Foreword

"No one knows for certain what Brazil is. Rip apart the interior, scrutinize all the physical secrets. Close the frontiers and count the inhabitants. Examine thus the body of Brazil. But what of the soul? Who knows Brazil's soul? When was it that Brazil revealed itself?"* These are the statements and questions of a Brazilian intellectual attempting to define and to understand his enormous and complex land. Brazil has long been a country in search of its own meaning and mission.

Early in their history Brazilians began to puzzle over their surroundings and their relation to them. The literati studied, analyzed, and debated those subjects. Ambrósio Fernandes Brandão in 1618 made probably the first effort to interpret Brazil in his informative Diálogos das Grandezas do Brazil ("Dialogues concerning the Grandeurs of Brazil"), a praise of his adopted land set in the form of a series of refutations of commonly repeated criticisms of Brazil in the early seventeenth century. His carefully written and convincingly argued study was the culmination of a century of works written to laud and to describe the new land, its lush vegetation, exotic fauna, mysterious Indians, lucrative resources, and—above all else—its limitless potential.

In the centuries which followed, other Brazilians contributed their interpretations. The eighteenth century produced an entire school of nativistic writers—André João Antonil (pseudonym for Giovanni Antonio Andreoni), Sebastião da Rocha Pitta, José de Santa Rita Durão, Gaspar da Madre de Deus, to mention only a few—who pondered the meaning and the mission of Brazil. Independence in 1822 so exhilarated that school that the bucolic nativists became fiery nationalists. Still, of all the introspective studies of their homeland made by Brazilians in the nineteenth century, none surpassed in perception and clarity the single essay of a Bavarian botanist, Karl Friedrich Philipp von Martius, who spent the years 1817–1820 journeying throughout Brazil. Much later, in 1843, he wrote his provocative essay "Como se deve escrever a história

^{*} Afonso Arinos de Melo Franco, *Preparação ao Nacionalismo* (Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1934), p. 179.

viii The Brazilians

do Brasil" ("How the History of Brazil Should Be Written"). Martius was the first to appreciate the fact that Brazil's unique quality derived from the cultural fusion—still in process—of the aboriginal Indian inhabitant, the imported African slave, and the European settler. Each contributed to the formation of a distinctly Brazilian civilization. In that amalgamation of races, Martius saw the key to understanding Brazil.

Nationalism waxed during the last decades of the nineteenth century. As the new century opened, the intellectuals determined to define their nation, its character, and its aspirations. Afonso Celso heralded the new search with his blatantly optimistic Porque me Ufano do meu País ("Why I Am Proud of My Country"). The antithesis of Afonso Celso's florid catalog of national virtues and blessings was Paulo Prado's Retrato do Brasil ("Portrait of Brazil") written in the late 1920's. Its opening sentence sets the depressingly pessimistic tone: "In a radiant land lives a sad people." His exposure of Brazilian weaknesses was intended to be the first step toward rectifying them. The works of Afonso Celso and Paulo Prado represent the two extremes in the intensified effort in the twentieth century toward national psychoanalysis. Between those two extremes stand a variety of other worthy studies, all products of the first half of the twentieth century: Plínio Salgado, Psicologia da Revolução ("Psychology of the Revolution"); Sérgio Buarque de Holanda, Raizes do Brasil ("The Roots of Brazil"); Afonso Arinos de Melo Franco, Introdução à Realidade Brasileira ("Introduction to the Reality of Brazil") and Conceito da Civilização Brasileira ("An Understanding of Brazilian Civilization"); and Gilberto Freyre, Brazil: An Interpretation, later published in Portuguese under the title Interpretação do Brasil, and still later expanded into New World in the Tropics. Freyre has made a number of other interpretive studies, the most significant of which is The Masters and the Slaves; the first Portuguese-language edition, bearing the title Casa Grande e Senzala, dates from 1934 and the first English translation appeared in 1946. In The Masters and the Slaves Freyre perfects the idea first advanced by Martius: Brazil's unique civilization results from the biological and cultural fusion of three races.

It is to this school of interpretive studies of Brazil that the present work of José Honório Rodrigues belongs. In a now well-established tradition, Rodrigues confronts the questions of who and what the Brazilian is, what Brazil stands for, where it has been, and where it is going. He seeks to understand and to explain his nation. In order to do so, he poses two questions: what are the national characteristics and what are the

Foreword ix

national aspirations? Both questions are complex; yet, in the pages which follow, the reader will find well-reasoned answers. Professor Rodrigues reveals how the Brazilians define themselves and how outsiders define them, what they aspire to be, the way in which they want to develop. A wealth of information on growth and development and abundant statistics substantiate these answers. The answers are, I believe, quite realistic. The author avoids the weaknesses of Afonso Celso and his followers, and the reader will detect notes of pride and optimism which eschew the dreary extremism of Paulo Prado. Rodrigues succeeds in skirting Scylla as well as Charybdis.

This book quite obviously is about Brazil. Yet, on one level, it has a much broader approach, as it is also about an underdeveloped country which shares much in common with other underdeveloped countries in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. According to the author, the aspirations of the Brazilian people are independence and sovereignty; territorial integrity; effective occupation of the entire national territory; national unity; a balance between centralism and regionalism; improved communications and transportation; the psychosocial integration of all inhabitants through miscegenation, racial tolerance, and acculturation of immigrants; social justice; democratic, representative government; diminution of the powers of the oligarchy; economic development; universal education; and improved health care. These might well be the aspirations of the people of Burundi or Burma, Tanzania or Thailand, Ecuador or Ethiopia. On the broadest level, then, we have a case study of the aspirations of underdeveloped peoples. Professor Rodrigues appreciates this larger application of his ideas but chooses to apply them to his more specific topic. He makes these aspirations particularly Brazilian by placing them within the context of Brazilian history, for above all else he is a historian. Intimately familiar with the Brazilian past, he has drawn freely from it in his analysis. And Brazil has had, as Rodrigues' comments and allusions reveal, a fascinating history.

Brazil was discovered in 1500 by a Portuguese fleet, under the command of Pedro Álvares Cabral, while it was en route to India from Lisbon. Trade with the East took precedence over the newly found land in the West until other Europeans began to poach on that territory in search of brazilwood and by their presence threatened Portuguese sea lanes in the South Atlantic. In 1534, to encourage colonization, the Portuguese monarch divided his lands in the New World into fifteen captaincies and distributed them among twelve of his courtiers. Because

x The Brazilians

they proved to be ineffective settlers the crown centralized control under a governor general in 1549, the date when the colonization of Brazil began in earnest.

The first task was to wrest the long coast from hostile Indians and clear it of European interlopers. Having accomplished that by 1616, the Luso-Brazilians next turned their attention to the conquest of the interior, their second major task. The intrepid bandeirante, that explorer in search of Indian slaves or precious metals, set out for the hinterland and eventually carried the Portuguese flag to the foothills of the towering Andes. Too late Spain realized what was happening in South America and the Spanish monarch was forced to concede to Portugal the lands which the Luso-Brazilians had explored and scantily populated. The Treaty of Madrid (1750) demarcated Brazil's frontiers along lines surprisingly similar to those of today.

From the interior the bandeirantes sent back Indian slaves, always too few in number and reluctant to adapt themselves to forced labor on the sugar plantations and in the mines. A more adaptable work force was found in Africa. Ships brought increasing numbers of slaves to bear the burden of Brazil's development. Gold, discovered in 1695, infused a new prosperity into Brazil, whose once lucrative sugar trade had encountered increasing competition from the Caribbean colonies for the European market.

Consolidation was the final phase of the colonial period, 1750–1822. Sebastião José de Carvalho e Mello, better known as the Marquis of Pombal, dominated the reign of José I, King of Portugal from 1750 to 1777, first as foreign minister and then as prime minister. Pombal unified and centralized Brazil by amalgamating the states of Maranhão and Brazil, abolishing all remaining hereditary captaincies, and restricting the authority of the municipalities. Brazilian unity in the national period owes much to the centralization imposed by Pombal. At the same time the ideas of the European Enlightenment began to penetrate Brazil. The elite in the small but growing urban centers imbibed those heady doctrines and expressed its dissatisfaction with the metropolis, turning soon to plotting against Portugal—as shown by the *inconfidências* in Minas Gerais (1789) and Bahia (1798) and by the revolution in Pernambuco (1817).

Brazilian history took a novel turn in 1807 when the Portuguese royal family fled Lisbon for Rio de Janeiro barely in advance of the French occupation. Enjoying life in Rio de Janeiro, King João VI lingered there until 1821, long after Napoleon's armies had been expelled from Portu-

Foreword xi

gal. At last, he reluctantly returned to Libson, leaving the Bragança heir, Prince Pedro, in Rio de Janeiro as regent of the Kingdom of Brazil, the former colony having been raised to equality with Portugal in 1815. The Côrtes (parliament) in Lisbon exerted every effort to reduce Brazil to its previous colonial condition, but the Brazilians refused to allow their status to be lowered. Won over to the Brazilian side by the patriot and savant José Bonifácio. Prince Pedro declared Brazil's independence on September 7, 1822. Brazil became independent in name only, however; the colonial structures and institutions remained. When Emperor Pedro I was deposed in 1831 he left the New World with his Portuguese retinue. The Brazilians for the first time began to govern themselves. As the Brazilian-born heir to the throne, Pedro II, was too young to rule, regents governed in the name of the child emperor. Without the control of a firm and respected authority, centrifugal forces, numerous in such an immense and varied land, tore the nation asunder. Permanent disunion threatened. Politicians of all hues looked to the crown to save the nation. As a consequence Pedro II assumed the exercise of his sovereignty in 1840, some four years before his legal majority. The hoped-for result took place: peace and stability returned. The unity of the nation was preserved.

During the long rule of Pedro II (1840–1889) the Empire progressed materially, coffee earned high returns as the principal export, and the cities grew in size and importance. The new urban class and the powerful coffee planters began to challenge the traditional control of the sugar-plantation aristocrats—the chief supporters of the monarchy. Unlike the once-affluent but now-impoverished sugar-planter class of the Northeast, the emerging urban-coffee alliance favored change. Cities in particular became centers of agitation. After 1870 new ideas aiming at the disestablishment of the church, manumission of the slaves, and proclamation of a federal republic radiated from the urban centers. When the monarchy had alienated the three groups that traditionally supported it—the sugar-plantation owners, the church, and the military—it fell, being totally unable to mount any resistance and finding no defenders.

The Republic proclaimed in 1889 represented principally the powerful coffee interests and the new urban classes. The economic center of the nation had shifted from the sugar-producing Northeast to the coffee-producing Southeast. Political power shifted accordingly. São Paulo and its coffee-growing allies, Minas Gerais and Rio de Janeiro, dominated the Old Republic (1889–1930), a political control broken only by the revolution of the Liberal Alliance, which brought Getúlio Vargas

xii The Brazilians

to power. Brazil was already in the process of industrialization—a process to which both world wars and even the depression of the 1930's gave a powerful impetus.

When the Brazilians resolved to industralize they also—knowingly or unknowingly—resolved to destroy much of their colonial heritage with its feudal characteristics. Industrialization and feudalism obviously were incompatible. Since 1930 an ever more intense struggle has been waged between those who want to preserve the old Brazil and those who desire to create a new system and modern structures. The struggle is traumatic. Since World War II, as Professor Rodrigues amply illustrates, the urbanization and the industrialization of Brazil have been rapid. Both developments inevitably threaten the archaic elements of Brazilian society with change and reform. A third tendency notable in Brazilian development from 1945 until 1964 also threatens the traditionalists: increased democratization.

For the moment, that laudable tendency to strengthen democracy has been halted if not reversed. Democracy in Brazil—in all Latin America—suffered a severe blow on April 1, 1964, when the military, usually well behaved in Brazil, overthrew the President and seized power. This time, contrary to all precedent, the officers kept power. They refused to retire to the barracks. In rapid succession the military government disbanded all political parties, imposed censorship, packed the Supreme Court, deprived over 400 citizens of their political rights for ten years—including such internationally respected figures as Juscelino Kubitschek and Celso Furtado—intervened in the state governments, and dismissed legally elected governors, senators, and representatives. In short, the military interrupted the progress and continuity of Brazilian history.

The imposition of this unfortunate military dictatorship occurred after José Honório Rodrigues wrote this book. Consequently, the reader will find references in the text to some institutions which ceased to exist in 1964. For example, the author discusses political parties, which were disbanded forcibly in 1965. He also refers to public-opinion polls, which, in the context of events from 1964 to the present, would doubtless reflect different results than they did during the heyday of democratic growth, 1945–1964. Still, I do not believe that the events after April 1, 1964, invalidate Rodrigues' conclusions respecting the Brazilian character and national aspirations. Professor Rodrigues is speaking of the vast majority of Brazilians and of their hopes. This present aberration is but a pause in Brazil's development, brought about by a military minority in alliance with the most reactionary elements of Brazilian society and with

Foreword xiii

the approval of myopic foreign governments. If it does anything, the military dictatorship will strengthen the Brazilian character and aspirations discussed in this book.

The American public is indebted to José Honório Rodrigues for his interpretation of the fifth largest and eighth most populous nation in the world, a nation which Arnold Toynbee predicted will be among the great powers of the next century, a prediction Brazilians enjoy making too, as evidenced by Pimentel Gomes' recent book, O Brasil entre as Cinco Maiores Potências ao Fim dêste Século ("Brazil among the Five Major Powers by the End of This Century"). The first work of Rodrigues' to appear in English was an essay on a nineteenth-century Brazilian historiographer, "Alfredo do Vale Cabral, 1851-1894," Inter-American Review of Bibliography, VIII (1958), 3-30. Several other essays and articles followed: "The Influence of Africa on Brazil and Brazil on Africa," Journal of African History, III (1962), 49-67; "The Foundations of Brazil's Foreign Policy," International Affairs, XXXVIII (1962), 324-338; "Webb's Great Frontier and the Interpretation of Modern History" in The New World Looks at Its History, edited by Archibald R. Lewis and Thomas F. McCann (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1963); "Brazil and China: The Varying Fortunes of Independent Policy," in Policies toward China. Views from Six Continents, edited by A. M. Halpern (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1965); and three historiographical essays in Perspectives on Brazilian History, edited by E. Bradford Burns (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967). In 1965 his book on Afro-Brazilian relations was translated into English and published by the University of California as Brazil and Africa. This book is his second to be translated into English.

A knowledge of Portuguese would allow the reader to become much better acquainted with Professor Rodrigues. His bibliography is extensive and space does not permit me to present it here. I do feel, however, that mention should be made of some of his outstanding books: Civilização Holandesa no Brasil (São Paulo: Companhia Editôra Nacional, 1940); Teoria de História do Brasil (São Paulo: Instituto Progresso Editorial, 1949), 2d ed., 2 vols. (Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1957); Brasil, Período Colonial (Mexico: Instituto Panamericano de Geografía e Historia, 1953); Brasil e Africa (Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1961), 2d ed. rev. (Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1964), translated by Richard A. Mazzara and Sam Hileman as Brazil and Africa (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1965); Conciliação e Reforma (Rio de Janeiro: Civilização

xiv The Brazilians

Brasileira, 1965); and, of course, this present work, first published in São Paulo by the Editôra Fulgor in 1963 and reprinted in 1965. In addition Rodrigues has contributed profusely to scholarly journals both in Brazil and abroad. He has been one of the most prolific, perceptive, and competent of contemporary Brazilian historians.

In Brazil, where history is generally the avocation of the dilettante, the study and writing of history have been the vocation of this author. He has held with distinction a series of research appointments which put him into constant contact with the Brazilian past: technical assistant at the National Book Institute, professor of Brazilian history and diplomatic history at the Rio Branco Institute of Itamaraty (the Ministry of Foreign Affairs), chief of the Research Division of the Rio Branco Institute, professor in the School of Sociology and Politics of the Catholic University in Rio de Janeiro, director of the Rare Book Collection of the National Library, and director of the National Archives. Presently he is executive director of the Brazilian Institute of International Relations and professor of the economic history of Brazil at the University of Guanabara.

Like many other historians in Brazil, José Honório Rodrigues entered the domain of Clio from the broader realm of law and the social sciences. When he received his degree from the University of Brazil in 1937, the study of Brazilian history was just beginning in the universities. In 1933 the Catholic University in São Paulo was the first to establish such a course. The following year the University of São Paulo added a similar chair. From its founding in 1935, the University of the Federal District (then Rio de Janeiro) offered courses in Brazilian civilization. The alma mater of Senhor Rodrigues did not offer a course in Brazilian history until 1939. Rodrigues, therefore, was obliged to initiate himself in the study of Brazilian history. He began with a broad reading program which emphasized European thinkers and historians—Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Karl Marx, Wilhelm Dilthey, Gustav Radbruch, Heinrich Rickert, Max Weber, Ernst Troeltsch, Ernst Cassirer, and Jakob Burckhardt. The European historians who exerted the strongest influence on his formation were Henri Pirenne, Johan Huizinga, George Macaulay Trevelyan, and Arnold Toynbee. He became acquainted with the works of American historians as well, among whom he has shown a preference for Charles A. Beard and Frederick Jackson Turner, the former for his economic interpretations of history and the latter for his geographic interpretations. On more than one occasion Rodrigues has compared Turner's concept of the frontier with João Capistrano de Foreword

Abreu's theory of the influence of the interior on Brazilian development.

It is not surprising that Capistrano de Abreu was the Brazilian historian who most affected Rodrigues. Capistrano was the first who could look beyond the facts to their meaning and significance. Like some of the European and American models whom Rodrigues revered most, Capistrano knew how to analyze, synthesize, and criticize. When as a student Rodrigues read the impressive Capitulos de História Colonial, he became at once an admirer of Capistrano de Abreu and has been a devoted disciple ever since. As a tribute to that influential book and its author, he made a definitive edition, the fourth, of Capítulos. He served as both secretary and president of the Sociedade Capistrano de Abreu, the introduction to which contains Rodrigues' masterful essay "Capistrano de Abreu e a Historiografia Brasileira," the best study yet written on that great scholar.

Two Brazilian social historians, Oliveira Viana and Gilberto Freyre, likewise influenced Rodrigues. As a student, he knew the former and was an assistant to the latter. He admired both men for their philosophical insight and their interpretive analysis.

Professor Rodrigues is himself a critical, analytical, and interpretive historian. He disdains the lifeless factual exposition so characteristic of Brazilian historiography and laments the absence of a general history of Brazil which is meaningful and well written. There are good histories of the colonial period or of the Empire or of one or another aspect of Brazilian development. However, there is no sweeping and meaningful study from the discovery to the present. Rodrigues sets the writing of such an interpretive synthesis as his major goal. Certainly he has been preparing himself well to undertake such an assignment. His books and articles on Brazilian historiography reveal a keen insight into and an appreciation of the past. Other works—of which this book is representative—display his ability to interpret and to synthesize.

The contributions of José Honório Rodrigues in this book are many: he analyzes his country's contemporary politics, characterizes his compatriots, supplies a historical interpretation of Brazil, and codifies Brazil's motivating aspirations. It is fortunate that the book has been translated into English. Americans—who only now are realizing that they must reckon with Brazil—will find José Honório Rodrigues a sure guide to understanding this emergent nation manifestly destined to achieve world importance.

Note: Footnotes marked by numerals appeared in the original work, with the exception of about a half dozen that were added by the author for this edition. Those marked by other symbols were supplied by E. Bradford Burns.