

## **Critical analysis on the communicative process between children's magical realism literature and animation movies: conceptual primitivism aesthetic context for the referential problems on children's texts**

Márcio Danilo Mota Varela\*

**Resumo:** A discussão entre verdade e realidade tem trazido muita crítica em relação aos modelos desenvolvidos na sociedade. Além disso, a segregação dos aspectos culturais por meio da filosofia racionalista e dialéctica tem mudado inteiramente a compreensão da formação de conceitos. Devido a um mercado competitivo, chama-se a atenção para o facto de a literatura infantil e os textos do cinema não considerarem as crianças como os receptores das mensagens. Desta forma, tal questão se deve aos problemas referênciais que as crianças atravessam na sua idade intuitiva. Para um tal problema, requer-se, portanto, a aplicação de uma análise crítica do processo comunicacional entre literatura infantil mágica-realista e o cinema de animação. Em primeiro lugar, o realismo mágico deve ser considerado como conceptualmente diferente do realismo mimético comum. Em segundo lugar, o realismo mágico deve ser conectado conceptualmente com a idade intuitiva das crianças. Em terceiro lugar, o quadro comum de trabalho, tanto no cinema de animação como na literatura, deve corresponder ao conceito da *Mythological Hero's Journey* que pode ser usado como escala para comparar e descrever a evolução mítica das histórias. Como resultado, podemos indentificar, através do processo de conceptualização do primitivismo pragmático, o que é e o que não é direccionado para as crianças, enquanto principais receptoras dos textos literários e cinematográficos.

**Palavras-chave:** primitivismo, cognição, infância, cinema, literatura.

\* University of Santiago de Compostela (Universidade de Santiago de Compostela –USC). E-mail: mdmpub@hotmail.com  
marciodanilomota.varela@usc.es

After observing some children's mythic elements embodied in literature and cinema materials, the main purpose of this project was to describe the critical points affecting, almost exclusively, the sorts of conceptual references applied on these specific texts. As many know, the conceptualization process has been studied in different lights by contrasting philosophies and authors from: Plato to Aristotle, San Augustine to Tomas de Aquino, Descartes to Kant, Locke, Stuart Mill, Berkley, and William James.

Therefore, it becomes paramount to set up a specific philosophic study branch in order to guide the whole project towards the most suitable theories and methodologies, for the application of the Mythological Hero's Journey (M.H.J.) primitivist context for solving some specific conceptual problems found in children literature and cinematographic texts. Consequently, the M.H.J. primitivist context is going to be used to work not as metanarrative<sup>1</sup>, but rather as a framework that must be applicable to both extracting and analyzing the different contents seen in children's literature and animation movies.

For instance, children's conceptualization problems throughout textual material is claimed to be due to their insufficient referential experiences in terms of art. To understand what the aesthetical approach arts consists of, it is required that experiences be considered as the main sources of conceptualization embodied in a given text. As we take this prerequisite in comparison with literature and cinema, for example, much evidence of inadequacies of referential concepts arise.

Yet, their primarily function as artistic text should respond mostly for the production of sensation by the means of linguistics signs. By contrast, what in fact happens is the formation of misconception of what literature and art really are, especially, as the artistic material was to be intended for child receptors of the texts.

The referential problem of children in artistic texts, especially, literature and cinema has become of great interest in studies which deals with cultural production analyzes of both the textual registration and inscription of the subjects involved. In other words, in one hand the authors and their multiple grown-up conceptual references, and on the other readers, listeners with their local contextual references that must be taken in consideration as particular elements for constructing knowledge and individual identity.

In between authors and readers there is a big spatial-temporal gap which needs to be bridged by the best linguistic resources, for a reasonable communication and exchanging of experiences. For centuries the commonsense view about the nature of communication was that, articulated by Locke (1971: 262) «unless a man's words excite the same ideas in the hearer which makes them stand for in speaking he does not speak intelligibly». As we can see, Locke was thoroughly aware of the difficulties of achieving such a communication ideal, or guaranteed form of communication at least.

<sup>1</sup> In critical theory, and particularly postmodernism, a metanarrative (from meta-narrative, sometimes also known as a master- or grand narrative) is an abstract idea that is thought to be a comprehensive explanation of historical experience or knowledge. Therefore, for describing an abstraction and express universals truths, metanarratives is claimed to prophesy political hegemonies as well as to keep up the status quo of economic classes on which the lower class might accept passively such a condition.

However, it is known that such a **universal ideal** sought by Locke, does not resist to the skepticism of our postmodern society, which disbelieves in all that might seem out of the natural and particular relation with the ordinary subject. The problem is that once a proof is accepted as the standard of believability not only must we prove our claims, we must also prove our proofs, and so on, *ad infinitum*. This is what Lyotard was referring to as he claimed that the postmodern condition is one of incredulity toward metanarratives.

In what concerns exclusively children's texts among the intuitive age (4-8 year old), the response of what Locke once suggested cannot be applied at all. First, because of the children's inexperience; second, for the different ways of conceptualization that puts the author and readers apart. Consequently, the only way for different subjects to communicate to each other on this point, it must be made by including especial textual components, which shall belong to the children's intuitive conceptual cognition.

After getting at this point and on, we can really begin to justify our project for saying that the primitive cultural text, such as myths and all its subsets of aesthetical elements in which includes folklore, narration, dance, plastic arts, music, and so on, has been considered as the most important bridge between authors and children.

The natural attraction for the **popular**<sup>2</sup> is the essential condition for the creation of texts intended for children; because as many know, childhood building up history was not as full of enchantment as commonsense might think it was. In short, until up to the liberation and specific concernment of children's own nature and own world, lots of water had to run under the bridge.

Therefore, children's cultural text as just as the concept of childhood is a **modern idea** that needed to be adapted with many different cultural sources. So far, what has largely been used and accepted as belonging to children's own aspect of life, relies upon folklore and its entire primitivist heritage based on music, dance, jokes, parodies, guessing games, and all sorts of populist elements. To say that for children being included into the cultural scenario, it is not the same though saying that, this inclusion was made only for the sake of human rights or whatsoever which might be used to express condolences for a tragic past.

According to Phillipe Aries (1987), only after XIII century that a somewhat awareness initialization of childhood as a different stage from the adulthood began to be spread. During that time, the notion of children goes through two different levels; the first one is staked off by childhood representation into the religious context; second level, in its turn, the precursor model for a childhood representation in the art history were based either on the figure of Jesus Christ the baby, or Mary the virgin. The reason for this specific choice is directly related to maternity mystery as well as to Marian worship.

<sup>2</sup> The notions of popular, populism, and populist will be treated here according to Ben Agger (1992) as he says that popular culture and populism are two positive factors for the decanonization of Elitism. The specific notion of populist might be understood as all political orientations that go toward popular culture in order to give popular meaning to their arguments. Thus at this point the notion of populist can be either seen as positive or negative depending on the ideology applied for.

Thus, since very early children were led to work with their family or in the apprenticeship houses. The notion of family in its whole were not understood up to that time, namely, the familiar organization is also a historical construction which was taken out slowly until the monogamist version of family we have today. In short, the modeling of childhood in to a monogamist family is a notion that was created in a long run in history inside bourgeoisie class. Therefore, what all sociological studies claim for childhood and family as two interdependent social categories, is due to a historical social construction which had lots of populist influences in terms of art and politics of the time.

In fact, such insertion of popular values, beyond being just appropriate in terms of aesthetic, it also hides something else in the backstage of its framework; something that cannot be seen without using the lenses of criticism of our postmodern society. In other words, instead of being just funny and playful adaptation into children's cultural text, folklore along with the notion of what is popular, that is, what is made for the people and by the people themselves, must be seen also as lucrative segment of cultural production especially after the second World War, when many different media sources began to spring new concepts and formulate new identities worldwide.

Accordingly, classical literature books began to be adapted and readapted to different media and audiences. The story told once in the original book version may not be the same version seen in the films, for example. If there is something real in postmodern societies is that, nothing is for free, and nothing is true unless someone pays for it to be so. Therefore, the notion of culture has been disguised and transformed into the notion of profits and lucrative cultural products, as the whole Frankfurt School had proclaimed in its cultural studies.

For instance, to observe how the notion of Culture<sup>3</sup> has been put apart from its anthropological sense, one might see that all social and economical strategies for its appropriation depends very much on philosophical issues that affect all other branches of the social structures, including science and religion. Therefore, the understanding of Culture as well as of all its compounding elements goes through different approaches in humanity history. So, to define what it really is depends on the kind of notion for which it has been applied.

According to the anthropological notions of Culture, it can be seen at three different aspects; first, at the notion that Culture was developed based on food transformation; second, based on mourning rituals. The third, in its turn, might be seen at the notion of a complex language structure which has the capability of both to form and be formed by individuals in collectivity. Despite of the different anthropological approaches, Culture has for its development, it affirmed that they altogether instead of being divergent, they converge themselves into a simple and mutual organization of experiences.

<sup>3</sup> Culture here in capital letter to refer to all manifestations of humans' productions and results of their cognitive efforts towards nature and reality; integrating with this all possible contexts: social, political, artistic, linguistic, philosophical, familiar, ethical, etc.

As we take in particular the notion of Culture as language structure, one might see that it consists of in an essential extension of the being, promoted by the exclusively by their experiences. In short, whichever notion might be applied for Culture, there is always something connected and common to all of them, that is: **Experience**.

Yet, in the notion of Culture the importance of experience is affirmed, because language is claimed to be the most important factor of differentiation for the humankind as a cognitive being; its first sign of development was based primarily on the orality in which myths and ritual worked out as its first cultural Texts<sup>4</sup>. In other words, the essence of popular was vivid, because the concept of Culture was also integrated to roots of knowledge and developmental experiences as human beings.

Therefore, Culture might be understood as a construction of reality founded on natural references, that is, for being a construction of a second human living world, Culture, first of all, must demand for its creation a practical necessary, and secondly a psychological fulfillment demand. In other words, Culture in its very basic root, is a prime pragmatic conceptualization of nature which primitively respond for being thought and thing at the same time. In short, Culture for satisfying the mind and body all at once consists in a process rather than just a place where signs are invoked.

Getting at this point it just last to say that, the dynamic characteristic mentioned here, pushes Culture forward towards development. Accordingly, it consists also in a natural necessary of the cognitive being for their knowledge development.

As it is mentioned here, both the primitive notion of Culture as well as its physical and intellectual necessary altogether shall be seen as one large developmental process, very much like to the way ancient people used to deal with their symbolic text. Instead of being just entertainment, myths, rituals, astrology, and many other primitive texts were used for presenting physically **truths** based on **conceptual** element, which in terms of immediate contact, were considered to be as just concrete and tangible as any perceptual object.

In other words, it means that, for example, the existence of a simple stone was considered to be as just real and sacred as all gods were so. In short, there were no *absolutes*, no pre-determination ready-made to be perceived as existing in the outer world of objects; rather, their way of life was oriented to construction, based on **practical need** poetically expressed. In other words, myths as a textual tool of language were determined by the religious primitive context; all the narration episodes were **magical realistic**, because primitive people somehow really lived all what the metaphors used to saying; yet, their sacred narration were seen and understood as truth, because myths were capable to answer conceptually all they want to ask. In other words, concepts of reality were indissoluble from its perceptive part felt in their primitive routine.

According to Mircea Eliade (1974, 2000); Joseph Campbell (1973); Ernst Cassirer (1964, 1979); and Lévi-Strauss (1964) the primitive concept of both world and reality was understood as an encounter between two different world, the upper world (sky)

<sup>4</sup> Text in capital letter is used to show that it shall be understood as as space of registration of subjects experiences, and not as simple witten piece of matter.

and the sub world (hell). Therefore, everything that existed in their primitive world and reality had the participation of both worlds coalesced into only one. The unity of the telluric and the human aspect is explained not by abstract concepts, but instead, by concrete ones.

The starting point primitive people used for guiding them through the instability of nature, was due to their trust based on concrete concepts of experiences and felt as truth by their body. That is why rituals were so important at the time to make sure and to reaffirm what all the myths expressed about. In other words, the quality of **faith** and **trust** rather than being based in dogmatism, it was based on the real necessary of knowledge about which all questions were answered and pragmatically felt as real.

After explaining this point of concurrence of conceptions and perception in the primitive culture, the discussion keeps going on about how different the notions of culture and reality have undergone since the introduction of reason and rationality into the matter of what is true and wrong; what is conception and what is perception, along with all contrasting elements that reality might have as existing “elsewhere out there” rather than “here and right now.” Therefore, to begin with the explanation of how the primitive concrete conceptualization has been put apart from the regular notion of truth and reality, we must say that civilized philosophical traditions based primarily on the Greek influence of rationality was the first stake for it.

Ordinarily, for such a distinction of conceptual values in the Western society, it seems to have a starting point at which marked since the dichotomy between Plato’s and Aristotle’s understandings of reality. As many know, ideas and knowledge, for the former, were just a mere representation of ready-made concepts; and for being so existing somewhere in the intelligible world, which consequently corresponded only for the *a priori* part of the universal reality. By contrast, for the later, the universal reality was possible to be achieved from the particular to the universal using *a posteriori* deductive methods.

Therefore, as one can see both of them diverged in their specific approaches to the origins of knowledge of a *Universal* reality. As a result of this philosophical segregation, was the culmination of an entire theoretical misleading and domination of simple minds over the existence of Universals and Absolutes of a unique reality existing either in the mind or in the matter, but never both at once. In short objectivity and subjectivity were for a long time split up as two different identities which the only way to acquire knowledge was by the means of self-transcendence. Such a self-transcendence, in its turn, required the supreme participation of an abstract figure that was believed to help people transcend the ordinary world of ignorance by performing the “jumping act” (*Acto Saltatorio per se*). An absolute, in its turn, was a mental entity that corresponded to concepts as a result of an *abstraction act*. So, concepts were seen as immaterial and existing elsewhere.

Such conceptualization of reality based on either *a priori*, or *a posteriori* entities, Universals were thus the mainstreams of all philosophical approaches, ranging from classic Greek philosophy to Renaissance, which the latter tried uselessly to set

Philosophy and Arts free from the traditions of the former. It could have been perfect and successful though if they had promoted a more humble approach to diversity and particulars instead.

Ordinarily, after the frustrated philosophical intends of explaining reality and knowledge in Renaissance, the same sort of search for universals continued being applied on by modern thinkers, especially, by René Descartes (1596-1650) for his notion of Dualism. Such dualistic doctrine included Nicolas Malebranche, Leibniz, Blaise Pascal, and **Baruch Spinoza** as the most important thinkers whom developed their philosophical approach over the segregation of **mind** and **body**.

However, as the name of Spinoza is mentioned a closer attention must be paid, because he was the only metaphysic thinker responsible for introducing a whole new idea about the notion of reality with his concept of Monism. For Spinoza, nature was only one, and all the substances were made of one unique element that consisted of both *a priori* and *a posteriori* at the same time which both was mediated by the means of experience.

Spinoza, in his work about Ethics and Religious experiences, believed in the existence of a practical *conscious* which rather than previously already existing; it needed to be developed in a long run of the existence of the being. In other words, the existence of conscious for Spinoza affects respectively at the same time concepts and percepts, or rather spirit and body as the same entity. Therefore, Spinoza's monism concept lies out the first main principles to break out with the whole Greek tradition of universals and also to break out with the dualism of the substance of Descartes.

In accordance with Spinoza, William James (1842-1910) developed a deeper understanding of Experience for emerging consciousness and knowledge as both physical and mental recognizance. In other words, for putting together **Idea** and **Matter** as the same thing, William James manifested a pragmatic realization of the world based not in universals anymore, but in particulars. As a result of this indissoluble view about concept (idea) and matter (percept), William James instead of considering the existence of only one reality, multiple and pluralistic realities were possible existing altogether after his thinking. It seems that with this new approach of truth and reality, William James, along with Charles Sanders Peirce (1839-1914), have proclaimed a new approach to logic, which corresponded to a turning back to primitive concrete logic based on the construction of a sensitive logical reality esthetic<sup>5</sup>.

Differently from Spinoza, William James affirmed the possibility of existence of such a pluralistic universe, because Experiences, he said, are the only means for the realization of such realities. In other words, the monism concept of Spinoza continued existing for James, but not in the sense of substances as the metaphysic doctrine required for it to be true. For instance, what James did was to eliminate the notion of substance and

<sup>5</sup> The term esthetics is used here to show that ethic and esthetic were connected as the studies of good and bad. This idea initiated by Peirce in his studies about Aristotle, Kant and Hegel influenced William James as they held that, esthetics is the study of the ends governing all conduct which comes ahead of other normative studies. The sense of Aesthetic, in its turn, Peirce isolated to the artistic value of beauty only.

apply ahead the notion of **action** and **movement** by which experiences run through; consequently paths, circuits, vias, ways, connections, relation, all of this words mean the same thing to James, because they express the continuity and the movement of experience from one to another forming thus another experience repeatedly so on and so forth as time and space pass by.

Therefore, the William James pragmatic view of reality is more related to the natural realism of the primitive culture than the rational point applied throughout the whole history of substances, entities, universals. For saying this, pragmatism considers reality as a construction guided harmoniously by both the senses and ideas. In one word, concepts and percepts both at once are used for the construction of **Reality** (practical needs) and **Culture** (psychological and practical needs).

Nonetheless, it is very important to mention that as just primitive culture used to dealing with reality and culture like two interdependent parts of the same “magical” process, Pragmatism in its turn, also considers such values as truth. Accordingly, the term Magical or Magic consists itself in a particular way in which reality construction is claimed to be made through concepts in the primitive and pragmatic fashion.

To rescue the term **Magic** from the generalized and twisted rational philosophical misconceptions has demanded lots of concerned efforts to establish its primer and essential meaning as truth; Magic, for instance, for the whole evolutionist and progressionist philosophical thinkers was denied its value of truth, because **myths** and **magic** were considered as being permissive lies, so magic with low letter is to refer that for a long time in history the term was seen as modification and distortion of perceptual reality.

Thanks to the radical primitivism applied on the artistic Avant-Gard movement in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, a very important meaning showed up for the appearance of a new philosophical awareness of Magic, as well as for the appearance of a new artistic esthetic was found in dance, sculpture, and literature of that time.

The new era of conceptualism brought about a lot value of the term Magic as process of truth; furthermore, the whole new Era began to be understood as a conceptual hybridism, which wound up doing on that, pointed out by Camayd-Freixas (1988) as the *aesthetical primitivism*<sup>6</sup> which, since then, has been best known for its influence on the appearance of the **Magical Realism**.

In other words, this aesthetical primitivism found in the arts of the Avant-Gard movement has been best understood for changing some important concepts of representation, which started from a *Perceptual Realism* towards a *Conceptual Realism* (Camayd-Freixas, 1988); (Camacho 2006); (Goldwater, 1967); (Gombrich 2003); (Seymour Menton, 1999).

In the explanation about the separation and depreciation of the term Magic as well as of the whole conceptualization process, Camayd-Freixas (1988) points out that due to the evolutionist theories presented throughout the whole 19<sup>th</sup> century, which had also domi-

<sup>6</sup> As an example of that new aesthetic era which was influenced for the artistic vanguard movement we shall cite: Pablo Picasso, Rimbaud, Heri Rousseau e Apollinaire.



nated the concepts of both Arts and Philosophy, he affirms that the first contacts European civilization had with the primitive cultures were done by the means of objects of art, which were brought from the African people, Amerindians, and Polynesians. However, not much could be accepted as truth by the evolutionist researchers regarding the primitive objects. Instead, such objects were only conceived as a mere material of décor.

Ultimately, the artistic value of such objects was denied due to the naturalist view of that time, which did not understand those objects as having the capacity of a trustful representation of reality; that is, the nature of those objects did only prove to the evolutionist philosophers that the primitive people were both intellectually and biologically inferior in comparison with the European civilization.

The reason found for such a tremendous ‘Eurocentricism’ rested upon the same objects taken from the primitive art, which were seen by evolutionists that primitive cultures were incapable of seeing the natural reality just as the European people did. That kind of assurance was very common among anthropologists, such as Tylor and Lubbock whom were used to studying the primitive handcrafts as objects of study for the mental evolution analysis about the ancient civilization.

Despite that, the new approach and constant influence that such primitive objects caused in philosophical and political issues in Europe was strong enough to bring them to a higher status of value. Afterwards, such social phenomenon was known as a new era of conceptual hybridism which wound up doing on the aesthetical primitivism<sup>7</sup> which, since then, has been best known for its influence on the appearance of the Magical Realism

Consequently, the highest point achieved by the Magical Realism as a conceptual way of building up reality begins, effectively, only when the formal aspects of the artistic objects of the primitive cultures begin to be assimilated as expressive *truths*, which later on such a new understanding would affect its understanding about what we nowadays understand as **Contemporaneous Art**.

According to the Goldwater’s thought (1967) Picasso and Braque are examples of artists who were strongly inspired by the African’s primitive art; ordinarily they were the first ones to adapt primitive concepts of art to emphasize the new fashion of transcription and representation of the three-dimensional perspective of volume; Cubism, for example, appears itself as a concept of representation of reality under the influence of the primitive aesthetic, because the relationship of the modern primitivism in Europe with tribal arts was not a mere imitation of its pure plasticity, but instead, it meant a deep insight of conceiving format structures as well as interpreting of the subject by the modern artists who analyzed the tribal arts during that time.

Therefore, regarding the idea of a Realism understood from a conceptual point of view corresponds exactly to what gives value to both the primitive aesthetic and the Human Being’s desire as truth (Joseph Campbell, 1973; 2005); (Ernst Cassirer, 1953; 1963; 1979); (Paul-Ricoeur, 1999); (Mircea Eliade, 1961; 1974; 2000); (Lévi-Strauss,

<sup>7</sup> As an example of that new aesthetic era which was influenced for the artistic vanguard movement we shall cite: Pablo Picasso, Rimbaud, Heri Rousseau e Apollinaire.

1964); (Lévy-Bruhl, 1983; 1987); (Lovejoy & Boas, 1965); (Malinowski, 1974). Here, at this point, there is an important paradigm breakout, which deals with particular elements of a broader structure of the subject in terms of Feelings and Emotions. As a result of new paradigm, Magical Realism emerges from the darkness of “scientificism.” Hence, Magical Realism understood under this fashion, assumed its place as a kind of Realism, which is thoroughly built up by the primitive concepts of reality.

The term Magical Realism is a representation of a conflict. It consists itself of an **oxymoron** that is constituted by two different philosophical concepts, which conflict one another in order to generate a third brand-new concept without losing any characteristic of its part. Consequently, both parts integrate into a concept that combines **Magic plus Realism**.

This point of explanation is important to define in this project that no dialectical relation is admitted here for the generation of a new conception between two different ones. For saying this we refer to a kind of relation of concepts which deals basically with pragmatism in its very core. In other words, for being requested a pragmatic relation for the construction of concepts, so inevitably one shall accept the conceptualization process as a natural phenomenon, which pragmatically considers Idea and Matter as the same numeric thing: one. Notwithstanding, concept and percept are two interdependent elements of knowledge connected by their multiple kinds of relations (William James, 1997; 1975); (Eugene Taylor & Robert Wozniak, 1996).

Aside from the pragmatic considerations of knowledge and relation for the construction of reality in terms of particulars (Emotion, Feeling, Volitions, etc.), there is also a particular stress in the syntax of the term Magical Realism, which turns it into a special type of Realism, because in one hand we have **Magical** (Adjective), and on the other hand we have **Realism** (Noun).

Consequently, the comprehension of this grammatical structure is important to make sure that Magical Realism is formed by a non-mimetic perceptive realism, as the regular Realism is; instead in its core it demands a broad vision for its understanding, which is made through pragmatic conceptualization for the involvement of percept (as physical stimulus) plus concept (as a result of such stimulus). For this type of concept is assumed that once it is formed, it can become perceptive matter as long as they may cause sensorial presence in terms of physical sensations, e.g. dreams, memories, taste, etc.

Hence, the conception of Magic applied in the Magical Realism is not the conception used by the evolutionists who used to stressing the manipulation of the reality into impossible things; instead, the conception of Magic here is closely related to the conception of Cosmovision of the primitive culture, which conceived reality based on the intuitive power of its construction.

Basically, the interest in developing this research project came along with the urge of analyzing the symbolic mythic structures concerning the Mythological Hero's Journey (M.H.J.) grounded in the children's Magical Realism literature discourse intended for ages from four to eight years old. The reason for such a limitation in terms of age was due to the fact that the (M.H.J.) structure shall be both understood and compared to

the Intuitive Age of children's development as a cognitive tool capable of generating concepts for the education betterment. Along with it, the (M.H.J.) structure shall be used for the insertion of this specific age group into their proper way of construct their reality. And for saying reality we inevitably tend to refer to concepts as formed by the perceptive stimulus of their social context.

Thus, what basically this project has been intended for consists itself of some descriptions and evaluations, concerning the main structural<sup>8</sup> principles of both the Magical Literature and the (M.H.J.) from which children make use in their symbolic age for generating meaning along with their experiences. That is assumed to be made through both a realistic and mimetic physical environment, and through their especial aesthetic process they make use for processing information and acquire knowledge in their imaginary world.

By saying this, this research tries to advance in the understanding of the basic children's intuitive concept, comparatively, with the primitive esthetic of Art and Narration, which both (children's concept and primitive esthetic) have so much to do with one another as a mutual relation than the commonsense might think they could possibly do.

Undoubtedly, the primitive concepts of reality in the ancient primitive society were founded on certain aesthetical aspects based primarily on religious experiences, which necessarily called for the direct participation of Myths and Rituals for the settlement and foundation of their sacred reality. Ordinarily, children's Intuitive Age (4% y.o.) presents the same mythic process of which consists, as such in a natural cognitive process. Moreover, this mythic process can be compared to the Intuitive Age because of its large manifestation found according to Joseph Campbell (2005) in all cultures; besides, its characteristics of expression are tacitly manifested through the layer of narratives, which used to combine realism with Magic; by the same token, such narratives are due to work as a logical procedure of organization of experiences.

In other words, it means that children make natural usage of the symbolic cognitive patterns of narratives just as the primitive cultures used to for validating and giving sense to their experiences (Arthur Applebee, 1989); (Marisa Bortolussi (1987); (Cervera 1991); (Teresa Colomer, 1999); (Juan Delval, 1975). Thus, the cognitive patterns of narrative we are referring to, correspond basically to Animism, Artificialism, and Finalism (Piaget, 1976; 1984). Aside from that, another reasonable point about the similarity of the mythic narrative structures observed existing between **primitivism** and **childhood** in their intuitive age is due to the kind of focus that both of them regularly spend on specific patterns of actions towards the construction of their cultural context.

<sup>8</sup> This project assumes the importance of structures principles; however, it is not assumed or affirmed here Structuralism as a dialectical prerequisite of validation of the theory being presented. Therefore, is used the term "structure" only to show the logical relation between common elements found in both myths and children's Magical Realism discourse.

Such patterns of action are claimed to be constructed by concepts, which involve basically notions of: *religion, ethics, and philosophy*<sup>9</sup>; ordinarily, both contexts (primitivism and intuitive age) are made by both practical Realism and Magic, all at once. Therefore, it is said that according to Camayd-Freixas (1998) both contexts have **ten common feature-conceptions of reality** (*traditions; mystic concept of time; mystic notion of causality; animism and vitalism; natural and supernatural unity; allegory transformation of reality; concrete logic; ludic element of narrative; natural and supernatural tendency*). Accordingly, both contexts can be called Magical Realism, because their primer Texts are based on simple conceptual structures needed to develop knowledge into their Culture.

Getting at this point, one may affirm that as Ernst Cassirer (1979) does as he says that myths consist themselves of a cognitive function, which is much more concerned with a practical and social integrity of the individual into their society than just the rhetorical explanations myths can express. In other words, myths as a structure of cognitive development deal with an important function of promoting a common feeling of unity and harmony between the members of a society, and also with the wholeness of nature or life.

The mythological aspects of the (M.H.J.), for instance, affirm the reminiscence of residual elements of mythic construction in our postmodern society. Yet, nowadays with the increasing development of new technologies, along with the new findings of the humanities and social science, as well as Philosophy and Art make a big importance for Texts construction based on ancient approaches of narratives. Consequently, the fusion of both primitive aesthetic and postmodern texts generates a great and valid change in the analysis of Culture, which according to Dijk (1989) is seen now as a Text<sup>10</sup>; and for being so, as a support of registration of subject's experience process.

The construction of concept from the pragmatic view assures its concreteness possible not just because concepts are formed by percepts in their initial structure, but also because both of them (percept and concept) are pointed out to be formed by Feelings and Emotions. The human body according to pragmatists is the place of realization and concretization of reality through complex organization of cells, tissues, organs and systems. So by affirming that the Brain is considered as the central organ for the organization of all stimulus perceived by the nervous system (Antonio Damasio, 2007); (Jáuregui, 2000). Its function, beyond that, stands for categorizing and discriminate meaning for its primarily own benefit not just as individual, but also as a species participant.

Even though the Brain develops a core function in the selectivity of the stimulus by its countless imaginary industry, it is assumed that the Brain only works as a regulator, a kind of refine decoder, which takes into account memories, dreams, desires, beliefs,

<sup>9</sup> Our classification of these specific principles of humanity studies in low letters is to preserve their regular concept as such and only to show their basis of their existence and both children and primitivism aesthetic as natural manifestation of the cognitive being.

<sup>10</sup> Note here that Text in capital letter come to differ from the regular "text" common sense understands it, which is seen only as support of authors' expressive content. Inversably, our Text in capital letter means support for which and by which the subjects involved in the communication make sense of both themselves as subject and of their experiences.

instincts, reflexes, moods, and so forth. As a result, the Brain turns out to be the central organ of registering and producing final images of experiences, but not the responsible for such phenomena. It is required so, to understand the whole complexity that evolves human lives in and out of Culture to consider that there is a mutual relation between them, or rather to realize that the only thing accepted as truth is experience and its relations. Consequently, that is why pragmatists tend to emphasize that Experience and Knowledge are connected through natural organic paths of the being.

Yet, considering Experience as the most important event to promote knowledge as well as to construct reality, one might ask: are all the experiences equal to everyone? What people understand by the means of their experiences is it necessarily the same thing from one another? Do people have different conceptions about a given object?

All these questions evoke the curiosity of studying texts as objects constructed and registered through experiences. Texts shall be seen as both a common and essential meeting place of ideas and experiences. This approach to text is considerably recent, because if we go back in time and compare the philosophical history, not much could be accepted as truth or possibly achieved as such without the influence of an *Absolute* entity created ideologically to determine reality as existing somewhere out of the ordinary human's world. Such entity was due to be rationalistically made up during the Cartesian influence in science with his phantasmal *dualism of substances* in metaphysics (William James, 1975).

Instead of rendering obedience to an abstract entity such and such rationalist did for a long time in history, pragmatists as well as constructivists in this sense have brought a lot effort together to show that in postmodern society no abstract entity can be accept existing. And for this, they have shown % instead of universal concepts as a guide model for all human kind to follow % condensed *monism* expressed in terms of Experience, freed of entities, which responds automatically for concept and percept at the same time as soon as the knowledge has been acquired.

As a result of this monism that pragmatists and we make use, not anymore a dualistic universe is the base of the dialectical creation of only one God; instead, and most important of all a pluralistic universe is produced. Many different realities can possibly be understood as truth. The possible worlds of the pragmatist reality are boundless; fiction, realism, fantasies, myths are all possible and true worlds just the same as laws, education, institutions, politics, science, media, and all other cultural segments common sense takes as the only trustworthy worlds that must be believed in.

No longer must concept be understood as an abstract thing. No longer must universal rule the roles of living of society. Anything that resists to this point might be accused of being dogmatic and ideologically Universalists for defending only "Noble" reasons. And for saying "Noble" with capital letter one might depict that only noble interest of hegemony must be considered in society; therefore, it rests on this affirmation a permissive ideology that must be corrected by pointing out different approaches for discerning of what concepts really are made of. For instance, the only matter which must be used as a guide of finding truth is due to be the experience and its particular structure.

To understand these philosophical differences between universals and particulars, and to distinguish the way rationalism conceives concepts differently from pragmatism is very important, because at the time to analyze children's literature texts, we shall see what is intended for them and what is not. So that, we can see what is made for fulfilling the actual children's psychological need for the sake of literature and cinema as Art, and what is made just to promote the persuasion of the parents for the buying of the cultural material (Marisa Bortolussi, 1987); (Cervera, 1991); (Teresa Colomer, 1999).

Accordingly, the questions about this point are: who is the actual **receptor** of the message of a specific children's material? What does the message consist of? What kind of knowledge can children construct with the specific cultural material? Can they really construct their reality through that cultural material, or can they merely get already-made reality? Do the authors respect children's own nature of conceptualization? What is missing out?

That is why it is so important to distinguish such aspects in children's texts before analyzing them. As soon as we begin to do so, we inevitably come to realize that Reality is made by experiences through which are connected automatically with other experiences; in other words, Reality as a whole consists itself in particular pieces of "truthiness" in movement; or rather circuits *in transit*. Ultimately, of particulars the ordinary reality is made; no outer reality exists already made for being revealed, but only pieces of a fragmented Reality that needs to be connected for the production of meaning by the subject.

Accordingly, Culture in general, serves as a general support of registration of experience, that is, creator and creature shall be understood as the very same thing, which respond to be both concept and percept; subject and object; culture and subject. As a result, the position that might be assumed by the subjects in order to achieve meaning is to put he/she in a constant particularization of its subjectivity towards Culture and Contexts (Derrida, 1992; 2007)

Affirmatively, children in their intuitive age have a natural tendency to such "deconstruction" of their wholeness to organize adaptively their sense as subject into a specific cultural text. Furthermore, it shows us that the intuitive age is mainly concerned with question involving the subject, namely, finding of a possible subject into cultural terrain which are registered on texts just as the primitive societies used to do for creating myths and rituals.

The biggest difference in conceiving reality between an adult and a child (in the intuitive age) consists of the amount of insights that were given to the adult during their whole childhood span, whereas the intuitive childhood is, or at least should be constructed with the help of appropriate text, and not otherwise by which insights are given unilaterally formed by concepts they cannot understand at all. This is the basic criticism of this project, which not just points out social problems concerning education, but also provides solutions that shall be taken into consideration for a better education as well for a better integration of childhood into a society freed of misconceptions applied in children's texts.

Therefore, this project affirms that Culture offers a great space of registration of experiences for subject's insertion; in short, for the mutual and playful cooperation between **Culture** and **Subject** that appears, too, a sensitive playful interdependency. Perhaps, this is the reason why it is so difficult to determine where is one and the other. Accordingly, Culture and Subject just as Concept and Percept, correspond altogether to a unique and very same matter, which one affects the other by playful relation at all times.

Consequently, as we approach to the studies of children's literature and cinema, especially concerning Magical Realism, we become committed to finding, too, a playful relation between subject (children) and culture by the means of the primitive conceptualization involving animism, finalism, and artificialism based on the (M.H.J.) structure as the framework for children's literature and cinematographic texts. For this reason, we also become committed to adapting the children's Magical Realism literature to the Animation Movies for being both literality equivalent as artistic expression developed by letters and images; besides, for them both being the first textual supports children have contact with.

This ellipse is important in our introduction, because it offers a pragmatic approach to the understanding of both Culture and Subject as well as of Experience; beyond that it is also important, because we can differentiate such understanding from the Phenomenological<sup>11</sup> approach which no voluntary act is invoked for the appearance of the conscious. Pragmatism, in its turn, also believes in the existence of conscious, but not in a conscious that exists without the *intentionality* to become such. Thus, for the pragmatist consideration of existence of conscious must there be voluntary act or intention. Hence, to understand what intention is made of consists in a huge challenge for all disciplines that must operate interdisciplinary in order to get closer to all the facts that cause its phenomenon to come to existence.

Despite of the tone that pragmatism evokes as though it were something new in terms of construction of reality, nonetheless is a philosophy that is very much connected with the traditional thinking of the primitive cultures, which believed concretely in their concepts formed by their percepts. Their religiosity was pantheistic rather than monotheistic; consequently their reality was interconnected with different realities as just as many gods were connected with them in their regular routine and rituals.

Besides, their construction of reality, basically, was oriented by an intentional conscious that followed, consequently, their needs which included physical and physiological both at once. As it has already been told here before, the creation of myths and rituals in the ancient cultures correspond neither to exactly explain what the world is about, nor entertain the group with their narratives but, instead, to lead the group to a collective conscious of integration and union. However, it is assumed that their narratives were playful for the pleasure they caused in their audience. Besides, narratives were playful, too, because they worked out as an intermediate text between different

<sup>11</sup> This project differentiates such understanding from the Phenomenological approach because of it has been influenced by the Kantian thinking which considers conscious as something existing *per se*.

realities which are conventionally explained by the possible worlds of fiction, Lubomír Doležel (1998).

At this point narrative assumes a special treatment for being a natural and accurate tool of developed knowledge created by humans to organize experiences logically (Branigan, 2001); (Joseph Campbell, 2005); (Cassirer, 1979); (Jurij Lotman, 1977); (Mayordomo, 1998). As result of such importance of narration, Culture is created by verbs and expressions inexorably attached in the core of its structure of registration the Subject in particular to the response of this project: child subjects in their Intuitive Age.

## References

- Agger, B. (1992) *Cultural Studies as Critical Theory*, Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.
- Applebee, N. A. (1989) *The Child's Concept of Story*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ariés, P. (1987) *El niño y la vida familiar en el antiguo régimen*, Madrid: Taurus S.A.
- Bortolussi, M. (1987) *Análisis teórico del cuento infantil*, Madrid: Alhambra.
- Branigan, E. (2001) *Narrative Comprehension and film*, New York: Routledge.
- Camayd-Freixas, E. (1998) *Realismo mágico e primitivismo*, Boston: University Press of America.
- Camacho, D. J. E. (2006) *Comentarios filológicos sobre el realismo mágico*, Madrid: Arco S.L.
- Campbell, L. J. (2005) *El héroe de las mil caras*, Madrid: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Campbell, L. J. (1973) *Myths to Live by*, London: Souvenir Press.
- Cassirer, E. (1953) *Language and Myths*, New York: Dover Publication INC.
- Cassirer, E. (1964) *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*, London: Yale University Press.
- Cassirer, E. (1979) *Symbol, Myth, and Culture*, London: Yale University Press.
- Cervera, B. J. (1991) *Teoría de la literatura infantil*, Bilbao: Ediciones Mensajero.
- Colomer, T. (1999) *Introducción a la literatura infantil y juvenil*, Madrid: Síntesis.
- Delval, J. (1975) *El animismo y el pensamiento infantil*, Madrid: Siglo Veintiuno de España Editores, S.A.
- Derrida, J. (1992) *Acts of Literature*, New York: Routledge.
- Derrida, J. (2007) *Psyche: Inventions of the other*, Standford: Standford University Press.
- Doleže, L. (1998) *Heterocósmica: ficción y mundos posibles*, Madrid: Arcos.
- Eliade, M. (1974) *Imágenes y símbolos*, Madrid: Taurus.
- Derrida, J. (2000) *Aspectos del mito*, Barcelona: Paidós Ibérica.
- Derrida, J. (1961) *Mitos, sueños y misterios*, Buenos Aires: Fabril Editora S.A.
- Goldwater, R. (1967) *Primitivism in Modern Art*, New York: Vintage.
- Gombrich, E. H. (2003) *La preferencia por lo primitivo*, London: Random House.
- James, W. (1997) *The Meaning of Truth*, New York: Prometheus books.
- Lévi- Strauss, C. (1964) *El pensamiento salvaje*, Mexico: Fondos de Cultura Económicas.
- Levy-Bruhl, L. (1983) *Primitive Mythology*, St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press.
- Levy-Bruhl, L. (1987) *Mito y significado*, Madrid: Alianza.
- Locke, J. (1971) *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, London: Fontana.
- Lotman, M. J. (1977) *Semiótica de la cultura*, Madrid: Cátedra.
- Lovejoy, A.; Boas, G. (1965) *A Documentary – History of Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity*, New York: Octagon.
- Malinowski, B. (1974) *Magia ciencia, religión*, Barcelona: Ariel.
- Mayordomo, T. A. (1998) *Teoría de los mundos posibles y macroestructura narrativa*, España: Universidad de Alicante.
- Menton, S. (1999) *Historia verdadera del realismo mágico*, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Piaget, J. (1984) *La representación del mundo en el niño*, Madrid: Morata S.A.
- Piaget, J. (1976) *La construcción de lo real en el niño*, Buenos Aires: Nueva Visión.
- Ricoeur, P. (1999) *The Rule of Metaphor: Multidisciplinary studies of creation of meaning*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Taylor, I. E.; Wozniak, H. R. (1996) *Pure Experience: The response to William James*, London: Thoemmes Press.