

11. Present and Absent Formations

Os Donos do Poder: Formação do Patronato Político Brasileiro (The Owners of Power: Formation of the Brazilian Political Patronage, henceforth DP) was first published by Raymundo Faoro (1925-2003) in 1958 and received a second edition in 1975, when the text was revised and considerably expanded: the 271 pages of 1958 became 750 pages in 1975.⁴²³ I will be mostly dealing with the last version of the text here, although, in the end, some changes between the editions and their relevance to the general discussion will be addressed.

The centrality of the concept of "formation" to DP is expressed since the subtitle: "formation of the Brazilian political patronage". And the historical ambition linked to this use of "formation" is exposed in the preface to the second edition: "[a] long period, from the Master of Aviz to Getúlio Vargas, valorizes the Portuguese roots of our political *formation*, until now disregarded in favor of the anthropological past and forgotten by the influence of ideological currents from France, England and the Unites States, translated only in the last a hundred and fifty years" (DP, p.14, italics added). Considering the shores of the text, it is possible to get a sense of how this formation is interpreted by Raymundo. The first chapter is entitled "origin of the Portuguese state" and the final chapter, "the round journey: from patrimonialism to the estament". This final chapter, by the way, begins with the following words: "[f]rom John I to Getúlio Vargas, in a six-century journey, a social-political structure resisted to all of the fundamental transformations, to the deepest challenges, to the crossing of the long ocean" (DP, p.819). "Master of Aviz" is referring to John I, declared King of Portugal, or Master of Aviz, in 1385; Getúlio Vargas was the head of Brazil for two periods (1930-1945 and 1951-1954). Origin and end of the formative journey meeting in a circle, defying any linear progressive metaphor of history.

Let me fast-forward this journey a little bit and highlight another of its aspects. In the same preface mentioned above, he notes that the text does not follow Max Weber's line of thought, despite its "close kinship", and that it "moves away from the orthodox Marxism", since it emphasizes the existence of an autonomous

⁴²³ DP had its 23th edition in 2012 (I have not found that edition in the website of *Fundação Biblioteca Nacional*, where the latest I identified was the 22nd edition, 2008).

layer of power, undiluted in an economic infrastructure (DP, p.13). Much later, already in the final chapter, Raymundo Faoro says that both the "liberal" and the "Marxist" critiques very often consider the patrimonial state as a transitory phenomenon - "either an anachronistic residue or a transitional phase" (DP, p.821) -, which is linked to their endorsement of a linear conception of history. Nevertheless, to Raymundo, "[t]he Brazilian historical reality showed... the secular persistence of the patrimonial structure" (DP, p.822).

Two things to have in mind for the interpretation I want to propose in the following pages: firstly, this move-away from a certain Marxism derives both from a reconsideration of the relation between economy and politics (or infrastructure and superstructure) and from a challenge to a Marxist teleological view of history;⁴²⁴ secondly, this appropriation of Weber's thought - "Weberian suggestions not rarely follow a different route [in the essay], with a new content and diversely tinted" (DP, p.13) - results from the claim that the historical reality studied requires this different route to Weber's concepts; or, more precisely, it results from the claim that the formation of Brazil is singular, therefore requiring this new content to Weberian suggestions. Let's see, then, how different this route is and how this round journey is traveled.

The round journey begins with the Master of Aviz (and will end with Getúlio Vargas, not because a new era, or journey, then begins, but because Getúlio is the furthest in history DP reaches). The dynasty of Aviz marked the consolidation of a "definite physiognomy" to the kingdom of Portugal, where the King's domination becomes an overwhelming sovereignty: "from *dominare* to *regnare*" (DP, p.19).⁴²⁵

⁴²⁴ It is not my point here to discuss whether this so-called "orthodox Marxism" is, indeed, teleological (or how it is so), but to highlight the way DP mobilizes it in its argumentation, more precisely in its use of the concept of "formation". The same is valid in relation to DP's use of Max Weber's concepts. In other words, it is not relevant to me whether DP or any other text selected are faithful or not to their conceptual references (or, to texts and thinkers from which they appropriate concepts and reflections); my aim is to interpret how they mobilize them and the implications of these mobilizations. To more detailed interpretations of DP's appropriation of Max Weber's insights, see Barreto (1995), Vianna (1999), Souza (2000; 2009), Schwartzman (2003), Campante (2003), Jasmin (2003) and Guimarães (2009). Raymundo Faoro's own version of how he appropriated Max Weber's thought can be seen in an interview he gave in 2002 to Jair dos Santos Júnior (Santos Jr., 2009).

⁴²⁵ As Renato Lessa (2009) notes, the revolution of Aviz as a starting point of DP's round journey is not a complete rupture itself, but the consolidation of a "nightmare" whose archaeology goes even further back in Portuguese history (see Lessa, 2009, pp.67-9). Still in the preface to the second edition, Raymundo says that "the classics of political science, Machiavelli and Hobbes, Montesquieu and Rousseau, [are] reread [in DP] in a dialectical context" (DP, pp.13-4). This rereading, as in the case of Weber's insights and Marxism, is also conditioned by how DP interprets "Brazilian reality".

This precluded the emergence of an autonomous layer, “*formed* by noble proprietors. Between the king and the subjects there are no intermediaries: one rules [*comanda*] and all the others obey” (DP, p.19. italics added). This process would end up constituting the Portuguese modern state, the “state that consecrates the supremacy of the prince, the unity of the kingdom and the submission of the subjects to a higher power, coordinator of the wills” (DP, p.27). The “revolution” that took place in Portugal, marking the beginning of this dynasty, did not witness the emergence of a bourgeoisie independent from the king, but of a commercial bourgeoisie “still attached to the traditional ties”, that is, to the rule of the king himself (DP, p.78); centuries later, this dependence would remain, this time in relation to the state (see DP, p.201). Therefore, even before “Brazil” was “encountered”, the (historical) starting point of the formation of the Brazilian political patronage is marked by the absence of the formation of a noble layer autonomous from the king - and later marked by the absence of the formation of an industrial bourgeoisie autonomous from the state.⁴²⁶

It is important to have always in mind that, when Raymundo Faoro goes far back in history, his concern is first and foremost with the implications of the Portuguese formation to Brazilian formation – or, as his already-quoted words tell, “the Portuguese roots of our political *formation*” (DP, p.14, italics added). One step further in history, and we take into account that another concern of DP, intrinsically related to the previous one, is the formation of capitalism in Brazil. And here, not only the Portuguese roots are considered, but also a recurrent comparison with the life of capitalism elsewhere. For instance, when DP is stressing the crucial role Roman law performed in Portugal, it is said that “England, mother of modern capitalism, was able to develop its legal instruments of economic relations without a relevant role performed by Roman law” (DP, p.29), as opposed to what has taken place in Portugal.

⁴²⁶ Elsewhere, Raymundo Faoro states that the modern age in Portugal begun, “prematurely”, with the dynasty of Aviz; he qualifies the Revolution of Aviz, however, as “unattained”, an “anomaly”, since it was immune to the popular sovereignty theories of other European countries, therefore keeping the power of the king and isolating Portugal culturally from “European science” and “universal political thought” (see Faoro, 1994, pp.15-24). Even the Pombaline reforms in the XVIII century, instead of eradicating, “reactivated the medieval roots... in a modernizing cultural context” (Faoro, 1994, p.28); liberalism, as the one practiced in other parts of Europe - that Raymundo sees as the best one - remained out of Portugal. In other words, modernity did not overcome tradition in the “unattained” Portuguese revolution.

The relation between capitalism and state pervades all the text, working in a double direction: on the one hand, in a historically vertical direction, this relation is tackled in order to interpret the Portuguese roots of Brazil, that is, how history connects Brazil to Portugal, beyond the colonial encounter; on the other hand, in a historically horizontal direction, it is incorporated in a comparative move, contrasting the history of Portugal and/or of Brazil to other simultaneous histories, showing how history separates Portugal/Brazil from other places. Moreover, both directions use the concept of “formation” also as a way to interpret contemporary Brazil. One could ask whether these two directions - horizontal and vertical - are, indeed, inseparable; or, whether it would be possible to disentangle them from each other in Raymundo's interpretation of Brazil. The reason why this disentanglement should not be done in my view is because this could make one lose from sight the double move DP is carrying forward: it is *both* identifying specific traces Brazil inherited from Portugal (vertical orientation) *and* qualifying them in comparison with another trajectory, considered better (horizontal direction). It is from this double move that the relation between Raymundo's interpretation of contemporary Brazil and his political position comes to the foreground.

The articulation of this double direction in DP can be interpreted through the relation it configures between history and structure. The coming into power of the dynasty of Aviz represents not only a singular historical fact, but also the consolidation of a certain structure of political power. The historical moment in which the caravels arrived in Brazil witnesses the debarkment of this structure and also another episode of state capitalism. This would constitute the historical enigma Raymundo Faoro identifies - I will get back to this enigma later.⁴²⁷

The link between this double direction and contemporary Brazil can be exposed in a question Raymundo formulates in the beginning of the text. After stating that, in Portugal, the modern state predated industrial capitalism, he poses the following question: “[t]his new political construction [the Portuguese modern state predating industrial capitalism], would it be an event possible only after the collapse of feudalism or it would have a line of growth of its own, without a

⁴²⁷ In *Existe um Pensamento Político Brasileiro?* (Is There a Brazilian Political Thought?), Raymundo Faoro gives another dimension of what I am calling here the vertical direction; in his interpretation, "Brazilian political thought is, in its origin, the Portuguese political thought" (Faoro, 1994, p.18).

necessary bond with the prevalent system in central Europe?" (DP, p.33). This question can be seen as an organizing aspect of the text, making sense of the link I have proposed to interpret it. After posing it, he adds that

[t]his question, of a misleadingly theoretical shape, has a wide scope in time: it will be one of the determinants that will explain the *history of Brazilian society*. Its resonance *will reach the XX century*, involving a passionate polemic, dictating the historical interpretation of the current economic structure. Underlying the central thesis, there are two other ones: feudalism in the Iberian Peninsula and in Portugal, and feudalism in Brazil.

There is a dogma, a cold, penetrating, expanding one, that aims at commanding the historical interpretation. The capitalist society, in the West, has emerged from the ruins of the feudal society (DP, p.33, italics added).⁴²⁸

Marching against this dogma means, in DP, resisting the homogenization of different historical realities under a single historical evolution. It means, in other words, understanding the peculiarity of the Brazilian political formation. This requires, as I have said, the interpretation of the relation between capitalism and state; and the way DP uses "formation" exposes this relation in the double direction I have proposed.

The polemic Raymundo talks about is one of the main debates of the interpretations of Brazil in the XX century. The coldness of the dogma refers to a lack of historical sensibility that interpreters present when they subsume Brazilian formation under a universal rule. Elsewhere in the text, this dogma is referred to as a "doctrine" that "has contaminated the studies in the XX century, committed, all over the place, mainly in the underdeveloped countries, to discover the 'feudal structure', the 'feudal remains', lost in the universal world of capitalism" (DP,

⁴²⁸ Later in the text, discussing the historical polemic again, Raymundo Faoro states that "the most convincing thesis in our history repels the so-called Brazilian feudalism. The plantation enterprise had a clear capitalist characteristic - within the mercantilist and politically-oriented capitalism of the XVI century in Portugal" (DP, p.155).

p.35). This doctrinal and cold thesis is profoundly problematic not only to interpret the historical formation of Portugal and Brazil, but also to interpret contemporary Brazil: the Portuguese world – “patrimonial, and not feudal” – echoes in the “present Brazilian world” (DP, p.35).⁴²⁹ This echo is so strong that, at times, was it not for some historical specificities, it would not be that easy to decipher whether Raymundo Faoro is referring to Brazil or to Portugal.⁴³⁰ Most often, his generalizations are about both: “[t]he so-called Portuguese and Brazilian feudalism is, in fact, the autonomous, truncated valorization of historical reminiscences collected, through *false analogy*, from nations of another nature, subjected to other events, theater of other struggles and different traditions” (DP, pp.36-7, italics added). Against this false analogy, Raymundo searches for historical accuracy, enhanced by *true analogies*.

The patrimonialism formed in Portugal turned the state in an enterprise conducted by the prince, who intervened in every sphere. In this scenario, capitalism was “politically conditioned”, a “state capitalism” whose patrimonial structure precluded the emergence of industrial capitalism (see DP, p.40). As Juarez Guimarães (2009) points out, by qualifying this capitalism as “politically oriented”, Raymundo Faoro is not implying that industrial capitalism does not have any participation of the state; the point, instead, is that the liberal state, as opposed to the patrimonial one, promotes free competition, private initiative and, in general, impersonal rules governing class relations (see Guimarães, 2009, p.86). According to DP, only the countries that have experienced feudalism, in Europe and in Asia, developed an industrial capitalism. In the case of Portugal, what emerged was this state-conditioned, commercial capitalism that would later be transplanted to America. The comparison runs as follows:

England, together with its expansions in the United States, Canada, Australia; France; Germany; and Japan have been able to develop and adopt, through different routes, but under

⁴²⁹ Later in the text: “Portugal did not have feudalism” (DP, p.37); the Portuguese state in the Medieval epoch was a “[p]atrimonial state”, rather than “feudal” (p.38). By now, the reader will be able to recognize that the debate regarding the presence or absence of “feudalism” in Brazil and in Portugal exposes the intimate link between interpretations of Brazil and different political positions.

⁴³⁰ For instance, when he states that “capitalism, driven by the state, preventing the autonomy of the enterprise, will gain substance, nullifying the sphere of public liberties, founded on economic liberties, liberties of free contract, free competition, free profession; all of them opposed to the royal monopolies and concessions” (DP, p.35). The quotation remains consistently applied in DP in case “royal” is replaced by “state” and in case the historical reference is Brazil, and not Portugal.

the same fundament, the capitalist system, integrating into it society and state. The Iberian Peninsula, with its colonial blooming, and the other countries deprived of feudal roots, including the ones from the ancient world, did not have capitalist relations in its industrial, *integral* expression (DP, pp.40-1, italics added).

From this quotation, two considerations come to the foreground. Firstly, it is plausible to say that Raymundo Faoro does not question the historical trajectory leading feudal countries to capitalism. Instead, he rejects the universalization of this trajectory, that is, he refutes the universal validity of a general thesis about the transition from feudalism to capitalism. More precisely, he accepts that, once a country has been feudal, industrial capitalism comes next. Nevertheless, not all countries have been feudal, not all countries passed through the same revolution: the Avis revolution predated the industrial revolution and consolidated an alternative historical path. Secondly, in addition to comparing two different major routes - the one leading to industrial capitalism and the other one, to state capitalism -, Raymundo states that the latter exposes a kind of capitalism that is not integral. The mark of this lack has two interrelated connotations: on the one hand, it is a lack of the full development of (industrial) capitalism, precluded by the prevalence of the state/prince; on the other hand, it is a lack of integration into capitalism of state *and* of society. In other words, DP is narrating not only two different routes, but also the coexistence in the world of an integral with a less-than-integral capitalism. The *presence* of state/political capitalism is inseparable from the *absence* of industrial capitalism.

The historical evolution separating these two routes is marked by another contrast: the industrial capitalism requires the formation of *classes*, while in state capitalism there are *estaments*. According to DP, "[c]lass is *formed* through the aggregation of economic interests determined, in the last instance, by the market. The propriety and the services offered in the market, both reducible to money, determine the emergence of the class, with the positively and the negatively privileged poles" (DP, pp.60-1, italics added). But the estament has a "different nature", since it is "primarily a social, and not an economic, layer, although it can rely... on a class" (p.61). This privileged layer changes and is renovated throughout

the centuries, but it "does not represent the nation" (DP, p.824). This means that, in the patrimonial state composed of estaments, "the *form* of rule, as opposed to the dynamics found in classes societies, is a top-down projection" (DP, p.62). As Rubens Goyatá Campante (2003) notes, to DP, an estamental society privileges internal inequality and particularism, as opposed to the potential equality and universality of a class society (see Campante, 2003, p.154).⁴³¹ Commercial capitalism becomes the only alternative compatible with this kind of state. The bureaucracy that is formed is not "modern" and "rational", but one concerned with the "appropriation of positions [offices]" directly linked to the sovereign (see DP, pp.102-3); it is an estamental bureaucracy that, "[i]nstead of integrating, commands; it does not lead, it governs" (DP, p.831).⁴³² Classes have been formed since the colonial Brazil, but have occupied a subaltern position, lacking the ascendancy gained in countries where the "industrial revolution" effectively took place (see DP, p.237). As Rubens Goyatá Campante (2009) stresses, Raymundo's interpretation of Brazil as a backward experience has, "as a fixed parameter, the evolution of Western Europe and North America" (Campante, 2009, p.129).

This horizontal direction - the comparison of societies composed of classes with the ones composed of estaments - works, simultaneously, as a way to specify different kinds of capitalism. The vertical direction, in turn, links Portugal to Brazil and is exposed in many moments in which DP is discussing the former's history. For example, when Raymundo Faoro is defining as mercantilist the practice of the Portuguese during overseas expansion, he claims that this ideology was "conveyed to Brazil, where, despite the liberal fascination of the XIX and the XX centuries, it has lived on, both in the public sector and in the private sector. In 1932, the 'paradoxical Brazilian mercantilism' was still talked about, being active in the administrative measures and in the governmental action, being rejected in the doctrine and in the theoretical debates" (DP, p.80). This discrepancy between thought and action is one of Raymundo's points of attack when he stresses the

⁴³¹ It is worth noting, following Rubens, that "estament", in DP, sometimes refers directly to the central government, while in other moments it refers to a wider group placed within the state apparatus. This ambiguity is less relevant if one takes into account that the dichotomy DP is focusing on is that between the patrimonial structure (composed of the sovereign and/or the administrative staff within the state) and the people (or the civil society, or the nation) (see Campante, 2003, p.164).

⁴³² For example, in the 1930 revolution, when Getúlio Vargas assumed the government, the state became "paternalistic in essence, controlled by a leader and well-grounded in a superior, estamental bureaucracy, without obedience to class impositions" (DP, p.777).

existence of that cold dogma pervading the interpretations of Brazil. This liberal fascination is pointed out by DP as an instance of the importation of thoughts or doctrines alien to Portuguese and Brazilian reality. Raymundo states that "the imported and late thought" coupled with the "tumultuous reality" were together responsible for the "scientific backwardness" and for the "inflexibility of law" (see DP, p.82).⁴³³ This vertical direction, in sum, puts into relief the way Brazil has become "an heir of a long history", the one that embarked the Portuguese caravels. In other words, colonization has been the crucial moment in this direction: a *historical* transplantation of a *structure* of power.⁴³⁴

Hence, Portuguese colonization exposes the double direction I have been discussing. On the one hand, it is the crucial moment in which Portuguese roots were transplanted to America, inscribing themselves in the formation of contemporary Brazil. On the other hand, it is a step further in the alternative trajectory of capitalism; colonization was capitalist at birth, but of a different kind of capitalism, a commercial one, conditioned by the state, incompatible with the industrial capitalism that would later develop in other parts of Europe and in other American colonies. As Marcelo Jasmin (2003) notes, DP associates "the absence of the desired [rational economy and rule of law] and the original sin [the Portuguese

⁴³³ In relation to science, he says that "[t]he technical utilization of scientific knowledge, one of the bases of the industrial capitalism expansion, has always been, *in Portugal and in Brazil*, an imported fruit. Science did not germinate from the practical necessities of the country... Science was practiced for the schools and for the literate, *and not for the nation...*" (DP, p.82, italics added). Portuguese law, as Portuguese science, has also been detached from the practical necessities; it "served the political organization more than it served commerce and private economy" (DP, p.82); in the patrimonial state, law "will always be a shadow of the political power" (DP, p.86).

⁴³⁴ In Raymundo's words: "[w]hile the world runs its course, the Iberian Peninsula, even if turgid by the American colonies, to where it will transfer its political and administrative inheritance, cools down and gets frozen" (DP, pp.103-4). The structural and cold transplantation leads to a colonization that is "a sovereign's enterprise, oriented, evoked, stimulated by him, from above, in the nominal benefit of the nation... Everything is a governmental task, tutoring the individuals, forever underaged, incapable or catastrophe-provoking in case they are left by themselves" (DP, p.103); or, as he puts later, "Brazil, as well as India, would be a king's business, integrated into the patrimonial structure" (DP, p.127) and king would not cut the "umbilical cord" uniting colonizer and colonized (see DP, p.159). Jessé Souza (2000) notes that this transplantation does not involve any substantial plasticity of the Portuguese institutions (particularly the state) in America, as opposed to other interpretations of Brazil; Juarez Guimarães (2009) goes in the opposite direction, saying that DP ascribes a capacity of "plasticity and adaptation" to patrimonialism brought from Portugal (see Guimarães, 2009, p.82). Despite the apparent divergence, it is plausible to say that both would agree with the formulation that the patrimonial structure is, at once, rigid, in terms of being transplanted with minor modifications from its original place (Portugal), and plastic, in terms of having adapted to centuries of historical challenges; the same structure has been capable of assimilating different pressures. On this same point, see Ricupero and Ferreira (2008, pp.76-7).

colonization]" in its interpretation of Brazil (see Jasmin, 2003, p.361).⁴³⁵ The simultaneous mobilization of this double direction by Raymundo Faoro can be seen, for instance, when he is characterizing the type of private initiative that took place in Brazil, which was confined within "the structure of the mercantilist policy, without the trace of autonomy characteristic of the future industrial capitalism, supported by Adam Smith's model of thought - an autonomy that is almost a rebellion against, and a challenge to, the state" (DP, p.135). And, in another instance, discussing the lack of class autonomy in colonial times, this double direction is mobilized together with a consideration concerning contemporary Brazil. After stating that classes have gained ascendancy where it was formed a "bourgeois society", therefore where an "Industrial Revolution" took place, Raymundo claims that the subaltern position of classes characterize colonial times in Brazil, "extending itself to recent days, the current industrialism being incapable of breaking this frame. Industrialism, in fact, evoked, encouraged and fomented by the state" (DP, p.237). The politically-oriented capitalism, that Raymundo also calls "political capitalism" (see, for example, DP, p.819), has persisted throughout history.

The double direction I have been proposing to interpret DP should not lead to the conclusion that the two major historical trajectories remain forever disconnected from each other. The colonial encounter was not reduced to a transplantation of Portuguese roots to the New World. The colonial Brazil had both an internal and an external dimension, the latter linking Brazil to Europe through the commercial exploitation conducted by Portugal. Capitalist at birth, colonization integrated "Brazil" into "Europe" right from the beginning - directly into Iberian Europe, indirectly into other parts of Europe. Moreover, later in the XVIII and XIX centuries, the expansion of a new kind of society in the world would reach Brazil. This encounter, however, did not represent another transplantation of an European

⁴³⁵ Later in the text, Marcelo summarizes DP's conception of history by saying that it shows the "eternal return of the absence of the desired" (Jasmin, 2003, p.364); Simon Schwartzman (2003) says that, in DP, "history served to the understanding of the genesis of an entelechy that resists everything, an essence that is never erased" (Schwartzman, 2003, p.210); Renato Lessa (2009) defines DP as a "mega essay about the Brazilian civilizing process, written from an agonistic and pessimist perspective and seeking the links of the persistence obstinacy of a decanted remote nightmare" (Lessa, 2009, p.67); Rubens Goyatá Campante (2009), in turn, differentiates "conservatism" from "immobilism", claiming that Raymundo's interpretation endorsed the former, but not the latter, since it did see changes throughout the formation of Brazil, but that they have not been capable of transforming the political structure (see Campante, 2009, pp.138-9). In sum, it is the interpretation of the repeated absence of modernity, despite many modernizations.

structure to America. Instead, it exposed a specific type of modernization. According to Raymundo Faoro, "[t]he countries imprisoned by the estament are modernized, Westernized, in a top-down direction imposed upon the nation... The estament absorbs the imported techniques, refraining the Westernizing elite, so that the new ideas, new ideologies do not disturb the rule of society; a rule that is traditionally coined, even if it gets dressed with new words" (DP, p.113). This top-down modernization generates a dissociation between "state and nation, government and people", each following its own track, "in an error renewed each century, in a continuous and ardent search for each other" (DP, p.114). The concept of "formation", as used in DP, exposes exactly this double articulation and its relation with a specific political position (I will get back to that later).⁴³⁶

This continuous search is constitutive of contemporary Brazil and it is associated to a practice that works as a "model of action of the estament, repeated in the [Brazilian] Empire and Republic: the creation of reality by law" (DP, p.143). Here, DP proceeds once more to a comparison. Despite the fact that "the initial impulse of both [colonizing] systems - the British and the Portuguese - followed a common mercantilist inspiration" (DP, p.143), the formation of industrial capitalism in England enabled, through private initiative, the projection of autonomy to the English American colonies: "[t]he [English] state...did not cross the ocean" and the English "founded in America a nation, while the Portuguese, an extension of the state" (DP, p.144, p.145).⁴³⁷ Later in the text, another comparison confirms this disparity: "[c]lassical capitalism, of a Puritan and Anglo-American character, is based on values that are completely strange to the trajectory of a six-century structure... Nation and state, in this dissonance of profound echoes, split into diverse realities, strange, opposed and unknown to each other" (DP, p.832). Bernardo Ricupero and Gabriela Nunes Ferreira (2008) stress that, to DP, the different political conditions of Portugal and England at time of the colonial encounter were decisive to what would happen next to the formation of both colonies (see Ricupero and Ferreira, 2008, p.76). And, according to Luiz Werneck

⁴³⁶ In 1998, agreeing with Sérgio Buarque de Holanda, Raymundo Faoro says that "the burden of our *formation* has not allowed the country the institutionalization of political power in symmetry with society" (Faoro, 1998, p.70, italics added).

⁴³⁷ More precisely, as he puts later: "Portugal did not seek to establish, in America, the reflex of its institutions, in a new copy of an old kingdom - what it aimed at was the passive extension of its institutions, empowered to create the political life, from above, through the work of a juridical frame" (DP, p.172).

Vianna (1999) this comparison between colonialisms (English and Portuguese) is intimately linked to the adaptation of Weberian suggestions proposed by DP; to him, this kind of revision of Max Weber claims that backwardness in Brazil results from a problem of origin, that is, the Portuguese colonization and the resulting Iberian patrimonialism inherited (see Vianna, 1999, pp.175-6).⁴³⁸ As Juarez Guimarães (2009) highlights, the new content DP announces to Weberian insights aims at “comprehending the originality and the unique way of our social *formation*” (Guimarães, 2009, p.83, italics added).

The course taken by colonization in Brazil has soon generated an internal disparity between the coast and the interior of the geographical territory. The "social type" of those that marched towards the West formed a "structure" that is opposed to the one found in the coast. This separation, according to DP, "has not yet been superseded, after four centuries" (see DP, p.182). The inheritance from these conquerors of the West "would remain, stable, conservative, in Brazilian life, not rarely postponing and slowing the modernizing wave projected from the Atlantic - modernizing more than civilizing" (DP, p.182). But even this incursion towards the interior would later be contained by the central government, curbing, domesticating the private impulse of the *bandeirantes*.⁴³⁹ The state was imposed upon the colony before the creation of the people and, even after the independence, this dissociation would persist (see DP, p.193). In this sense, 1822 is not a clear dividing line between a before - colonial regime - and an after - national regime -: "[c]olonial regime was not extinguished, it was modernized; the remaining Brigantine have been updated, persisting the divorce between the state - monumental, ostentatious, heavy - and the nation - *formless*, undefined, disquiet" (DP, p.331, italics added).⁴⁴⁰ More than a century later, the situation would be almost the same: "[a] foreigner, in 1935, discerned in Brazilian reality a dualist structure in a plurality of markets - the modern country side by side with the colonial country" (DP, p.605). This internal discrepancy can be seen, therefore, throughout Brazilian history - independence,

⁴³⁸ Luiz Werneck Vianna is, in fact, making a larger claim about the heterogeneous appropriations of Weber by "social sciences and public opinion on the interpretation of Brazil" (Vianna, 1999, p.175; see also Moreira, 1999; and Campante, 2003); DP figures, to Luiz Werneck, as an example of how Weber was adapted to interpret patrimonial state in Brazil and its Portuguese origin. I am not able to discuss these appropriations here. See note 528 below.

⁴³⁹ For a definition of "*bandeirantes*", see note 107.

⁴⁴⁰ "Brigantine" refers to *Casa de Bragança* (House of Braganza), an imperial, royal and noble branch of the Portuguese nobility.

Empire and Republic - forming a persistent dilemma: "[t]he unity of the government, translated and realized into a social layer, will be the rock on which will rely the national unity, struggling against the regional and autonomist vocation of local forces" (DP, p.202).

It should be clear by now that the point is not that change is absent from DP. Instead, change is subsumed under a long-term continuity; historical events are incorporated into a structure consolidated in the beginning of the round journey. At the same time, however, I have already pointed out instances in which movements of resistance emerged, if only to be soon tamed and domesticated (such as the *bandeirantes'* march towards the West and the liberal impulse coming from local units of power).⁴⁴¹ Despite these resistances, changes have been of an "accommodation" kind, and not "structural" ones (DP, p.823). This accommodation process runs as follows: [t]he *estamento forms* the bond between the country and the external world pressing for the domination of its patterns, incorporating the new social forces" (DP, pp.833-4). This bond is often established by a bourgeoisie connected to the capitalist world; "[i]n the Brazilian historical peculiarity, however, the ruling layer acts on its behalf, using the political instruments that derive from its ownership of the state apparatus" (DP, p.834).

The case of liberalism is crucial to DP. Raymundo Faoro interprets its incorporation in Brazil since the Independence (1822) in the following way: "European liberalism has been contaminated by a new content, that disfigured it *in essence and in form*. To Brazil, the imported ideas, the acclimatized revolution, mean the modernization of political institutions..." (DP, p.307, italics added).⁴⁴² After the turmoil of a short period of time, the "estamental norms of political organization" returned (see DP, p.315). And, when the "Anglo-Saxon self-

⁴⁴¹ According to Rubens Goyatá Campante (2003), Raymundo Faoro "sometimes 'distorts' Brazilian history. He admits centrifugal moments and tendencies, but they are invariably defeated and/or remain secondary" (Campante, 2003, p.159). Jessé Souza (2000) is another interpreter of DP that claims that the text ignores evidences from historical reality, such as the profound modernizing impact in society after the transference of the Portuguese Crown to Brazil in 1808. Needless to say, many other engagements with DP try to present historical evidence to question his structural historical perspective. Following the perspective I am proposing to interpret the texts selected, it is not my point to discuss whether DP "distorts" a certain historical "reality" or not. I do agree, however, that the resistance movements mentioned in the text are interpreted as invariably being defeated or incapable of dismantling the long-standing patrimonial structure transplanted from Portugal to Brazil, but it is not my claim that this is "historically false" or "innacurate".

⁴⁴² Referring to the impact of liberalism in the XIX century, Raymundo says that, in Brazil, "liberalism would not be more than an imported disease, that [Luso-Brazilian society] would have to live with, without conceding to it" (DP, p.418).

government" was transplanted to the Portuguese America in the XIX century, "imposed upon Brazil as a copy of the North American model", it did not find the "social bases of the integrated community" that it had found in North America, but a "long tradition [that] had separated the order of the state, the political order, from the social order" (see DP, p.357); consequently, the self-government became void (see DP, p.379).⁴⁴³ In sum, Independence has replaced the old colonizer-colonized antinomy by a new one: state-nation. That incompatibility mentioned above between liberalism and patrimonialism does not mean that the former is completely absent from Brazil, but that it is molded according to the latter.⁴⁴⁴

In this patrimonial state, bourgeoisie would not be given the opportunity to "emancipate", remaining "tutored from above" (see DP, p.236). And, situated above, a minority - the estament - rules society, speaking in the name of nation. It is relevant to note that the vocabulary of dependence is used in DP most often to refer to the relations between the bourgeoisie and the patrimonial state in Brazil. These dependence relations are connected to the impossibility of the former's emancipation, and consequently to the incompatibility between patrimonialism and liberalism when the latter tries to make its way into Brazil.⁴⁴⁵ They are also

⁴⁴³ Self-government performs a multifaceted role in DP: it expresses the failure of the attempt to copy a foreign model in "Brazilian reality"; it exemplifies an instance in which law was used to "create reality"; and it is taken as an advanced principle of social organization, through which "Brazilian reality" is identified as backward. In other words, self-government exposes, at once, the double articulation, the historical dynamics and the political position exposed in DP.

⁴⁴⁴ Marcelo Jasmin (2003) claims that the appropriation of Weber's insights in DP can be seen as depicting an "absence", an "impossibility". Not surprisingly, to him, "the thesis is better formulated by negation: the estamental and bureaucratic patrimonialism had made unfeasible, in Brazil, the modernity associated with the rational economy and the rule of law" (Jasmin, 2003, p.361; see also Guimarães, 2009, p.83). I am not sure if this negative formulation is, indeed, the best one, but it is plausible to emphasize that DP's interpretation of Brazil is inseparable from the statement that the *presence* of industrial capitalism and of an integrated nation in some European and North American countries contrasts with the *absence* of both in Brazil. More than that, the presence of the latter in Brazil seems desirable to DP, at least if the country was able to reproduce the path followed by those fully modern and capitalist ones. To Raymundo, it was not able to do that, however; and it remains that way, due to the peculiar *formation* of contemporary Brazil. In sum, the definition by negation, or by "absence", is crucial to DP, since it is mostly associated with what I am calling the horizontal direction (the comparison with fully modern countries); at the same time, the vertical direction also gives a definition of contemporary Brazil through the roots transplanted from Portugal, therefore through a certain "presence".

⁴⁴⁵ The transference of the Portuguese Crown to Brazil in 1808 is interpreted in DP as curtailment of a "liberal impulse" that had emerged among farmers and local units of power (see DP, p.283). That is to say, according to Raymundo Faoro, the encounter with a liberal Europe, mainly through the impact of the industrial revolution and through the power England was exerting upon Portugal by that time, had implications in the internal politics, but it was also not able to rupture the patrimonial structure of the state in the long run (in the round journey, I should add). As a consequence, analogously to what happened with the *bandeirante*, whose private impulse had soon been domesticated, this liberal impulse was also tamed.

connected to the internal duality mentioned above, since it precluded the formation of an integrated nation. Already in the XX century, when the state of São Paulo represented the most dynamic and modern sector in this dualistic country, state interference kept moving politics, conditioning the economy; according to Raymundo, this sector "will be an extension of the official character of Brazil, preaching the protected private initiative, [the] *Brazilian modality of economic liberalism*" (DP, p.757, italics added). As a consequence, instead of heading a bottom-up modernization, this sector "is proliferated within patrimonialism" (DP, p.757).⁴⁴⁶

In 1987, Raymundo Faoro discussed the mixture of "two liberalisms" in Brazil: one linked to the "national element" and the other one, to the "reactionary element" (Faoro, 1994, pp.35-55). The latter is the liberalism that came from Portugal, while the former expresses the penetration of industrial capitalism and the emancipatory version - the double articulation again. In Brazil, "[I]beralism was not able to transform the state structure, establishing a state protector of rights" (Faoro, 1994, p.47). The many insurrection movements Raymundo mentions in this text were incapable of incorporating the "European model of liberalism" in its full potential. In this sense, the "Brazilian modality of economic liberalism" DP talks about gains another dimension. In another text, Raymundo Faoro presents a liberalism that "*deserves being depicted within inverted comas, taken as peculiar, specific to Brazil*" (Faoro, 1994, p.74. italics in the original), expressed in the XIX century. This Brazilian version was an "ossified liberalism" that "disqualified all the liberal conceptions that were authentically liberal... The liberals of the emancipating cycle were banned from the history of liberties, qualified as exalted, extremist, chimerical, theoretician, metaphysician" (Faoro, 1994, p.54). The old and the new under the constant structure. More of the same, even if slightly different.

⁴⁴⁶ Elsewhere, Raymundo traces the route liberalism made from Portugal to Brazil and claims that "Brazilian liberal model" is "official and driven from above, as an appendix of the state" (Faoro, 1994, p.32). In 1992, the interpreter insisted on the differentiation between "modernization" from "modernity": "*modernity* encompasses in its process the entire society, widening the scope of expansion to all the classes, revitalizing and removing their social roles, while *modernization*, because of its voluntary, perhaps voluntaristic, tone, reaches society through a conductor group that, by privileging itself, privileges the ruling sectors" (Faoro, 1992, p.8, italics in the original). It is not the point to detail Raymundo's discussion in this text, since the focus here is DP; this distinction does reinforce, however, his interpretation that the formation of contemporary Brazil does not expose the formation of a fully modern country, nationally integrated socially speaking, but a modernizing process from above: "Brazilian modernizations have never emancipated themselves from this mold" (Faoro, 1992, p.8).

This is the repeated pattern of the importation of European ideas to Brazil. These encounters with "Europe" expose the work of the tradition, "tenacious in its four-century permanence, triturating, in the gear teeth, old imported ideas, theories assimilated in hustle and modernizing tendencies, avidly imitated from France and England" (DP, p.445); these ideas were, indeed, active factors, but were "incapable of transforming the data of the historical enigma" (DP, p.445).⁴⁴⁷ This enigma is constituted by that divorce between state and nation, turning the people something alien to the state and considered by the estament incapable of self-government, therefore in need of tutelage. The point is not the estament simply negates the bottom-up sovereignty, but the it asserts that the people lacks the autonomy required for that, justifying the need for a top-down government. As a consequence, to DP, both the progressivism of the XIX century and the developmentalism of the XX century, for instance, were attached to the state, modernizing from above (see DP, p.500). In this sense, the imported ideas end up being accommodated to Brazilian reality. Instead of a rupture between feudalism and capitalism, one observes in Brazil that "personal patrimonialism is converted into a state patrimonialism" (DP, p.823) and, as a consequence, modern capitalism and traditional arrangement become compatible.

As I have said, this top-down modernization mobilizes the people only rhetorically, nothing more than a fiction that has never been given the free participation in government. Two examples will suffice to show how DP interprets the role of the people in the formation of Brazil. First, in the XIX century, in the independent, but not yet republican Brazil, the appeal to the people "will be as false and demagogic as the denunciation of anarchy" (DP, p.386); it is worth recalling that the latter has been used as a justification for the state centralization, since the people would not be considered mature enough for self-government. Second, in the XX century, the threat of anarchy remains in the political scene of the Republic. The divorce between state and nation, the official and the unofficial country, the

⁴⁴⁷ Elsewhere in the text, Raymundo Faoro says that the first half of the XIX century witnessed the "Europeanization" of the country, following "English models"; in this scenario, the state, "the most active reality of the social structure, performs the role of intermediating the foreign impact, reducing it to the native temperature and speed" (DP, p.457). Neither the Proclamation of the Republic in 1889 showed a different pattern: "[t]he Republic would be stable, progressist, abandoning the exclusive agrarianism of the Empire; nevertheless, it relied on the characteristic, not fully recognized, that was the monarchy's most peculiar one: the bond between state and money. Industry, in this scheme, would be a product of governmental incentive; speculative in its essence, mercantilist in its planning and forgetting the liberal blow" (DP, p.581).

legal and the real country, persists: "under the official country, there was the *formless* world" (DP, p.738, italics added). Comparing the Empire with the Republic, Raymundo says that, in the former, "the restrictions posed to political activity would have been justified by the people's backwardness and lack of culture", while, in the latter, "to accelerate progress, the oppositions should be silenced" (DP, p.782). In the XX century, with the 1930 revolution that put Getúlio Vargas in power, modernization was not anymore the adjustment to an "European" or "North American" model, but a search for national integration (see DP, p.792). The formed state and the formless nation still coexisted, interrelated.

When I said above that DP narrates the history of a constant structure (the one consolidated when the dynasty of Aviz emerged in Portugal and that was brought to Brazil embarked the Portuguese caravels), I did not mean that at no point in history a deviant event took place. As in the cases of the *bandeirantes'* incursion towards the interior of the country and of the liberal impulse in Brazil, contestations did arise. So, what I am proposing is that the interpretation of Brazil in DP is not exactly exposing a history of the same, but, instead, a history of how the Brazilian political dynamic has always reinstated the centralization of the state, the state-conditioned capitalism.

Talking about Getúlio Vargas' first government (1930-1945) - the arriving point of the round journey in DP - and the way the inequality among classes was related to the prevalence of the estament, Raymundo Faoro makes this clear:

The root [of this situation] is not revealed in moralizing censures; it absorbs the sap of a historical bargaining, in place since the state has gotten autonomy, a long time ago, adulterating and sealing the renovating conduits that come from below; this contribution from below has been disregarded because the people was illiterate, then because it was poor and incapable of independence to give opinions and to vote.

The 1937-1945 regime is not explained as a high-level mystification, as well as it was not a high-level mystification that took place in the Empire. The permanent bases that the interregnums of 1889-1930 and the 1934-1937 only dissimulate - it is a dissimulation since the *structural*

girders are there - translate the patrimonial reality in the centralized state order...; a reality that is superior to everyone; a conductor reality and not one that is passively molded (DP, p.814, italics added).⁴⁴⁸

The revolution of 1930 and the establishment of the *Estado Novo* by Getúlio Vargas in 1937 express, therefore, historical moments in which patrimonialism was reorganized, defeating once more the opposing forces from civil society (see Mello e Souza, 1999, pp.353-4). In 1992, Raymundo Faoro extended this round journey, saying that 1964 (the military coup) is a further instance of modernization from above (see Faoro, 1992, pp.16-7). In 2002, a year before he died, he said in an interview that patrimonialism "still preclude[d] the *formation* of nationality" (Santos Jr., 2009, p.113, italics added).⁴⁴⁹ This is the historical enigma Raymundo talks about. It is as if a point of equilibrium, in each and every historical moment, was either actually achieved or in the process of being reinstated; it has always been *there* - actually or potentially -, at the crossroads of the formation of the political estament and of the non-formation of the nation.

⁴⁴⁸ I have made minor adaptations from the original in this quotation. Although it is not my purpose to develop this point, I want to note that these interregnums refer in DP to the emergence of the state of São Paulo as the most dynamic sector in Brazil, that would soon be contained by the patrimonial state. The example of São Paulo is far from trivial in the XX century interpretations of Brazil, since this state has been seen by many interpreters - Raymundo is an example of this current - as a potential leader of industrial capitalism in Brazil. In DP, for instance, one reads that if São Paulo had won the federal government in 1932, this "would correspond to the victory of the North over the South in the United States" (DP, p.799). In another widely resonating formulation of a similar position, Simon Schwartzman said that "[i]t was from São Paulo that came the strongest social pressures against the concentrated powers of the Federal Government...; ultimately, it is in São Paulo that it is advanced the possibility of the constitution of a political system more open and stable, that is able to provide the process of opening [that is, redemocratization] with a more permanent basis" (Schwartzman, 1982, p.9). What permeates Simon's texts is a contrast between two "historical developments": one presiding the passage of a "feudal Europe" to "occidental, modern and developed societies"; and the other, the passage from "patrimonialism" to "underdeveloped", "socialist" or "authoritarian" and "fascist" societies (Brazil being an example of the latter) (see Schwartzman, 1982, pp.20-1, ch.2). To Luiz Werneck Vianna (1999), for example, the interpretations of Brazil that focus on the patrimonial state (DP among them) tend to narrate the "misfortunes of Brazilian democracy from the political defeats of São Paulo, which would preclude the universalization of its Western paradigm" in Brazil (Vianna, 1999, p.178; see also Souza, 2000, ch.7, pp.168-182; Souza, 2009, p.152; Campante, 2003, p.176; and Ricupero and Ferreira, 2008, pp.85-6). In other words, the interpretation of São Paulo is more than a mere example; it potentially expresses the relation between the interpretation of Brazil, the internal inequality and the political position towards capitalism and state (including the external comparison with state and capitalism in "(fully) modern" countries).

⁴⁴⁹ Later in this same interview, he said: "I think [estament is not yet dead], but it is marching towards that. I think citizenship is estament's biggest enemy. Citizenship is almost there" (Santos Jr., 2009, p.115).

In sum, the traces of the concept of "formation" in the interpretation of contemporary Brazil exposed by DP mark the following aspects: (1) the permanent dissociation between state and nation conducts the text, in a way that the formation of the former is inseparable from the non-formation of the latter; (2) those present/absent formations result in an incomplete modernity or, at least, in a modernity structurally pervaded by colonial reminiscences; (3) these reminiscences, in turn, are not simply residues of a past to be soon eradicated, since they form an internal inequality that privileges the estament above the classes and that also reproduces a disparity between the coast and the interior; (4) this structural compatibility between the old and the new, the colonial and the modern, is constitutive of a politically-oriented capitalism, that contrasts with the industrial capitalism of fully-modern capitalist countries (the ones that, contrary to Portugal and Brazil, have experienced feudalism and, after that, its eradication with the establishment of capitalism); finally, (5) the double direction (vertical and horizontal) marks a singularity of Brazilian history (for example, in the Brazilian incorporation of liberalism), not reducible to a linear conception of history.

I have mentioned in the beginning that DP's definitive text - the one I have been interpreting here - was published 17 years after the first edition. I want now to tackle some aspects, if only briefly, concerning the changes between these editions. I will suggest that they are linked to reactions within and beyond the academic circles in Brazil.

It is important to remind, first of all, that the edition of DP I have been dealing with here is the definitive text, unchanged since the second edition, published in 1975.⁴⁵⁰ The first, in turn, was published in 1958, when nationalism and a state-driven development were the crucial topics in the political debate, and not authoritarianism; this scenario is likely to have majorly contributed to the little attention this edition received (Jasmin, 2003; Ricupero, 2008b; Guimarães, 2009; Vianna, 2009).⁴⁵¹ Raymundo Faoro, in a 2002 interview, said that DP's first edition

⁴⁵⁰ While the first edition, published in 1958, has 14 chapters, 271 pages and 140 notes, the second, definitive, published in 1975, has 16 chapters (preceded by a preface), 750 pages, 1335 notes and many additional bibliographical references. As I did not have access to the 1958 edition, my comments on the changes between both editions will rely on interpreters of the text that have compared both. For the numbers just mentioned, see Iglesias (2009 [1976]), Jasmin (2003) and Ricupero (2008b). The second edition was divided into two volumes; the third was already published in a single volume (Lessa, 2009, pp.63-4).

⁴⁵¹ Despite the fact that it received in 1959 an award from *Academia Brasileira de Letras* (Brazilian Academy of Letters, ABL). As Luiz Werneck Vianna (2009) notes, the first edition of DP went

was not well received because the critics "had no idea of what was that... The right and the left categorically rejected the book. I was combated by both. The Catholics, in their turn, also vehemently rejected the book" (Santos Jr., 2009, pp.104-5). In the 1950s, he notes, the concept of "estament" was not able to speak to a situation in which the main concern was development through industrial growth.

If, in the political debate, the text was not well received, the reception was not much better in the academic sphere. Raymundo recalled that the University of São Paulo (USP) was "always very Marxist" and added that the "universities of the state of São Paulo, both USP and Unicamp [*Universidade Estadual de Campinas*, State University of Campinas], renovated the studies of sociology and politics [in Brazil], but the downside they have is that they import too much... In history, the same thing happened" (Santos Jr., 2009, p.105, p.106). Raymundo Faoro, in this interview, also said that Max Weber was crucial for his disagreement with Brazilian historiography influenced by Karl Marx (see Santos Jr., 2009, p.99). Fábio Konder Comparato (2003) mentions the impact DP had in the intellectual scene deriving from its resistance against a Marxist interpretation focused on the infra-structural dimension of society (see Comparato, 2003, p.331): his interpretation "profoundly irritated the Marxist critics, since it made unnecessary the methodological resort to the scheme of class struggle" (Comparato, 2003, p.333). Alfredo Bosi (2004) notes that DP inverted a certain Marxist position that posed the political sphere depending upon the economic, infra-structural one, since, in DP, the later depended upon the former. Simon Schwartzman (2003) adds another element in this topic, saying that "what made the obscure book of the 1950s a mandatory reference since the 1970s was that it helped to question the conventional Marxism that dominated Brazilian social sciences, mainly since the works conducted by the famous reading group devoted to *Capital* in the University of São Paulo in the 1950s and the works of Caio Prado Jr." (Schwartzman, 2003, p.208).⁴⁵² In sum, the reception of DP since its first edition exposes some links between the interpretation of Brazil it proposes,

almost in the opposite direction of the expectations nurtured in the 1950s in Brazil (see Vianna, 2009, p.366-7).

⁴⁵² José Murilo de Carvalho mentions that the Department of History at USP became the first center of production of historical knowledge outside Rio de Janeiro (then the capital of Brazil); he adds that the Marxist influence (linked to Caio Prado Jr. and to the reading group on *Capital*) "impregnated a great deal of Brazilian historiography in the 1970s" (Carvalho, 2008, p.564). The reading group was organized by Fernando Henrique Cardoso, José Arthur Giannotti and Fernando Novais; other participants included Roberto Schwarz, Paul Singer, Octávio Ianni, Francisco Weffort, Ruth Cardoso.

the intellectual scene in which it became situated, and the political positions it mobilizes. But this would change in the second edition.

According to Marcelo Jasmin (2003), apart from the increase in size, verifiable mainly in relation to Raymundo's interpretation of the Republican period, and from the inclusion of important references to Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, neither the structure of the text nor its main arguments have changed (see Jasmin, 2003, p.357).⁴⁵³ The second edition took 17 years to be published, but, soon after that, the text had other editions in 1976 and 1977 (and many others in the following decades). Marcelo claims that the main reason for this repercussion are not the textual changes, but the fact that "the cultural environment of struggle against dictatorship was hospitable to a book that brought in its title the critique of the authoritarian power and that proposed new horizons to comprehend the permanence of the military in the command of the Brazilian state" (Jasmin, 2003, p.358).⁴⁵⁴ Another hypothesis mentioned by Marcelo in order to account for the success of the second edition is the fact that Raymundo Faoro had gained public notoriety, due to his activism in the state of Guanabara (now state of Rio de Janeiro) and in the *Ordem dos Advogados do Brasil* (Order of Lawyers of Brazil, henceforth OAB), fighting dictatorship.⁴⁵⁵ The intensification of the authoritarian regime in the late 1960s is another aspect that can help in understanding this issue: "[i]f, on the one hand, facts seemed to confirm the book thesis, on the other hand, this thesis worked, in the 1960s, as an instrument in the struggle against the military, widening its reception beyond the academic environment" (Jasmin, 2003, p.359).⁴⁵⁶

⁴⁵³ Marcelo seems to agree with Francisco Iglesias (2009 [1976]), who had affirmed that the 1975 edition was "the same" as the 1958 one, "only more elaborated and made more explicit" (see Iglesias, 2009 [1976], p.41). Note, however, that Francisco had also pointed out some changes, minor ones, according to him, between the editions (see Iglesias, 2009 [1976], for example pp.46-8, p.50, pp.59-61).

⁴⁵⁴ Luiz Werneck Vianna (2009) also points that out, adding that in the 1970s a series of texts renewed the debate on authoritarianism in Brazil (see Vianna, 2009, pp.369-71).

⁴⁵⁵ Raymundo Faoro was OAB's president from 1977 to 1979. It is worth recalling that OAB had not consistently opposed the interference of the Armed Forces in the political scene since its foundation. In 1964, for instance, OAB's president at that time, Porvina Cavalcanti, supported the military coup (see Cittadino, 2009 [2003], p.34). According to Gisele Cittadino (2009 [2003]), it was only after Raymundo reached OAB's presidency that the institution consolidated its independent position against dictatorship (see Cittadino, 2009 [2003], pp.35-6).

⁴⁵⁶ These hypotheses can be seen as trying to grasp why Francisco Iglesias' prediction failed; in 1976, he said that the new edition would have "less readers" and "less impact" because of its increased size (see Iglesias, 2009 [1976], pp.60-1). If it is impossible to assert whether everyone quoting *The Owners of Power* has, indeed, read the text, it is possible to observe that the expression "owners of power" has had an widespread impact, being constantly (re)appropriated in Brazil, even beyond the academic circles.

Raymundo Faoro himself never ceased to combat military dictatorship and, in many of his public manifestations, some aspects developed in DP were tackled again. For instance, in 1978, his speech at the opening session of the VII OAB National Conference combined statements directly referring to the situation at hand (the military dictatorship in the beginning of its final phase) with long-term historical ones, such as: "the concern with merging political society and civil society is not a new challenge, but a secular and multi-secular reality. Civil society has always been, in Brazil, controlled and suffocated by political society, in an estamental context that precludes class manifestations and private initiative, muddying, through a rigid top-down action, the calculability and the predictability of their actions" (Faoro, 2009 [1978], p.19). In the same speech, his commitment to liberalism - a certain kind of liberalism, that is, the "authentic" liberalism DP discusses - is reiterated when he says that the "liberal state [was] the only one on Earth and in history that, facing crises and wars, expanded frontiers and elevated its peoples to levels of wealth never dreamed of" (Faoro, 2009 [1978], p.21). This speech is permeated by skepticism, but also by hope - "[w]e are facing an inevitable transition and we are facing the morning light, the uncertain, painful morning of hopes and probable frustrations" (Faoro, 2009 [1978], p.23).⁴⁵⁷

The uncertain hopes of 1978 appeared again later, when he said that the authentic liberalism (emancipatory, democratic) has been banned in the formation of Brazil, but still existed, "even if in the underground", as a "missing link" (see Faoro, 1994, pp.54-5). In his words, "[t]he absence of Liberalism... stagnated the political movement, precluding it from encompassing, in its development, the emancipation, as a class, of the national industry" (Faoro, 1994, p.55).⁴⁵⁸ The kind of liberalism Raymundo defends requires another kind of state, "not the patrimonial-estamental-authoritarian one that is alive in Brazilian reality" (p.55). Five years later, Raymundo showed another disappointment with a renewed attempt

⁴⁵⁷ In the original, "morning of hopes and probable frustrations" stands as "*manhã de esperanças e malogros prováveis*"; this means that "probable" can refer *either* to both "hopes" and "frustrations" or just to "frustrations". This ambiguity in a text that conveys a general tone of relative optimism - despite the fact that the "inevitable transition" is coupled with the "uncertain morning light" - accidentally, perhaps unconsciously, exposes the ambiguity in relation to the probability of realizing the hopes... the hopes held in relation to military dictatorship at that time and the hopes held in relation to the possibility of modernity in a country in formation through a six-century round journey.

⁴⁵⁸ In other words, the necessary link between liberalism and democracy requires, to Raymundo, the strengthening of national industry and its liberation from political-state conditionings (see also Barreto, 1995, p.189).

at modernizing Brazil. This time, it was not a "Pombaline-positivist" modernization, but a "neoliberal one"; according to him, "[o]nce more, a dissident elite - dissident, but conservative - aims at nullifying the state, through the state" (Faoro, 1992, p.20). This neoliberal modernization put forward a variation of liberalism that reproduces the top-down projection of the state upon civil society; ultimately, this was another episode in a series of modernizations in Brazil that have sought, but not achieved, "industrial modernity", being modernizing projects unable to establish the "authentic capitalism". Once more, modernization without modernity. To conclude this 1992 text, Raymundo resorts to another comparison: "[t]he recovery of modernity... is not made from above, through a passive revolution, in a Prussian way, or through bureaucracy. The path that leads to it is the same path in which citizenship travels: [it] does not have shortcuts, and only modern, not modernizing, countries have travelled it" (Faoro, 1992, pp.21-2). In an interview ten years later, as I have already quoted above, he said that, despite not yet dead, estament was heading towards its death: "I think citizenship is estament's biggest enemy. Citizenship is almost there" (Santos Jr., 2009, p.115).

It seems plausible to say, therefore, that, from 1958 onwards, Raymundo Faoro was situated in-between confirmations of his 1958 interpretation and demands coming from - political, intellectual - elements of his times. The wide resonance of the second edition of DP, as said, is linked with the authoritarian political regime established in Brazil in 1964 and with the intellectual environment in the social sciences. It is beyond any doubt that DP problematizes political authoritarianism in the formation of contemporary Brazil; nevertheless, its defense of liberalism, crucial since the first edition and repeated in the second edition, as well as in other instances, turned out to be highly controversial. According to Jessé Souza (2000), Raymundo's point of view endorses a XIX century classical liberalism, the one that the state of São Paulo, considered by him the most modern sector inside the country, would have been able to universalize in Brazil, if it had not been defeated by the patrimonial state.⁴⁵⁹ Luiz Werneck Vianna (1999) also reminds that DP is among the interpretations of Brazil that defend "both the *paulista* [referring to the state of São Paulo] paradigm and the valorization of the interest-based approach as strategic to the democratization of the country" (Vianna, 1999,

⁴⁵⁹ See note 448.

p.189; see also Vianna, 2004 [1996], pp.51-2; and Souza, 2000, 2009). This negative view of the state have persisted in ulterior Raymundo's texts and in the wider political debate in Brazil throughout the subsequent decades (see also Campante, 2009, pp.139-147).⁴⁶⁰ For instance, the two main political parties in Brazil since the 1990s - the Workers' Party (*Partido dos Trabalhadores*, PT) and the Brazilian Social Democracy Party (*Partido da Social Democracia Brasileira*, PSDB)⁴⁶¹ - have represented, from different standpoints, the shared ambition of eradicating the Iberian heritage in contemporary Brazil in favor of civil society (see Vianna, 1999, pp.189-192; and Vianna, 2011 [2010]).⁴⁶² Jessé Souza (2009) also notes how DP provides an "institutionalized version" of the interpretation of Brazil as dominated by personalism and patrimonialism, something that ends up reinforcing a self-image cultivated by academic and non-academic perspectives (see Souza, 2009, pp.153-5).⁴⁶³

⁴⁶⁰ This "negative view" of the state should not be confounded with what I mentioned in terms of a formulation of his interpretation by "negation". This latter refers to how DP narrates the *absence* of the formation of an authentic liberalism in Brazil – and I added that his negative formulation is accompanied by an interpretation of the roots transplanted from Portugal, therefore a "positive" formulation. The negative view of the state as I have mentioned above is first and foremost associated with the relation between DP's interpretation of Brazil and the political positions it expresses. If both (interpretation and political position) had to be summarized in few words, I would say that DP ultimately expresses a variation of the anti-Iberian interpretation of contemporary Brazil.

⁴⁶¹ PSDB was founded in 1988 and reached the presidency in 1995, with Fernando Henrique Cardoso, who was reelected four years later, staying in power from 1995 to 2002. In 2002, PT, founded in 1980, won the elections with Luís Inácio Lula da Silva, who was later reelected and stayed in power from 2003 to 2010; in 2010, Dilma Rousseff (2011-), also from PT, won the elections and would later be reelected. Both parties were founded in the state of São Paulo.

⁴⁶² In this vein, Fernando Henrique Cardoso, in 1998 (the fourth year of his first mandate as president of Brazil), said that a reform of the state was necessary, in order to eradicate the "remnants of patrimonialism" (Cardoso, [2005] 1998, p.18); later, however, in 2013, Fernando Henrique said that the estament, "now more civil than military, [was] increasingly present" (Cardoso, 2013b, p.261). André Singer (2013), one of the main figures during the first mandate of Lula's government (2003-2007), warned and lamented that "the owners of power" survived in Brazilian political scene, more specifically in the Congress; in that same year, Francisco de Oliveira, a former member of PT who became a harsh critic of the party and its government, as well as of PSDB's government, referring to the demonstrations in the streets of Brazil that year, said that they have "scared the owners of power, and that this was good" (see Mendonça, 2013). Luiz Werneck Vianna would later reaffirm that both PT and PSDB shared the defense of a rupture in relation to the "past", but that, under Lula's government, the "past" - represented by the Getúlio Vargas' Era -, was less the target of a rupture than "an object of negotiation" (Vianna, 2011 [2007], p.25; see also Vianna 2011 [2009]). Wanderley Guilherme dos Santos, in turn, stated in 2011 that Lula's government has lead the Vargas' Era to its end, marking a rupture with the "past" (Santos, 2011).

⁴⁶³ Jessé defends that this self-image - or "national myth" - fails to grasp contemporary challenges in Brazil, since it reproduces a certain vision of a "pre-modern" country that does not correspond anymore to the current social condition (see Souza, 2000, 2009). I will get back to Jessé Souza's interpretation of Brazil later in the text. I should remember, however, two aspects of my text. Firstly, it is not my aim to contrast each interpretation of Brazil with what I consider to be "the Brazilian reality". Secondly, it is not my purpose to discuss the agreements and disagreements I have with the interpretations of the texts I am approaching more closely here, but to discuss their uses of "formation".

I have mentioned above that Raymundo Faoro endorsed a liberal perspective, but also criticized neoliberalism. It is important to note that, if, indeed, DP defends a certain prevalence of the market and of civil society and advances a negative view of the patrimonial state, this does not mean that it rejects the state interference by definition. The liberal (not the neoliberal) state is what Raymundo considers the model to be followed, after all. This is important to have in mind, since the ambition of eradicating the Portuguese roots of Brazilian political formation should not be taken as necessarily implying a neoliberal position. This does not preclude, however, this kind of appropriation of Raymundo's conceptions. Juarez Guimarães (2009), for instance, mentions that Raymundo defended DP against it being interpreted as a theoretical justification of neoliberalism (see, for example, Faoro, 1992, p.20). But, as Rubens Goyatá Campante (2003) notes, if, on the one hand, those that claim, from DP, that the state should be minimized in favor of a neoliberal market are "distorting" his explicit position (in DP and in subsequent texts); on the other hand, "this kind of reception is also due to some elements present [in his interpretation], in particular the idea that a class society, with a full prevalence of the market, is the conducting line of democratization" (Campante, 2003, p.186; see also Campante, 2009, pp.125-6 and pp.139-147).⁴⁶⁴

What I have been suggesting above is that DP exposes a certain political position, related to its interpretation of Brazil, and is also appropriated in varied ways in subsequent debates - not only in the political-partidary and the academic scenes, but also in the wider debate on modernization, and the role the state and civil society perform and/or should perform. I am certainly not claiming that there is an unidirectional causality from DP to these debates; neither I am saying that DP

⁴⁶⁴ According to Juarez Guimarães (2009), Raymundo defends not the absence or the negation of the state, but "the democratization of its fundamentals, a symmetrical order of rights and duties of citizenship, and the affirmation of universalist criteria of its political and economic action" (Guimarães, 2009, p.81); Juarez also says that his narrative interprets "our political *formation* from the principle of liberty", consequently emphasizing how curtailed it has been in Brazil (Guimarães, 2009, p. 83, italics added; see also Campante, 2009). In any case, Rubens' reserve in relation to possible interpretations of Raymundo's perspective should be taken very seriously: the anti-patrimonialist stance has often been captured by "neoliberal" positions demonizing "state interference" as a whole, and this is a crucial issue in which the so-called "left" has sometimes unintentionally offered munition to the opposite perspective. It is completely beyond my scope here to advance this discussion, but I just want to note that texts such as Faoro's can be an advantageous site of problematization of the conflation often made between liberalism and neoliberalism in the history of concepts and in political positions since at least the 1990s; more specifically, the problematization DP potentially triggers brings to light the uses of the concept of "liberty" and its relation with certain philosophies of history and political philosophies.

or Raymundo have directly influenced them. My point has been to touch upon what Rubens Goyatá Campante (2009) had already pointed out: in his terms, Raymundo's interpretation of Brazil is descriptive, analytical *and* normative (see Campante, 2009, pp.125-6). Or, to use the terms I have been proposing in this text, the uses of the concept "formation" in DP exposes Raymundo's political position in relation to the debates mentioned above. Moreover, I agree with Rubens when he says that Raymundo's public engagements should not be seen as opposed to his intellectual texts (see Campante, 2009, p.127).⁴⁶⁵ I mention that not to reproduce the dichotomy between "theory" and "practice" (as if they had to be either separated or consistently articulated), but to claim that the conflation of his interpretation with a neoliberal position presupposes misleading confluences of "liberalism" with "neoliberalism" and of "capitalism" with "neoliberalism", something DP and his public engagements can help in avoiding.⁴⁶⁶

Previously, I said that both Marcelo Jasmin (2003) and, before him, Francisco Iglesias (2009 [1976]) defended that the second edition is basically the same as the first one (with minor changes, but an untouched structure). In the preface to its second edition, quoting Michel de Montaigne, Raymundo Faoro himself says that "*j'adjouste, mais je ne corrige pas*" ["I adjust, but I do not correct"] (DP, p.13); then, he adds that "the thesis of this essay is the same as the one from 1958, upright in its fundamental lines, invulnerable to thirteen years of doubts and reflection. The form, however, is almost totally remodeled; the arrangement of the topics is different; the style was adjusted to my current demands" (DP, p.13). Finally, he says that it would not be possible to avoid in the text "the T' (*eu*) of a remote nightmare, with a certain 'peevish pessimism'" (DP, p.14).⁴⁶⁷ Hence, the invulnerability of the thesis, but also a total remodeling of the form of the text. All that permeated by a self - an interpreter of Brazil - living a nightmare.

⁴⁶⁵ Rubens is alluding to interpretations of Raymundo that defended the existence of "two Faoros": in DP, there would be a neoliberal perspective; while in his public engagements, he would be running against the neoliberal implications of his texts. It should also be noted Raymundo Faoro also wrote a text on Machado de Assis, called *Machado de Assis: a Pirâmide e o Trapézio* (Machado de Assis: the Pyramid and the Trapeze), published in 1974, a year before DP's second edition. Alfredo Bosi (2004; republished as Bosi, 2009) and Leopold Waizbort (2007, part I; 2009), for instance, have discussed the intertwinements of his interpretation of Machado and DP.

⁴⁶⁶ To be clear: I am explicitly saying that the theory/practice dichotomy should be problematized; I am not saying, however, that those confluences (from DP and beyond that) have not been made and have not had a substantial impact. They have, indeed.

⁴⁶⁷ The expression in quotation marks refers to what a "loveable critic, more of a friend than a critic" (DP, p.14) had said. The use of "remote nightmare" is stressed by Renato Lessa (2009, p.66).

Leopoldo Waizbort (2009) disagrees with Raymundo: "[a]lthough Faoro affirms, under the auspices of Montaigne, that the idea of the 1958 is not altered in its re-edition, the reading of both versions does not leave many doubts about the extension of the modifications" (Waizbort, 2009, p.214; the same passage is in Waizbort, 2007, p.30). Notwithstanding this observation, Leopoldo does not develop these changes.⁴⁶⁸ If I wanted to do it here in detail, this would extend too much this already-long discussion. I want, however, to point out at least one modification.⁴⁶⁹

Let me go back to DP. As I have proposed, the historical enigma DP exposes is constituted by an actual or potential point of equilibrium in the formation of contemporary Brazil. I also said that this does not mean that changes have not taken place, but that they have not been able to dismantle the structure, which, then, has been constantly in place (or, at least, recurrently reactivated). Already at the end of the 1975 text, one reads that the history of Brazil shows that a "patch made of a new cloth was put on an old dress, new wine [was put] in old wineskins, without the dress being ripped or the wineskin being ruptured" (DP, p.837). The absence of rip or rupture - which is also, and simultaneously, the absence of the nation *and* the presence of the patrimonial state - produced a civilization caught in paradoxes: "to be and not to be, to go and not to go, the uncertainty of *forms* and of the creative will. Covering it, above the skeleton made of air, the rigid tunic of the inexhaustible, heavy, suffocating past" (DP, p.838, italics added).

Nevertheless, in the 1958 edition, the potential of rupture is differently considered. Let me quote Bernardo Ricupero and Gabriela Nunes Ferreira quoting it:

The first edition (1958) of *The Owners of Power* concludes in a pessimist tone: "it seems impossible, as Jesus taught, to put new wine in old wineskins because, with the wine fermentation, they rupture and the wine spills". Soon after that, it clarifies: "it is necessary that the new wine be put in new wineskins, so that both can be conserved"

⁴⁶⁸ Bernardo Ricupero and Gabriela Nunes Ferreira (2008) discuss them, as I will show below. Fernando Henrique Cardoso (2013b) and Bernardo Ricupero (2008b) provide an interpretation of DP focusing on the first edition, less concerned with the ulterior modifications, however.

⁴⁶⁹ Having in mind, as I said, that I am always relying here on interpreters that compared both editions, and not comparing them myself.

Hence, the only option would be the rupture: "the old boilers, in order to expand the pressure, must break apart and be fragmented in a thousand formless pieces". Moreover, hope could only be linked to a radical transformation: "the explosion must be total and profound, and the old wineskins should be abandoned. Only this way the disabled and diseased child will have the opportunity to grow and become an adult"

Nevertheless, [the text] does not miss a reservation: "these are the blind expectations of faith, that both reason and the historical analysis reject..." (Faoro, 1958, p.271 *apud* Ricupero and Ferreira, 2008, p.65).

According to Bernardo and Gabriela, then, the main modification concerns the pessimist tone, stronger in the second edition.⁴⁷⁰ If the first edition does not identify major possibilities of change, the second narrates the failures of each attempt made throughout six centuries and "accentuates the argument about the subordination of the nation by the State in Brazil" (Ricupero and Ferreira, 2008, p.97).⁴⁷¹

This modification between the editions keeps alive the nightmare Raymundo claims to be living in the preface to the second edition; it also leaves invulnerable his thesis in a certain way. However, his hopes and his peevish pessimism seem to be differently expressed. In 1958, he had blind expectations - acts of faith, not of reason - that the wineskins could rupture. In 1975, the reminiscence of the rigid tunic of the inexhaustible and suffocating past seemed to have eradicated those expectations. There is an immediate, historically situated, but certainly partial, interpretation of this new balance between hope and pessimism in DP: the 1964 military coup confirmed the thesis, deepened pessimism and killed hope. To be clear: I am not proposing, as a general rule, that this "external" or "historical" event has inevitably led to, or caused, more pessimism and less hope;

⁴⁷⁰ Bernardo Ricupero (2008b) also contrasts the ends of both texts, but he does not go into the details of these modifications (see Ricupero, 2008b, pp.178).

⁴⁷¹ See, for example, what DP (second edition) says about the interregnums of 1989-1930 and 1934-1937, on page 364 above.

my claim is that it is plausible to interpret, *from the way this event is expressed in DP*, that the changes between editions are one of Raymundo's reaction to 1964.

In addition to that, Bernardo Ricupero and Gabriela Nunes Ferreira (2008) stress that these changes are linked to the way Raymundo defends liberalism. In their words, "when [he] considers that liberals could have changed the prevailing political orientation in Brazil - as he does in the 1958 book -, he evaluates in a negative way this possibility", that is to say, he thinks that, in fact, liberals were unable to rupture the patrimonial structure; but, "if [he] considers that liberalism was unable to put in practice its program - as he does in the second edition of *The Owners of Power* -, then he becomes more sympathetic towards it" (Ricupero and Ferreira, 2008, p.99). Although I have not compared in detail both editions, I have pointed out in the discussion above that Raymundo's commitment to liberalism remained virtually unchanged - changes in hopes aside - since at least the second edition of DP. Now, after mentioning one aspect in which both editions differ, it is possible to say that, if, on one hand, the blind expectations of 1958 were killed, on the other hand, a stronger commitment to liberalism emerged. Perhaps this is a way to deal with his claim that the thesis remained invulnerable, but the form was remodeled and style adjusted facing current demands. In other words, in-between *future* confirmations of his 1958 interpretation and reinterpretations of *past* events, Raymundo has adapted his *present* commitments towards Brazil. Curiously, in a text constituted by such a long round journey, political positions and historical interpretations have been displaced over a fairly short time.

The remodeled *form* has kept the nightmare alive; but it has also strengthened a certain political position. *Contemporary* Brazil is interpreted in DP through the historical enigma constituted by the encounter between the *formation* of the political estament and the *non-formation* of the nation. In the other side of the Atlantic, new wine in old wineskins. Historically, a New World was encountered; structurally, a round journey has been made.