


Diálogos


ISSN 2177-2940



"The coincidence of the revolutionary poetic invention with the revolutionary political invention": the cases of the pieces *Cuba Colectiva* and *48 Artists*, 48 Years of Fascism.¹

 <https://doi.org/10.4025/dialogos.v26i1.62094>

Cristina Pratas Cruzeiro

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7836-9148>

Institute of Art History, Faculty of Social and Human Sciences, NOVA University of Lisbon, 1069-061 Lisbon, PT.

E-mail: cristinacruzairo@fsh.unl.pt

"The coincidence of the revolutionary poetic invention with the revolutionary political invention": the cases of the pieces *Cuba Colectiva* and *48 Artists*, 48 Years of Fascism.

Abstract: This article focuses on the relationship between the collective painting experiences *Cuba Colectiva* (Havana, 1967) and *48 Artists*, 48 Years of Fascism (Lisbon, 1974) and the impact they had on the Portuguese context of their production. In 1967, Portugal was under a dictatorship and although the Portuguese artists Lourdes Castro and René Bertholo had participated in the painting carried out in Havana, the event had no repercussion in the Portuguese press. The Portuguese revolution of the 25th of April 1974 allowed the opening of a series of artistic experiments carried out in public spaces. It was in this context that the Portuguese painting was executed. The article will inquire about the poetic and political meaning of the relationship between the two realizations.

Key words: Dictatorship; revolution; censorship; cold war; collective painting.

"La coincidencia de la invención poética revolucionaria con la invención política revolucionaria": los casos de las obras *Cuba Colectiva* y *48 Artistas*, 48 Años de Fascismo.

Resumen: Este artículo se centra en la relación entre las experiencias pictóricas colectivas *Cuba Colectiva* (La Habana, 1967) y *48 Artistas*, 48 Años de Fascismo (Lisboa, 1974) y el impacto que tuvieron en el contexto portugués de su producción. En 1967 Portugal estaba bajo una dictadura y aunque los artistas portugueses Lourdes Castro y René Bertholo habían participado en el cuadro realizado en La Habana, el hecho no tuvo repercusión en la prensa portuguesa. La revolución portuguesa del 25 de abril de 1974 permitió la apertura de una serie de experimentos artísticos llevados a cabo en espacios públicos. Fue en este contexto que se ejecutó la pintura portuguesa. El artículo indagará sobre el sentido poético y político de la relación entre ambas realizaciones.

Palabras clave: Ditadura; revolución; censura; guerra fría; pintura colectiva.

"A coincidência da invenção poética revolucionária com a invenção política revolucionária": os casos das obras *Cuba Colectiva* e *48 Artistas*, 48 Anos de Fascismo.

Resumo: Este artigo incide sobre a relação entre as experiências de pintura colectiva *Cuba Colectiva* (Havana, 1967) e *48 Artistas*, 48 Anos de Fascismo (Lisboa, 1974) e o impacto que tiveram no contexto português da sua realização. Em 1967, Portugal vivia uma ditadura e embora os artistas portugueses Lourdes Castro e René Bertholo tivessem participado na pintura realizada em Havana, o acontecimento não teve repercussão na imprensa portuguesa. A revolução portuguesa de 25 de Abril de 1974 permitiu a abertura a uma série de experiências artísticas realizadas em espaço público. Foi nesse contexto que a pintura portuguesa foi executada. O artigo irá indagar sobre o significado poético e político da relação entre as duas realizações.

Palavras-chave: Ditadura; revolução; censura; guerra fria; pintura colectiva.

¹ This work is funded by national funds through FCT – Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia under the project [SFRH/BPD/116916/2016].

I thank Lillian Llanes Godoy and her family for providing bibliographic material and for their friendship.

Received on: 14/01/2022

Accepted on: 21/02/2022

In Portugal, the revolution on 25 April 1974 dictated the end of the fascist dictatorship, called the "Estado Novo"², which had been in place for forty-eight years and was characterized by the domination of monopoly capitalism, the repression and liquidation of freedoms and rights, and the militaristic and colonialist policy of the state. The country had lived under this oppressive regime since 1926, when the military coup of 28 May established a government of military dictatorship that led the country until 1933/34 (NOGUEIRA, 2009, p. 157). This was followed by the "Estado Novo", led by António de Oliveira Salazar, who approved a new Constitution (1933) and continued the main aims of the preceding regime. This period in Portuguese history was marked by the dissolution of Parliament, the prohibition of political parties, the creation of a political police (PVDE/PIDE) and the establishment of censorship applied to all spheres of human activity.

Although long and consolidated, the Portuguese fascist dictatorship underwent moments of greater fragility. Initially it had the support of the German nazi regime, Italian fascism and, after 1939, fascism in Spain, but the situation changed with the end of World War II. In 1945, the defeat of nazi-fascism – toward which the military intervention of the Soviet army was decisive on the eastern European side, and of the North American and British military forces, on the western side – determined a change in the global correlation of forces. The anti-fascist opposition in Portugal, which existed since the beginning of the regime, then assumed greater preponderance in the country. It was during this period that, for example, Movimento de Unidade Democrática [MUD, 1945; Democratic Unity Movement] and MUD Juvenil [MUD Juvenil, 1946] was created, joining the already existing organized political opposition forces, in particular Movimento de Unidade Nacional Antifascista [MUNAF, 1943; Anti-fascist National Unity Movement] and Partido Comunista Português [PCP, 1921; Portuguese Communist Party].

At the cultural level, opposition to fascism had developed since the establishment of the dictatorial regime. Since the 1930s, several intellectuals and artists operated an intense civic and cultural intervention contrary to the ideals of the fascist dictatorship, centred on some publications such as *O Diabo*, *Vértice* or *O Sol Nascente*. This is how the neo-realist movement manifested itself in Portugal, first in literature and then in painting.

During this period, there was increased dissent against the regime, including its restrictive

2 In this article, the period of the "Estado Novo" [New State] is designated as a fascist dictatorship. This designation has been used by different authors, together with others such as salazarism, Portuguese fascist regime or even "Estado Novo", the term the regime used to designate itself. This is not the place to elaborate on the differences among these designations, but it should be noted that there is discussion on the ideological definition of the regime. For a summary of this discussion and those differences, see, among others NOGUEIRA, 2009 e LOFF, 2008.

policies on exhibitions. The Exposições Gerais de Artes Plásticas³ [General Exhibitions of Visual Arts], held at the Sociedade Nacional de Belas Artes [SNBA; National Society of Fine Arts] between 1946 and 1956, were paradigmatic in this regard. These exhibitions were decisive in affirming some Portuguese artistic movements, but also in affirming the arts within the political and social terrain⁴.

While the neo-realist movement regularly manifested its clear opposition to the fascist dictatorship, other movements, groups and artists did so also, albeit in a less systematic way. This was the case of the Grupo Surrealista⁵ [Surrealist Group], created in 1947, at the same time as, in Paris, the surrealist movement was attempting to relaunch itself (FRANÇA, 2000, p. 49). For example, the group's first exhibition, in Lisbon, in 1949, sharply manifested opposition to fascism. The catalogue's original cover was a political poster supporting the presidential candidacy of Norton de Matos⁶, with the phrase: "The Surrealist Group of Lisbon/ asks/ after twenty two years of/ Fear/ Are we still capable of/ an act of/ Freedom?/ It is absolutely/ indispensable / to vote against / fascism" (FRANÇA, 2000, p. 387). With a well-oiled censor system, the regime rejected the cover, which was eventually "replaced at the last minute by a white cover with two strokes by hand with a blue pencil"⁷ (FRANÇA, 2000, p. 388).

There were several episodes of censorship at the cultural level and, in particular, in the arts. There was also anti-fascist resistance at this level, with several artists actively working towards overthrowing the ongoing dictatorship in Portugal. In addition to the SNBA, the creation of several cooperatives for artistic creation, such as Gravura – Sociedade Cooperativa de Gravadores Portugueses (1956) [Engraving – Cooperative Society of Portuguese Engravers] and Árvore – Cooperativa de Atividades Artísticas CRL [Tree – Cooperative of Artistic Activities LLC], were important to establish spaces for artists to engage, freely and independently, in cultural production and diffusion.

The strain due to the colonial war (1961-1974) and its effects on society, among other

3 These exhibitions were organized anonymously by the Subcommittee of Visual Artists of the Committee of Journalists, Writers and Artists of the Movement of Democratic Unity (MUD). The first exhibition occurred in July 1946 at the National Society of Fine Arts (SNBA), Lisbon, Portugal. There were a total of ten exhibitions up until 1956.

4 The 1947 exhibition was paradigmatic, as several works were apprehended, including by such authors as Júlio Pomar, Maria Keil, Manuel Ribeiro de Pavia, Arnaldo Louro de Almeida, Nuno Tavares and Jose Viana, among others. Beginning with the 3rd General Exhibition, in 1948, works were subjected to prior censorship and only works authorized by the regime were placed on display (FUNDAÇÃO CALOUSTE GULBENKIAN, 1982, p. 82-85).

5 The founding members of the Surrealist Group were the artists Marcelino Vespeira, Fernando de Azevedo, Antonio Domingues and Moniz Pereira; the poets and writers Mario Cesariny and Alexandre O'Neill; and the critic and art historian José Augusto França. They were joined by the slightly older António Pedro.

6 General Norton de Matos ran for President in the 1949 elections, opposing the fascist dictatorship. As freedom in the elections was not guaranteed and there would likely be electoral fraud, he gave up his candidacy.

7 A blue pencil was used by the regime's censors to identify the censored content in the different documents inspected before publishing.

factors, contributed decisively to progressively weaken the fascist dictatorship, leading ultimately to its overthrow in 1974. Carried out by Movimento das Forças Armadas [MFA; Armed Forces Movement], the Portuguese revolution counted on the participation of the popular and democratic movement. The cooperation between the military and popular components – known in the country as the People-MFA alliance – was essential for the revolutionary process, between 1974 and 1976, during which the first free legislative elections occurred and the new Constitution⁸ was approved. Civil society was mobilized in this process, integrating or promoting diverse political and cultural initiatives.

The Portuguese revolutionary process laid bare a desire to establish an anti-capitalist democracy, paving the way for socialism⁹. That aim was expressed by PCP and PS [Socialist Party], but also by parties from the centre-right, such PPD [Democratic People's Party].

Therefore, during this period, there was some rapprochement between Portugal and socialist countries, among them Cuba, whose close cooperation, in several political and diplomatic meetings (FERREIRA GOMES; COSTA LEITE, 2017, p. 7), occurred mainly before the counter-revolutionary coup on 25 November 1975. The experience of the Cuban revolution – which had been gathering enthusiasm in Europe – represented a recent example of success in the fight against imperialism (BARREIRO LOPÉZ, 2015, p. 6), an aspect that was relevant to Portugal.

Cooperation between the two countries extended to the cultural level and some strategies, procedures and cultural models developed in Cuba served as an example to Portugal. Structures such as Campanhas de Dinamização Cultural e Acção Cívica [CDCAC; Cultural Promotion and Civic Action Campaigns], Campanhas de Alfabetização e Educação Sanitária [Literacy and Sanitary Education Campaigns], Serviço Ambulatório de Apoio Local [SAAL; Local Support Ambulatory Service] or Serviço Cívico Estudantil [SCE; Student Civic Service], centred on cultural dynamization and animation, on literacy programs and collecting diverse cultural elements throughout the country, were inspired by the experience of the literacy brigades and the Committees in Defense of the Revolution (CDR) developed in Cuba (CERVELLÓ, 1996, p. 263-264). For example, at the time, the CDCAC were often compared in foreign media with the Cuban model (VESPEIRA DE ALMEIDA, 2009, p. 94). This connection was also emphasized by Rodrigo de Freitas, who coordinated CODICE's¹⁰ visual arts sector (which coordinated the CDCAC) and who

8 Until the first Constitutional Government, following the first legislative elections on 25 April 1976, the country was led by six Provisional Governments vested with implementing the MFA's program.

9 The Portuguese Constitution, approved in 1976, still maintains in its preamble the aim "(...) to ensure the primacy of the democratic Rule of Law and pave the way for a socialist society (...)" (PORTUGAL, 2005).

10 CODICE was the Central Coordinating Commission that coordinated the CDCAC. It was a structure of the 5th Division of the General Staff of the Portuguese Armed Forces, in collaboration with the Directorate General of Culture and Entertainment.

indicated the Cuban CDR as "a starting point" to "adapt to Portuguese reality" (VESPEIRA DE ALMEIDA, 2009, p. 94).

One can also find some points of contact with the Cuban experience in the artistic practices in Portugal in that period. In addition to more structural aspects, such as the approach to politics, collectivism, and participation – which can be observed in several revolutionary processes in Europe and Latin America, during the 20th century –, there were exchanges and direct contacts between artists from the two countries. The Associação de Amizade Portugal Cuba [AAPC; Portugal-Cuba Friendship Association], founded in November 1974, developed relevant activity in this regard, by strengthening these contacts. For example, at the swearing-in ceremony of AAPC's governing bodies, the president of AAPC's board, Manuel João da Palma Carlos, publicly announced a program, supported by several official entities, which included a week of Cuban cinema, a performance by a Cuban ballet company and an exhibition on the Portuguese political poster after the 25 April revolution (RTP, 1974). This exchange was promoted by several institutions during this period, and there were some relevant exhibitions in Portugal, including one promoted by the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation [FCG] in 1979, entitled *The cultural poster in Cuba*, which was attended by several Cuban artists and institutions.

The collective painting experience *48 Artistas, 48 Anos de Fascismo* [48 Artists, 48 Years of Fascism] occurred in this context in Portugal, on 10 June 1974, during a Day of Solidarity with MFA. Organized by the Movimento Democrático de Artistas Plásticos [MDAP; Democratic Movement of Visual Artists], this painting was the first collective experience of its kind in Portugal after the revolution. Despite the criticism by artists and art critics at the time, it stood out for the experience's performativity and for representing the visual art's commitment with the ongoing revolutionary process. As a collective experience, this painting's idea and conception was based on a similar experience in Havana (Cuba), in 1967, with the participation of the Portuguese artists Lourdes Castro and René Bertholo. The *Cuba Colectiva* [Collective Cuba] painting experience had no media projection in Portugal, which in 1967 lived in dictatorship. Nevertheless, this event's relation with Portugal was resumed in 1974, which was then a different country, with freedom and where, unlike 1967, Portugal's relationship with Cuba was valued.

The *Salón de Mayo* in Havana within the circuit of anti-imperialist struggle

In 1967, the *Salon de Mai* [May Salon] of Paris was held in Havana (Cuba). The history of the *Salon de Mai* is not within the scope of this article, but we stress its political significance in the

struggle against fascism, as it was conceived by artists and intellectuals in 1943, during the nazi occupation of France, as a form of resistance. In the 1960s, "it was evident that it had passed its glory days" (GODOY, 2011, p. 5), although its past of resistance and revolutionary audacity remained at the root of the Salon's history.

The idea of taking the *Salon de Mai* to Cuba arose, firstly, because in the most progressive European circles there was a "mystique surrounding the Cuban Revolution [which] had converted the island into one of the main centres of interest for the progressive intelligentsia of the whole world" (GODOY, 2011, p. 7). This poetry is perceptible in the words of Yvon Taillander, a French artist and member of the *Salon de Mai's* organizing commission, who stated when presenting the event to Cuba: "From my window, the island of Cuba also seems like a large red and green painting. Green for hope, red for the people's revolution" (THAILANDIER, 1967).

Nevertheless, given the global political situation, it was more than a matter of poetry. In the context of the Cold War, when the US and the USSR represented polar opposite worldviews, the Cuban revolution (1959) was a great stimulus for the anti-imperialist struggle, globally. The attempted invasion at Playa Girón¹¹ (1961) and the missile crisis (1962), as well as the economic, commercial and financial blockade imposed on Cuba since 1960, were the American response to a revolution that in 1961 adopted a socialist character (GUANCHE, 2006, p.108). But the permanent ability to resist and overcome US interference made the Cuban Revolution an example of success. An example for many intellectuals in anti-imperialist movements and for other revolutionary processes in Latin America, including Mexico, Nicaragua, Colombia, Uruguay, Bolivia and the Dominican Republic (BARREIRO LÓPEZ, 2015 p. 6).

Thus, for many artists and intellectuals participating in the *Salón de Mayo* [May Salon], "going to Havana was an act of solidarity with the Cuban people, who bravely faced one of the greatest powers at the moment" (GODOY, 2011, p. 8). Furthermore, as Paula Barreiro stated:

For some of the artists and intellectuals who would participate in May' 68, a more direct experience provided by the Revolutionary Government of Cuba one year prior would further incite their fascination for the Latin American cause and foster their dis-identification with the ideological-geographical bipolarity of the Cold War (BARREIRO LÓPEZ, 2015 p. 6).

For Cuba, this was a "possibility to break the isolation Cubans were subjected to" (GODOY, 2011, p. 8). The Cuban revolution sought to create a "new sociality" translated as a "refutation of the past, a fact that became a central category of the new political culture" (GUANCHE, 2006, p.

¹¹ Also named the Bay of Pigs Invasion.

106). This led to a significant change in the "ways of thinking about and projecting national culture" (BATISTA, 2013, p. 12) that resulted in the construction of a new cultural policy in the country¹². Although the socialist character acquired by the Cuban revolution triggered various tensions in the intellectual sector, they were not sufficient to undermine the common objectives of "the Revolutionary intelligentsia and the revolutionary power" (GUANCHE, 2006, p. 112).

The idea of taking *Salon de Mai* to Cuba came from Wifredo Lam (living in Paris at the time) and Carlos Franqui (who was in Rome in 1967). The two Cubans saw this opportunity as a means to participate in the discussions in Cuba, ongoing since the revolution, on cultural policy and the role of culture in the revolutionary process (GODOY, 2011, p. 9), but simultaneously to establish "a link of exchange with the European continent" (BARREIRO LÓPEZ, 2015 p. 6).

The proposal was readily accepted by the government, which saw it as an opportunity for foreign demonstrations of political support, but also a chance to "develop the conditions allowing the people to satisfy all their cultural needs" (ROA, 1967).

More than a hundred foreign artists participated, among whom were René Bertholo and Lourdes Castro. Both were living in Paris since 1958, where they founded the magazine KWAY (1957-1964), and were fully integrated into the city's avant-garde artistic milieu. Their experience in Cuba is still hardly mentioned within the perimeter of history and art criticism. Nevertheless, during his stay in Havana, the journalist Raúl Palazuelos collected the opinion of some participants in the *Salón*, which he published in *La Gaceta de Cuba*, including the testimony of the two Portuguese artists. Lourdes Castro considered that the most important aspect of the initiative was the exchange it fostered, insisting "on the need to break the isolation, because an artist must live in a large centre, where he can acquire new mental forces for his work." She mentioned having seen "few works by Cuban creators", but nonetheless highlighted "the caricaturists De Armas, Guerrero, and also Lillo (...). I was also very interested in the work of Mendive and Bellechasse" (PALAZUELOS, 1967). René Bertholo underlined the importance of the event occurring in Cuba "because it is necessary to exchange ideas and expressions. Culture cannot be isolated." However, he considered "the *Salón de Mayo* is as alive as possible as an exhibition (...)" although it represents "(...) a certain era of painting" and has "a static steering committee" (PALAZUELOS, 1967).

Although, as mentioned by Günter Schütz at the time, all the guests spanned "many different art trends and, politically, do not represent a homogeneous group" (SCHÜTZ, 2008, p. 276), the atmosphere in Havana during the *Salón de Mayo* garnered great interest and commitment: "Artists

12 As evidenced by the foundation of the 'Imprenta Nacional' [National Press], the 'Instituto Cubana del Arte e Industria Cinematográficos' [ICAIC; Cuban Institute of Cinematographic Art and Industry], the creation of the 'Casa de las Américas' [House of the Americas], but also the literacy campaign and the revolutionary government's support of artists from different disciplines (GUANCHE, 2006, p. 108).

in communion with revolutionaries and guerrilleros (...) were actively involved in Havana's cultural life, not just planning and organizing, but making that year's Salón de Mayo a lively event" (BARREIRO LÓPEZ, 2015 p. 7).

Cuba Colectiva was painted between 17 and 18 July 1967, as part of the Salón's program. The idea of inviting several artists to perform a collective painting was again by Wifredo Lam (SCHÜTZ, 2008, p. 277). The event gained great prominence, with many dozen participants "manifesting the communitarian spirit of the revolution" (BARREIRO LÓPEZ 2015 p. 8). Following a speech by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Raul Roa, the painting was executed live, in the street, next to one of the busiest avenues of Havana (Rampa), with about 5000 people watching and with television transmission (1967, p. 26) (Figure 1).



Figure 1 – Photograph of the painting *Cuba Colectiva* in the *Salón de Mayo*, 1967 (GRANMA). Available at: <https://cubanartnewsarchive.org/2017/12/12/paris-in-havana-la-gran-espiral-celebrates-the-1967-salon-de-mayo/> Accessed: 14 jan. 2022.

A spiral structure (by Eduardo Arroyo and Gilles Aillaud), divided into several segments, was drawn on a 55 meter-long panel (SCHÜTZ, 2008, p. 277). Each segment or painting space was

randomly assigned¹³ to a participant. Although collective, the painting is a combination of each artist's individual expression, who on rare occasions sought to merge their intervention with that of nearby segments. Among the visual and textual representations, there are many references to the revolutionary context, although there are also many more abstract segments. Overall, it is a heterogeneous composition, unified by the spiral structure. Of the initiative, Paula Barreiro Lopez highlighted the "collective collaboration (in terms of an indivisible art piece)", which "challenged the praise of the (bourgeois conception of an) individual production by the West as well as the orthodoxy of the Soviet Union's Socialist Realism" (BARREIRO Lopez, 2015 p.8).



Figure 2 - *Cuba Colectiva*, 1967. Painting. Available at: <http://espina-roja.blogspot.com/2019/09/cuba-colectiva-mural-realizado-por-100.html> Accessed: 14 jan. 2022.

René Bertholo and Lourdes Castro occupied segments 62 and 50, respectively¹⁴. Their interventions are in close proximity and, relative to the panel, are located on the left side, roughly in the middle. In both, one recognises their artistic paths at that time. René Bertholo's painting depicts an accumulation of small objects on a white background, where an explosive and a card with cut-out heart stand out. Lourdes Castro's painting consists of black contour lines drawn on a white background, perhaps contours of a landscape seen through a window (Figure 3).

13 With the exception of two segments assigned previously: segment 26 was assigned to Fidel Castro (who did not use it) and the first segment, from the centre, was painted by Wifredo Lam (SCHÜTZ, 2008, p. 277).

14 The segments were numbered from the centre of the spiral.



Figure 3 – Detail of the *Cuba Colectiva* painting, with fragments painted by Lourdes Castro and René Bertholo. BONDIL, Nathalie. *Cuba Art et Histoire de 1968 à nos jours*. Montréal: Musée des beaux-arts de Montréal. 2008.

The experience in Cuba was reported by several of the participating artists and art critics as a political experiment. Even the collective painting was framed by the political attitude it represented. Several artists manifested this very idea. Allain Jouffroy stated that "Suddenly, thanks to this collective mural (...) each of those participating there (...) could feel, for the first time in their life, a coincidence of revolutionary poetic invention with revolutionary political invention" (JOUFFROY, 2011). Jean Schuster said, "We surrealists arrived in Cuba with a favourable idea, but we are here in spirit and heart, not only simple sympathy. All we saw in Cuba (...) gives us hope that the paths of communism are opening" (BUENO, 1967). Jean Messagier described:

(...) We were transported to this multitude, the spectacle of a burgeoning country. In any case, this mood was

expressed in the mural, with all this implies: a kind of miracle that can only be produced in a country like this and whose consequences are still unpredictable for Cuba (ROMÁN, 1967, p. 5).

This stance, profusely disseminated in the Cuban media, was brought to France mainly by the contemporary art magazine *Opus International*, edited by Alain Jouffroy, Gérard Gassiot Talabot, Jean Clarence Lambert, Jean-Jacques Lévêque and Raoul-Jean Moulin. In issue 3, the experience of the *Salón de Mayo* salon was reported in several articles. Gerard Gassiot Talabot wrote:

Rebeyrolle, Bitran, Adami, de Rosny, Alleyn, Bertholo, César, Hiquily, Kowalski, Lourdes Castro and (...) Arroyo and Aillaud worked in a spirit similar to what they did in France: (...) the proof of their support of the Cuban revolution goes beyond the pictorial gesture, through the continuity of their act" (TALABOT, 1967, p. 14).

On the relationship between "the artists of the Paris school and the Cuban painters", Gerald Gassiot Talabot (1967, p. 14) mentioned the conversations and collective experiences, as well as the paintings that about twenty artists produced while in Cuba, destined for the new Museum of Modern Art in Havana. For this author, these works "have a special meaning due to the conditions in which they were conceived" (TALABOT, 1967, p. 14). He indicates different behaviours. In some cases, the artists created works following their path immediately prior to the experience they were having in Cuba. Among them, Talabot includes René Bertholo and Lourdes Castro who "worked in a spirit similar to what they worked in France" (TALABOT, 1967, p. 14), leaving aside their "circumstantial experience" (TALABOT, 1967, p. 14). Other artists allowed themselves to be "inspired by the «Cuban climate»", such as Corneille and Peverelli (TALABOT, 1967, p. 14). The author considers both attitudes justifiable and respectable, but in the article he highlights the works that welcomed the Cuban experience.

The Cuban experience had a great impact for some of the participating artists. While the *Salón de Mayo* was reported in France (and possibly other European countries), in Portugal there were echoes of silence, as the country was under dictatorship.

The obliteration of the *Salón de Mayo* and Portuguese participation in the written press

Although the *Salón de Mayo* in Havana had an impact on European artistic practices, and the Portuguese artists René Bertholo and Lourdes Castro gained visibility at the time in the national

and foreign artistic contexts, no records of the event were found in the Portuguese written press, which, at the time, dedicated relevant space to culture¹⁵. The main magazines and newspapers dedicated to culture and art in Portugal – *Colóquio/ Artes e Letras*, *O Tempo e o Modo*, *Seara Nova* and *Vértice* – had no report, article or reference to the *Salón de Mayo*, the collective painting *Cuba Colectiva* or any other aspect related to the event. The newspaper *Avante!*, PCP's clandestine publication, also had no content on the event.

In 1967, censorship of the press was fierce in Portugal. The state censor system, uninterrupted during the forty-eight years of fascist dictatorship, was the target of different reforms and decrees. Since 1962, per the Decree-Law No. 44278 stipulating the Judicial Statute, media offenses were tried in plenary courts and, in October of that same year, Salazar reaffirmed¹⁶ that "the censorship services depend solely on the Presidency of the Council and do not take orders from any other department of the State (...)"¹⁷ (NUNES, 2016-2017, p. 201). It should be noted that the early sixties were marked by the beginning of the colonial war, the academic crisis and student struggles (1962), and an increase of anti-fascist resistance in various social sectors. Thus, the censor system became decisive for the regime and, in it, the control of the press.

Contents presented in the press were previously approved or refused, trimmed or adapted by a vast team of censors. Changes to published articles was so shameless that, in 1967, Mário Neves, deputy director of *Diário de Lisboa*, stated that it was "very difficult to obtain collaboration of good experts in Portuguese newspapers" because "most people who could do so were not willing to subject themselves to any restrictions, as is quite understandable. They have their ideas, they would be willing to present them, but in perfect correspondence with their thinking" (MOURA, F. P.; NEVES, M.; FERNANDES, R.; ZENHA, S., 1968, p. 47).

Nonetheless, the existence of a state censor system did not prevent transgressive and progressive ideas, events and opinions from circulating in the written press, even the non-clandestine press. Some newspapers and magazines enjoyed a certain tolerance and independence due to various factors. In the artistic context, this was the case of the magazine *Colóquio/ Artes e Letras*¹⁸, a magazine specialized in the visual arts, backed by the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation. Thus, as Margarida Brito Alves notes, it was "possible to publish articles authored by collaborators who were prohibited from signing in public editions – as occurred with José-Augusto França between 1965 and 1966" (ALVES, 2008, p. 365).

15 The following publications were consulted, from between July and August 1967: 'Diário de Lisboa', 'Vértice', 'Colóquio/ Artes e Letras', 'Seara Nova', 'O Tempo e o Modo' and 'Avante!'.

16 The system of censorship was directly dependent upon the head of government since 1944, as per Decree-Law No. 33 545, February 23, 1944.

17 Order of the President of the Council of Ministers of 20 October.

18 Predecessor of the magazine *Colóquio/Artes*, whose publication began in 1971.

In terms of artistic production in Portugal, the sixties are considered a turning point (ESQUÍVEL, 2008, p. 339). A turning point also in terms of art criticism, which began to organize itself in a more concerted way during the second half of the decade. An example is the I Encontro de Críticos de Arte Portugueses [First Meeting of Portuguese Art Critics] in 1967 and the restructuring of the Portuguese section of the Associação Internacional de Críticos de Arte [AICA; International Association of Art Critics] in 1969. In turn, as indicated by Patrícia Esquível, "the attitude of the press also tends to contribute to the critic's appreciation and professionalization" (ESQUÍVEL, 2008, p. 339). In fact, Rui Mário Gonçalves, José-Augusto França, Fernando Pernes, Rocha de Sousa and Francisco Bronze, among others, were regularly invited to collaborate in both specialty publications – such as *Jornal de Letras e Artes*¹⁹ and *Colóquio/ Artes e Letras* – and in general publications – such as the newspapers *Diário de Lisboa* and *A Capital*. In 1967, there are several articles signed by these authors.

Thus far, it hasn't been possible to ascertain whether the *Salón de Mayo* and the Portuguese participation were erased from the Portuguese written press by imposition of the censorship. However, this is likely considering the context of the event and its geo-political significance.

Nonetheless, the aforementioned art critics often reported on contemporary artistic activity abroad, and followed the careers of Lourdes Castro and René Bertholo quite closely. For example, in the three volumes of the magazine *Colóquio/Artes e Letras*, published between June and December 1967, both authors are mentioned. In the June issue, in an article about the I Encontro de Críticos de Arte Portugueses, Rui Mário Gonçalves mentions a survey about the most significant artists of Portuguese art. Among the most voted names were Lourdes Castro and René Bertholo (Gonçalves, 1967, p. 16). In the following issue, in October, Francisco Bronze classifies the exhibition *Seis Pintores Portugueses de Paris* [Six Portuguese painters from Paris], at the Buchholz Gallery, in October 1966 – with works by René Bertholo, Manuel Cargaleiro, Lourdes Castro, Eduardo Luis, José Escada and Jorge Martins –, as one of the most important events of Portuguese art galleries (BRONZEa, 1967, p. 38). In December, José-Augusto França, referring to the *San Marino Biennale*, reports that Lourdes Castro was one of the artists selected "by an international committee that acts in unison", a fact with "a cultural significance that another Biennale could not confer" (FRANÇA, 1967, p. 32). René Bertholo was also mentioned in this issue, by Francisco Bronze, in an article that begins by referring to "a generation of artists who were forced to emigrate to defend their dream of creation (...)" (BRONZE, 1967, p. 41).

Lourdes Castro and René Bertholo were part of the group of Portuguese artists residing in

19 The publication of *Jornal de Letras e Artes* was interrupted between November 1966 and December 1967, and was therefore not included in this research.

France since 1958. The main promoters of KWY magazine, they were associated with the "paradigm and myth of the migratory wave of the generation linked to the new-figuration (...)" (DIAS, 2008, p. 263). In Portugal, they had been quite active in the artistic panorama, making them "emerging names of reference" (DIAS, 2008, p. 264). In the second half of the sixties, they were involved in avant-guard problematics in Paris, where they settled. After a phase dedicated to abstract experiences, Bertholo manifested in the early sixties "this experimentation of gesture and matter, researching figurative possibilities in their own transformation" (DIAS, 2008, p. 287), reaching "a new-figuration by a kind of «dripping» of previously conceived figures (...)" (DIAS, 2008, p. 288). In 1966, René Bertholo's artistic practice took a turn. He interrupted his painting and began a period dedicated to the creation of objects called 'reduced models'. Bertholo would only return to painting in 1975, although painting always remained present in his objecthood.

Lourdes Castro also went through an abstract period, where gestuality stood out in her paintings. In Paris, in a rapprochement with *nouveau réalisme*, the artist produced works/boxes based on consumed objects with accumulated marks of their past use. In this phase, Lourdes Castro began to reveal interest in the plastic potential of the shadows and contours of various models, which gained prominence in her artistic production in 1963. In 1967, the year she travelled to Cuba, Lourdes Castro was still involved with the problem of shadow-contours, which she explored in painting but also in acrylic glass.

Portuguese art critics were closely following the path of the two artists, as well as the proposals of aesthetic formulation around new figurations and of the Paris school. Hence, they very likely knew about the participation of Castro, Bertholo and French artists in the *Salón de Mayo*, but by either self-censorship or imposed censorship this knowledge did not transfer onto the publications where they collaborated. However, in 1971, in the catalogue of the exhibition *10 Ans d'Art Portugais a Paris 1960-1970* [10 years of Portuguese Art in Paris 1960-1970], organized by the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation in Paris at the Centre Culturel Portugais [Portuguese Cultural Centre], the biographies of René Bertholo and Lourdes Castro also had no mention of their participation in the *Salón de Mayo*.

The celebration of the Portuguese revolution: the Festival of culture in the Mercado do Povo

In 1974, the Cuban experience was included in the history of Portuguese art, albeit timidly. The Portuguese revolution of 25 April 1974 fostered a moment of euphoria extending to various sectors of society. In the arts, several artists were strongly committed to discussing forms of social

intervention of art (PRATAS CRUZEIRO, 2021). The revolutionary period was marked by artistic projects carried out in the public space, but also by a desire to reflect on the cultural policies under construction. From this desire arose some structures of artistic self-organization, such as Movimento Democrático de Artistas Plásticos [MDAP; Democratic Movement of Visual Artists], Frente de Acção Popular de Artistas [FAPAP; Popular Action Front of Visual Artists], Movimento Unitário dos Trabalhadores Intelectuais para a Defesa da Revolução [MUTI; United Movement of Intellectual Workers for the Defence of the Revolution], Frente de Artistas Populares, Intelectuais Revolucionários [FAPIR; Front of Popular Artists and Revolutionary Intellectuals] or Colectivo de Trabalhadores da Actividade Cinematográfica [Collective of Cinematographic Workers], among others.

The main objective of these structures was to contribute in an organized way to the new cultural policy (PRATAS CRUZEIRO, 2021), since they considered that "the only correct cultural policy is one proposed by the artists and critics themselves" (GONÇALVES, 1980, p. 64).

Among the aforementioned structures, MDAP was one of the most active. Made up of visual artists²⁰, members of SNBA²¹, this movement had the purpose of intervening "more generally toward cultural democratization" (GONÇALVES, 1974, p. 38). Therefore, in addition to artistic actions in the public space, the drafting of communiqués with proposals for the cultural sector, the dynamization of working groups, and collective artistic initiatives (Goncalves, 1974, P.38-42), MDAP established a direct dialogue with the first democratic governments of the revolutionary period.

In this context, MDAP and MFA began to collaborate. The first contact took place on the Day of Solidarity with MFA, organized by MDAP (CORREIA, Ramiro; GOMES, Varela, 1984, p. 145).

This initiative, held on 10 June 1974, at Mercado do Povo [People's Market], in Lisbon, arose from the movement's desire to celebrate the revolution, and simultaneously demonstrate its intention to integrate the ongoing process of cultural democratization. According to the artist António Mendes, the idea appeared "on May 1st, in the street, when a group of painters, recalling

20 The MDAP was constituted, among others, by the artists Ana Vieira, António Palolo, Alice Jorge, A. Mendes, Armando Alves, Artur Rosa, Clara Menéres, Eduardo Nery, Eurico Gonçalves, Espiga Pinto, Fátima Vaz, Fernando Conduto, Guilherme Parente, Hélder Baptista, Helena Almeida, Henrique Manuel, Henrique Ruivo, João Abel Manta, João Nascimento, João Cutileiro, J. Moniz Pereira, Joaquim Rodrigo, Jorge Martins, Jorge Vieira, José Aurélio, José Rodrigues, J. Brito, Júlio Pereira, Júlio Pomar, Justino Alves, Kukas, Lima de Freitas, Lima Carvalho, Luís Dourdil, Manuel Baptista, M. A. Dias, Menez, Nikias Skapinakis, Quintino Sebastião, René Bertholo, Rogério Ribeiro, Sá Nogueira, Romualdo, Sérgio Pombo, T. Magalhães, Virgílio Domingues, Marcelino Vespeira, João Vieira, Helena Lopes, David Evans and João Hogan (COUCEIRO, 2004, p. 109).

21 On 27 June 1974, a plenary meeting decided that members of the MDAP should be members of the SNBA. The same meeting also approved the movement's structure, which from then on would have several working groups (GONÇALVES, 1974, p. 40).

their recent experience in Cuba, suggested they paint the walls of Técnico [the Engineering School]" (SOUSA, 1974, p. 45). The idea would then gain structure, since, according to the same artist, "then came the organizing stage... and when we realized (at least when I realized) it was already far from the initial idea. And I, who had joined a celebration, out of pure enjoyment, found myself embarked on a very serious «tribute»..." (SOUSA, 1974, p. 45).

The program included different interventions from the areas of music, visual arts and theatre²² and with the participation of hundreds of artists. The initiative rehearsed "a set of actions (...) that proposed a new relationship between art and the public" (VESPEIRA DE ALMEIDA, 2009, p. 113). This proximity occurred in several moments of painting, music and theatre, and these contributed substantially to an atmosphere of celebration and "great communal joy" (GONÇALVES, 1974, p.40) (Figure 4).



Figure 4 – Day of solidarity with MFA, June 10, 1974. Available at: <https://arquivos.rtp.pt/conteudos/inqueritopara-um-museu-de-arte-contemporanea-1-epainel-da-liberdade/> Accessed: 14 jan. 2022

²² Musical participation included the Coro da Juventude Musical Portuguesa [Portuguese Musical Youth Choir], do Coro da Academia de Amadores de Música [Choir of the Academy of Music Amateurs], do Grupo de Música Contemporânea [Contemporary Music Group], the pianist Maria João Pires, a jazz sextet with elements from Hot Club, and Banda da Armada [the Navy Band]. Participation from the field of theater included the groups A Comuna, Teatro de Rua, Grupo Teatral do Campolide Atlético Clube and Teatro de Marionetas Francisco Esteves (VESPEIRA DE ALMEIDA, 2009, p. 112).

In addition to contact with the popular masses, during the event there was collaboration among artists that, in effect, embodied the political purpose MDAP had enunciated after the revolution. Although there were previous examples of collective work in the country, namely by the surrealists, this now took on new contours, because "the emphasis was placed on the collective character of the action (...)" (VESPEIRA DE ALMEIDA, 2009, p. 113).

Although the event had a symbolic importance – recognized at the time –, there was a controversial moment that, in a way, interrupted the festive atmosphere. The event was being broadcast live on national public television (RTP), but the broadcast was interrupted by order of the government during the performance by the theatre group A Comuna. The reason for the interruption was that the theatre company was caricaturing some individuals linked to the dictatorship²³. According to Rui Mário Gonçalves, the interruption provoked "a lively revolt among those who, in the Mercado da Primavera [Spring Market] and in their homes, were interested in following the celebration's events" (GONÇALVES, 1974, p. 40). Some reacted during the event, such as Júlio Pomar, an artist who at that moment was participating in the collective painting *48 Artistas, 48 Anos de Fascismo* and that "took some brushes, tied them to the painting he had made (...) and painted on the panel «Censorship exists»"²⁴ (VESPEIRA DE ALMEIDA, 2009, p. 112).

The initiative organized by MDAP marked a "new way of using urban space, not only according to partisan values, but also recreational values" (Goncalves, 2004, p. 110), which can be understood as a "very rich creative *situation*" of "experimenting *democracy live*" (CAEIRO, 2014, p. 116-117).

48 Artistas, 48 Anos de Fascismo: the collective painting that recovers the Cuban experience

In Portuguese art history, the most outstanding activity regarding the Day of Solidarity with MFA was the collective painting entitled *48 Artistas, 48 Anos de Fascismo*. The painting of this panel marked the beginning of the initiative (VESPEIRA DE ALMEIDA, 2009, p. 112), conceived as a tribute to 25 April, "Liberation Day" (GONÇALVES, 1974, p. 41). Its structure (4.5 by 24 meters) was divided into 48 segments²⁵, which were randomly attributed to the participating visual

23 The caricatured characters were Américo Tomás, Marcelo Caetano and cardinal Cerejeira.

24 According to Rodrigo de Freitas, one of the coordinators of the CODICE's visual arts sector (VESPEIRA DE ALMEIDA, 2009, p. 112; GONÇALVES, 2004, p. 111).

25 With three rows of quadrangular spaces, each row had 16 squares.

CRUZEIRO, Cristina Pratas. "The coincidence of the revolutionary poetic invention with the revolutionary political invention": the cases of the pieces *Cuba Colectiva* and *48 Artists, 48 Years of Fascism*.

artists²⁶, except for the first grid that was attributed to Teresa Dias Coelho, a child at the time, in honour of her father, José Dias Coelho, a visual artist and PCP militant, who was murdered by the Portuguese political police on 19 December 1961 (Figure 5).



Figure 5 – Collective painting *48 Artistas, 48 Anos de Facismo*, created on 10 June 1974, Lisbon (left and right part of the panel). GONÇALVES, Eurico. Movimento Democrático de Artistas Plásticos: A intervenção necessária. **Flama**, nr. 1378, p. 38-42, 1974.

26 According to Eurico Goncalves, the painting counted on the participation of (from top to bottom): Teresa Dias Coelho, Sá Nogueira, João Abel Manta, Júlio Pereira, Henrique Manuel, Palolo, Artur Rosa, Ângelo de Sousa, Nuno Sampaio, Lima de Carvalho, Teresa Magalhães, Guilherme Parente, Fátima Vaz, Manuel Pires, René Bertholo, João Vieira; Jorge Martins, Querubim Lapa, Manuel Baptista, Ana Vieira, Charrua, Helena Almeida, Costa Pinheiro, Jorge Pinheiro, Júlio Pomar, David Evans, Alice Jorge, Nadal, Fernando de Azevedo, Marcelino Vespeira, Rogério Ribeiro, José Escada; Victor Palla, Tomás Mateus, António Domingues, Menez, António Sena, Justino Alves, Eurico, Sérgio Pombo, Moniz Pereira, Nikias Skapinakis, Vitor Fortes, Jorge Vieira, Nery, Maria Velez, António Mendes, and Carlos Calvet (GONÇALVES, 1974, p. 39).

The aspects that garnered greater interest were related to the collective painting's composition and aesthetic. Art historian José-Augusto França wrote that the panel corresponded to "personal formulas, already tried or improvised, allusive or explosive (...) a very irregular work, where the abstract and conceptual were joined by an ancient *imagerie*, resurrecting the neo-realism of 1945" (FRANÇA, 2000, p. 63). Ernesto de Sousa, a multidisciplinary artist, with prolific activity in art dissemination, art criticism, essays and curatorship, stated that "the «work» has qualities and inevitable limits: a conventional canvas with no space of its own, which is not (nor belongs) to any architecture, therefore functionally absurd beyond its ephemeral and evident celebratory character (...)" (SOUSA, 1974, p. 46). Art critic Rui Mário Gonçalves was less blunt in his disapproval of the experience, stating that:

The panel was very divided. But, as a whole, the strength of modern art's fundamental options was verifiable, building a language systematized by abstractionism and new figuration; the primacy of the support, the timbric chromaticism, the sign-figure (GONÇAVES, 2004, p. 110-111).

Eurico Gonçalves, an artist who participated in the experience, described it in greater detail, highlighting from the outset the fact that artists paint "according to the laws of chance", without any previous scheme or guidelines other than those of the imagination (GONÇALVES, 1974, p. 41). He highlighted the "atmosphere of conviviality and celebration", which he indicated as one of the organization's aims, so that "by contagion, people would express themselves freely and reveal themselves through what they create (...)" (GONÇALVES, 1974, p. 41). Regarding the content of the painting, this artist highlighted, above all, the use of the written word, used by several participating artists as an expressive mechanism.

The aspect of greater innovation and originality in the national context was very little mentioned and reflected upon at the time, namely the very performativity of the action, the atmosphere of "celebration and the contagious power of creativity, which led the children present to quickly paint a tower of bricks, soon followed by adults filling a neighbouring wall with numerous inscriptions" (GONÇALVES, 2004, p. 110). Even Ernesto de Sousa, who was associated with the new dynamics in Portuguese artistic performance, did not value this aspect. Although he considered that "passing into action was a valiant and highly sympathetic feat", he also referred that "if the artists give themselves in a performance, which is nice, the distance between the stage and the audience does not decrease for this reason. They made puppets-for-the-people and in the sight of the people" (SOUSA 1974, p. 47).

Seldom mentioned at the time was that the idea that this collective painting may have originated from knowledge some participants had of the experience in Cuba. At the time, Rui Mário Gonçalves referred to this relationship saying that the Portuguese panel "was no worse than another made in Cuba and that was disseminated internationally" (GONÇALVES, 2004, p. 111). However, apart from this statement and the aforementioned testimony of the artist António Mendes, there was no reflection on the influence of the Cuban experience. Ironically, forty-eight years after the execution of the collective painting, this aspect still lacks analysis by Portuguese art historiography²⁷.

The procedural and formal similarities between the two collective paintings are evident, as is the fact that the Cuban experience was known in Portugal. Echoes of the Cuban experience most likely reached Portugal through the artists who resided in France, in particular the participants René Bertholo and Lourdes Castro. In fact, Bertholo participated in the collective painting *48 Artistas, 48 Anos de Fascismo*, occupying square 15, in the upper right corner of the panel's first row. His composition is marked by the new figuration, with the presence of dispersed signs and objects. The artist also resorted to textual discourse, inscribing some words and phrases, among which "Viva O 25 de Abril" [Long live 25 April].

The specific role René Bertholo or Lourdes Castro played in the organization of the Day of Solidarity or the collective painting is unknown. Neither belonged to MDAP's governing bodies, although Bertholo was part of the movement. Nevertheless, the contribution of these artists would have been fundamental to impart the lived experience. And it is precisely this experience, similar in its festive and politicized environment, that stands out from the two paintings.

The collective desire emanating from the execution of this panel was embryonic in Portugal in terms of adopting that basis for interventions in the public space, and this was the participating artists' greatest contribution. Precisely because it was considered "meaningful, an unrepeatable moment" (GONÇALVES, 2004, p.111), the panel was requested by the Venice Biennale, which "reserved a place in the main pavilion" (GONÇALVES, 2004, p.111), which did not eventually happen. In 1981, a fire at Galeria de Arte Moderna [Modern Art Gallery], where the collective painting was located, led to its disappearance.

27 In the recent bibliography, a very brief reference, with no development, was found in Couceiro (2004, p. 22). Vespeira de Almeida (2009, p. 113) mentioned "the idea of collective painting came from Vespeira (...)". Marcelino Vespeira, artist and member of MDAP, may have thus proposed the realization of the painting based on his knowledge of the Cuban experience. However, this information could not be confirmed.

Conclusion

The historical intersection of the paintings *Cuba Colectiva* and *48 Artistas*, *48 Anos de Fascismo* emerges from the evident influence the Cuban experience had upon the Portuguese experience. The two events occurred seven years apart, during which time there was a radical change in the political and social context in Portugal. While in 1967 Portugal lived in dictatorship, in 1974 the revolution was being celebrated.

The *Salón de Mayo* in Havana and the execution of the painting *Cuba Colectiva*, in which two of the main Portuguese artists at the time participated, was not disseminated through the written press in Portugal, even the more progressive press. The official censorship imposed in the country determined this obliteration, either by determination of the regime or by self-censorship of the most active art critics at the time, who knew beforehand that hardly any reference to the Cuban revolution would pass the censorial sieve.

The political and social context was diametrically different when the collective painting *48 Artistas*, *48 Anos de Fascismo* was performed in 1974. As mentioned, not only was the national political situation favourable to a relationship between the Cuban revolution and the Portuguese revolution, but Portugal became an important pole internationally in the context of the Cold War²⁸, particularly for intellectuals who were part of the anti-imperialist movement. However, the same art critics who in 1967 represented the most progressive sectors remained silent about the relationship between the two experiences. In fact, although this period was marked by politicization of the citizenry, an aim also involving the arts (PRATAS CRUZEIRO, 2021), there was an art criticism circuit that remained on the side-lines to some extent. This is evident by analysing the issues of *Colóquio/Artes*, where critical discourse remained mostly associated with the exercise of painting in its visual and formal components. Even the most radical performativity that emerged from artists linked to painting – like the ACRE Group²⁹, which carried out several performative actions of political intervention – was little reflected upon as such³⁰. That may be why *48 Artistas*, *48 Anos de Fascismo* was not analysed as an action, that is, as a performative practice integrated within an initiative marking the arts sector's support of the revolution. If this had occurred, the realization would have been included in a broader framework, where the political performativity of the arts was important in that period's global context. In such a framework, attention would be given to the fact that participating artists had recovered the experience of *Cuba Colectiva*, given its symbolic

28 Particularly until November 25, 1975.

29 Founded in 1974 by artists Lima Carvalho, Clara Meneres and Alfredo Queiróz Ribeiro (who died 1974) and active until 1977.

30 Regarding the performativity of the ACRE group, see: CARVALHO (2011); ROSA DIAS (2014); SABINO (2016).

significance in political terms for the struggle against imperialism.

Therefore, it is important to resume the event's history, adding this layer of complexity. As one of the most important cultural events in the period immediately after the revolution of 25 April 1974, the Day of Solidarity with MFA and its initiatives gave rise to a new way of thinking about artistic production and fruition³¹. Although art criticism has focused particularly on analysing and thinking about the aesthetic characteristics of that collective painting, its main artistic contribution did not reside there. Rather, it resided in the attempt to mobilize artists to discuss the role of culture and art in a revolutionary context. And this is exactly where the poetic and political significance of this experience lies, as previously with the Cuban experience.

Reference Works

ALVES, Margarida Brito Alves. A revista *Colóquio/Artes*. In: ACCIAIOULI, M.; LEAL, J.C.; MAIA, H.M. *Arte & Poder*. Lisboa: IHA. p. 363-369, 2008.

BARREIRO LÓPEZ, Paula. Collectivization, participation and dissidence on the transatlantic axis during the Cold War: Cultural Guerrilla for destabilizing the balance of power in the 1960s. *Culture & History Digital Journal*, Espanha: CSIC, nº 4, p. 1-15, 2015. Disponível em: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282462217_Collectivization_participation_and_dissidence_on_the_transatlantic_axis_during_the_Cold_War_Cultural_Guerrilla_for_destabilizing_the_balance_of_power_in_the_1960s. Acesso em: 03 dez.2021.

BATISTA, Yaniber E. Acosta. Cuba y la cultura. Primera etapa del proyecto revolucionario internacional: el Salón de Mayo y el Congreso Cultural de la Habana. 2013. Dissertação (Máster Universitario em Estudios Avanzados en Historia del Arte) - Universidad de Salamanca, Salamanca, 2013.

BONDIL, Nathalie. *Cuba Art et Histoire de 1968 à nos jours*. Montréal: Musée des beaux-arts de Montréal. 2008.

BRONZE, Francisco. Exposições de Arte. *Colóquio – Revista de Artes e Letras*, nº. 46, p. 41-47, dez. 1967.

BRONZE, Francisco. O Salão de Verão na S.N.B.A. *Colóquio – Revista de Artes e Letras*, nº 45, p. 36-42, out. 1967.

BUENO, Salvador. Salón de Mayo. Escritores y artistas invitados. *Bohemia*, La Habana, 8 set. 1967. Disponível em: <https://rialt.org/salvador-bueno-salon-de-mayo-escritores-y-artistas->

31 In this regard, see PRATAS CRUZEIRO (2021).

[invitados/](#). Acesso em: 10 mar. 2021.

CAEIRO, Mário. *Arte na Cidade: História Contemporânea*. Lisboa: Círculo de Leitores, 2014.

CERVELLÓ, Josep Sánchez. Las Fuerzas Armadas durante la revolución portuguesa: autonomía y reorganización (1974-1976). In: TORRE GOMEZ, H. de la *Fuerzas Armadas y poder político en siglo XX de Portugal y Españ*. Merida: Centro Asociado Uned Merida, p. 243-273, 1996.

CORREIA, Ramiro; GOMES, Varela. *Livro Branco da 5ª Divisão 1974-75*. Lisboa: Ler Editora, 1984.

COUCEIRO, Gonçalo. *Artes e Revolução 1974-1979*. Lisboa: Livros Horizonte, 2004.

DIAS, Fernando Rosa. *A Nova-Figuração nas artes plásticas em Portugal (1958-1975)*. Volume 1: Parte I-I, 2008. Tese (Doutoramento em Ciências e Teorias da Arte) - Universidade de Lisboa, 2008.

ESQUÍVEL, Patrícia. Anos 60, anos de viragem: o novo poder da crítica. In: ACCIAIOULI, M.; LEAL, J.C.; MAIA, H.M. *Arte & Poder*. Lisboa: IHA. p. 333-344, 2008.

LOFF, Manuel. "O nosso século é fascista!" *O mundo visto por Salazar e Franco (1936-1945)*. Porto: Campo das Letras, 2008.

FERREIRA GOMES, Nancy Elena; COSTA LEITE, Isabel. Portugal no período 1974-1978: a influência Cubana e a América Latina como nova orientação na política externa portuguesa. *Revista Electrónica Iberoamericana*. Madrid: Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, Vol. 11, nº 2, p. 1-13, 2017. Disponível em: https://repositorio.ual.pt/bitstream/11144/3510/2/REIB_11_02_Art2.pdf. Acesso em: 02 jan. 2022.

FRANÇA, José-Augusto. A 6ª Bienal de San Marino. *Colóquio – Revista de Artes e Letras*, nº 46, p. 30-37, dez. 1967.

FRANÇA, José-Augusto. *A Arte e a Sociedade Portuguesa no Século XX (1910-2000)*. 4ª Ed. Lisboa: Livros Horizonte, 2000.

FUNDAÇÃO CALOUSTE GULBENKIAN. *Os Anos Quarenta na Arte Portuguesa*. Vol. 1, Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, p. 82-85, 1982.

GODOY, Lilian Llanes. *Salón de Mayo de París en La Habana, julio de 1967*. Cuba: ARTECUBANO Ediciones, 2011.

GONÇALVES, Eurico. Movimento Democrático de Artistas Plásticos: A intervenção necessária. *Flama*, nº 1378, p. 38-42, 1974.

GONÇALVES, Rui Mário Gonçalves. O Primeiro Encontro de Críticos de Arte Portugueses. *Colóquio – Revista de Artes e Letras*, nº. 44, p. 12-17, jun. 1967.

GONÇALVES, Rui Mário. Carta de Lisboa. *Colóquio/Artes*, nº 47, p. 64, 1980.

GONÇALVES, Rui Mário. *Vontade de mudança: Cinco décadas de artes plásticas*. Lisboa:

Editorial Caminho, 2004.

GUANCHE, Julio César. El camino de las definiciones. Los intelectuales y la política en Cuba, 1959-1961. *Temas*, nº 45, p. 106-113, 2006.

JOUFFROY, Alain. Che si. *Opus International*, nº 3, Paris, p. 21-32, Out. 1967.

JOUFFROY, Alain. La gran espiral. In: GODOY, Lillian Llanes. *Salón de Mayo de París en La Habana, julio de 1967*. Cuba: ARTECUBANO Ediciones, p. 112-114, 2011. Disponível em: <https://rialta.org/alain-jouffroy-la-gran-espiral/>. Acesso em: 10 mar. 2021.

DE MOURA, Francisco Pereira et al. *O estatuto da Imprensa. Debate*. Lisboa: Prelo Editora, 1968.

NOGUEIRA, Cristina Alexandra Marques. *De militantes a clandestinos: práticas e processos de formação na clandestinidade comunista (1940/1974)*. 2009. Tese (Doutoramento em Ciências da Educação) - Universidade do Porto, 2009.

NUNES, Henrique Barreto. "Estes Escritores Morreram". A Censura aos Livros e à Leitura no Estado Novo. *Boletim Cultural de Vila Nova de Famalicão*, nº 10-11, p. 196-215, 2016-2017.

PALAZUELOS, Raúl. Varios participantes del Salón de Mayo opinan. *La Gaceta de Cuba*, Ano 6, nº 60, p. 6-7, Jul-Ago, 1967. Disponível em: <https://rialta.org/raul-palazuelos-varios-participantes-del-salon-de-mayo-opinan/>. Acesso em: 23 Maio 2021.

PORTUGAL [Constituição (1976)] *Constituição da República Portuguesa de 1976*. Lisboa: Assembleia da República Portuguesa, [2005] Disponível em:

<https://www.parlamento.pt/Legislacao/Paginas/ConstituicaoRepublicaPortuguesa.aspx>. Acesso em: 8 abr. 2021.

PRATAS CRUZEIRO, Cristina. Art with Revolution! Political mobilization in artistic practices between 1974 and 1977 in Portugal. *On the W@terfront*, nº 63(10), p. 3–35, 2021. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.1344/waterfront2021.63.10.01>. Acesso em: 13 jan. 2022.

ROA, Raúl. Palabras de apertura del Salón de Mayo. In: GRANMA. *Salón de Mayo, Pabellón Cuba, La Habana, 30 de julio de 1967*, Havana: Talleres de Granma, 1967. Disponível em: <https://rialta.org/raul-roa-palabras-de-apertura-del-salon-de-mayo/>. Acesso em: 23 Maio 2021.

ROMÁN, Enrique. Entrevista al pintor Jean Messagier. *GRANMA*, p. 5, 9 de ago., 1967. Disponível em: <https://rialta.org/enrique-roman-entrevista-al-pintor-jean-messagier/>. Acesso em: 10 mar. 2021.

RTP. Associação de Amizade Portugal Cuba. *Noticiário Nacional de Dezembro*, Portugal, 07 dez. 1974. Disponível em: <https://arquivos.rtp.pt/conteudos/associacao-de-amizade-portugal-cuba/>. Acesso em: 12 dez. 2021.

SCHÜTZ, Günter. Paris à Cuba, 1967: Le Salón de Mayo et la murale Cuba Colectiva. In:

BONDIL, Nathalie. *Cuba Art et Histoire de 1968 à nos jours*. França: Editions Hazan, p. 276-285, 2008.

CRUZEIRO, Cristina Pratas. "The coincidence of the revolutionary poetic invention with the revolutionary political invention": the cases of the pieces *Cuba Colectiva* and *48 Artists*, 48 Years of Fascism.

SOUSA, Ernesto de. O Mural do 10 de Junho ou a passagem ao acto. *Colóquio/ Artes*, nº 19, p. 44-47, 1974.

TALABOT, G. Gassiot. La Havane: Peinture et Révolution. *Opus International*, nº 3, Paris, p. 14-20, Out. 1967.

THAILANDIER, Yvon. Vista de avión. Historia del Salón de Mayo. *Revista del Granma*. p. 5-8, 15 Jul. 1967. Disponível em: <https://rialta.org/yvon-taillandier-historia-del-salon-de-mayo/>. Acesso em: 06 dez. 2021.

VESPEIRA DE ALMEIDA, Sónia. *Camponeses, Cultura e Revolução: Campanhas de Dinamização Cultural e Acção Cívica do M.F.A. (1974-1975)*. 1.^a Ed. Lisboa: Colibri, 2009.