldeias [indigenous village], with both offered as models of collectivity predicated on meaningful ritual. For Aracy Amaral, the “festivalization” of Brazilian life was particularly strong in indigenous aldeias, where “life practically unfolds as preparation for the festas that occur regularly in accord with the calendar, and for which are prepared body paintings, drinks, food, and mass, elements also present in propitiatory rituals for sexual initiation, funeral rites, etc.” The Paiwe photograph is explicitly labeled as a dance for a funeral rite, and while Oiticica’s Parangolés are not overtly religious or ritualistic, they are rooted in Carnaval processions that mark the last efflorescence of the secular and profane before the religious austerity of Lent.

As an outgrowth of Catholic observance, as a recurrent public celebration in modern Rio de Janeiro, and as a set of institutions around which morro [hillside favela] communities might organize, samba can be understood as a form of ritual.

Even while continuing Neoconcretism’s focus on bodily presence and refusing traditional modes of composition and choreography, the Dionysiac mode of Oiticica’s Parangolés is neither aleatory nor purely spontaneous, but refers to popular ritual. As Oiticica explicates, the Parangolé is a form of “social” art centered on dance “born from the internal rhythm of the collective,” whereby familiar gestures and bodily rhythms “take on new forms determined by the demands of the structure of the Parangolé.” In the conditions of mid-1960s Brazil, as Tania Rivera has highlighted, Oiticica’s Parangolés sculpt social relations into something like a Möbius strip, “annul[ling] the distinction between inside and outside—not because both are united in a gapless conjunction, but because something happens between subject and object, in a torsion, displacing them from the position of masters of space, of the visual field and of the object.” In fact, Oiticica distinguished between the “poetic” Parangolé that was more focused on individual subjectivity, and the “social” Parangolé as collective...
expression. But this latter type of Parangolés is not social because it is activated by gathered bodies, but because its forms offer "an homage to our popular myths, our heroes, considered by many to be little more than bandits."^41

While the Parangolés remain firmly attributed to Oiticica, his appropriation of popular forms was a way to approximate the absence of a singular author. The Parangolés thus exemplify the changing role of the artist as postwar art became contemporary, and parallel shifting structures of authority within religion and politics. Even as Oiticica's Parangolés parallel the anti-hierarchical impulses of radical educator Paulo Freire and radical dramatist Augusto Boal, they also reflect Catholic reorganization surrounding Vatican II's new understanding of the laity's importance in the early 1960s, which maintained the Church hierarchy but "revised patterns of authority."^42 Interpreting Oiticica's Parangolés in light of Max Weber's (1864–1920) model of charismatic leadership, one might position the work's structure as caught between charismatic and institutional. While the structure of the samba desfile means that any participant should be able to follow the "rules" to activate the Parangolés, still Oiticica retains his privileged status as artist. While the Parangolés can be worn by anyone, their art historical import is unimaginable apart from the framework of Oiticica's intentions and handicraft, a fact that became obvious in the wake of a 2009 fire that destroyed many of Oiticica's works.^^ Arguments about the authorization of reproductions reveal the ghost of Oiticica haunting the Parangolés even when the works themselves no longer exist.


38 Anna Schober asserts that the Parangolés "are situated in [...] a transitional area between religious-mythical rituals and profane ones." Anna Schober, "Hélio Oiticica's Parangolés: Body-Events, Participation in the Anti-Doxa of the Avant-Garde and Struggling Free from It." theory@buffalo 9, Politics and Doxa, 2004, 82.
43 On the fire and the problem of reproductions, see Irene V. Small, 2016, op. cit., 5, 229–38.
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