

*Radu Lilea*<sup>1</sup>

### **SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CENSORSHIP AND EXPERIMENT IN BRAZILIAN VISUAL ARTS DURING THE PERIOD IN FORCE OF INSTITUTIONAL ACT NUMBER 5**

**Abstract:** The Brazilian military dictatorship restricted citizens' rights and freedoms and legitimised repression, culminating in the promulgation of Institutional Act Number 5 (AI-5, 13 December 1968). Freedom of expression was burdened by censorship, a phenomenon with a history that began long before the military dictatorship period. Applied with less intensity and in a more arbitrary way than in other areas, the visual arts censorship exerted during the dictatorship meant that various personal and collective projects were altered or even prevented from taking place, and it also attempted to discourage civic debate and fuel self-censorship. Paradoxically, however, it also proved to be a catalyst for visual language expansion and diversification. The pressure exerted through control and prohibition mechanisms and the arbitrary, unpredictable nature of the restrictions led to an amplification of artists' quest for forms of expression that could evade the censor's vigilance and denounce the crimes of the Brazilian military regime and societal structural injustices. For many Brazilian artists, aware of the developments in the international art scene, the 1960<sup>s</sup> and 1970<sup>s</sup> were a time of intense experimentation. They were looking to define a Brazilian-specific identity and role for the visual arts in line with the times, opening up a process of debate and renewal that resulted in the emergence of diverse, radical, and at times contradictory artistic sensibilities and forms of expression.

**Keywords:** Brazilian military dictatorship, censorship, experiment, Institutional Act Number 5 (AI-5), Brazilian visual arts.

#### **The coup d'état and civil-military dictatorship: a brief historical framework**

The Brazilian civil-military dictatorship did not represent a monolithic regime<sup>2</sup>, nor did it base itself on a highly elaborate and cohesive ideology. It was established on 1 April 1964 after a coup d'état, and until 1985 the power remained in the hands of the military alongside civilians within the government, with five generals and a military junta running the country in succession, representing groups within the military establishment with sometimes fluctuating views on politics and the country's priorities. It was an authoritarian regime resulting both from the Cold War<sup>3</sup> paradigm and a long Brazilian

<sup>1</sup> radi.lilea@editura-art.ro

<sup>2</sup> **Leslie Bethel**, *The Cambridge History of Latin America*, v. IX, p. 167. See also Elena Shtromberg, *Art Systems: Brazil & the 1970s*, p. 7.

<sup>3</sup> It should be noted, however, that the Brazilian military governments had an oscillating attitude towards the United States, as did the United States towards Brazil, especially after the promulgation of Institutional Act Number 5 – see Rodrigo Patto Sá Motta, “Sobre as origens e motivações do Ato Institucional 5”, p. 202.

authoritarian tradition<sup>4</sup>, a political project in which ghosts of the past, both relatively recent and more distant, mingled with the insecurities of the present: the still-enduring consequences of slavery, racism, socio-economic inequalities, the underdevelopment of the country in general and the development gaps between its different regions (a more prosperous and industrialised southeastern region compared with the underdeveloped north, center and northeastern regions), the lack of economic diversification, various social crises, the fragility of the country's democratic tradition, the populist legacy of Getúlio Vargas' authoritarian project, and the surge of the radical left, to name just some of the most important aspects that made up the complicated and contradictory Brazilian environment of the time.

In 1964, the military's original allies did not suspect that the new regime would be anything other than transitory<sup>5</sup>, a short, but necessary step to prevent the country from sliding towards a radical left orientation and to lead it towards a new and genuine era of democracy. To substantiate its legitimacy, the military regime built its own legislative system, which maintained in an altered form the institutions of democratic life<sup>6</sup>. The professed objectives of the coup d'état (or "victorious revolution"<sup>7</sup>, as it was referred to by the authoritarian power that resulted from it) were to start "the economic, financial, political and moral reconstruction of Brazil"<sup>8</sup>, to cleanse society of corruption and undermining communist influences, to restore order and build up a democratic system on sound foundations<sup>9</sup> in accordance with genuine Brazilian tradition<sup>10</sup>. The return to full democracy was insisted on<sup>11</sup> both in the first stage of the civil-military regime and in its final, liberalising period, the regime is sometimes characterised by its leadership as a "restricted democracy" ("*democracia restringida*")<sup>12</sup> or even a "strong democracy", and by public opinion as a "democracy without people"<sup>13</sup>.

### Institutional Act Number 5

Against a backdrop of protest movements, the loss of a significant proportion of their allies, the launch of the first armed insurgencies<sup>14</sup>, and a defeat suffered by the regime authorities in Congress<sup>15</sup>, which benefited from the support of many of the congressmen of the pro-establishment ARENA party, Institutional Act Number 5 (Ato Institucional N°5, AI-5) was issued on 13 December 1968. AI-5 proved to be the most restrictive of all the 17 so-called Institutional Acts issued by the regime and was to definitively alter the political climate for the next ten years. AI-5 is therefore regarded as the most consequential act enforced during the authoritarian regime.

<sup>4</sup> A synthetic analysis of this topic was made by Lilia Moritz Schwarcz in her 2019 book *Sobre o autoritarismo brasileiro*.

<sup>5</sup> Leslie Bethel, *op. cit.*, p. 170.

<sup>6</sup> Leslie Bethel, *op. cit.*, p. 165; see also p. 166: "And elections were not free: the old party system was completely restructured in 1966, leaving (until the return to a multiparty system in 1979) only two parties, a pro-government Aliança Renovadora Nacional (ARENA) and an opposition Movimento Democrático Brasileiro (MDB) [...]."

<sup>7</sup> See the preamble ("A Nação") of Institutional Act Number 1 (AI-1)

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> "The movement of 31 March 1964 was ostensibly initiated to rid the country of corruption and communism and to restore democracy, but the new regime began to bring about changes in the country's institutions through decrees, called Institutional Acts (AI). They were justified as the consequence of 'the exercise of Constituent Power, inherent in all revolutions'," in Boris Fausto, *História do Brasil*, p. 397. See also the preamble ("A Nação") of the AI-1.

<sup>10</sup> As seen in the preamble of the later promulgated Institutional Act Number 5 (AI-5)

<sup>11</sup> Leslie Bethel, *op. cit.*, p. 165.

<sup>12</sup> Boris, Fausto, *op. cit.*, p. 401, and also p. 437: "In the midst of exceptional and discretionary measures, the rulers did not assume the principle that the authoritarian regime was desirable for the country and therefore superior to democracy." See also: "In the context of the Cold War, the military always regarded Brazil as part of the liberal capitalist-democratic world," in Leslie Bethel, *op. cit.*, p. 173.

<sup>13</sup> Marcos Napolitano, *O regime militar brasileiro, 1964–1985*, p. 54

<sup>14</sup> Leslie Bethel, *op. cit.*, p. 184.

<sup>15</sup> Lilia, M. Schwarcz and Heloisa M. Starling, *Brasil. Uma biografia*, p. 455.

In 1964, the coup, which had been orchestrated by the military and supported not only by the conservative forces but also by moderates, by a broad spectrum of social categories (especially the upper and middle classes), big business, the Church, the mass media and the United States of America, had been accomplished with the support of the Congress, a key institution in a democracy. Now, the AI-5 was directed not only against the traditional enemies of the conservative right but also (some say mainly) against former allies, now estranged (“the press, the Judiciary, the Church, the middle classes and the parliamentary elite”)<sup>16</sup>. As a result, the AI-5 was defined as “a coup within the coup” (“*golpe dentro do golpe*”), marking a new, more radical turn within the civil-military regime. The AI-5 represented a brutal revision of the course of the “revolution”, opening up the possibility that individuals and groups with various social and professional backgrounds could be targeted according to criteria that the authorities could apply at will. It became clear that anyone could now more easily fall victim to a wide range of abuses.

The AI-5 preamble claims that the decree was issued to defend “the authentic democratic order, based on freedom and respect for the dignity of the human being”, which was supposedly the purpose of “the Brazilian Revolution of 31 March 1964”, and also “the order, the security, the peace, the economic and cultural development and the political and social harmony of the Country”, thus constituting a necessary instrument for fighting corruption, anti-revolutionary groups, subversive actions and any ideology opposed to the country’s tradition<sup>17</sup>. The provisions of the AI-5 focus on increasing presidential powers via various methods: through intervention “in the national interest” in the affairs of states and municipalities “without the limits provided for in the Constitution”<sup>18</sup>; through the authority to suspend the political rights of any citizen for a period of ten years and to cancel the mandates of federal, state and municipal elected officials “in the interest of preserving the Revolution”<sup>19</sup>; via the declaration and extension of a state of siege<sup>20</sup> which allowed, among other measures, the censorship of correspondence, mass media, telecommunications and public entertainment<sup>21</sup>. AI-5 instituted a set of severe measures that could be applied to all critics and opponents of the regime – from searches and seizures of property and dissidents’ removal from office to the suspension of *habeas corpus*<sup>22</sup> and the enabling of the abusive detention, torture and even killing of political opponents, for which AI-5 provided a legal basis, guaranteeing the perpetrator’s impunity<sup>23</sup>.

It should also be noted that AI-5 was far from being the first official act to support censorship in Brazil. Exerted over time in all its forms<sup>24</sup>, censorship had a long tradition in Brazil<sup>25</sup> and an institutional apparatus that was already firmly consolidated. Still, even if AI-5 represented a radical alteration of the Brazilian socio-political environment, censorship was unevenly applied during the period the act was in force, and it especially targeted the mass media, the book industry, and the performing arts: theatre, cinema, and music.

<sup>16</sup> **Rodrigo Patto Sá Motta**, *op. cit.*, p. 209 and p. 212.

<sup>17</sup> See the preamble the AI-5.

<sup>18</sup> AI-5, art. 3.

<sup>19</sup> AI-5, art. 4.

<sup>20</sup> AI-5, art. 7.

<sup>21</sup> AI-5, art. 9, with reference to the 1967 Constitution, art. 152, § 2º, f. Some of the AI-5 provisions, such as articles 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, were found in similar versions in previous institutional acts (mainly in AI-1, but also in AI-2 and AI-4).

<sup>22</sup> AI-5, art. 10.

<sup>23</sup> AI-5, art. 11.

<sup>24</sup> Religious, moral, political and economic censorship.

<sup>25</sup> “Censorship was a constant in Brazilian life due to the colonial condition that marked four centuries of our history. The counter-reformist principles of the Catholic Church, together with the absolute monarchy as a form of government – in Portugal and then in Brazil – and the civilising purposes of European expansion were always aimed at controlling, acculturising and repressing all that was unusual, inappropriate, anarchic or undesirable to the vision and the interests of the colonisers”, in Cristina Costa, *Censura em cena*, p. 27.

## Censorship and repression as catalysts for change and experimentation in the visual arts

In her book *Art Systems: Brazil & the 1970s*, Elena Shtromberg explores visual arts' relationship, during the civil-military dictatorship, with various economic and cultural mechanisms and circuits that structured some of the most important aspects of social life (money, television, print media, and maps). She notes that during this time the visual arts were "relatively protected from the kind of repressive government censorship sanctions directed at newspapers, television, and other arts such as music and cinema", adding that there were, however, some radical interventions by the authorities targeting left-wing visual artists and art historians, some of the latter being forced to leave their teaching positions<sup>26</sup>. Caroline Saut Schroeder considers that the authoritarian regime was not particularly concerned with critiques in the visual arts discourse, in this case, censorship and repression "following the same authoritarian logic that affected other cultural manifestations"<sup>27</sup>.

The form of censorship that was commonest, yet selectively or maybe just carelessly applied, was that of canceling exhibitions or withdrawing artworks from them<sup>28</sup> even when the artworks had been previously selected by an official jury and were going to represent Brazil at international events<sup>29</sup>. On the other hand, artists such as Antonio Manuel, Cildo Meireles, Artur Barrio, Claudio Tozzi, and many others joined a kind of "artistic guerilla" campaign<sup>30</sup>, which could not, strictly speaking, be described as a movement, but rather as an outburst of artistic projects and testimonies in response to repression, often employing "more indirect modes of expression to circumvent censorship"<sup>31</sup>.

Perhaps the most resounding success of an artistic collective action to draw attention to censorship was the 1969 boycott "Non a la Biennale de São Paulo", a campaign launched in Paris and supported by Brazilian exiles in the wake of the promulgation of AI-5. "The many cases of art censorship have provoked public reaction from artists and art critics. The Brazilian Association of Art Critics (ABCA), then headed by Mário Pedrosa, immediately reacted by sending a note of repudiation of the government's act, stating that it was an attack on 'artistic creation and the free exercise of art criticism'. On the same occasion, Mário Pedrosa advised his associates (ABCA is a branch of AICA)<sup>32</sup> to refuse to take part in the judging of contests promoted by the government, given the coercive attitude shown by the latter. This recommendation was decisive in setting up an international protest against the 10th iteration of the São Paulo Biennale."<sup>33</sup> Many of the artists initially invited to exhibit their works at the Biennale that year canceled their participation. In the end, more than 50 countries and approximately 510 artists participated in the show<sup>34</sup>, but the protest against the persecutions exacted on the Brazilian social, political, cultural, and artistic environment had reached the international media by then.

The fact that visual arts are sometimes left out of the more general debates on censorship in Brazil or given less attention in this respect is not exactly accidental, although, on the other hand, not entirely justified. There are multiple explanations in this regard, some of them deriving from the status of the

<sup>26</sup> Elena Shtromberg, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

<sup>27</sup> Caroline Saut Schroeder, "As artes visuais sob vigilância: censura e repressão nos anos de ditadura", p. 48.

<sup>28</sup> Lilia, M. Schwarcz and Heloisa M. Starling, *op. cit.*, p. 464.

<sup>29</sup> Caroline Saut Schroeder, "A censura política às artes plásticas em 1960", pp. 118–121.

<sup>30</sup> Lilia, M. Schwarcz and Heloisa M. Starling, *op. cit.*, p. 465; the phrase is used by the two authors to indicate the anonymous and subversive artistic projects of Cildo Meireles, known as *Insertions in the ideological circuits*, which aimed to reach the general public, not only the traditional art audience, criticising the American support given to the Brazilian authoritarian regime and accusing the Destacamento de Operações de Informações – Centro de Operações de Defesa Interna (DOI-CODI) of the assassination of journalist Vladimir Herzog. Claudia Calirman employs the concept to describe Artur Barrio's radical project *Situação T/T1* of spreading bloody bundles in Belo Horizonte, as part of the *Do corpo à terra* exhibition. The project referred directly to the gruesome practices of forced disappearances, torture, assassination and body disposal applied to the regime's opponents. (*Brazilian Art Under Dictatorship. Antonio Manuel, Artur Barrio, and Cildo Meireles*, p. 8).

<sup>31</sup> Claudia Calirman, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

<sup>32</sup> Association Internationale des Critiques d'Art (International Association of Art Critics).

<sup>33</sup> Caroline Saut Schroeder, "A censura política...", p. 122.

<sup>34</sup> Claudia Calirman, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

visual arts themselves and especially from the specifics of the Brazilian new avant-garde. Among them is that, during the dictatorship, visual arts had a smaller audience compared to the cinema or Brazilian popular music (MPB), for instance. At that time, visual arts were going through a radical phase (in Brazil, in Latin America – in fact in much of the Western world) marked by the questioning of their own foundations. Many artists of the 1960s and 1970s wanted their art to evade museums and invade public spaces, challenging the traditional public and looking to reach out to new audiences. They took to testing hybrid media and new genres and forms of expression, sometimes only to abandon them straight away, flirting with the evanescent, the random, the banal, the scandalous, experimenting with excessive naturalism, and above all taking a stand against authoritarianism and political repression. There was an immense interest in questioning the purpose of visual arts – their practices, system, and relevance – in a quest for new, plural artistic paradigms. In Brazil, this process took place concurrently with the artists' rejection of the official propaganda<sup>35</sup> and the denouncement of oppression up to the point where they became, if not inseparable, then very closely correlated: artists contested both the art system/establishment and the political one, for they saw in the former the reflection of the latter.

When artists felt the need to express a straightforward political protest through their projects, they resorted to language, relying on the increased efficiency of the association between powerful ideas/slogans and images such as student marches and depictions of police violence – hence the popularity of politically radicalised Pop Art and certain influences that came from conceptual art, as in the case of Antonio Manuel, Claudio Tozzi, Hélio Oiticica, Rubens Gerchman, and others<sup>36</sup>. Cildo Meireles slipped subversive messages into what he called “ideological circuits” (on banknotes and Coca-Cola bottles) through which they could navigate through society and reach anonymously a random, but wider public. Artur Barrio resorted to shocking and degradable materials like toilet paper, waste, meat, bones, etc. in his projects, challenging good morals and aiming at arousing violent and disturbing reactions in the viewers, affirming a radical perspective on art as a creative practice adapted to the realities of a Third World country and as a convenient means of expression for everyone. Anna Maria Maiolino set up a monument to hunger, an installation resembling a domestic and rudimentary altar with a sack of rice and another of black beans as offerings, conveying a strong funerary impression. Paulo Bruscky reduced artistic expression to simple, but powerful words that highlighted the economic precariousness of large chunks of Brazilian society at that time (“hunger”, “food”, “land”, “death” etc.). Leticia Parente, Antonio Manuel, and others focused, through performance and video art, on the relationship between body, identity, vulnerability, political repression, and art. To the names already mentioned, we must add other artists who participated in the renewal of artistic language through the critical, social, and political instrumentalisation of their practices during the Brazilian military dictatorship: Anna Bella Geiger, Carlos Zilio, Maurício Nogueira Lima, Marcello Nitsche, Antonio Henrique Amaral, Gabriel Borba Filho, Sonia Andrade, Leonhard Frank Duch, and many others. Through its innovative, peculiar, deceptive works, the 1960s and 1970s Brazilian avant-garde set out both to challenge the audience's notion of art and its purpose and to evade censorship. The diverse range of artistic manifestations whose authors sometimes remained anonymous, or whose works no longer fitted into what art was supposed to be, must

<sup>35</sup> This is how Caroline Saut Schroeder summarises one of the intellectuals' and artists' polemics with the authoritarian regime's propaganda: “It is noticeable that the national question was discussed by the State and by the new avant-garde in a different manner. While the State promoted a nationalism that ‘beautified’ [the reality], a nationalism manifested by a mixed and peaceful race, a symbol of a genuine democracy, the artists and intellectuals associated with the new Brazilian avant-garde disseminated a critical nationalism, which denounced the authoritarianism of the State's official institutions, and exposed the condition of Brazil as a Third World country.” (“A censura política...”, p. 115).

<sup>36</sup> **Elena Shtromberg** credits the appropriation of the word by the 1960s and 1970s Brazilian visual arts avant-garde to conceptualism and to the reaction to censorship restrictions in official media circuits: “The shift to graphic works and in particular towards text as artistic practice, or the textual turn [...], a hallmark of international manifestations of conceptual art, overlapped in Brazil with the tightening of censorship restrictions imposed on text in official media circuits. It is as if by suppressing text in official circuits, censorship inadvertently diverted it into unlikely spaces where it sought the freedom to exist”, in *op. cit.*, p. 46.

have proved disconcerting not only in the eyes of the public but also of the censors, even when political criticism was clearly expressed.

AI-5 restricted civil rights and liberties and legitimised the harshest forms of repression. In terms of artistic production, even though repression and censorship were exerted inconsistently, they still heavily affected careers, shut down projects, shows, and exhibitions, and attempted to isolate the Brazilian arts environment from undesirable foreign influences. The intention was to divert artists' work from a critical, politicised, and civically involved path, and to fuel self-censorship.

In the 1960s, "leftist political contestation was gaining ground in universities, music festivals, theatre and cinema. This politicised cultural exuberance was stifled by the promulgation of AI-5, the well-known 'coup within the coup'", argues Caroline Saut Schroeder<sup>37</sup> – and she is not the only voice to support the cultural void theory during the period that AI-5 was in force. However, the AI-5 did not create a cultural vacuum<sup>38</sup> either in visual arts or in other creative and cultural areas. AI-5 was rather an unexpected catalyst for experimentation, forcing artists to innovate and discover new forms of expression<sup>39</sup> in a society where many things were forbidden, but not all of them. The imperatives of the present became even more pressing, and thus so did the need for artists to find a personal, convincing, effective response to them, a response capable of circumventing censorship and overcoming interdictions, dangers, fears, traditions, prejudices, and institutional inertia.

## RESOURCES

### A. Legal framework

Ato Complementar Nº 38, 13. 12.1968, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/acp/acp-38-68.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/acp/acp-38-68.htm)

Ato Institucional Nº 1, 9.04.1964, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/ait/ait-01-64.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/ait/ait-01-64.htm)

Ato Institucional Nº 2, 27.10.1965, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/ait/ait-02-65.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/ait/ait-02-65.htm)

Ato Institucional Nº 3, 5.02.1966, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/ait/ait-03-66.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/ait/ait-03-66.htm)

Ato Institucional Nº 4, 7.12.1966, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/ait/ait-04-66.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/ait/ait-04-66.htm)

Ato Institucional Nº 5, 13.12.1968, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/ait/ait-05-68.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/ait/ait-05-68.htm)

Ato Institucional Nº 6, 1.02.1969, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/ait/ait-06-69.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/ait/ait-06-69.htm)

Ato Institucional Nº 7, 26.02.1969, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/AIT/ait-07-69.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/AIT/ait-07-69.htm)

Ato Institucional Nº 8, 2.04.1969, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/ait/ait-08-69.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/ait/ait-08-69.htm)

Ato Institucional Nº 9, 25.04.1969, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/ait/ait-09-69.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/ait/ait-09-69.htm)

Ato Institucional Nº 10, 16.05.1969, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/AIT/ait-10-69.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/AIT/ait-10-69.htm)

Ato Institucional Nº 11, 14.08.1969, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/ait/ait-11-69.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/ait/ait-11-69.htm)

Ato Institucional Nº 12, 1.09.1969, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/ait/ait-12-69.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/ait/ait-12-69.htm)

Ato Institucional Nº 13, 5.09.1969, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/ait/ait-13-69.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/ait/ait-13-69.htm)

Ato Institucional Nº 14, 31.09.1969, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/ait/ait-14-69.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/ait/ait-14-69.htm)

Ato Institucional Nº 15, 11.09.1969, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/ait/ait-15-69.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/ait/ait-15-69.htm)

Ato Institucional Nº 16, 14.10.1969, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/ait/ait-16-69.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/ait/ait-16-69.htm)

Ato Institucional Nº 17, 14.10.1969, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/ait/ait-17-69.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/ait/ait-17-69.htm)

Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil de 1967, 24.01.1967, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/constituicao/constituicao67.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/constituicao/constituicao67.htm)

<sup>37</sup> "A censura política..." , p. 116.

<sup>38</sup> **Claudia Calirman**, *op. cit.*, p. 151: "It was time to revise other pervasive myths as well. Despite the prevalent notion that the dictatorship, specifically the AI-5 and its concomitant censorship, had created a vacuum of artistic endeavours – the so-called *vazio cultural* (cultural emptiness) first described in the magazine *Visão* in July 1971 – there was in fact robust artistic production during the dictatorship." In support of this position, Calirman cites some of the most important exhibitions of that time: *Salão da Bússola* (Modern Art Museum of Rio de Janeiro, 1969), *Do corpo à terra* (Municipal Park of Belo Horizonte, 1970), *O sermão da montanha*: Fiat Lux (Candido Mendes University Gallery, Rio de Janeiro, 1979). Many more exhibitions can be added to these examples, and, along with them, the names of all the artists whose work proved relevant in the context generated by the AI-5 and has remained so since the repeal of the act in 1979 and the end of the military dictatorship in 1985.

<sup>39</sup> "Experiences with censorship were unquestionably formative for artists," says Elena Shtromberg, immediately citing the case of Antonio Manuel, in *op. cit.*, p. 68.

Decreto-Lei Nº 317. Reorganiza as Polícias e os Cargos de Bombeiros Militares dos Estagiados, dos Territórios e do Distrito Federal e dá outras providências, 13.03.1967, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/decreto-lei/1965-1988/De10317.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/decreto-lei/1965-1988/De10317.htm)

Decreto-Lei Nº 477. Define infrações disciplinares praticadas por professores, alunos, funcionários ou empregados de estabelecimentos de ensino público ou particulares, e dá outras providências, 26.02.1969, <https://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/declei/1960-1969/decreto-lei-477-26-fevereiro-1969-367006-publicacaooriginal-1-pe.html>

Decreto-lei Nº 869. Dispõe sobre a inclusão da Educação Moral e Cívica como disciplina obrigatória, nas escolas de todos os graus e modalidades, dos sistemas de ensino no País, e dá outras providências, 12.09.1969, <https://www2.camara.leg.br/legin/fed/declei/1960-1969/decreto-lei-869-12-setembro-1969-375468-publicacao-original-1-pe.html>

Decreto-Lei Nº 898. Define os crimes contra a segurança nacional, a ordem política e social, estabelece seu processo e julgamento e dá outras providências, 29.09.1969, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/decreto-lei/1965-1988/del0898.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/decreto-lei/1965-1988/del0898.htm)

Decreto-Lei Nº 1077. Dispõe sobre a execução do artigo 153, § 8º, parte final, da Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil, 26.01.1970, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/decreto-lei/1965-1988/del1077.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/decreto-lei/1965-1988/del1077.htm)

Lei Nº 5250. Regula a liberdade de manifestação do pensamento e de informação, 9.02.1967, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/leis/l5250.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/l5250.htm)

Lei Nº 6620. Define os crimes contra a Segurança Nacional, estabelece a sistemática para o seu processo e julgamento e dá outras providências, 17.12.1978, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/leis/1970-1979/l6620.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/1970-1979/l6620.htm)

Lei Nº 6683. Concede anistia e dá outras providências, 28 august 1979, [http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/leis/l6683.htm](http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/l6683.htm)

Projeto de Lei Nº 3494. Dispõe sobre a censura de jornais e revistas, 1977, [https://www.camara.leg.br/proposicoesWeb/prop\\_mostrarintegra;jsessionid=node01jqsjxrlsfrr12ikj7qm39jcf1158980.node0?codteor=1183943&filename=Dossie+-PL+3494/1977](https://www.camara.leg.br/proposicoesWeb/prop_mostrarintegra;jsessionid=node01jqsjxrlsfrr12ikj7qm39jcf1158980.node0?codteor=1183943&filename=Dossie+-PL+3494/1977)

B. Studies and interviews

**Barrio, Artur**, “Textos, manifestos e um «texto mais recente»”, *Revista Visuais. Revista do Programa de Pós-graduação em Artes Visuais da UNICAMP*, no. 2, v. 2, 2016, pp. 139–185.

**Bethel, Leslie**, *The Cambridge History of Latin America*, v. IX: Brasil since 1930, Cambridge University Press, 2008.

**Calirman, Claudia**, *Brazilian Art Under Dictatorship*. Antonio Manuel, Artur Barrio, and Cildo Meireles, Duke University Press, Durham & London, 2012.

**Comissão Nacional da Verdade**, Relatório, v. 1–3, 2014.

**Costa, Cristina** Costa, *Censura em cena. Teatro e censura no Brasil*, EdUSP, São Paulo, 2006.

**Costa, Cristina**, *Censura, repressão, resistência no teatro brasileiro*, FAPESP/Anna Blume, São Paulo, 2008.

**Costa, Cristina (ed.)**, *Liberdade e interdição: pontos de vista*, Escola de Comunicações e Artes da USP, São Paulo, 2016.

**Costa, Cristina (ed.)**, *Privacidade, sigilo, compartilhamento*, Instituto Palavra Aberta, São Paulo, 2017

**Costa, Cristina (ed.)**, *Seminários sobre censura*, Núcleo de Pesquisa em Comunicação e Censura (NPCC/ECA/USP)/FAPESP/Balão Editorial, São Paulo, 2012.

**Costa, Maria Cristina Castilho; Sousa Junior, Walter de**, “Censura e pós-censura: uma síntese sobre as formas clássicas e atuais de controle da produção artística nacional”, in *Políticas Culturais em Revista*, section: “Censura e Políticas Culturais”, v. 11 no. 1, 2018.

**Costa, Cristina; Sousa, Walter de**, *Diálogos impertinentes: arte e censura no modernismo brasileiro*, Universidade de São Paulo, 2022.

**Danziger, Leila**, *Cadernos do povo brasileiro*, Relicário Edições & FAPERJ, Belo Horizonte, 2021.

**Fausto, Boris**, *História do Brasil*, EdUSP, São Paulo, 2015.

Fico, Carlos, “Violence, Trauma, and Frustration in Brazil and Argentina: The Role of the Historian”, *Topoi*, 14 (27), July – December 2013.

**Francklin, Adelino; Teles, Janaína de Almeida; Fidelis, Thiago**, “Versões e controvérsias sobre o AI-5: os ecos e repercussões da ditadura militar o Brasil”, *História e Cultura*, v. 10, no. 2, 2021, pp. 283–309.

**Jaremchuk, Dária**, *Políticas de atração. Relações artísticos-culturais entre Estados Unidos e Brasil (1960–1970)*, Editora Unesp, São Paulo, 2023.

**Lilea, Radu**, “Arta e inutilitatea indispensabilă, tocmai de aici se naște forța ei”, interview with Cildo Meireles, *Observator Cultural*, no. 1232, 6.11.2024, pp. 12–13.

**Lilea, Radu**, “Călătoria prin care îți împrășpești limbajul plastic nu se sfârșește niciodată”, interview with Claudio Tozzi, *Observator Cultural*, no. 1242, 4.02.2025, pp. 20–21.

**Lilea, Radu**, “De aceea sînt atît de radical și de teribil: pentru că sînt un outsider”, interview with Artur Barrio, *Observator Cultural*, no. 1227, 2.10.2024, pp. 16–17.

**Lilea, Radu**, “Opera de artă nu se naște politică, ci devine astfel”, interview with Antonio Manuel, *Observator Cultural*, no. 1237, 11.12.2024, pp. 20–21.

**Lilea, Radu**, “Situations/Simulacra: Artur Barrio’s Challenges to the Brazilian Art System in the Late 1960s and Early 1970s”, *Visual Studies*, vol. 8/1, pp. 85–91.

**Marconi, Paolo**, *A censura política na imprensa brasileira, 196–1978*, Global Editora, São Paulo, 1980

**Miyada, Paulo (ed.)**, *AI-5, 50 anos. Ainda não terminou de acabar*, Instituto Tomie Othake, São Paulo, 2019.

**Morais, Frederico**, “Manifesto Do Corpo á Terra”, Belo Horizonte, 18.04.1970, in Tristão, Mari’Stella, “Da Semana de Vanguarda” (1) & (2), Estado de Minas, Belo Horizonte, 28.04 & 5.05.1970, Documents of 20th-century Latin American and Latino Art. A Digital Archive and Publication Project at The Museum of Fine Arts, Huston, <https://icaa.mfah.org/s/en/page/home>

**Napolitano, Marcos**, *Cultura brasileira. Utopia e massificação, 1950–1980*, Editora Contexto, São Paulo, 2001.

**Napolitano, Marcos**, *O regime militar brasileiro, 1964–1985*, Atual Editora, São Paulo, 2000.

**Patto Sá Motta, Rodrigo**, “Sobre as origens e motivações do Ato Institucional 5”, *Revista Brasileira de História*, v. 38, no. 79, São Paulo, 2018, pp. 195–216.

**Ridenti, Marcelo**, “Intelectuais e artistas brasileiros nos anos 1960/70: «Entre a pena e o fuzil»”, *ArtCultura*, Uberlândia, v. 9, no. 14, p. 185–195, January – June 2007.

**Ridenti, Marcelo**, “Intelectuais e romantismo revolucionário”, *São Paulo em Perspetiva*, no. 15 (2), 2001.

**Schneider, Nina**, “Breaking the «Silence» of the Military Regime: New Politics of Memory in Brazil”, *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, 30/2, 2011, pp. 198–212.

**Schroeder, Caroline Saut**, “As artes visuais sob vigilância: censura e repressão nos anos de ditadura”, *Modos. Revista de História da Arte*, Campinas, v. 3, no. 3, September, 2019, p. 45–59.

**Schroeder, Caroline Saut**, “A censura política às artes plásticas em 1960”, *Anais do IX Fórum de Pesquisa em Arte*, ArtEmbap, Curitiba, 2013, pp. 113–123.

**Schwarcz, Lilia M.; Starling, Heloisa M.**, *Brasil. Uma biografia*, Companhia das Letras, São Paulo, 2015.

**Schwarcz, Lilia M.**, *Sobre o autoritarismo brasileiro*, Companhia das Letras, São Paulo, 2019.

**Shtromberg, Elena**, *Art Systems: Brazil & the 1970s*, University of Texas Press, Austin, 2016.