Why the Forest is the School

Pedro Neves Marques

VI-

Anthropophagy, the chronicled ritual of cannibalism practiced by many Amerindian tribes, forms a paradigmatic image of Brazil, if not South America; an image tying nature and culture together in that original trauma revealed on October 11, 1492, "the last day of a free America; the following day, Columbus arrived..."[1] In the region, nature and culture have never been effectively set apart, neither for the indigenous, for whose cosmologies the divide is foreign (though not necessarily inexistent) nor for colonizers past or present, for whom the savages and the land tend to mirror one another as if a multistable image. In the times of first encounters, the Amerindians were simultaneously the preferred and the most incomprehensible of savages, open to conversion and avid for mercantile exchange yet paradoxically bent on perpetuating their wars and their anthropophagic rituals hidden among the tropical foliage, "conceived, at best, as a species more natural than cultural, a kind of anthropomorphized emanation of a particularly 'natural' nature that constitutes an intermediary, or an avatar, between the Good 'Savage' of the eighteenth century and the 'Universal Adaptor' of twentieth century cultural ecology."[2] Out of the forest, the anthropophagic Indian could only be naturalized and later negated and exploited —just like the land and its resources.

At the birth of modernity there was the cannibal. The anthropophagi allowed for the distinction between primitive and civilized, and as importantly between animal and human, a state of nature and another of culture. A secondary cannibalism was thus legitimate, that of civilized men on savage men, and along with it on their land. Justifiably, the riches of the continent were there to be reaped.

VI-

Antropofagia, the political and aesthetic movement "discovered" in the 1920s by a faction of São Paulo's modernist vanguard, is the only Brazilian movement that consciously faced modernity's naturalizing negation.[3] And yet, it not only wished to denounce modernity's logic but also to devour it in the way of anthropophagic Amerindian rituals, that is, to transform oneself and the other through the digestion of the enemy.[4] In the modernists' words, "Those who think we are against the abuses of Western civilization are mistaken. What we are is against its uses."[5]

Antropofagia has been mostly understood simply as an aesthetic movement, undeniably influential for the twentieth-century Brazilian arts and literature —including the 1960s Tropicália, and the globalist multiculturalism of the 1990s. This artistic success, nonetheless,

has unfortunately trapped and reduced it to the role, or worse a style, of artistic acculturation and hybridity. As Suely Rolnik has painfully reminded her own tropicalist generation, Antropofagia too has been officialized by state power and incorporated into the nationalistic narrative of Brazil: tropical hybridity and syncretism are the necessary qualities of products for exportation "made in Brazil," as the song by Os Mutantes goes.[6] Marketed, Antropofagia, particularly in its Tropicália variation, becomes a caricature of multiculturality and acculturation, often sustained by the affirmation that the Brazilian identity is *that it has no identity*. In this way, it is exemplary of a paradoxical loop, to which Félix Guattari, who visited Brazil on several occasions, often alluded not without facing resistance, whereupon difference is again subsumed under identity, not as the lived sign of a frontier of conflict and negotiation but simply as a token of capital exchange and of the reproduction of capitalist alternatives.

Pacified, Antropofagia today is mostly an autophagy, resembling more what, following a warning left in Oswald de Andrade's 1928 inaugural *Anthropophagic Manifesto*, Rolnik has termed "low anthropophagy,"—as if politics could be enacted simply by the logic of hybridity, and worse, as if the acceptance of difference were true for the poor rather than brutally suppressed within the confines of its instrumental illusion under capital. Commodified, it becomes synonymous with a Neo-Darwinist mode of predation, precarious, and individualistic. Once again society becomes a jungle; nature the wildness tamed by bourgeois reason; and predation the social logic of capitalistic growth. Throughout, however, the cannibal must keep on being demonized as inhuman, for he is "the only one that [can] not be tolerated," the taboo.[7] It is as if we were back in the colonizers mind, with the cycle of oppression complete, and Antropofagia again naturalized.

VI-

Flávio de Carvalho, book cover for the first edition of Raul Bopp's *Cobra Norato* (1931).

Why Antropofagia then? Because, to quote Alexandre Nodari, "Antropofagia is not only a *theory of culture*, but also and simultaneously a *philosophy of nature*."[8] Moreover, because once revisited the writings of modernist anthropophagi such as Oswald de Andrade, Flávio de Carvalho, or many articles found in the original *Revista de Antropofagia* —besides the long genealogy Antropofagia built upon and the political legacy it set in motion and of which the anthropologist Eduardo Viveiros de Castro may very well be its most elaborate contemporary representative— Antropofagia was also a veritable anthropology.[9] Better yet, a proto-symmetrical anthropology, wherein the examination, and adoption, of Amerindian predation promised the cosmopolitical transformation of our own *capitalist predation* and modern sterilization of the world. Against it, Antropofagia brought forth the Amerindian, but also nature, more specifically an Indian nature radically other to ours, or even a radically open, negotiated nature. This is why, from an anthropophagic perspective, the Indian is not strictly Indian; it is also the poor and the oppressed, and thus any other living being, the Earth system itself.

In reaffirming Amerindian cosmologies, however, the modernist anthropophagi ultimately cannibalized them beyond any anthropological essentialism, or, despite guilty at times, nationalism:

> "From yesterday, today, and tomorrow. From here and abroad. The anthropophagous eats the Indian and eats the so-called civilized; only he licks his fingers. Ready to swallow his brothers … The Indian is, solely, a reference point in the apparent chaos."[10]

VI-

For Oswald, the Indian is a misconception waiting resolution for the past five hundred years. The primitive is yet to arrive —*for us*. This is a total inversion of the naturalist ontology that placed the indigenous as the primitive form of an evolutionary humanity, wherein they would be the past and us moderns the future of the species.[11]

> "Antropofagia is simply the search for (not the return) to the natural man, announced by every stream of contemporary culture and guaranteed by the muscular emotion of a marvelous epoch —ours!
> The natural man we are searching for can easily be white, wear a suit and fly by plane. Just as he can be a black or an Indian. That is why we call him 'anthropophagous' and not foolishly 'Tupi' or 'Pareci.'"[12]

Against any expectation of a Luddite mentality, Oswald de Andrade appropriates technology anthropophagically. His primitivism is rather a futurism guided by the dialectics, "thesis —natural man; antithesis—civilized man; synthesis— technological natural man,"[13] and a communist technology founded on the idea that "the historical rupture with the matriarchal world was produced when man ceased to *devour* man, and instead made him a slave."[14]

What is the nature of this devoration? Again, it is not only the commonplace appropriation of the other's best qualities. Instead what should be emphasized is, on the one hand, its predatory or warlike quality —eating the enemy—and on the other, its *cosmo*political role within a system of ontological exchange of perspectives—elements highlighted both by the modernist Antropofagia and recent South American anthropology.

Since the sixteenth century, while certain travellers and philosophers saw in cannibalism the Indians' *nature*, others saw the Indians' religion, that is, their culture. "Here is the difference: cannibals are people who feed on human flesh; but it is a different case with the Tupi, who eat their enemies for *vengeance*."[15] The predation, capture, and digestion of their opposite, for the Tupinambá of the Brazilian coast only ate their enemies, allowed for the substantiation of the self and of the community at large: "Cannibalism coincided with the entire social body: men, women, children, all should eat from the contrary."[16] For the Tupinambá, however, the self may have meant something altogether different to our "encapsulated"[17] self, for as Viveiros de Castro suggests:

> "The warrior exocannibalism complex, projected a form in which the *socius* was constructed through a relationship with the other, in which the incorporation of the other required an exit from oneself —the exterior was constantly engaged in a process of interiorization, and the interior was nothing but movement towards the outside [...] The other was not a mirror, but a destination [...] Tupinambá philosophy affirmed an *essential ontological incompleteness*: the incompleteness of sociality, and, in general, of humanity. It was, in other words, an order where interiority and identity were encompassed by exteriority and difference, where becoming and relationship prevailed over being and substance. For this type of cosmology, others are a solution, before being —as they were for the European invaders— a problem."[18]

The arrival of the Europeans perhaps only exacerbated this alterity — "it was perhaps the Amerindians, not the Europeans, who saw the 'vision of paradise' in the American (mis)(sed)encounter."[19] The anthropophagic ritual was not necessarily epistemic but it was certainly a process of familiarity with the outside— literally, in how the captive was offered women and food, became a partner in war and trading, and in how only through the enemy's digestion would he become metaphysically human. Here, "the *socius* is a margin or a boundary, an unstable and precarious space between nature (animality) and supernature (divinity)."[20] Anthropophagy was a veritable *epistemology from the other side*, rather than a syncretic accumulation of difference. Following Claude Lévi-Strauss's classic example, both the Europeans and the Amerindians were intent on verifying the other's humanity, the former through their soul, the later through their body — but each according to their characteristic "sciences."[21] It was just that "humanity" had very different meanings for one and the other.

Indians and the Ahuaï tree. Woodcut from André Thévet, *Les Singularitez de la France antarctique*, 1957.

Against the ontological determinism of Western modernity, where differences cannot live but by regimentation, anthropophagy stands for a process of decolonization of self and world that can only result in a "fundamental ontological inconstancy." The refusal of essentialism. Of purity. Let me emphasize: despite its praise of difference, Antropofagia is a critique of the *determinism* of difference, in other words, of a difference resulting from modern processes of purification, fundamentalist excisions, or capitalist divisions. "Tupi or not tupi,"[22] the iconic Shakespearean pun of the *Manifesto* is misleading in its dualism. Yes, Tupi or not tupi —a becoming Indian, becoming resistance: opening oneself to the metaphysics of the other. But the pun should also read "Tupi *and* not tupi." To be Indian but also to be boundless and unconstrained by what "Indian" might mean. Anthropophagy then, as the accumulation of identities but also as a process of becoming human, of *touching* the other's humanity, another humanity that we would be otherwise incapable of recognizing and relate to.

In the end, the issue is not the cooption of difference by capital, differences it generates so as to open up an outside for growth and profit. What is important is how capitalism must always and by necessity open differences within society; that for capital to exist, produce, and accumulate it must institute difference and partition societies between the rich and the dispossessed, those who appropriate and those disenfranchised, those with a voice and those silenced —and this applies both for human and nonhumans. Although alterity may be at the heart of Antropofagia, it is enmity, predation, and violence that sets its politics in motion, irresolvebly for the well intentioned. Antropofagia is a war philosophy, and not simply the model for the acculturated resolution of differences. This does not mean that Antropofagia is circumscribed by a theory of war; rather, it means that the violence at the heart of anthropophagic Amerindian societies cannot be simply resolved by multiculturalism. Antropofagia is not only a matter of appropriation, but also of expropriation. Here's an explanatory sentence from Oswald's matriarchal utopia: "Love is the individual act par excellence, but its fruit belongs to the tribe."[23]

Clearly, this epistemological critique of modernity cannot be reduced simply to exchanges within mankind's nature, that is, between cultures; in its full extension, it includes or excludes radically distinct ontologies: animals, plants, rocks, objects, even immaterial computational entities

and systems.[24] With anthropology's recent ontological turn in mind, one can thus venture that anthropophagy is a model for *crossing ontological frontiers*. Evidently, there are other models. But given its psychoanalytical imaginary —the trauma of cannibalism, repressed since modernity's primeval moment of division, humanity apart from nature, in the Age of Discovery— anthropophagy is the conceptualization of the irruption and confrontation with the nature/culture divide, possibly even a theory for its negotiation or possible collapse. This is why it forms part, along with images such as the rights of nature or Pachamama, of the cosmopolitical, ecological transformation of communizing struggles across South America, where what is at stake is much more than Marxist class struggle.

Here again, however, the act of anthropophagy disrupts the landscape of a *pacifying* ecology —as if the networks connecting beings to other beings would flow endlessly uninterrupted, without breaks or turmoil or oscillation.[25] One can say that every position in a given ecosystem is political, for everything is interconnected. Ecologically, positions may imply connectivity, even agency, and yet this does not imply by necessity a will. And the fact is that a position without a will is reduced solely to geography, rather than being, truly, a geopolitical force —one could say that, politically, it does not even suffice to be called a position. But if we follow Viveiros de Castro's perspectivism, wherein in Amerindian cannibalism what one eats is not the other's substance but its position (or perspective), then to eat the other is to negotiate ontological cuts, abysmal at times, to change and be changed by the transgression and the encounters with being on the other side. The immanence of the enemy —to confront what is alien to oneself *in oneself*.

VI-

This serves to say that this crossing can only be violent. Anthropophagic epistemology: not ontology (fixed and stable essences) but "odontology" (beings that are open and inconstant, predatory and mutable). The politics of anthropophagic violence is not in the act of eating itself, but in the ontological transgression eating implies, the "exchange of perspectives" —"Tell me what you eat, and I'll tell you who you are," said the gastronomist Brillat-Savarin in the eighteenth century. Evidently, the degree of violence depends on the breadth of a given society and the mechanisms and the intensity of its relations with the exterior.

Openness to the outside and the inconstancy of being, together with trans-speciesism and the variability of the human —although not necessarily the universality of humanity— are central, albeit potentially

counterintuitive, ideas of what Viveiros de Castro has termed "cannibal metaphysics." Another metaphysics defined along three vectors that, together, propose a reversal of Western anthropology:

interspecific perspectivism
ontological multinaturalism
cannibal alterity

The subject is too complex to expand on here.[26] Suffice to stress, in relation to the revitalization of Antropofagia I'm proposing, a main premise behind perspectivism: "Whatever is activated or 'agented' by the point of view will be a subject."[27] In contrast to naturalism, where the subject creates the point of view and objects are created by that point of view, in Amerindian perspectivism it is the point of view, the perspective, that creates the subject. As for multinaturalism, its consequences are radical and open to political investigation. In contrast with the multiculturalism of the moderns, for whom there is one nature and a multiplicity of cultures, multinaturalism states inversely the multiplicity of nature and the universality of culture. There is one culture and many natures, instead of one unifying nature and diverse cultures. As a variation, or intensity, of animism, in each and every multinaturalist world there is humanity, universally yet differently for each specific being because experienced through the idiosyncrasy of each human embodiment. From a perspectivist point of view, "each living species is human in its own position, or better… *everything is human for itself*."[28]

This is not to say that everything *is* human, or that the nature/culture divide is inexistent within a cannibal metaphysics, for as Viveiros de Castro reflects, "The nature/culture distinction needs to be criticized, but not in order to conclude that such a thing does not exist (there are already too many things that do not exist)."[29] Rather, it is *mankind* (the species, conflated with the condition) that does not represent the human but rather the reverse: humanity not as man's definition but of the world's diversity. Mankind is the reactionary idea that arrives in order to suppress difference and the plurality of cosmologies built on the variability of what the human is or may mean. A complete inversion of modern thought, and in particular of how our sciences are structured, to how our epistemology captures and classifies —predates— the outside world.

VI-

Is it possible to separate mankind from the human? If so, this is a project at the core of Antropofagia. But then again, is this humanity? Perhaps a strange humanity no longer dominated by speciesism, and no longer bound to what we formerly thought of as human. This would be "a world many would call anthropomorphic, but one that nobody could call anthropocentric, given that what man provides here is the *un*measurability of all things, at the same time as he is measured and mediated by all of them. A world, then, that is *metaphysically* anthropophagic, where alterity is anterior to identity, relation superior to the terms it relates, and transformation interior to form."[30]

Indigenous people watch as the Brazilian Congress deliberates on the introduction of Indigenous Rights in the 1988 Brazilian Constitution. Photo: Castro Júnior, ADIRP.

Under current global economic changes, what is at stake is either the constitution of Brazil and South America simply as a simulacrum of Western capitalism —reproduced by the very much active industrial determinism and the silencing of the continent's multiplicity— or, in contrast, the production of a new, multinatural, communalist, Earth-bound economics. In this respect, Antropofagia may be either forgotten as a commodified strategy, or expand beyond its current frontiers to join the continent's struggles. It is this second route that imagines Antropofagia not as a topical moment in time —the vanguard— but as a typically South American cosmopolitics. I make mine Alexandre Nodari's words, "perhaps only today has anthropophagy, understood as a philosophy, reached a degree of legibility, even if its scope (art, myth, the savage mind) has long been established. Perhaps this spatial territorialization (an artistic philosophy) and temporal anachronism (almost a century of delay) are accidents constituting anthropophagy as a proper political concept."[31] An anthropophagic anthropology, or "the permanent decolonization of thought."[32]

> Oswald de Andrade already noted:
> "The proletariat has evolved. It is no longer what Marx wrote in the lancinating pages of *Capital* ... What is the proletariat today? A revolted *humanity* is gathering on its *blurry frontiers*, reclaiming the redistribution of surplus value."[33]

VI-

Is it fair to see in these blurred frontiers a communism beyond man? The communism of species? The possibility of a trans-speciesist egalitarianism —which is the same as saying, of those beyond the limits? It may be that cannibal metaphysics points neither to inhumanism nor to the return of the humanist project— a dualism that has come to the fore in recent years, precisely at the moment when, due to technological acceleration and the complexity of info-biochemical systems, the dissolution between formerly rigid ontological frontiers, between what is agented or not in society, begins to find a place in our thought.[34] If there is any "humanist" project in Antropofagia, it is one that cuts across this divide to state: the end of discontinuity is possible only with the end of capitalism —the difference capitalism forcibly implants in society. "Man (I mean the European man, heaven forbid!) was searching for man outside of man. And with lantern in hand: philosophy. We want man without the doubt, without even the presumption of the existence of doubt: naked, natural, anthropophagic."[35]

Notes:

1. Raul Bopp, "The Life and Death of Antropofagia" (1965-1966), (excerpt) in ***The Forest and The School/ Where to Sit at the Dinner Table?***, ed. Pedro Neves Marques (Berlin: Archive Books, 2014) 135-150.
2. In a by now iconic work of anthropology, Eduardo Viveiros de Castro has, drawing from 16th century chronicles, termed this feature "the inconstancy of the savage soul." See Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, ***The Inconstancy of the Indian Soul: The Encounter of Catholics and Cannibals in 16th-Century Brazil***, translated by Gregory Duff Morton (Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press, 2011). As for the naturalization of the Amerindians, see Anne-Christine Taylor's essay "O Americanismo tropical: Uma fronteira fóssil da antropologia," from which the above citation derives, originally in ***Histoires de l'anthropologie (XVIe-XXe siècles)*** (Paris: Klincksieck, 1984) 8. The translation is mine. A further note should be added: Unsurprisingly, to this day this too is the fate of the land, negated by the illustration of its tropical pristineness, wild, luxurious, diverse, unique, yet acknowledged only for its promotional, capitalist value; a backdrop for operas. This is why the state celebration of the tropical landscape and its destruction by the industrial development of the nation —the Trans-Amazonian highway, the Belo Monte hydroelectric power plant, the monoculture, and the logging—are able to coexist. This is also why the biopatenting of biodiversity —again the intertwinement of nature with the indigenous in the commodification of their knowledge— may very well be the end result of the naturalist inventories of American flora during the Enlightenment.
3. "This new philosophy, 'which was not invented, nor imported, but discovered right here,' predominant, the hunger of an imagination marching in search of new forms." Soquilles Vivacqua, ***Revista de Antropofagia***, 2nd "dentition," n° 7 (May 08, 1929). The translation is mine.
4. Ibid.
5. Oswald de Andrade, "Anthropophagy and Culture," in ***The Forest and The School/ Where to Sit at the Dinner Table?***, 125-127. Originally in ***Revista de Antropofagia***, 2nd "dentition," n° 9 (May 15, 1929).
6. Suely Rolnik, "The Politics of Anthropophagy in the Transnational Drift," ***in The Forest and The School/ Where to Sit at the Dinner Table?***, 537-558.
7. Manuela Carneiro da Cunha, "Images of the Indians of Brazil: The Sixteenth Century," (excerpt) in ***The Forest and The School/Where to Sit at the Dinner Table?***, 81-95. Originally published in ***Estudos Avançados***, vol. 4, n° 10 (1990).
8. Alexandre Nodari, "'The Transformation of the Taboo into Totem': Notes on an Anthropophagic Formula," in ***The Forest and The School/ Where to Sit at the Dinner Table?***, 409-454.
9. To think this genealogy is one of the objectives behind the recent anthology I have edited, ***The Forest and The School/Where to Sit at the Dinner Table?***, the introduction of which this article is a much shortened, but hopefully effective, revisitation.
10. António de Alcântara Machado, "Give Way," in ***The Forest and The School/Where to Sit at the Dinnert Table?***, 112-113. Originally published in ***Revista de Antropofagia***, 1st "dentition," n° 1 (May 1928).
11. On this history and the singular role performed by the Amerindians in its development, see Hélène Clastres, "Primitivismo e a ciência do homem no século XVIII," ***Discurso***, nr. 13 (São Paulo: USP, 1980) 187-209.
12. Poronominari, "An Adhesion we are not Interested In," (excerpt) in ***The Forest and The School/ Where to Sit at the Dinner Table?***, 128. Originally published in ***Revista de Antropofagia***, 1st "dentition," n° 1 (May 1928).
13. Oswald de Andrade, "The Crisis of Messianic Philosophy," (excerpt) in ***The Forest and The School/ Where to Sit at the Dinner Table?***, 151-177. Originally published in 1950.
14. Ibid. The italics are mine.
15. Manuela Carneiro da Cunha, "Images of Indians of Brazil: The Sixteenth Century," 81-95.
16. Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, ***The Inconstancy of the Indian Soul***, 100.
17. "Ptolemaic Capsule," a "physical capsule of which the radius of action cannot go beyond an horizon of lynching," is the term used by the anthropophagic movement for the humanist legacy of enlightened Reason. See Oswald de Andrade, "Anthropophagy and Culture," ***in The Forest and The School/Where to Sit at the Dinner Table?***, 125-127.
18. Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, ***The Inconstancy of the Indian Soul,*** 46-47. Editor's italics.
19. Ibid., 30.
20. Ibid, 29.
21. The anecdote, which has proven of great importance to multinaturalist anthropology, can be found both in ***Tristes Tropiques and Race and History***: "In the Greater Antilles, a few years after the discovery of America, while the Spaniards were sending out Commissions of investigation to discover if whether or not the Indians had a soul, the latter spent their time drowning white prisoners in order to ascertain, by long observation, whether or not their bodies would decompose." Claude Lévi-Strauss, ***Race and History*** (Paris: UNESCO, 1952) 12.

22. I owe this distinction to Brazilian sociologist Laymert Garcia dos Santos, who pointed it out to me in in São Paulo, 2011.
23. Oswald de Andrade, "The Crisis of Messianic Philosophy," 151-177.
24. For the later see, Philippe Descola, ***Beyond Nature and Culture*** (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2013).
25. The pun with the term "pacification" used by the military in South America to refer to the inclusion (and preservation) of the indigenous is obviously intended.
26. See in particular Eduardo Viveiros de Castro's recently translated ***Cannibal Metaphysics*** (Minneapolis: Univocal, 2014).
27. Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, "Exchanging Perspectives: The Transformation of Objects into Subjects in Amerindian Ontologies" in ***Animism***, ed. Anselm Franke and Chiara Marchini Camia (New York/Berlin; Sternberg Press, 2010), 229. However, in this respect, Viveiros de Castro is not alone, and other authors should mentioned, such as the anthropologists Tânia Stolze Lima and her book "Um peixe olhou para mim: O povo Yudjá e a perspectiva" (UNESP, 2005), Aparecida Vilaça and her book ***Strange Enemies: Indigenous Agency and Scenes of Encounters in Amazonia*** (Duke University Press, 2010), as well as Carlos Fausto's recent ***Warfare and Shamanism in Amazonia*** (Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 2014).
28. Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, "Some Reflections on the Notion of Species in History and Anthropology," interview Álvaro Fernández Bravol, ***emisférica***, vol. 10, N. 1 (2013).
29. Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, "Perspectivism and Multinaturalism in Indigenous America," in ***The Forest and The School/Where to Sit at the Dinner Table?***, 313-372.
30. Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, "Transformation in Anthropology, Transformation of Anthropology," in ***The Forest and The School/Where to Sit at the Dinner Table?***, 559-587.
31. Alexandre Nodari, personal exchange, 2012.
32. Viveiros de Castro, ***Métaphysiques cannibales*** (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2009) 92.
33. Oswald de Andrade, "The Crisis of Messianic Philosophy," 151-177. The italics are mine.
34. Examples abound at a vertiginous pace. From climate change to molecular computation, or think simply of Isabelle Stengers's examples from physics: the invisibility of the neutrino implying not only the existence of "life" beyond our sensorial capacity —only induction can prove it— but also the confirmation of an exterior, exact technological agency, human in origin but not human bound, and "spirited" not with greater but other epistemological mechanisms, other logics, different affects.
35. Oswald Costa, "The Anthropophagic Descent," in ***The Forest and The School/ Where to Sit at the Dinner Table?***, 114-116. Originally published in ***Revista de Antropofagia***, 1st "dentition," N. 1 (May 1928).

VI-