

## 12. (Up)Roots Of Formation

*Raízes do Brasil* (Roots of Brazil, henceforth RB) was first published in 1936, but Sérgio Buarque de Holanda (1902-1982) would make important changes in the second and in the third editions, published in 1948 and 1956, respectively.<sup>472</sup> In what follows, I will provide an interpretation of RB, without neglecting the impact some of these changes can have on the uses of "formation" in the text and the political position it exposes.

Even before addressing the content of each edition, a lot of quantitative modifications are observable. The size of the text has dramatically increased, for example. João Kennedy Eugênio notes that the edition in circulation has 347 paragraphs, approximately one third of which were added to the second edition, while 216 were at least somehow modified from 1936 to 1948 (see Eugênio, 2010, pp.272-3). The first three editions were in charge of *José Olympio* Publisher, as part of a collection entitled *Documentos Brasileiros* (Brazilian Documents).<sup>473</sup> When the first edition was published, the collection was directed by Gilberto Freyre, whose presentation, included in this edition, was suppressed from the following ones.<sup>474</sup> Moreover, chapters III and IV of the first edition had the same title, "The

<sup>472</sup> I have identified the 26th edition (2014) of RB in the website of *Fundação Biblioteca Nacional*, but at least one more edition was published in 2015.

<sup>473</sup> *Raízes do Brasil* was the first text of the collection and the first twenty-five editions were published by *José Olympio*, except the fourth, published by the *University of Brasília*. Since the twenty-sixth edition, RB has been published by *Companhia das Letras* (Wegner, 2000, p.230, n.1). When the second and the third editions were published, the director of the collection was Octavio Tarquinio de Sousa. To the second edition, additional notes and bibliographical references were included. In the third edition, a list of Sérgio's works, already published and in progress, is provided and two appendices are included (an essay by Cassiano Ricardo, "Variations on the Cordial Man", and Sérgio's "Letter to Cassiano Ricardo"). The fourth edition, revised but not extended, was published by the *Universidade de Brasília Publisher* (a three-page preface by Antonio Candido is added to it). The fifth edition came out in 1969, again by *José Olympio Publisher*, under the collection "Brazilian Documents", this time directed by Afonso Arinos de Melo e Franco; this text established the final version of the text and included a text by Antonio Candido ("O Significado de *Raízes do Brasil*" ["The Significance of *Roots of Brazil*"]). After that, the only modification took place in the seventeenth edition, to which was added a "Note" written by Sérgio's widow, Maria Amélia. The modifications I have just mentioned are listed and/or discussed, for example, in Eugênio (2010, ch.5), Rocha (2012, pp.14-6), Feldman (2013, pp.119-120).

<sup>474</sup> In Gilberto's presentation included in the first edition, it is said that the "*paulista* writer [that is, from the state of São Paulo]", Sérgio, "is one of those Brazilian intelligences in which both the desire to and the capacity of analysis, the pleasure in interpretation and the intellectual joyfulness in clarifying, are better expressed" (Freyre, 1936, p.v). It would be a whole different text if I addressed the intellectual scene in which this presentation was written and the possible reasons why it was suppressed after the second edition. I cannot develop that point here, but let me note at least in passing this detachment of Sérgio in relation to Gilberto. Their relations were considerably tense

Agrarian Past" (chapter IV being "The Agrarian Past (continuation)"); since the second edition, they have become "The Rural Heritage" (chapter III) and "Sowers and Builders" (chapter IV).

My overall purpose here is twofold: to interpret the uses of "formation" in RB and to interpret how its different editions impact upon those uses and upon the political positions exposed.<sup>475</sup> I have chosen to deal with the chapters sequentially, and, then, make general considerations about RB and about the implications of the set of modifications previously exposed. This option seemed to me advantageous in that it allowed a more organized and careful account on the specificities of what is changed across the editions and, in addition to that, it enabled me to divide the comments on the modifications in two main types: the first type contains those comments restricted to each modification along each chapter (these ones will be made along the sequential reading); and the second contains considerations referring to modifications made to different parts of the text, providing a general sense of how the editions of RB propose different interpretations of Brazil and expose different political positions (these ones will be made after the sequential reading).

In order to make visualization easier, I will add *italics* to the parts of the first edition modified in the second edition and preserved in the modified form to the third edition; I will add **bold** to the parts in the first edition preserved in the second,

---

across the decades. An example from RB will suffice here. In the first edition, talking about Catholicism in Brazil, Sérgio refers to Gilberto Freyre as the author of a work (*Casa Grande & Senzala* [The Big House & the Slave Quarters]) that "represents the most serious and complete study on the social formation of Brazil" (RB1, p.105). Later editions have simply suppressed this reference to Gilberto, with no impact on the claims being advanced in the part of text where this reference was situated. Sérgio simply removed the flattering reference to Gilberto. Also, as I have already mentioned, Gilberto's presentation was also suppressed from later editions. There, one reads that Sérgio "is one of those Brazilian intelligences in which both the desire to and the capacity of analysis, the pleasure in interpretation and the intellectual joyfulness in clarifying, are better expressed" (Freyre, 1936, p.v). João Cezar de Castro Rocha has noted that in many occasions, for instance Rocha (1998, pp.164-6; 2004; 2012). The references to Gilberto's texts appeared in many other instances after the second edition of RB, most often in a critical tone; Gilberto also reacted to Sérgio's considerations, if only in implicit ways, without giving names. The intellectual, political, literary relations between Sérgio and Gilberto expose one of the most crucial points to the interpretations of Brazil, since they bring up complex aspects related to (inter)regional questions, literary rivalries, political positions in dispute, institutional architecture of the university domain, among others. I will tackle that problematization in another occasion. For some recent accounts focused on the relation between them, see Bastos (2008), Rocha (2003; 2004; 2012) and Feldman (2015b).

<sup>475</sup> RB1 will refer to the first edition; RB2, to the second; and RB3, to the third. The translations are mine, but I have consulted the English translation made by G. Harvey Summ, with a foreword by Pedro Meira Monteiro, published in 2012 as *Roots of Brazil* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2012). See To the foreword, see Monteiro (2012b). I will resort to other texts from Sérgio only insofar as they can shed light on the discussion about RB.

but modified in the third edition; and I will add both *italics and bold* to the parts in the first edition modified in the second and modified again in the third edition. Changes that fit neither category will be specified. Except if otherwise stated, all italics and bold are mine.<sup>476</sup> A final remark: the interpretation provided below is far from an exhaustive attempt at addressing all the modifications of RB and their implications. The selection of the passages is oriented by the specific purpose of my discussion. That said, I will begin now to follow the chapters sequentially.

The first chapter, "European Frontiers", begins with what would become one of the most importantly modified paragraphs in later editions of RB (particularly in the third one):<sup>477</sup>

**Every comprehensive study of Brazilian society has to highlight the truly fundamental fact that we constitute the only large scale and well-succeed effort of transplantation of the European culture to a tropical and subtropical climate zone. If Brazilian territory had the same population density seen in Belgium, it would reach the same number of inhabitants one verifies in the entire globe. We live a unique experience [*uma experiência sem simile*]. Bringing from distant countries **our forms of life**, our institutions and **our worldview**, and being proud of maintaining all of them in an often unfavorable and hostile environment, **we are still exiles in our own land**. We can make great accomplishments, enrich our humanity with new and unexpected aspects, elevate to perfection the type of culture we represent: what is certain is that all the fruits of our work and of our laziness *inevitably belong to a style and to a system of evolutions that are natural to* another climate and another landscape.**

---

<sup>476</sup> The Portuguese orthography was also modified, particularly updated, in each of the later editions, but this is not relevant to my discussion here and will not be specified.

<sup>477</sup> This chapter has received two more paragraphs to the second edition, while twenty-five were modified (Eugênio, 2010, pp.272-3).

This way, **before inquiring** [*antes de investigar*] **to what extent we will be able to feed in our environment a kind of culture of our own**, it would be necessary to ascertain how far **we represent** in this environment **the forms of life**, the institutions and **the worldview we inherited and which we are proud of** (RB1, p.3).

In the second edition, the italicized part suffers a slight change: "what is certain is that all the fruits of our work and of our laziness *seem to inevitably belong to a system of evolution that is natural to* another climate and another landscape" (RB2, p.15). That is, the outcomes of our work and our laziness now "seem" to be - in contrast to the simple inevitability verified in the previous version - foreign to Brazilian system of evolution, pertaining to other parts of the world (this change is mostly preserved to the third edition). This seeming inevitability does not imply a hidden reality (as if, in fact, there was nothing foreign to the outcomes mentioned); rather, it opens room to adjustments of those fruits to the tropics.

In 1956, the passage quoted above is substantially modified. The part in bold gains a different content right from the first word:

**The attempt at implantation of the European culture in a large territory under natural conditions that are foreign, if not adverse, to its thousand-year tradition is the dominant fact in the origins of Brazilian society and the one that has yielded the most valuable consequences.** Bringing from distant countries **our forms of association**, our institutions, **our ideas**, and being proud of maintaining all of them in an often unfavorable and hostile environment, **we are still today exiles in our own land.** We can make great accomplishments, enrich our humanity with new and unexpected aspects, elevate to perfection the type of culture we represent: what is certain is that all the fruits of our work and of our laziness *seem to inevitably belong to a system of evolution that is proper of* another climate and another landscape.

This way, **before asking** [*antes de perguntar*] **to what extent such attempt will be able to succeed**, it would be necessary to ascertain how far **we have been able to represent those forms of association**, institutions and **ideas we inherited** (RB3, p.15).

Let me go step by step. Firstly, in 1936, Sérgio considers Brazil the only well-succeed effort of a large scale transplantation of the European culture to a tropical or subtropical zone. The same judgment is made in 1948. But, in 1956, he considers the effort of implantation (not anymore a transplantation) of the European culture the dominant fact and the one containing the richest consequences in what regards the origins of Brazilian society. In few words: the successful transplantation becomes a persistent and full-of-consequences attempt at implantation.

Secondly, both the successful transplantation and the persistent and consequential attempt at implantation lead Sérgio to the same catchphrase: in 1936, "we are still exiles in our own land"; two decades after that, "we are still **today** exiles in our land". This statement works, in fact, as a depiction of how contemporary Brazilians are situated in their own country; being exiles in their own land, Brazilians can be seen as being both inside and outside their nation, since this nation itself is formed through the articulation of the inside and the outside (that is, through a process of transplantation (RB1 and RB2) or of implantation (RB3) of the European culture in the tropics). I will get back to this exile condition later, since the modifications to the third edition bring other profound implications that can only be grasped once the RB is considered as a whole.

Thirdly, the insertion of "today" ("**we are still today exiles in our own land**") reinforces this condition in progress of the formative process. As Thiago Lima Nicodemo puts, the passage of the third edition exposes a "mismatch between 'form' and 'content' - the action that orients the formation of Brazil is characterized by a kind of action that is not defined by an end, but by the circumstances of a still incomplete adaptability process" (Nicodemo, 2014, p.144). That is to say, the insertion of "today" "reinforces the retrospective structure of the entire 'formation'" (Nicodemo, 2014, p.144) and, therefore, makes of a certain past a still living condition. It should be noted, however, that, despite the reinforcement of the exile condition in all editions, in 1956 this condition derives from an experience that is

interpreted through a less favorable angle: the success attested in the first edition becomes a persistent, and still-in-progress, effort in the third.

Fourthly, in the first paragraph of the third edition, neither the reference to Belgium nor the statement that Brazil is a unique experience is found. As João Cezar de Castro Rocha notes, the reference to Belgium had already been made by Affonso Celso in the text *Porque me ufano do meu país* [Why I am ufanist about my country]<sup>478</sup>, where one reads: "[i]t means that if the population of Brazil equates the density of Belgium population, it will become bigger than what it is calculated to exist in the entire Earth" (Affonso Celso *apud* Rocha, 2004, p.110, n.14). It seems, then, that the relation between, on the one hand, the reference to Belgium and, on the other hand, the statement that Brazil expresses a "unique experience" as "the only large scale and well-succeeded effort of transplantation of the European culture to a tropical and subtropical climate zone", implies an interpretation with at least some affinities to - even if never a full agreement with - Affonso Celso's ufanism.

Finally, related to the previous point, in 1936, "we" had inherited - and had been proud of - forms of life, institutions and worldview. In 1956, however, "we" do not seem to be proud anymore of what was inherited.<sup>479</sup> The inheritance is specified in the third paragraph, the same for all the editions:

[i]t is significant, in the first place, that we have received our heritage through an Iberian nation. Spain and Portugal, as well as Russia and the Balkan countries (and, in a very special sense, also England), are bridge-territories through which Europe communicates with other worlds. They constitute a frontier, transition zone that is, exactly for this reason, less laden with the Europeanism that they nevertheless keep as a common heritage (RB1, p.4; RB2, p.16; RB3, pp.15-6).

---

<sup>478</sup> "Ufanism" comes from the Portuguese word "*ufanismo*", which refers to a strong sense of pride for one's own country.

<sup>479</sup> For the conceptual modifications related to "forms of life" becoming "forms of association" and "worldview" becoming "ideas", see Rocha (2004, p.124) and Waizbort (2011, p.60, n.28).

The forms of life (or association), institutions and worldview (or ideas) that Sérgio defines in 1936 as a heritage to be proud of and, in 1956, as only a heritage, they all come from an Iberian nation, Portugal, that is also a territory linking Europe to other parts of the world.<sup>480</sup> The erasure of the declaration of pride reinforces the previous point in respect to the elimination of the reference to Belgium and the definition of Brazil as a unique experience. I will get back later to those opening paragraphs, since further modifications in RB will shed light on other of their aspects.

Iberian nations, according to Sérgio, made a "late entrance" in "the European scene", and this was "responsible for many peculiarities of their historical and spiritual development. They became a kind of society that, in some senses, would develop almost on the margins of their European counterparts, receiving from the latter no inducement [*incitamento*] that they did not already **contain** [*had*, RB2; **bring**, RB3] in germ [*em germe*]" (RB1, p.4; RB2, p.16; RB3, pp.16).<sup>481</sup> Iberia is conceived in RB as a "bridge-territory" or a "transition zone" and its formation is interpreted in terms of a play of substance and process; that is, Iberian nations possess (or bring) traits that constitute their "essence", and these traits condition the

---

<sup>480</sup> João Kennedy Eugênio stresses that when Sérgio says that "we are proud of the Portuguese heritage", the "we" does not stand for Brazilians as a whole, but for some of them (including Sérgio himself, Gilberto Freyre and few others). This becomes clear when one takes into account that RB positions itself against the Brazilian elites that aim at the complete eradication of the Iberian heritage in the formation of Brazil (see Eugênio, 2010, p.276). Furthermore, the first edition observes that the nourishment of a "culture of our own" depends on the extent to which "we represent in this environment the forms of life, the institutions and the worldview we inherited and which we are proud of", which implies a rejection, not only of the position defending a complete eradication of the Iberian heritage in name of an imported model of modernity, but also of the position defending a return to a more primitive arrangement, before even the arrival of the Portuguese (see Castro, 2008, p.205). Later editions modify the "proud" and the "culture of our own", but preserves the importance of well representing what Brazilians have inherited.

<sup>481</sup> As indicated by my italics and bold, two modifications were made in this paragraph. The first one refers to a historical correction: Nelson Werneck Sodré notes in a review of RB that Portugal and Spain had already entered the European scene before the "discovery of America" (that is, the "great discoveries"), at least since the conquest of India (see Eugênio, 2010, p.274). The second is the modification of the verb "contain": in the first edition, Iberian nations already "contained" (from the Portuguese verb "*conter*") certain inducements in germ; in the second edition, they already "had" (from the Portuguese verb "*ter*") them in germ; and, in the third, they already "brought" (from the Portuguese verb "*trazer*") them in germ. All these variations refer the notion that some traces, or seeds, were already constitutive of Iberian nations before they became part of the European scene. Note: "incitamento" could have perhaps been translated as "incitement" or, as the English translation proposes, "influence"; my option for "inducement" intends to keep the botanic or organic metaphor ("implantation", "transplantation", "in germ") of the text.

"process" of their formation. After all, they only develop things they already contain in an inchoate form - it is process of germination, so to speak.<sup>482</sup>

The comparative mobilization that permeates all the text in different ways comes here explicitly, since he claims that the comparison between the Iberian Peninsula and the rest of Europe marks the peculiarity of the former in relation to its neighbors: "none [*of these neighbors*, RB2 and RB3] *developed* [*knew how to develop*, RB2 and RB3] to such an extreme this culture of personality, that seems to constitute the most decisive trait in the evolution of the Hispanic people since immemorial times" (RB1, p.5; RB2, p.17; RB3, p.17).<sup>483</sup> Sérgio ascribes a great deal of the "national originality" of Spanish and Portuguese peoples to the "particular importance they attribute to the very value of the human person, to the autonomy of each person in relation to his peers [*in time and in space*, RB2 and RB3]" (RB1, p.5; RB2, p.17; RB3, p.17).<sup>484</sup> The value of a person is measured according to how independent from others one is capable of being, that is, how far goes one's self-sufficiency.

This culture of personality has a profound political and social implication, since it is from this conception of person that, "to a large extent, results the unique weakness of all forms of organization, of all associations, that imply solidarity and order among these peoples. In a land where all are barons, lasting collective agreement is not possible unless through a respectable and feared outside force" (RB1, p.5; RB2, p.18; RB3, pp.17-8). The forms of coexistence of these barons of Iberia are contrasted by Sérgio with places where "feudalism has created [*deep*, RB2 and RB3] roots": in the latter, "hereditary privileges" had a much more decisive influence, while, in Iberian countries, they not only did not have such a relevance, but they also did not have to be abolished in order for "the principle of individual competition" to be established (RB1, p.6; RB2, p.18; RB3, p.18).<sup>485</sup>

---

<sup>482</sup> The Aristotelian vocabulary, associated with an organicist idiom, that permeates RB is discussed in detail by João Kennedy Eugênio (2010).

<sup>483</sup> "Of these neighbors" and "developed" were inserted in the second edition and preserved in the following ones.

<sup>484</sup> "In time and in space" was added in the second edition.

<sup>485</sup> "Deep", in "deep roots", was included in the second and the following editions. It seems plausible to say that this inclusion is a reaction to a fierce debate on the existence of feudalism in Portugal. By saying that some places have witnessed a "deep rooted" feudalism, Sérgio is perhaps accepting that Portugal and Spain had feudal relations, even if not as embedded as in other European countries; with a different emphasis, one could say that Sérgio is reinforcing the position that Iberian countries did not have a deeply feudal past.



The combination of not-so-relevant hereditary privileges and individual competition leads to a specific social and political arrangement in "Hispanic nations":

[s]ome of the most singular episodes in the history of Hispanic nations, including among them Portugal and Brazil, derive from the weakness of social structure and the lack of organized hierarchy. The anarchic elements have always easily flourished here, with the complicity or the indifferent indolence of institutions and customs. The initiatives, even when meant to be constructive, were continuously in the sense of separating people, never of uniting them (RB1, p.6; RB2, pp.18-9; RB3, p.18).

Sérgio claims, however, that the anarchic elements and the weak social organization are not a recent phenomenon, that one could overcome by regressing to a period in time when they were not yet present. In his words,

[t]he lack of social cohesion in our social life does not represent a modern phenomenon. And this is why those who imagine that the only possible defense against our disorder lies in a return to the tradition, to a certain tradition, are wrong. The commandments and orders elaborated by these erudite people are really ingenious spiritual creations, detached from and adverse to the world. In their point of view, our anarchy, our incapacity for solid organization are nothing more than an absence of the only order they deem necessary and effective. If we think about it carefully, it is the hierarchy they glorify that needs such anarchy to justify itself and gain prestige (RB1, pp.6-7; RB2, p.19; RB3, pp.18-9).

In this critique of the "erudite people", RB is opposing itself to certain interpretations of Brazil and the political positions linked to them. In a way, one can say that Sérgio does not disagree, at least not in a radical way, with the interpretations that identify a lack of our social cohesion. The disagreement arises, then, when it comes both to how far in the past this lack can be situated, and to the

solutions proposed to overcome it.<sup>486</sup> RB does not prescribe a move back in history, in order to restore a lost, pre-modern tradition, as if the future should try to reestablish a certain pre-modern past. "Ours" is not a modern disorder; rather, it is inseparable from "our" tradition.<sup>487</sup> Here, Sérgio even proposes a generalization, claiming that a traditionalist position is always at odds with the search for a better social organization: "[i]n any case, will it be legitimate this resort to the past, in search for a stimulus to better organize society? Would it not mean, on the contrary, merely an evidence of our incapacity for spontaneous creation? The really active [vivas] epochs were never deliberately traditionalists" (RB1, p.7; RB2, p.19; RB3, p.19). Hence, what is at stake is not a nostalgic stance, but one that puts into relief the detachment of a certain kind of Brazilians, a certain elite, from the characteristics of the formative process of the country.

The disorder identified above is intimately linked to the historical formation of the culture of personality in Iberian nations and in Brazil. The definition of Iberia is often accompanied by a comparison with other places in Europe where "revolutionary ideas" triumphed and where "modern mentality" developed itself. Sérgio states that the "full recognition of individual merit and responsibility" that characterizes personalism has become the main obstacle

to the spirit of spontaneous organization, so characteristic of Protestant peoples, and mainly Calvinists... In Iberian nations, with the lack of this rationalization of life, that was so early experienced in some Protestant lands, the unifying principle was always represented by governments. The kind of political organization that is artificially maintained by an outside force incessantly predominated; in modern times, one

---

<sup>486</sup> In 1926, in a text discussing different positions under the "modernist attitude" in Brazil, Sérgio strongly opposes his position to the one held by those wishing "the creation of an elite of intelligent and wise men, although without much contact with the land and the people;... [an elite of] well-intentioned people, capable enough to impose on us a hierarchy, an order, an experience that strangle all at once this cursed levity of a young and senseless [*sem juízo*] people... And they insist above all in this abominable panacea of *construction*. Inasmuch as, in their view, for the time being we are agitated in chaos and are pleased in disorder. Disorder of what? This question is indispensable, since the order disturbed among us is certainly not, it cannot be, *our order*: it must be a thing that is fictitious and foreign to ourselves, a dead law that we imported, if not from the other world, at least from the Old World" (Holanda, 1989 [1926], p.87, italics in the original).

<sup>487</sup> As Jacques Leenhardt emphasizes, "[Sérgio] is quite clear: Brazil cannot, in no way, aspire to an affiliation to an ancient form of social organization that would have been lost. This tradition has never existed" (Leenhardt, 2005, p.94).

of its typical forms is found in military dictatorships" (RB1, pp.11-2; RB2, p.27; RB3, p.26).

This lack of rationalization has one of its main expressions in the question of work. To RB, "[i]t is only very recently, with the higher prestige of the institutions of the people from the North, that this work ethic has gained some terrain among them [Iberian peoples]. But the resistance that it found and still finds has been so vividly and persevering that it is plausible to have doubts about its *success* [*complete success*, RB2 and RB3] (RB1, p.12; RB2, p.27; RB3, pp.26-7).<sup>488</sup> It is noteworthy the inclusion of "complete" in the second and the following editions. While, in 1936, the success of the work ethic seemed to be an all-or-nothing thing - that is to say, the doubt was placed in the very possibility of its success in Iberian lands -, in 1948 and 1956, it seems that its success has become to a certain degree inevitable, the doubt being placed now on how successful it could become. This attention to the obstacles to the establishment of a work ethic in Iberian nations reiterates RB's focus on the implications of the importation of foreign cultural, social and political aspects to the formative process of Brazil.

The text is permeated by a constant play of identifications and differentiations. As I have noted, in this chapter the identification of traits in Iberian nations is constantly followed by a differentiation in relation to other peoples ("peoples from the North", "Protestant peoples"). In this sense, one reads that, "[w]hat is certain is that, among Spanish and Portuguese peoples, this morality of work was always an exotic fruit. It comes as no surprise, then, that their ideas of solidarity were precarious" (RB1, p.13; RB2, p.29; RB, p.28). Sérgio specifies here the kind of solidarity lacking: "solidarity exists among them only where the links are related to feelings more than to interests - [that is,] in the domestic circle or among friends. Circles that are by definition restricted and particularistic; more hostile than favorable to associations formed on a broader basis - a broader group

---

<sup>488</sup> In the second and following editions, it is inserted in this paragraph a reference to Medieval times. Sérgio stresses, then, the "insurmountable repulsion that all morality founded mainly on the cult of work has always infused them with. *Their normal attitude was precisely the theoretical opposite of the system of medieval craftsmanship, which placed a high value on physical labor and looked down on lucre, 'filthy lucre'.* Only very recently..." (RB2, p.27; RB3, pp.26-7). A little later, this repulsion of work ethic is reinforced (in all editions): "[m]anual and mechanical kinds of work envisage an objective foreign to man and aims at achieving perfection in a work [*obra*] that is not his" (RB1, p.12; RB2, p.28; RB3, pp.27).

or a national basis" (RB1, p.14; RB2, p.28; RB, pp.28-9).<sup>489</sup> To put it differently, it is a civic and a national solidarity that is lacking in Iberian people, not a particularistic one, linked to family and friends.

To conclude the chapter, the last paragraph goes back to a point he had made in very first one, in relation to the "transplantation" (RB1 and RB2), or "implantation" (RB3), of European culture in Brazil:

[w]ithout the possibility of this break [that is, of obedience as a principle of discipline], it is in vain that we have been [trying]<sup>490</sup> to import from systems of other modern peoples, or to create by our own, an adequate *substitute*, capable of overcoming the effects of our restless and disorderly nature. Experience and tradition teach that all culture truly absorbs, assimilates or elaborates traits of other cultures only when these traits find a possibility of adjustment into its frames of life. In this case, we should recall what happened to European cultures transplanted to the New World. Neither the contact nor the mixture with *aboriginal* [*native or foreign*, RB2 and RB3] races has made us as different from our grandfathers from overseas as we [sometimes, RB3] would like to be. In the case of Brazil, the truth, no matter how unattractive it may seem to our patriots, is that we are still associated with the Iberian Peninsula, especially Portugal, through a long and living tradition, living enough to nourish until today a common soul, despite all that separates us. We can say that the present *form* of our culture came from there; the rest was **plastic** substance, that was well or badly adjusted to this form (RB1, p.15; RB2, pp.31-2; RB3, p.30).<sup>491</sup>

<sup>489</sup> There are minor modifications in this last quotation (more precisely, in the phrase "on a broader basis - a broader group or a national basis"), but they are nothing more than textual adjustments.

<sup>490</sup> In the first edition, the Portuguese word is *descurado*, which could be translated as *neglected*; in the second and following editions, he modifies the word to *procurado*. This change seems to be only a correction, since "descurado" makes no sense in the overall meaning of the paragraph and of the text in general. João Kennedy Eugênio have noted this point in Eugênio (2010, p.275).

<sup>491</sup> In the first edition, the Portuguese word for "substitute" is "*substitutivo*"; in the second and following editions, "*sucedâneo*". This is not a relevant modification, since both Portuguese words have similar definitions in this case. In second edition and following editions, instead of "aboriginal races", one reads "native or foreign [*indígenas ou adventícias*]". "Sometimes" is included only in

This final paragraph of the chapter contains much of what is at stake in the whole chapter and in what comes next: the problem of importation of foreign elements to Brazil; the feelings with respect to the Portuguese tradition alive in Brazil (recall that the "proud" of the Portuguese heritage identified in the first and in the second editions is not found anymore in the third); and the future possibilities and impossibilities of our social and political organization. I would also like to stress that "aboriginal races" becomes "native or foreign races". This change puts into relief another differentiation: if, in the first edition, the contact, or mixture, depicted in one between Europeans and aboriginals (or natives), later editions emphasize that "we", "Brazilians", are formed through contacts with both native and foreign races. Associated to both, especially with Portugal; but equal to neither.

As I have been noting, the first chapter of RB exposes a play of identifications and differentiations. The identification of an Iberian, especially Portuguese, heritage alive in Brazil is accompanied by a differentiation in relation to Protestant countries, including, in this comparison, the difference between the traditional social relations in Iberia, and the medieval and feudal relations deeply rooted in other parts of Europe. However, this heritage does not mean that Brazil is, or should be, simply a copy of Portugal. In this sense, the identification of the Iberian roots of Brazil comes with the differentiation of what takes place in this tropical part of the world: importation (transplantation or implantation) and exile make Brazil different from, and similar to, Portugal. In sum, the European frontiers are also constitutive of Brazilian frontiers, that is, of Brazilian roots.

Chapter two is entitled "Work and Adventure".<sup>492</sup> The first line is a praise to the Portuguese: "[p]ioneers in the conquest of the tropics for civilization, the

---

the third edition. "Form" is in italics in the first edition, but this italics is suppressed in later ones. Finally, "plastic" is suppressed from the third edition.

<sup>492</sup> This chapter has received thirty-four more paragraphs to the second edition, while thirty-three were modified (Eugênio, 2010, pp.272-3). The first edition brings an epigraph, in Latin, by Sallustio: "*Hi postquam in una moenia convenere, dispari genere, dissimili lingua, alius alio more viventes, incredibile memoratu est quam facile coaluerint* [After having found themselves within the same walls, it is memorable how easily they, of different races, different languages and living in different ways from one another, formed a union]" (RB1, p.17. I have mostly relied on the translation to the Portuguese proposed by Eugênio 2010, p.281). This epigraph is suppressed in later editions. According to João Kennedy Eugênio, this epigraph signalizes the chapter's discussion on plasticity and the advantages and achievements of the Portuguese colonization in the tropics (see Eugênio, 2010, p.282). In my view, this epigraph could foster an imprecise conclusion that RB is unequivocally praising Portuguese colonization, which would thus miss the ambiguities of his stance, already present in the first edition and intensified in later ones, as will become clear below.

Portuguese had, in this accomplishment, their greatest historical mission" (RB1, p.19; RB2, p.35; RB3, p.33). The following lines resume a comparison between Portugal and other European peoples. But it is worth noting that, in a certain sense, the praise that opens the chapter is not a complete one, that is, the position towards Portugal is not one of unrestricted approval: "despite all the claims one can make against its achievement [*obra*], one must agree that the Portuguese were not only effective, but also natural bearers of this mission" (RB1, p.19; RB2, p.35; RB3, p.33). So, if this judgment has an unquestionably favorable tone, it does not discard possible negative considerations.

In my view, a great deal of the favorable dimension in this judgment can be attributed to two main historical comparisons. Firstly, to a historically comparison between past and present criteria. Sérgio admits that, judged according to "currently prevailing moral and political criteria, we perhaps find [in the Portuguese venture] many and serious shortcomings" (RB1, p.19; RB2, p.35; RB3, p.33). And, secondly, to a historical comparison between kinds of colonization: "[n]o other people of the Old World was so well equipped for venturing into irregular and intense exploration of lands near the equator" (RB1, p.19; RB2, p.35; RB3, p.33). The comparison is reinforced next, when Sérgio says that the Portuguese exploration was not "a methodical and rational enterprise, nor derived it from a constructive and energetic will; rather, it took place with negligence and somewhat carelessly. It could be said that it occurred in spite of its authors" (RB1, pp.19-20; RB2, pp.35-6; RB3, pp.33-4). The methodical and rational exploration is later attributed to other colonizers, as I will mention below.

At this point, Sérgio resorts to the categories signalized in the chapter title, proceeding with another play of identifications and differentiations. According to him, two principles that "fight to death [*se combatem de morte*]" and that regulate human activity in diverse ways, can be seen in the "forms of collective life". These principles are incorporated into two types: "the adventurer and the worker" (RB1, p.20; RB2, pp.36; RB3, p.34). The former is so much worried with the "ultimate aim", that he can even discard the "intermediary processes", considering them "almost superfluous". In Sérgio's identification, "[t]his kind of human ignores boundaries... Lives off unlimited spaces, vast projects, distant horizons" (RB1, pp.20-1; RB2, pp.36-7; RB3, pp.34-5). The worker, on the contrary, takes into account, first of all, "the difficulty to be overcome, not the triumph to be achieved...

His field of vision is naturally restricted. The part is greater than the whole" (RB1, p.21; RB2, p.37; RB3, p.35). These types express two different ethics: the work ethic and the adventure ethic. Instead of an absolute opposition between them, Sérgio sees "a radical incomprehension": "[t]o a greater or lesser degree, both [types] participate in multiple combinations; and it is obvious that, in a pure form, neither the adventurer nor the worker has a real existence, outside the world of ideas". In any case, they are very helpful "in the study of the formation and evolution of societies" (RB1, p.22; RB2, p.38; RB3, p.36).<sup>493</sup>

The singularity of the Portuguese enterprise is intrinsically linked to its "spirit of adventure", the "preeminently harmonizing element" in "our national life"; this element, "[b]y favoring social mobility, also stimulated men to boldly confront nature's harshness and resistances" (RB1, pp.24-5; RB2, p.41; RB3, p.40). The Portuguese became unique in this respect: "[t]rying to recreate here their own original environment, they have made it so easily that there is perhaps no other example in history" (RB1, p.25; RB2, p.41; RB3, p.40). Their capacity of adaptation to the tropical zone enabled a series of combinations of their own techniques with others, learned from indigenous people.<sup>494</sup>

---

<sup>493</sup> I have been emphasizing so far that the comparison Sérgio mobilizes works mainly in two interrelated directions: one, between Protestant countries and Iberian countries; and, two, between the past of the former, where feudalism was deeply rooted and, then, revolutionary ideas had a great impact, and the past of the latter, where neither took place. In chapter two, he specifies that the industrial revolution that took place in England should not obliterate that fact that the "ancient English" or "the typical English is not industrious... On the contrary, he has the propensity for indolence and prodigality, and valued the 'good life' above all. Such was the prevailing, almost unanimous, opinion of foreigners who visited Great Britain before the Victorian Era" (RB1, p.23; RB2, p.39; RB3, p.37). In 1921, in a text entitled "O Homem-Máquina" ("The Machine-Man"), Sérgio warns against the spread of the "Anglo-Saxons' utilitarian spirit" around the world; he recalls, however, that England, during "Renaissance, before the Reformation, was called by everyone *The Merry England*", when utilitarianism had not yet begun to replace "idealism" (Holanda, 2011a [1921], p.17). This makes clear that, to Sérgio, before the Victorian Era, England was not as different from Iberian countries as it turned out to become. This implies that, contrary to Iberian nations, where tradition and modernity are not separated by a complete rupture, England has witnessed a break in time when it became a Protestant country. Sérgio's early opposition to utilitarianism is also exposed in a text from 1920, entitled "Ariel", where he claims that "utilitarianism and the concern with making money, the *auri sacra fames* [accursed hunger for gold] conquered North-Americans to the detriment of intellectual spirit, political morality and individual freedom itself" and states that "the *yankee* utilitarianism is not in line with the temperament [*índole*] of Brazilian people, ...which is its opposite extreme" (Holanda, 1989 [1920], p.44). See also note 543 below.

<sup>494</sup> That does not mean that Sérgio does not consider the relation between colonizers and indigenous people to be a violent one. In 1940 ("O Índio no Brasil" ["The Indian in Brazil"]), for instance, he wrote that the indigenous people are submitted to "four-hundred years of spoliations, massacres, exodus and misery" (Holanda, 2011a [1940b], p.93). This text is focused on the exploitation suffered by the indigenous people and on their current condition in the country; it refutes the argument that they are incapable of organized work, claiming that, in fact, their use as a labor force came to be less advantageous over time, once the legislation turned them into serfs (and not slaves anymore), while the Africans could be enslaved, that is, were pure commodities, with no rights or lands of their own.

When it comes to the interpretation of the formation of the agrarian large land properties in Brazil, the reader faces some modifications in the second edition of RB. In 1936 (first edition), one reads:

It is not correct to say that the particular form taken by the large agricultural lands was a kind of original management, arising from a creative and a somewhat arbitrary will. *The truth is that it came ready and complete from the [Portuguese] Kingdom. Here, it was only refined [apenas apurou-se] due to peculiar conditions, such as the abundance of lands, the scarcity of goods [gêneros], the necessity of continuous surveillance against the enemy...* (RB1, p.26)

Now, in the second and following editions, one reads:

It is not correct to say that the particular form took by the large agricultural lands was a kind of original management, arising from a creative and a somewhat arbitrary will. *It arose in large part from foreign elements and due to production and market conveniences. It is also not possible to guarantee that the farming system, established, indeed, with a curious uniformity of organization in almost all the tropical and subtropical territories of America, has been, here, the result of intrinsic and specific conditions of the environment. This*

---

In sum, according to this text, the conception that the indigenous people are inapt to organized labor is a prejudice with no historical fundament, although widely diffused in history. The text concludes stressing that it is crucial not to forget that, "in Brazil, while most of the population speaks about steel industry, uses radio and electricity, airplane, automobile and cinema, as part of their daily lives, another part of the population - much smaller, but still alive - lives in the stone age, ignores the simple use of steel"; moreover, it is only a "delicate process", with "our support", that, according to Sérgio, can make this smaller part of the population "overcome, in few years,... those stages that the major part took some centuries to move through" (Holanda, 2011a [1940b], p.171). The passages I quoted make clear, not only Sérgio's concern with centuries of exploitation of indigenous people, but also his modernizing concern with the coexistence of modernity and backwardness. But, if it is true that he is devoted to highlight these violent practices, it is also true that his interpretation of the formative process of Brazil and of the state of São Paulo is majorly focused on the encounters between European and natives regarding the techniques and habits of daily practices. For instance, as he put in 1951, in a text entitled "Algumas Técnicas Rurais no Brasil Colonial I" ("Some Rural Techniques in the Colonial Brazil I"), "[t]he acceptance of an imported element did not correspond [among the indigenous populations] to an indiscriminate acceptance of traditional foreign forms of use of this element. While, in the case of the European, it can be said that he conceded in everything in relation to the indigenous processes, without even the care of improving them" (Holanda, 2011b [1951a], p.96).



*system was possible and its expansion was fomented because of the circumstance that, at the time of the discoveries, Europe was not industrialized and produced sufficient agricultural goods for its own consumption; therefore, it only effectively needed natural products from warm-climate zones* (RB2, pp.42-3; RB3, p.41).<sup>495</sup>

I want to note two aspects from the quotations above. Firstly, despite the fact that, already in the first edition, it is stated that "the particular form taken by the large agricultural lands" is modified when it arrives in Brazil, Sérgio also claims that "it came ready and complete" from Portugal. In the paragraphs included since the second edition, more details are given on the encounter of the settlers with the indigenous people, regarding the processes used in farming and techniques put in practice; these details attenuate the claim that this form came "ready and complete", as I will mention again below. Sérgio affirms, then, that "the methods [the Portuguese] put in practice in Brazil do not represent a major progress in relation to what the indigenous people already practiced before them" (RB2, p.51; RB3, p.49).<sup>496</sup> Secondly, since the second edition, the farming system that arose from this

---

<sup>495</sup> This observation regarding the not-yet industrialized Europe had already been made in a text from 1946: "[i]t seems more plausible to admit... that our colonizers represented... an instrument more or less docile to extrinsic factors that they themselves had not contributed to provoke. What made possible and fomented the expansion, among us, of that agrarian system was the fact that Europe was insufficiently industrialized at the time of the discoveries and, therefore, was capable of dedicating itself to the production of the enough quantity of agricultural goods for its own consumption, needing only the importation of natural products from warm-climate zones" (Holanda, 2011a [1946], pp.279-80). This text, entitled "Economia Colonial I" ("Colonial Economy I"), is focused on the understanding of the "root causes of the difficult adaptation of our economic life to the more rational and modern conditions" (Holanda, 2011a [1946], p.279). It reinforces Sérgio's concern with the possibilities and impossibilities of modernity in Brazil and also signalizes the modifications he would make in this direction in the second edition of RB. Other parts of this text were incorporated to the second and following editions of RB.

<sup>496</sup> Another modification goes in a similar direction. In the first edition, the first settlers and life under the Portuguese domain are defined by Sérgio with the following words: "[o]ur first settlers were like that: above all, passive instruments; they acclimatized easily, accepting what the environment suggested, not concerned with imposing on it fixed and indelible norms. Even when compared to the Spanish, they stood out in this respect... Among us, the European domain was in general bland and soft [*brando e mole*], less obedient to rules and regulations than to the law of nature. Life here was incomparably smoother, more accommodating of the social, racial, moral and even religious dissonances (RB1, pp.26-7)". To the second edition, some modifications and additions were made and Sérgio interprets the formation of the farming system deriving from the encounter of the Portuguese with the land and the indigenous people: "[i]n this case, once they accommodated to the convenience of large-scale production, it was not in order the modification of the crude processes used by the indigenous people, guided as these processes were by the law of minimal effort. Above all passive instruments, our colonizers acclimatized easily, yielding to the suggestions of the land and of its first inhabitants, not concerned with imposing on it fixed and

encounter gains another aspect of its development, insofar as it is seen also as a result of an external dynamics; more precisely, the formation of this system in Brazil is oriented to the external market and it is influenced by the European condition, not yet industrialized.

From the above, it is plausible to say that, following RB, the interpretation of Brazil cannot obliterate the articulations of inside and outside in its formative process; or, to put it differently, it takes place through the construction of what is internal and what is external. The characteristics of the Portuguese are constantly raised, in order to interpret the formation of Brazil; and, in addition to that, one also reads the constant comparison with other kinds of colonization and the attention given to the encounter between, on the one hand, the colonizers and, on the other hand, the land and the people from the land. In that vein, the words included since the second edition bring the attention to the links between the formation of Brazil and the dynamics of external market ("conveniences of large-scale production"); and to the links between the formation of Brazil and the encounter of Portuguese people with native land and native people ("yielding to the suggestions of the land and of its first inhabitants").

The chapter continues to develop the definition of the Portuguese and its impact upon the definition of Brazilian themselves. The contrast of workers and adventurers works in this direction. It impacts not only the formation of the farming system, but also the formation of Brazilians themselves. This becomes clear when Sérgio states, in all editions, that the "other face quite typically of the [Portuguese's] extraordinary social plasticity" is "the complete, or almost complete, absence among them of any racial pride. At least of the *frantic* [*obstinate*, RB2 and RB3] and uncompromising pride that characterize Northern peoples" (RB1, p.27; RB2, p.53; RB3, p.51).<sup>497</sup> Social plasticity, or adaptability, constitutes, then, both the processes of land exploitation and the processes of racial coexistence. Regarding

---

indelible norms. Even when compared to the Spanish, they stood out in this respect... Among us, the European domain was in general bland and soft [*brando e mole*], less obedient to rules and regulations than to the law of nature. Life here was incomparably smoother, more accommodating of the social, racial, moral and even religious dissonances" (RB2, p.52; RB3, pp.50-1).

<sup>497</sup> In a text from 1939, "Caminhos e Fronteiras" ("Pathways and Frontiers"), that is devoted to the interpretation of the formation of the state of São Paulo, he says that "the colonizers' admirable plasticity seeks to mark a new and unknown world with life-styles that are familiar to them; and they are devoted to that with an extraordinary consistence. The consistence of leather - not of the iron or bronze -, folding, adapting, molding itself to all the harshness and peculiarities of the land" (Holanda, 2011a [1939], p.84). In 1957, Sérgio would publish a collection of texts also entitled "Caminhos e Fronteiras".

the latter, it implies that miscegenation becomes one of the main traits of Portuguese colonization in Brazil. In fact, Sérgio notes that, even before arriving in Brazil for the first time, the Portuguese were already a mixed-race people, more than any other European people.<sup>498</sup>

According to Sérgio, the spirit of adventure favored social mobility. This is reiterated when he talks about social plasticity again: "the feeling of distance between the masters and the working mass composed of people of color was rare [in Brazil]... [The relation of the slaves with their owners] often oscillated from the situation of dependency to one of protection, and even of solidarity and the like" (RB1, p.29; RB2, p.56; RB3, pp.54-5)<sup>499</sup>. The reduced social distance dissolved "any idea of separation of castes or races, any discipline based on such separation" (RB1, p.29; RB2, p.57; RB3, p.55). In the second and following editions, Sérgio somewhat attenuates this statement: if, in all editions, he identifies a "tendency of the population to abandon all the social, political and economic barriers between white and colored people, free and enslaved" (RB1, p.30; RB2, p.57; RB3, p.55), since the second edition, he remarks that "such liberties were not the general rule", the only point being that the racial criterion was not the "determinant factor" (RB2, p.58; RB3, p.56).

In the play of identifications and differentiations I have highlighted in chapter one, one of the main aspects was related to the obstacles posed to the formation of associations and bonds of solidarity that were broader than those based on family relationships and friendship. Now, in chapter two, Sérgio gets back to this point. According to him, the colonial economy in Brazil, based on slavery and

---

<sup>498</sup> A modification should be pointed out here. In the first edition, RB states that "[a]lso in this case, Brazil was not a brand-new scenario. *Miscegenation begun, in a large scale*, in Portugal itself" (RB1, p.28). In the following editions, the text is modified: "[i]n this case, Brazil was not a brand-new scenario. *The mixture of people of color had largely begun* in Portugal itself" (RB2, p.54; RB3, p.52). The suppression of "also" since the second edition erases the complete similarity brought in the first edition between the formation of the farming system and the formation of Brazilian people: if, in 1936, the particular form taken by the large agricultural lands came "ready and complete" from Portugal, after the 1948 edition it seems that only in terms of miscegenation Brazil was not something new in relation to Portugal. It is worth noting, however, that, in all editions, the farming system and the formation of people are processes intrinsically associated with Portuguese's social plasticity (they are, as I quoted above, "faces of their extraordinary social plasticity"). To put it differently, since the second edition, what is effectively formed - the farming system and Brazilian people - is specific to Brazil, at the same time that it is a result of the same Portuguese characteristic - social plasticity. The latter enables the specificity of the former.

<sup>499</sup> The continuation of this quotation brings, in the first edition: "...and even solidarity and the like, *sharing with them the labor in farming, housing and food preparation*" (RB1, p.29). The italicized part was suppressed in later editions.

the large-land agricultural system, raised barriers against efforts of cooperation among workers in other productive activities, as opposed to what took place in other countries, including those colonized by the Spanish.<sup>500</sup> This lack of solid associations and its relation with a broader social cohesion is clearly, but differently, stated in all the editions of RB. In the first edition, one reads that

*[o]ur society was, thus, an amorphous and invertebrate organism, only shaken here and there, often by struggles between factions, between regionalisms and between powerful families, that disputed the primacy or had things to come to terms with. In these cases, there were groupings founded in common emotions and feelings, but that promptly disappeared as soon as the ties that momentarily associated them became superfluous. Thus, the peculiarity of Brazilian life by that time seems to have been a singularly strong emphasis on the affectionate, the irrational, and the passionate, as well as a stagnation, or rather a corresponding atrophy, of the qualities linked to order, discrimination, rationalization. That is, exactly the opposite of what may be appropriate for a population in the process of organizing itself politically, according to the modern conceptions (RB1, p.32-3).*

In later editions, one reads that

---

<sup>500</sup> Here, in fact, one sees another modification from the first to the second edition. In the first one, one reads: "[n]othing existed among us that was comparable to the prosperity of the mechanics' guilds that, according to a Peruvian historian, existed already in the first century of conquest in Lima..." (RB1, p.30). In later editions, one reads: "[l]ittle existed among us that..." (RB2, p.60; RB3, p.59). Sérgio concedes in later editions, then, that certain efforts of cooperation may have taken place, even if not fully successfully. This different tone is reinforced in another modification: in the first edition, he says that "the corporatist experience... had its effects frustrated, in a great deal, because of the prevailing conditions" (RB1, pp.31-2); in later editions, he says that "the organization of occupations... had its effects disturbed" (RB2, p.62; RB3, p.60). In the second and following editions, Sérgio extends the text to point out some instances of incipient collective work and some obstacles to enduring bonds of association; overall, he insists that what was lacking in Brazil for the "success" of forms of productive labor was "a capacity of free and lasting association among entrepreneurial elements of our country" (RB2, p.65; RB3, p.64). This same passage had already been published in a text from 1946, entitled "Cooperação e Trabalho Livre" ("Cooperation and Free Labor"), from which other parts as well were incorporated to later editions of RB.

*[i]n a society as clearly personalistic in its origins as ours, it is understandable that the simple person-to-person links, independent and even exclusive of any tendency toward authentic cooperation among individuals, have almost always been the most decisive ones. Personal groupings and associations, although at times precarious, as well as struggles between factions, between families, between regionalisms, have made this society an incoherent and amorphous whole. The peculiarity of Brazilian life by that time seems to have been a singularly strong emphasis on the affectionate, the irrational, and the passionate, as well as a stagnation, or rather a corresponding atrophy, of the qualities linked to order, discipline, rationalization. That is, exactly the opposite of what seems to be appropriate for a population in the process of organizing itself politically (RB2, p.68; RB3, pp.66-7).<sup>501</sup>*

In both quotations, RB stresses the relation between the origins of Brazilian society and the absence of solid associations during the colonial period. In later editions, the influence of the culture of personality is made explicit, implying a negative connotation to personalism that was not formulated in the first edition. It is also worth noting that, in the first edition, no space seems to have left for any kind of authentic cooperation, while, in later editions, the "person-to-person links" have "almost always" been the most decisive - but not always.<sup>502</sup> Finally, I want to highlight that later editions make clearer the sense that the problem remains on the

---

<sup>501</sup> The beginning of this quotation had already appeared in a 1946 text, but in a different version: "[i]n a society as clearly personalistic in its origins as ours, it is understandable that the simple person-to-person links, independent and even exclusive of any tendency toward authentic cooperation among individuals, aiming at an end exterior to them, were always the most decisive ones. It certainly stems from that the vitality, among us, of certain affective and tumultuous forces, to the detriment of the qualities of discipline and method, that seem to be more appropriate for a people in the process of organizing itself politically" (Holanda, 2011a [1946], pp.292-3). The first part of this passage, from "in a society..." to "the most decisive ones", can be only read in RB2 (p.68) and RB3 (pp.66-7), not in RB1 - neither RB2 nor RB3 contains, however, the phrase "aiming at an end exterior to them". The second part, from "It certainly..." to "organizing itself politically", is found, with different formulations, in RB1 (p.32-3), RB2 (p.68) and RB3 (pp.66-7), as I stressed above.

<sup>502</sup> Recall the nota 500 above on the "frustrated effects" (RB1), or the "disturbed effects" (RB2 and RB3), of the efforts of cooperation.

table in the formation of contemporary Brazil: the peculiarities of Brazilian life are taken by Sérgio as the opposite what "seems to be appropriate [*parece convir*]" (or, in the first edition, "may be appropriate [*poderia convir*]") for a population that is "in the process of organizing itself politically". But, here, as Luiz Feldman (see Feldman, 2013, p.121) notes, the suppression of "according to the modern conceptions" suggests a stronger, unqualified resistance by Sérgio towards the Iberian heritage or, more precisely, towards "the peculiarity of Brazilian life" - that is, the "emphasis on the affectionate, the irrational, and passionate, as well as a stagnation, or rather a corresponding atrophy, of the qualities linked to order, discipline, rationalization" and, in words found since the second edition, the "person-to-person links" of a personalistic society.

Chapter two compares Portuguese colonization, not only with the Spanish, but also with the colonizing attempt put forward in Brazil by the Dutch.<sup>503</sup> In very few words, what Sérgio reiterates through this comparison is the "extraordinary social plasticity" of the Portuguese, since, to him, "[the Dutch's] *generous* endeavor to make Brazil into a tropical extension of the European homeland succumbed disastrously to their inability to build up the prosperity of land on its natural basis, as was done, well or badly, by the Portuguese" (RB1, p.36; RB2, p.73; RB3, p.72).<sup>504</sup> In other words, the Portuguese succeeded exactly because of their plasticity, that is, because they were able to adapt themselves to the native environmental conditions: "[t]heir weakness was their strength" (RB1, p.37; RB2, p.73; RB3, p.72). Or, as Sérgio later puts, "[a]s opposed to what happened to the Dutch, the Portuguese entered into intimate and frequent contact with the colored population... They became Americanized of Africanized, to a necessary extent" (RB1, p.38; RB2, p.75; RB3, pp.73-4).<sup>505</sup> Hence, in the last lines of the chapter, one

<sup>503</sup> During part of the XVII century, between 1630 and 1654, the Dutch colonized part of what is now the "Northeast" Brazil.

<sup>504</sup> "Generous" was suppressed since the second edition.

<sup>505</sup> In a footnote added to the second edition (and preserved in the following ones), Sérgio cites Arnold J. Toynbee' *A Study of History, I*, as the one who have formulated the thesis of the "specifically Protestant origins of modern racial prejudices". Although not in agreement with everything Arnold J. Toynbee said, Sérgio states that "it can be granted that the fact that such racial prejudice is today more accentuated among Protestant peoples is in no way fortuitous or independent of the factors that led these peoples, at a certain period of their history, to embrace the Reformation" (RB2, p.76, n.1; RB3, p.75, n.47). Once more, it is reiterated the comparison between the Portuguese and the Protestant in relation to their respective historical coexistence with different races and its impact in present configurations. Let me note that, while Sérgio is deeply and persistently concerned with the indigenous people's performance in the formation of Brazil, he is not equally devoted to the study of the Africans' performance. In fact, as one can read in a text from 1951, his efforts often

reads that miscegenation represented "a noteworthy element of fixation to the tropical environment"; it was, after all, a "normal process" (not "an sporadic phenomenon") that enabled the Portuguese "to build, without any superhuman effort, a new motherland far from their own" (RB1, p.39; RB2, pp.77-8; RB3, p.76).

In sum, the worker and the adventurer are types delineated by Sérgio, in order to advance his interpretation of the formation of contemporary Brazil through a play of identifications and differentiations. As I have stressed, he puts into relief the links between the internal and the external: the characteristics of the Portuguese, the constant comparison with other kinds of colonization, and the attention given to the encounter of the colonizers with the land, as well as with the people from the land. All that is ultimately what is at stake in interpreting the relation between the origins of Brazilian society, its present problems and its future ways of organization (together with its obstacles). In other words, the articulation of past, present and future is constitutive of Brazilian roots.

Chapter three is entitled in the first edition "The Agrarian Past" and, in later editions, "Rural Heritage".<sup>506</sup> The first sentence of the chapter - "[t]he entire structure of our colonial society was based *outside the cities* [*outside the urban environments*, RB2 and RB3]" (RB1, p.43; RB2, p.89; RB3, p.87) - gains a different sense when the modifications to which subsequent passages are submitted are taken into account. So, in the 1936 text one reads that: "[t]his fact is of the most lively interest to those who want to understand a state of affairs that, in its essential aspects, prevailed until the end of Monarchy [1889] or, more precisely, until *de abolition of slavery* [1888]" (RB1, p.43). Since the second edition, this passage has become: "[i]t is necessary to take into account this fact in order to understand precisely the conditions that governed us, directly or indirectly, long after the proclamation of our political independence [1822] and whose implications [reflexos] have not been erased until today" (RB2, p.89; RB3, p.87). This modification conveys a stronger sense of a still living past in the present: the

---

implied a resistance against the prevalence of the Afro-Brazilian studies over the study of the indigenous populations, ascribing to the African people all the influences that were not identified as European: "the fashion of Afro-Brazilianism, stressing the role of the blacks in our national formation, helped in a certain way to make even more superficial [*perfunctório*] and indefinite the role of the Indian... All among us that was not inscribed very clearly in the European and Portuguese tradition became of African origin" (Holanda, 2011b [1951b], p.144).

<sup>506</sup> This chapter has received thirty-three more paragraphs to the second edition, while twenty-six were modified (Eugênio, 2010, pp.272-3).

agrarian past and the colonial period have not been simply overcome after political independence, abolition or the proclamation of the republic. To put it differently, past, present and future do not express sequential stages in history, the one before being replaced by the one after in a linear formative process.

The topic at stake in the chapter is the formation of urban spaces and the material development in Brazil, as well as the obstacles to the consolidation of a bourgeois, modern world. In all editions, 1888, the year of the abolition of slavery, marks a crucial moment in the formation of Brazil: "*perhaps the most decisive moment in our entire evolution as a people*" (RB1, p.43);<sup>507</sup> or, "*in our national evolution, this date is of unique and incomparable significance*" (RB2, p.89; RB3, p.87). But, as the modifications above and the ones I will highlight below indicate, the implications of this moment are considerably different in terms of the interpretation of the formative process advanced and the political position exposed.<sup>508</sup>

In the first edition, 1888 marks the moment after which "Brazilian life is clearly dislocated from one pole to another, with the transition to 'urbancracy' [*urbanocracia*] that only from this time onwards imposes itself completely" (RB1, p.43). As always, this transition does not bring a complete break in time. The "fever of material progress" that took place, according to Sérgio, between 1851 and 1854 has not met a hospitable environment for such profound transformation: "[the great economic undertakings] would not find in our temperament and in our habits a proper environment, despite all the good will of certain elites" (RB1, p.46). The chapter, then, goes on analyzing the precarious formation of the cities during the colonial period, when the rural domain prevailed indisputably - a situation that would change only after 1888.

In later editions, however, the depiction of the past is modified. The waning of slavery is said to correspond to the rise of modern activities in Brazil and to a clash between the interests associated to the latter and those associated to ruralism. Sérgio, then, draws the emergence of a conflict during the second half of the XIX century: "[t]here were two distinct worlds that were hostile to each other with a

---

<sup>507</sup> Also in the first edition, he says, some paragraphs later, that 1888 "has a unique and incomparable transcendence" to Brazil (RB1, p.44).

<sup>508</sup> Part of the extension of chapter three in later editions comes from a text published a year before the second edition was published, entitled "Da Lei Eusébio à Crise de 1864" ("From the Eusébio Act to the 1864 Crisis") (see Holanda, 2011a [1947], pp.333-9).



growing rancor; two mentalities in opposition, as the rational opposes the traditional, as the abstract opposes the corporeal and the sensitive, and as the urban and cosmopolitan opposes the regional or parochial" (RB2, p.98; RB3, p.96). In Brazil, no ruptures took place in its formative process; not even political independence was a rupture. So, he poses the following question: "[h]ow could one expect profound transformations in a country where the traditional foundations of the situation that was intended to be overcome were maintained?" (RB2, p.99; RB3, p.96).

In fact, as he later affirms, "numerous turmoils among us during the years before and after Independence" had a "purely external, epidermal character"; this exposes the difficulty in overcoming "the limits that certain conditions generated by Portuguese colonization had raised to our political life" (RB2, p.116; RB3, p.113).<sup>509</sup> Those limits become clearer when Sérgio mobilizes a comparison with "modern countries", where a bourgeoisie managed to consolidate itself:

[i]n the absence of an independent urban bourgeoisie, candidates for newly created functions are recruited perforce among individuals of the same mass of ancient rural landowners, who brought with them the characteristic mentality and inclinations of that class. Brazil's entire administrative apparatus during the empire and even after that, during the republican period, had to contain, because of that, elements that are tightly linked to the old seigniorial system (RB2, pp.118-9; RB3, p.116).<sup>510</sup>

<sup>509</sup> In a text published two years before the second edition of RB, Sérgio states that "traditionalists and iconoclasts move, in fact, in the same orbit of ideas", since both preserve "the colonial legacy, their differences among each other being only formal and superficial"; later, he claims that the "purely epidermal character of numerous turmoils that took place among us during the years before and after Independence shows how difficult it was to overcome the limits that certain conditions generated by the Portuguese colonization had raised to our political life. And, would it be correct to affirm that, in current times, we have already overcome them? Isn't it, in sum, the same paternalism, of colonial and baroque roots, that forms until today, overtly or not, the core of almost every public activity in Brazil?" (Holanda, 2011a [1946], p.272; p.274). The passage is very similar to what the one quoted above, included in RB since its second edition, although the questions posed in the 1946 text are not reproduced in RB.

<sup>510</sup> In the first edition, a similar passage is found in chapter five, "The Cordial Man", when RB is discussing a "social disequilibrium" caused by the process of urbanization in Brazil, where "the primitive type of patriarchal family" predominated "since the most remote times of colonization". There, the passage brings the following: "[i]n a land where the free manual work virtually did not exist, in where an almost null middle class was not capable of imposing its influence, the individuals that would serve the functions created with the new state of affairs had to be recruited perforce among elements of the same mass of ancient rural landowners. The entire administrative apparatus

In the last paragraph of the chapter, Sérgio stresses that "[f]ollowing all the evidence, the overwhelming predominance of ruralism was a typical phenomenon *stemming the effort of our colonizers* rather than *an imposition* of the environment" (RB2, p.125; RB3, p.122).<sup>511</sup>

The passages above express a different frame to the changes taking place in Brazil. If the periodization remains similar - emphasis on 1888 -, the accounts on possible transformations are given more attention. In that sense, from a similar statement about the past - "the entire structure of our colonial society was based outside the cities" (RB1), or "outside the urban environments" (RB2 and RB3), in an "overwhelming predominance of ruralism" - two different stances are developed. In the first edition, this characteristic of Brazilian formation is "of the most lively interest to those who want to understand a state of affairs that, in its essential aspects, prevailed until the end of Monarchy [1889] or, more precisely, until de abolition of slavery [1888]" (RB1, p.43). But, in the second and following editions, this fact is crucial to the understanding of "conditions that governed us, directly or indirectly, long after the proclamation of our political independence [1822] and whose implications have not been erased until today" (RB2, p.89; RB3, p.87). In this more recent depiction, the "two distinct worlds", or "mentalities", become hostile to one another in ways that were not expressed in the 1936 text. Furthermore, as Luiz Feldman notes, "the expectation of 'profound transformations' was not found [in the first edition], but it is now professedly confessed by the author, infusing the narrative with a certain pressing need of modernization that was not previously perceived" (Feldman, 2013, p.123).

As I have stressed above, chapter three is concerned with the characterization of the agrarian past, and its corresponding rural heritage, in order to expose that the formative process in Brazil did not follow a linear and progressive historical development. Past, present and future are entangled in such a way that no

---

during the empire and even after that, during the republican period, contained elements tightly linked to the old domestic system, still in force, not only in the cities, but also in the farms" (RB1, p.99). I will discuss chapter five below.

<sup>511</sup> In the first edition, one reads: "[f]ollowing all the evidence, the overwhelming predominance of ruralism was a typical phenomenon *of the Portuguese colonizing effort* rather than *a fatal imposition* of the environment *during a long process of adaptation*" (RB1, p.55). Let me recall that some modifications Sérgio made in chapter two imply the attention to the encounter between the Portuguese and the native land and people.

clear before/after dichotomy can be identified. The identifications of the past with the present (and the other way around) coexist with what differentiates them from each other - two hostile, distinct, but coexisting worlds. In sum, when Sérgio resorts to the historical study of the first centuries of colonization in Brazil, it is not to recreate a dead and already-gone past, but to expose a living heritage - a Portuguese, rural, patriarchal heritage - in the roots of Brazil.<sup>512</sup>

Chapter four also had its name changed: from "The Agrarian Past (continuation)" to "The Sower and the Builder".<sup>513</sup> It is mainly devoted to compare the Portuguese with the Spanish colonization. If, in the beginning of RB, both were often considered together from their Iberian identifications, in this chapter the play of identifications and differentiations emphasizes their differences. For example, Sérgio states that

[o]n our own continent, Spanish colonization is largely characterized by what the Portuguese lacked: an insistent use of methods that ensured the mother country's military, economic and political predominance over conquered lands, mainly through the creation of large centers of settlement that were stable, permanent and orderly. Meticulous zeal and foresight guided the founding of Spanish cities in America" (RB1, p.60; RB2, p.130; RB3, p.126).

The cities built by the Portuguese, on the contrary, are not

a mental product, do not reach the point of contradicting nature's frame, and their silhouette *merges with* [*intertwines with*, RB2 and RB3] the line of the landscape. No rigor, no

<sup>512</sup> In 1940, Sérgio wrote that "[t]he monumental and staggering [*tonitruante*] characteristic of the past has now little interest, and it does not want to be contemplated as one contemplates an spectacle. Rather, we begin to live the past as we live the present, to valorize it for what it has that is close, familiar, quotidian. We do not see it as a thing that disappeared without leaving traces and that is lost forever, but as that which simply preceded us and continues to survive within us" (Holanda, 2011a [1940a], p.175). This text celebrates recent initiatives regarding the study of Brazilian past, such as the collection *Documentos Brasileiros* (Brazilian Documents) - let me recall that the first edition of RB was the opening text of this collection.

<sup>513</sup> This chapter received twenty-eight more paragraphs to the second edition, while forty were modified (Eugênio, 2010, pp.272-3). According to Sérgio, the new titles to chapters three and four "are better adjusted to the content of each chapter, at least to the current content [after the revision]" (RB2, p.12). Sérgio has also modified some parts of this chapter, as well as dislocated others. I will mention them only when they are relevant to my discussion.

method, [no preparation, RB2 and RB3], always this *characteristic* [*significant*, RB2 and RB3] abandonment that is *well* expressed in the word '*desleixo*' ['laxity]' (RB1, p.62; RB2, p.157; RB3, p.152).<sup>514</sup>

Another angle of this comparison is proposed when Sérgio says that the Portuguese efforts are predominantly based on "commercial exploitation", while the Spanish, on the contrary, "aim at turning the *conquered* [*occupied*, RB2 and RB3] country into an organic extension of their own country" (RB1, p.66; RB2, p.135; RB3, p.130). In addition to that, in respect to the places they have focused on for settling, he states that: "[a]s opposed to the Portuguese colonization, which was above all coastal and tropical, the Spanish seems to deliberately escape the seaside towards interior lands and highlands" (RB1, p.68; RB2, p.137; RB3, pp.132-3). Here, again, Sérgio is not merely referring to a dead past in the formation of contemporary Brazil. Instead, he points out that "[t]he influence of this coastal colonization that mainly the Portuguese practiced persists until today" (RB1, pp.71-2; RB2, p.141; RB3, p.136). This remark is immediately followed by an account on the expeditions towards the interior of the country conducted by the *bandeirantes*<sup>515</sup> from the region of São Paulo. According to him, despite linked to Portugal, these expeditions cannot be fully understood, unless one takes them as "a little detached from the Portuguese effort, as a self-explanatory enterprise, although it does not dare yet to cut its ties with the motherland"; in this sense, "[i]t is not by a mere accident that the first autonomous gesture that took place in the colony [in the XVII century]... occurred precisely in São Paulo, a land with little contact with Portugal

---

<sup>514</sup> In later editions, "well" is suppressed; "no preparation" is inserted; and this phrase is dislocated from the beginning to near the middle of the chapter. In a long note added to later editions, Sérgio states that "in their capacity to mold themselves to all environments, often to the detriment of their own racial and cultural characteristics, the Portuguese revealed better skills as a colonizer than the other peoples, perhaps more inflexibly anchored in peculiarities formed in the Old World" (RB2, pp.192-3; RB3, p.188). This note comes from a series of three texts published in 1946, entitled "*A Língua Geral em São Paulo*" ("The General Language in São Paulo") (see Holanda, 2011a [1946], pp.294-309). *Desleixo* is systematically used in Sérgio's texts to characterize Portuguese colonization and identify its traces in the formation of Brazil. In 1965, for instance, talking about the first century of the colonization in Rio de Janeiro, Sérgio states that the Portuguese naturally accepted its topographic outline, without much reflection on it. This acceptance does not derive from a rule-following behavior, as it is the case with the Spanish; rather, it follows, "always with some *desleixo* [laxity], a more convenient, obvious pattern, and that turned out to prevail at that time" (Holanda, 2011b [1965], p.309).

<sup>515</sup> See note 107 above on "bandeirantes".

and with a lot of miscegenation with *aboriginals* [*natives*, RB2; **outsiders and natives**, RB3]" (RB1, p.72; RB2, pp.141-2; RB3, pp.136-7).<sup>516</sup> This first autonomous move attributed to São Paulo indicates how much Sérgio ascribes to this region (currently the state of São Paulo) a crucial part in the formative process of Brazil: "[o]n the Piratininga plateau [located on the region of São Paulo], a truly new moment in our national history emerges" (RB1, p.72; RB2, p.142; RB3, p.137).<sup>517</sup> The attention to the events in this region would be increasingly focused by Sérgio in future texts, but it is already possible to see in RB its relevance as an alternative configuration within the formative process of Brazil. If, as quoted above, the coastal colonization of the Portuguese has implications to contemporary Brazil,

---

<sup>516</sup> Let me recall that the modification inserted in the third edition - the inclusion of "outsiders" - reinforces how the formation of Brazilian people takes place through different encounters between Europeans and natives, forming a different people, neither exclusively European nor exclusively native. Two comparisons are often mobilized in terms of the multiple encounters of this formative process. One compares the Portuguese to other colonizers. In this sense, for instance, Sérgio states, in 1951, that the intimate contact of the European colonizers with the natives "varied in intensity across the different colonial areas"; then, he compares the occasional episodes of this contact in the Anglo-Saxon possessions to the frequent ones in the Portuguese America, where "these cases could be the rule" (Holanda, 2011b [1951a], p.91). The other major comparison contrasts the march towards the interior of the country that took place in the northern part of Brazil to the one conducted by the *bandeirantes* in the southern part, taking into account the role the European colonizers had in each. In this sense, in a text from 1941, Sérgio contrasts the expansion towards the interior of the country conducted from São Paulo to the expansion towards the interior conducted in the Amazon region: in the case of the latter, "this expansionism was not indeed different from the natural tendencies of the Portuguese colonization - colonization along the coast -, since the occupation of the river-sea [the Amazon river] and its large affluent rivers was a logical extension of the conquest of the Atlantic coast" (Holanda, 2011a [1941], p.218; this same point is made in Holanda, 2011a [1949], pp.540-1). In a series of texts on the "pre-history of the expeditions [*bandeiras*]", published in 1948, Sérgio concludes by saying that the *bandeirantes* "[l]ived at the margin of the natural lines of communication and contact with the Kingdom" and, therefore, they had to move across "increasing distances and to face every kind of obstacle", in order to accomplish "the human ideal of rest and stability that had seemed denied them by the law of nature" (Holanda, 2011a [1948], p.506). The whole series of texts are in Holanda (2011a [1948], pp.465-506).

<sup>517</sup> In a text from 1930, Sérgio had already said that the *bandeirantes* were "extraordinary pioneers, that expanded the boundaries of the country, founded settlements and favored the formation of a firm national consciousness" (Holanda, 2011a [1930], p.53). The attention given to the *bandeirantes* moved the focus from the coastal colonization to the dynamics taking place in the interior of the country and, moreover, it brought to the scene the characteristics of the formation of the state of São Paulo. These two aspects were extensively discussed by Sérgio in other texts. Indeed, their discussion raises important points regarding the regional dimensions in the interpretations of Brazil - suffice to mention, for instance, the controversies surrounding Gilberto Freyre's focus on the Northern colonization and Sérgio's focus on São Paulo. More generally, it is still to be advanced in my view a careful study on the impacts of regional considerations upon the interpretations of Brazil, taking into account issues ranging from the institutional disputes in the academic and intellectual environment to broader dimensions regarding the way Brazil is very often depicted through clear-cut regional distinctions (I am alluding here, for instance, to the still alive, if only often implicit, rivalries between the academic environments in São Paulo and in Rio de Janeiro; or to the frequent occasions, within and beyond the academic circles, when the Southeast is depicted as the advanced pole of the country, as opposed to the backwardness ascribed to the North and to the Northeast).

the first autonomous gesture linked to the *bandeirantes* is also relevant to understand contemporary internal disparities.

Some passages added to the second edition bring the discussion of social mobility back to the table and is accompanied by a comparative account. In this vein, he argues (in the second and following editions) that "[t]he relative flexibility of social classes meant that [the rise of the merchant bourgeoisie] did not meet, in Portugal, a strong impediment, in contrast to what often took place in lands where the feudal tradition had created deep roots and where, therefore, the stratification was more rigorous" (RB2, p.160; RB3, p.155). But, the phenomenon of upward social mobility of the bourgeoisie is double-faced: if, on the one hand, it was clearly facilitated, due to the historical formation of Portugal, and of the Iberian people in general, on the other hand, this facilitation also meant that the formation and ascension of this bourgeoisie did not correspond to a social revolution in relation to traditional society. In this sense, Sérgio says, "it was not possible to consolidate or crystallize ethical patterns that were very different from those preexisting to nobility; and it was not possible to complete the transition to the prevalence of new values that often accompanies the bourgeois revolutions" (RB2, p.161; RB3, pp.155-6).<sup>518</sup>

All that is also important to the contrast between the economic relations in the Iberian countries and the "so-called capitalist mentality" (RB2, p.195; RB3, p.190). Here, however, Sérgio notes that what mainly distinguishes the Portuguese and Spanish from other peoples, "among whom that typically bourgeois creation, the capitalist mentality, would come to flourish", is not that the former supposedly dislike riches or are supposedly less miserly; what distinguishes them, instead, is a "certain incapacity, which could be called congenital, for making any form of

---

<sup>518</sup> On this topic of the conservation of traditional patterns in the new configuration, later editions bring a long note that resorts more closely to the identification Iberian peculiarities, emphasizing that "it is precisely the firm rejection of all modalities of rationalization, and thus of depersonalization, that has been until our days one of the most constant traits of the peoples of Iberian origin" (RB2, p.193; RB3, p.189).<sup>518</sup> In this note, the contrast is once again between Iberian peoples and peoples in which rationalization and impersonal rules have prevailed. An obvious implication of this resistance against depersonalization (recall that the culture of personality was earlier identified as part of the definition of the Iberian peoples) is that "it is rarely achieved in business an appropriate rationalization; the customer or client by preference usually has to be a friend" (RB2, p.194; RB3, p.190). From this social behavior, based on person-to-person relations, derive "the main obstacles that in Spain and in all the Hispanic countries - including Portugal and Brazil - are erected against the rigid application of norms of justice and of any legal rules" (RB2, p.195; RB3, p.190).

impersonal and mechanical order prevail over organic and communal relations as those based on kinship, neighborliness, and friendship" (RB2, pp.198-9; RB3, p.194).<sup>519</sup>

These passages added since the second edition stress the importance of comparative mobilizations in RB. Moreover, the considerations expressed by these new passages reinforce previous modifications in the text, where personalism is identified to a certain extent as an obstacle to the establishment of broader ties of solidarity, and also reinforce Sérgio's attention to the transitional moment in the formative process of Brazil, outlined in later editions as the conflict between two worlds and two mentalities.<sup>520</sup>

In sum, by contrasting "sowers" and "builders", chapter four advances other aspects of the identifications and differentiations of the formative process in Brazil, particularly through the contrast between Portuguese and Spanish colonizations. But the chapter moves from this contrast to other comparative moves that identify both countries through their shared Iberian origin, this time contrasting them with places where impersonal rules and rationalization prevailed. In any case, if Sérgio devotes a great part of the chapter to discuss social mobility in the formation of Portugal, it is because, in his interpretation, this is a crucial aspect in contemporary Brazil. More precisely, it comes from Portugal this historical move that enables the upward social mobility of the bourgeoisie, without provoking a revolutionary change in society. The fact that the Portuguese had not lived a deeply rooted feudalism is not only of historical interest in RB; on the contrary, these roots resonate in the formation of Brazil, since they influence the way society is arranged and the way old patterns do not simply fade away in face of the new, but survive in

---

<sup>519</sup> In a text from 1960, Sérgio discusses the possible existence of a "bourgeoisie" in Portugal when the Brazil was "discovered". "[i]t is indeed possible, and even likely, that the Portuguese discoverers were encouraged at first by a numerous and active 'bourgeoisie'. But to want to make it to the image of abstract models, detached from time and space, is to make a retrospective and evanescent construction. It was a bourgeoisie, if it is necessary to resort to the magic word, but it was first and foremost a Portuguese and a V century bourgeoisie, ambitious to get goods [*presas*] and honors, but alien to certain virtues that are more prosaic and that this concept evokes today... Perhaps it is not an exaggeration to say that the Portuguese great navigations belong not to the history, but to the pre-history of modern economy" (Holanda, 2011b [1960], pp.294-5).

<sup>520</sup> I have also mentioned above how Sérgio identifies the *desleixo* (laxity) as one of the main Portuguese traits, with a crucial influence in the colonization process. In this chapter, *desleixo* is exposed mainly when the Portuguese is compared to the Spanish colonization in other parts of America or even to the Dutch colonization in Brazil. At the end of the chapter, it comes associated with "the natural conservatism, the letting things be" (RB2, p.170; RB3, p.165).

new social, political, ethical and economic configurations. In few words: the roots of Brazil are also formed outside Brazil.

Before moving to the next chapter, let me note some passages of the first edition that were suppressed in later ones. At the end of the chapter, Sérgio gets back to the obstacles to the establishment of bonds of solidarity broader than those referring to family relationships and friendships, and claims that, during the colonial period, "the sphere of domestic life was certainly the one in which the principle of authority has showed itself to be less vulnerable to the corrosive forces that attacked it" (RB1, p.87). In this scenario, the traditional family can ignore "every superior principle that tries to disturb or oppress it" (RB1, p.88). Hence,

[t]he familial frame is, in this case, so powerful and demanding that it accompanies individuals even beyond the domestic domain. The private entity always precedes, in them, the public entity. The nostalgia of this compact, unique and untransferable frame, where the preferences founded on affective bonds always prevail, left evident traces in our society, our political life, in all our activities... It stemmed from this circumstance an almost exclusive prevalence, in the entire social mechanism, of feelings characteristic of the domestic community, particularistic and anti-political by definition; an invasion of the public by the private, of the State by the Family. This largely explains our difficult adaptation to the principle of democratic State, to be dealt with ahead, and also the obstacles, already pointed out in the preceding chapter, raised against the formation of an efficient bureaucratic apparatus among us (RB1, pp.88-9)

These passages reiterate the ethical, social and political implications of how the public and the private are configured in Brazil, but, at the same time, they do not convey the sense of transition that later editions bring, as some modifications stressed above show. In other words, the articulation of past, present and future has been submitted to an important dislocation from the first to the second edition.

"The Cordial Man", chapter five, is one of the most cited texts among the interpretations of Brazil and "cordiality", a word that gained a life of its own, even



beyond the academic circles.<sup>521</sup> The very first lines of this chapter address the relation between family and state that, in the first edition, was addressed as well in the last lines of chapter four, but suppressed in later editions, as I mentioned above. Here, RB states that

[t]he State, to the contrary of what presume some theoreticians, does not constitute a broadening of the family circle, and it is even less an integration of certain groupings, of certain particularistic wills, best exemplified by the family. There is no gradation between the family circle and the State, but rather a discontinuity and even an opposition. The [fundamental, RB2 and RB3] lack of distinction between these two forms is a romantic prejudice, which had its most enthusiastic *and zealous* supporters during the XIX century. To those espousing this doctrine, the State and its institutions descended in a straight line, and through simple evolution, from the Family *and other particularistic forms*, by a kind of *generatio aequivoca*. The truth, quite differently, is that such forms belong essentially to different orders. It is only through the **overcoming** [transgression, RB3] of the domestic and family order that the State is born and that the simple individual becomes citizen, taxpayer, voter, eligible for office, potential recruit, and responsible for the laws of the City. This fact contains a clear triumph of the general over the particular, of the intellectual over the material, of the abstract over the corporeal, rather than a successive

---

<sup>521</sup> This chapter received four more paragraphs to the second edition, while twenty-eight were modified (Eugênio, 2010, pp.272-3). In the first edition, it brings an epigraph, later suppressed, that Sérgio ascribes to Milton, but that comes in fact from Samuel Johnson, according to Pedro Meira Monteiro's correction (see Monteiro, 2008b, p.358, n.1; and Eugênio, 2010, p.281): "How small of all that human hart endure/ That part that kings or laws can cause or cure...". According to João Kennedy Eugênio, this epigraph "deconstructs illusions: that the ideal political regime, the good constitution, the laws and the political instruments - the norms of the *polis* - would suffice to satisfy the anxieties and to cure the wounds in the heart" (Eugênio, 2010, p.283). It is important to have in mind here that this chapter will deal with the notion of cordiality, linked etymologically to heart ("cordial" relates to "heart"), and its social and political implications to Brazil. In my view, the suppression of the epigraph does not mean that Sérgio does not position himself anymore against the abstract laws and the importation of political regimes; rather, I think that the suppression avoids the conclusion that any kind of importation is necessarily harmful to the formative process of Brazil.

purification, a spiritualization of the more natural and rudimentary forms, a procession of substances, to speak in Alexandrian philosophical terms. The family order, in its pure form, is abolished through a transcendence (RB1, pp.93-4; RB2, pp.203-4; RB3, pp.199-200).<sup>522</sup>

This problem involving the way the "Family" and the "State" related to each other is considered by RB a crucial point to all cultures at all times. Sérgio resorts to Sophocles' tragedy *Antigone* to depict what is at stake: "the fundamental incompatibility" between family order and state order (RB1, p.94; RB2, p.204; RB3, p.200). The conflict between Creon, who "incarnates the abstract, impersonal notion of the City", and Antigone, who represents the personal will, "belongs to all ages and maintains its eloquence even in our days" (RB1, p.94; RB2, p.204; RB3, p.200).<sup>523</sup>

This perennial problem is, thus, one of the clash between the general and the particular. In modernity, this acquires a specific configuration, linked, for instance, to the transition to the industrial work and to the educational methods that seek to detach the individual from his or her domestic (family) community. As a matter of a general claim, Sérgio states that "wherever the idea of family prospers and has very solid bases - and mainly where the patriarchal kind of family predominates -, the formation and evolution of society along *modern* [current, RB2 and RB3] conceptions tend to be precarious and to fight against strong resistances" (RB1, pp.97-8; RB2, p.208; RB3, pp.203-4). This modern society is one in which "certain antifamily virtues" have prevailed, such as "the spirit of personal initiative" and "the competition among citizens". The replacement of "modern" by "current" can be seen in the same direction of the suppression of "according to the modern conceptions" highlighted above:<sup>524</sup> it implies an unqualified stance towards "current conceptions" related to "the formation and evolution of society". In more precise words, it seems that, instead of distinguishing very clearly a "modern" and a "non-modern" conception of society and of political organization, as if they were destined

<sup>522</sup> "Fundamental" is inserted in later editions; "zealous" and "and other particularistic forms" are suppressed in later editions. I have omitted minor Portuguese-language adjustments.

<sup>523</sup> Luiz Dantas (1999) and Pedro Meira Monteiro (2008b) explore Sérgio's mobilization of *Antigone* in more detail.

<sup>524</sup> See pages 395-7.

to be simply incompatible, they are now in a more declared conflict - it comes to mind again the notion of two worlds and two mentalities fighting each other.

In this sense, after this characterization of society, Sérgio includes three paragraphs in later editions in which the family ties are seen as limitations to the formation of individuals, of capable public men and of a society of free people. In this sense, he puts, for instance, that "[a]mong us, even during the empire, it had already become evident the limitations that overly narrow, and not rarely oppressive, family ties can impose on later lives of individuals"; that certain "patterns of behavior early imposed by the domestic circle" generate "inconveniences" in need of correction; that some institutes of higher education founded on the XIX century "have largely contributed to the formation of capable public men", enabling teenagers to "progressively free themselves from old domestic ties"; and that "the mentality created in the encounter with a patriarchal environment" is opposed to "the requirements of a society composed of free men and with an increasing equalitarian inclination" (all these passages are in RB2, pp.208-9; RB3, pp.204-5).

The insertion of these paragraphs in later editions - taking into account the positive judgment they carry at least about some aspects of this modern society - gives a different tone to the subsequent paragraph. There, Sérgio repeats a frequent move in RB, that is, the sudden transition from a discussion about the past to a reference to a present situation.<sup>525</sup> In his words:

[t]he recent tendency in some States to create vast social security and welfare systems [*aparelhamentos de seguro e previdência social*] has been criticized based solely on the fact that they leave too little room for individual action and also because these systems lead to the weakening of all kinds of competition. Such reasoning belongs *to our epoch, when, for the first time in history, competition among citizens has become a positive social value* (RB1, p.98).<sup>526</sup>

<sup>525</sup> Let me recall, however, that, often when RB is interpreting the past, it is also interpreting the present, since a certain past lives within the present in its interpretation of Brazil. That said, these sudden transitions are not exposing a break in time, but, on the contrary, the reminiscences of past in the present (which condition the future as well).

<sup>526</sup> The final part of the passage was modified: "[s]uch reasoning belongs *to an epoch in which, for the first time in history, competition among citizens, with all its consequences, has become a positive social value*" (RB2, p.210; RB3, p.206). Another change is that, in the first edition, this passage is

Those paragraphs above added to later editions also seem to give another tone to subsequent points made in all editions about the prevalence of patriarchalism and about the relation between the public and the private in Brazil. According to the text, "[i]n Brazil, where the primitive type of patriarchal family had dominated since *the most remote times of colonization* [*since remote times*, RB2 and RB3], the development of urbanization... caused a *huge* social disequilibrium, whose effects remain alive until today" (RB1, p.99; RB2, p.211; RB3, p.207).<sup>527</sup> When it comes, more specifically, to the formation of the state, it becomes evident the obstacles to the separation of the public from the private. After presenting a Weberian-inspired distinction between a "bureaucrat official" - who follows objective interests under an impersonal order - and a "'patrimonial' official" - who regards political activity as matter of private interest -, Sérgio proceeds to another account on the formation of contemporary Brazil. In his interpretation, "it is possible to trace throughout our history, the constant prevalence of private wills that meet their own environment in closed circles with little permeability to an impersonal order. Amongst those circles, that of the family was undoubtedly the one that expressed itself in the strongest and the most developed way" (RB1, pp.100-1; RB2, pp.212-3; RB3, p.208).<sup>528</sup> One of the most crucial implications of

---

the first part of a long paragraph, while later editions divided this paragraph into two, with some modifications in the second paragraph, as I will note right below.

<sup>527</sup> "Since the most remote times of colonization" become, in later editions, "since remote times"; and "huge" is only in the first edition.

<sup>528</sup> Almost every interpreter of RB notes and sometimes discusses the presence of Max Weber in the text. This is not my focus here, so I will just mention general aspects of what is at stake. If Caio Prado Jr. is often seen as the first interpreter of Brazil that is explicitly inspired by a Marxist approach, Sérgio is often considered the first to have been explicitly inspired by a Weberian approach. Sérgio himself said in a interview in 1980s that "it is likely that I have been the first Brazilian to cite Weber in a publication" (Holanda *apud* Monteiro, 1999, p.60). Antonio Candido wrote, in 1967, that Sérgio "deploys, I think for the first time in Brazil, Max Weber's concepts of 'patrimonialism' and 'bureaucracy', in order to elucidate the problem [of the relation between state and family] and provide a sociological fundament to the characterization of the 'cordial man'" (Candido, 1995 [1967], p.17). Referring to this preface, Raymundo Faoro expresses his disagreement in 1998, when he says that Sérgio "did not mean that the political-social order was 'patrimonialist' (I am disagreeing, with renewed respectful tributes, with Antonio Candido...), but exactly the opposite: that patrimonialism would be impossible as a political order, hampered by the patriarchal environment, incapable of coming out from the private order" (Faoro, 1998, p.61). Four years later (2002), Raymundo Faoro said in a interview that his opposition was not exactly in relation to Sérgio, but to Antonio Candido. His words, then, were somehow less benevolent in relation to the latter: "Antonio did a preface there where he says at some point that 'the introduction of Weber on this subject of patrimonialism is due to Sérgio'. And I am not this kind of person, but I do not give anyone priority. Then, I showed - Antonio Candido was present and became pale-faced - how he had mistranslated it. Moreover, I do not understand this thing of a public official working for himself. This happens in feudalism, not in patrimonialism... [Antonio Candido] could write about

this formative process to contemporary Brazil is that "the relations created in domestic life always provided the mandatory model to any social composition among us. This happens even when democratic institutions, based on neutral and abstract principles, aim at founding society on anti-particularistic norms" (RB1, p.101; RB2, p.213; RB3, pp.208-9).

Before moving to RB's interpretation of cordiality itself, let me recall that chapter five is mainly devoted to the discussion of the relation between the private and the public in Brazil. Beginning with the perennial problem of the clash between state order and family order, it sets this problem as a parameter to interpret the specificities of the formation of Brazil. The comparative move here is delineated between, on the one hand, a bureaucratic state and, on the other hand, a political activity that does not distinguish clearly the private from the public, the private interest from the objective interest. I also emphasized that the new paragraphs added to the second and following editions seem to put into relief a favorable stance towards modern society and state order. In other words, what I am suggesting is that those added paragraphs can lead to an interpretation of the subsequent paragraphs that would see the latter as reinforcements of a positive tone towards a modern society (defined as increasingly egalitarian), as opposed to a patriarchal one, and towards state order, as opposed to family order. That said, I will now deal with the way the notion of "cordiality" is tackled in RB.

This notion of "cordiality" is one of the most controversial, not only in the interpretations of Brazil in general, but also in what regards Sérgio's lifetime intellectual engagements themselves.<sup>529</sup> In the first edition, one reads that "[t]he

---

everything - including things he does not understand - and has never opened Max Weber in his entire life, but he feels himself authorized to write about Weber... I have even tried to be very diplomatic in this case. I have tried not to be hard-hitting, but the message is given, isn't it? I claim priority, and do not give it to anyone!" (see Santos Jr, 2009 [2002], pp.116-7). The difference in tone from 1998 to 2002 seems less related to a change of opinion, than to a matter of circumstances: the text published in 1998 results from an event on Sérgio organized by Antonio Candido himself, while the 2002 comment comes from an interview conceded to Jair dos Santos Júnior. For more on Raymundo's disagreement, see Monteiro (1999, pp.191-4). Another Weberian trace in RB is identified in the use of "types"; once more, Antonio Candido mentions that in his preface, saying that Sérgio "makes use of Max Weber's typological criterion, but modifying it, to the extent that he is focused on pairs, not on a plurality of types, what enables him to leave aside the descriptive mode, in order to treat them in a dynamical way, stressing mainly their interaction in the historical process" (Candido, 1995 [1967], p.13). For more on the construction of "types" in RB, see Monteiro (1999; 2008b), Dias (2008), Goldfeder e Waizbort (2009).

<sup>529</sup> It is worth noting that, in 1935, a year before the first edition was published, Sérgio published "Corpo e Alma do Brasil: Ensaio de Psicologia Social" ("Body and Soul of Brazil: An Essay on Social Psychology"), where he tackles for the first time the notion of "cordial man"; many

writer Ribeiro Couto had a joyful expression when he said that the Brazilian contribution to civilization will be that of cordiality - we will give the world the 'cordial man'" (RB1, p.101). Later editions bring: "[i]t was already said, in a joyful expression, that the Brazilian contribution to civilization will be that of cordiality - we will give the world the 'cordial man'" (RB2, p.213; RB3, p.209). After that, Sérgio adds to these editions a long footnote, whose main objective is the differentiation of his own definition of "cordial man" from the use made by another interpreter of Brazil, Cassiano Ricardo. In the footnote, he says that

[i]t would seem unnecessary to reiterate what is already implicit in the text, that is, that the word 'cordial' should be taken in this case in its exact and strictly etymological sense; nevertheless, this becomes necessary since the word was interpreted in the opposite sense in a recent work of Mr. Cassiano Ricardo, where the *cordial man* being dealt with is the one of cocktail parties and "cordial greetings", "which are the conclusions of amiable as well as aggressive letters", and which stands in contrast to cordiality understood as the "essential sentiment" of Brazilians, which is goodness and even a certain "technique of goodness", "a more seductive, a more political, a more assimilating goodness". This clarification being made, and in order to emphasize the basic, in fact fundamental, difference between the ideas held in the work just mentioned and the suggestions proposed by this work [RB], it is worth saying that, the expression "cordiality" here eliminates all the ethical judgments and apologetic intentions to which Mr. Cassiano Ricardo seems inclined when he prefers to speak of "goodness" or "good man". It is also worth adding that cordiality, as approached here, on the one hand, is foreign to all social formalism and conventionalism, and, on the other hand, does not only and necessarily encompass positive and *harmonizing* sentiments. Enmity can be just as *cordial* as friendship, since both are

---

paragraphs of this text were reproduced in two different chapters of RB. Some of these paragraphs were modified from the 1935 text to the 1936 edition of RB.

born from the *heart* and thus proceed from the sphere of the intimate, the familiar, the private. Resorting to a term sanctioned by modern sociology, they effectively belong to the domain of "primary groups", the unity of which, in the words of the one who elaborated the concept, "is not only of harmony and love". Friendship, once it leaves the domain circumscribed by private or intimate sentiments, becomes at most benevolence, since the imprecision of the word permits a greater extension of the concept. In this vein, enmity, if it is public or political, not *cordial*, will be more precisely called hostility. Carl Schmitt formulated the distinction between enmity and hostility clearly, calling on the Latin lexicon: "*Hostis is est cum quo publice bellum habemus (...) in quo ab inimico differt, qui est is, quocum habemus privata odia...*["*Hostis* is someone with whom we wage war publicly... which differs from *inimicus*, who is someone we hate privately"]" (RB2, pp.213-4; RB3, pp.209-10. All italics in the original).<sup>530</sup>

Then, in his use - as it appears in later editions - cordiality is differentiated from friendship, goodness, harmony, benevolence; it is also taken as foreign to formalism and social conventionalism; finally, it is stripped of ethical judgments and apologetic intentions. This footnote is meant to be thus a reiteration of what was supposedly said already in the first edition - at least implicitly, as Sérgio observes. The reference to "modern sociology" reinforces, as Robert Wegner notes, a dimension of cordiality that is historically situated, linked to ruralism in Brazil, as I will stress below (see Wegner, 2000, pp.57-8).

Nevertheless, if one gets back to the use of cordiality in the first edition, things get a little more complicated. Here, however, I will have to suspend for a moment my sequential interpretation of RB and skip abruptly to chapter seven. There, it is stated that "[t]he good principles are not created by cordiality, *goodness*"

---

<sup>530</sup> I have omitted minor adjustments made from the second to the third edition. I rely on the English translation of *Roots of Brazil* for the translation of Carl Schmitt's words (in Latin in the Portuguese version) (see Holanda, 2012, p.177).

(RB1, p.156).<sup>531</sup> In later editions, Sérgio modified that phrase: "[t]he good principles are not created by *simple cordiality*" (RB2, p.279; RB3, p.274).<sup>532</sup> Hence, in the first edition, "goodness" had a synonymic sense in relation to "cordiality", which would be closer to the use Cassiano Ricardo would later make of it, being replied by Sérgio in the footnote.

In fact, in a text from 1948, Cassiano Ricardo himself replied Sérgio's considerations in the second edition of RB. After quoting the long note above, Cassiano concludes that Sérgio "reexamines the concept of *cordial man* and now under new aspects that were not present in the first edition. This is already an honor to me, showing at least that my divergence was not totally groundless" (Ricardo, 1956 [1948], p.284, italics in the original). Cassiano's main disagreement in his interpretation of the first edition of RB arises from the opposition Sérgio makes between "cordiality" and "politeness": "if our form of association is exactly the opposite of politeness, how is it possible to define it with a word [cordiality] that means precisely politeness?" (Ricardo, 1956 [1948], p.286). The modifications made to the second edition have made things different: "[t]he contradiction that existed between *cordial* and the concept of Brazilian man becomes now another contradiction - not less interesting - of the author with himself" (Ricardo, 1956 [1948], p.287). This contradiction refers, for instance, to the elimination, in the second edition, of the apologetic dimension that Cassiano identifies in the first edition.<sup>533</sup>

---

<sup>531</sup> In the original: "Com a cordialidade, a bondade, não se criam os bons princípios". In the 1935 text ("Corpo e Alma do Brasil..."), one reads another version of this phrase: "[t]he good principles are not created by cordiality and goodness" (Holanda, 2011a [1935], p.73) - in the original: "Com a cordialidade e a bondade, não se criam bons princípios". As João Cezar de Castro Rocha notes, the replacement of "and" (in the 1935 text) by "," (in the 1936 text) "tightens the semantic bond between cordiality and goodness" (Rocha, 2012, p.18).

<sup>532</sup> In the original: "Com a simples cordialidade, não se criam os bons princípios"

<sup>533</sup> It is not my purpose here to discuss Cassiano's interpretation of cordiality or all his disagreements with Sérgio's uses of "cordial", "cordial man" or "cordiality". To put it very briefly, Cassiano disagrees that "cordial man", as Sérgio uses, is an expression that singularizes "Brazilians"; to him, "goodness" is the "cultural trait specific to Brazilians" (see, for instance, Ricardo, 1956 [1948], pp.292-4). Cassiano's text was first published in 1948, then reprinted in the third edition of RB. In 1959, it was revised and included in a collection of essays from Cassiano Ricardo. In this revised edition, he states that the modifications Sérgio made in the notion of "cordial man" in the second edition went "beyond what was licit to expect" (Ricardo, 1959, p.14) and, ultimately, have provoked the loss of the clear definition of "the character of the Brazilians" (see Ricardo, 1959, p.17, p.21). In this sense, the cordial man must be conceptualized, according to what the revised version makes explicit, as "the representative type of 'Brazilian goodness', even when it is transposed to the political sphere, in our 'technique of goodness'" (Ricardo, 1959, p.45).



Sérgio published, in that same year, a "letter to Cassiano Ricardo", where one reads:

I must say that I am not eagerly clung to the expression *cordial*, that deserved your objections. If I have appropriated it, it was for the lack of a better one. It is certain, however, that your arguments to the contrary have not convinced me, when you oppose *goodness* to *cordiality*. I do not see how to escape, indeed, from the ethical sense associated to the word *goodness* (Holanda, 1956 [1948], p.311, italics in the original).

He then insists that the use of "cordiality" in the first edition already brought implicitly what the note added to the second edition would make explicit. Moreover, Sérgio states that he does not "believe that much in the so-called fundamental *goodness* of the Brazilians. I do not intend us to be better, or worse, than other peoples. But any discussion on this topic would lead to digressions around necessarily subjective criteria, without a plausible outcome" (Holanda, 1956 [1948], p.313, italics in the original).

Hence, so far Sérgio seems to be reiterating that it is cordiality, in the sense he has used since the very first edition of RB, the Brazilian trait, rather than goodness. But, then, the final words of the letter are the following:

Finally, I want to stress that *cordiality* itself does not seem to me a definitive and complete virtue that has to prevail independently of the changing circumstances of our existence. I believe that, at least in the second edition of my book, I have made this point clear enough. Rather, I associate it [cordiality] to particular conditions of our rural and colonial life, that we are quickly overcoming. With the progressive urbanization - that consists not only in the development of the metropolitan cities, but also first and foremost in the incorporation of increasing areas to the sphere of metropolitan influence - the cordial man's likely fate is to disappear where it has not yet completely

disappeared. And, sometimes, I honestly suspect [*receio*] that it has already been said too much about this poor defunct.

Cordially.

Sérgio BUARQUE DE HOLANDA

(Holanda, 1956 [1948],

pp.313-4)

The end of the letter refers thus to the second edition as being at least a clarification of the claim that "cordiality" is susceptible to transformations, even its own complete vanishing, depending on the changing conditions of "our existence".<sup>534</sup> More precisely, the eradication of the characteristics of the rural and colonial life formed in Brazil would lead to the disappearance of cordiality, of the cordial man. In fact, in this letter, this disappearance is seen as his "likely fate", perhaps now already a "poor defunct".<sup>535</sup> If, following Sandra Jatahy Pesavento, it is possible to claim that the cordial man is a mark "of the presence of the past in the present" (Pesavento, 2005, p.48), then its announced death can represent the death of a certain past. This will get more complex ahead.

Let me go back, now, to chapter five. After announcing the "cordial man" as Brazilian contribution to civilization, the text of the first edition continues as follows: "[t]he affability in relationships, hospitality, generosity, virtues extolled by

<sup>534</sup> Sérgio recalls this point in a 1967 lecture, when he refers to this letter, more specifically to these final words, as nothing more than "a greater precision to the concept that has given space to so many misunderstandings" (Holanda, 2008 [1967], p.620). I will get back to this lecture below.

<sup>535</sup> Interviewed in 1976, Sérgio reinstated his disagreement in relation to Cassiano Ricardo's interpretation, but stated, however, that "[i]t is undeniable... that the independence, the proclamation of the Republic and even the revolutions of 1930 and 1964 took place without a bloodshed. Hence, cordiality remains valid to our History" (see Coelho, 1976, p.3). In this interview, cordiality gains a profoundly negative tone, being the main characteristic of the revolutions in Brazil, all of them conducted by civil or military elites, leaving the popular masses aside and making room for the cordial man: "[f]or this reason democracy, that was born here from a misunderstanding, traveled in our History through an unusual path. That is, it was slowly fading away" (see Coelho, 1976, p.4). One must agree neither with this later interpretation Sérgio gave to cordiality nor with his prognosis in the letter to Cassiano that the cordial man would soon disappear. Indeed, I agree in part with João Cezar de Castro Rocha when he says that, contrary to Sérgio's prognosis, "cordial man did not disappear with the urbanization of 1940s and 1950s" (Rocha, 1998, p.27; see also Rocha, 2004, p.300). With João Cezar (and many others), I believe that "cordiality" is still a powerful interpretative track regarding social organization (and not psychological disposition) in "Brazil". I would not agree, however, if to "cordiality" an entirely negative view was ascribed (as Sérgio himself did in the 1976 interview). João Cezar tries to avoid that, saying that he does not consider "cordiality a priori a positive or a negative value" (Rocha, 1998, p.172). Ultimately, however, his 1998 text does imply a negative connotation to it - but, as I will not address that here, I will leave at that.

visiting foreigners in Brazil, *form a well-defined aspect of national character*. It would be..." (RB1, p.101). In later editions, not only the part in italics is modified, but also extended, before the paragraph continues with "It would be...": "[t]he affability in relationships, hospitality, generosity, virtues extolled by visiting foreigners in Brazil, *represent indeed a defined trait of Brazilian character, at least to the extent that the ancestral influence of patterns of human coexistence formed in the rural and patriarchal environment remains active and flourishing*. It would be..." (RB2, pp.213-4; RB3, pp.209-10). According to Pedro Meira Monteiro, this addition to the second edition serves to reinforce the relevance of the "rural roots" in the formation of contemporary Brazil: they can be defined as the "'presence of the past' in Brazilian history" (Monteiro, 1999, p.200). Furthermore, it inserts in the paragraph a transitional dimension to Brazilian character, and to contemporary Brazil in general, in virtue of the changes to which the traditional patterns can be submitted to (as Sérgio himself stressed in the letter to Cassiano).<sup>536</sup> Following João Kennedy Eugênio, RB, since its first edition, does not define Iberian heritage as "'monolithic', 'peremptory', resistant to every possible change", as it is clear from the distinction it makes between Brazilians and Portuguese: the former are "very different from the Portuguese colonizers, despite being inheritors of the Iberian mentality. The Iberian mentality and the complex of influences brought by the Portuguese are being bowed to and drawn [*estão sendo vergados e esbatidos*] by the influences of the capitalist modern world and the utilitarian mentality" (Eugênio, 2010, p.309). On this same topic, Luiz Feldman points out that the added-passage links cordiality to "a careful spatial and temporal conditioning" and that, in the letter to Cassiano Ricardo, where the cordial man is defined as a "poor defunct", Sérgio highlights the "acceleration of the process of rupture of those patterns of coexistence typical of cordiality" (Feldman, 2013, p.124). Hence, it is plausible to say that, indeed, the Iberian heritage is never configured as a monolithic or peremptory trait in the formative process of Brazil and that the modifications to

---

<sup>536</sup> As Robert Wegner highlights, this addition should not be interpreted as something completely new in RB, as if the first edition had not already contained a transitional dimension (as will become clearer with the discussion of "our revolution" below); the new passage thus emphasizes the transformations the Iberian heritage, and the ruralism and patriarchalism linked to the cordial man, were passing through in contemporary Brazil (see Wegner, 2000, pp.53-8). André Goldfeder and Leopoldo Waizbort note that the concept of the "cordial man" expresses "all the historical path that goes from the formation of the Iberian culture of personality to the constitution of the Brazilian political institutions of the 1930s" (Goldfeder and Waizbort, 2009, p.33).

later editions intensify the sense of transformation, point to a more specific direction towards which the process could be going, and at least downgrades the positive connotation ascribed to traditional traits in the formation of contemporary Brazil (including the cordial man). Nevertheless, the margin of resistance inscribed in cordiality is not completely erased from RB (as I will stress below).

The continuation of the paragraph warns against a mistake regarding the virtues of the cordial man: "[i]t would be a mistake to assume that, in the case of Brazil, those virtues can mean 'good manners', civility. Above all, they are legitimate expressions of an extremely rich and overflowing emotional basis. There is something coercive in civility - it can be expressed in commands and judgments" (RB1, p.101; RB2, pp.214-5; RB3, p.210). Perhaps surprisingly, the comparative mobilization here brings the Japanese people, among whom "politeness" sometimes gets to the point of being conflated with "religious reverence". To Sérgio, "[n]o other people is further from this ritualistic notion of life than the Brazilian people. Our ordinary form of social coexistence is fundamentally exactly the opposite of politeness" (RB1, p.102; RB2, p.215; RB3, p.210). In fact, "politeness" is defined by RB as "a kind of deliberate mimicry of manifestations that are spontaneous in the 'cordial man': it is the natural and living form that has been converted into a formula"; it is also defined as "somehow a defense mechanism [*organização de defesa*] against society. It is reserved for the external and superficial part of the individual, and it can even serve, when necessary, as a means of resistance. It is a disguise that permits each of us to preserve intact our sensibility and our emotions" (RB1, p.102; RB2, pp.215-6; RB3, p.210).

From the above, it is possible to interpret that cordiality and politeness (or civility) are opposed to each other. But, even more than that, civility is born from the transformation of the spontaneous manifestations of cordiality into a formula. In other words, civility is a "standardization of the exterior forms of cordiality" through which "spirit" triumphs over "life" (RB1, p.102; RB2, p.216; RB3, p.211). The spontaneity of cordiality is linked to an "aversion to social ritualism" and is expressed, above all, in how hard it is for Brazilians to sustain a "prolonged reverence for a superior. Our temperament allows, and even welcomes, formulas of reverence, but for the most part only insofar as they do not wholly erase the possibility of a more familiar relationship" (RB1, p.103; RB2, pp.216-7; RB3, p.212). So, to get back to the point announced above, the process of rupture with

traditional elements does not take place devoid of resistance, since cordiality, as André Goldfeder and Leopoldo Waizbort remind, is a "form of sociability whose content resists in a certain way being completely formalized; or rather, it consists in a crystallized social form, but whose composition contains certain margin of spontaneity, of vital flows that persist and that do not let themselves be completely hampered by the attempts to invest them with constituted forms" (Goldfeder and Waizbort, 2009, p.34).<sup>537</sup> In this respect, Brazilians are different even from the Portuguese, as a further comparative move makes clear: "[t]he respect normally manifested by other peoples has its counterpart in Brazil, in general, in the desire to establish intimacy. And that specificity becomes even more notable, when one takes into account the attachment the Portuguese, who are so close to us in so many ways, often have for titles and signs of reverence" (RB1, p.103; RB2, p.217; RB3, p.212).

This peculiar trait of Brazilians - the desire to establish intimacy - is expressed, for instance, in the strong inclination to use diminutives, adding "*inho*" to words, and therefore, making things and people closer and more familiar. In a footnote added to the second and following editions, Sérgio affirms that,

[i]n Brazil, where this characteristic [the attachment to diminutives] persists even in environments strongly affected by progressive urbanization, its presence can denote a recollection and a *survival*, among many others, of styles of human coexistence formed by rural and patriarchal environment, which the cosmopolitanism of our times has still not been able to erase. This can be said to be a clear trait of the "cordial" attitude, which is indifferent, or somehow opposed, to rules that are called, and not accidentally so, rules of *civility* and *urbanity* (RB2, p.218; RB3, p.213. All italics in the original).<sup>538</sup>

---

<sup>537</sup> For a different take on the resistance posed by cordiality, see Santiago (2006, pp.239-249). Cordiality, in his interpretation, is linked to the preservation of "*natural* elements, in order for us to remain being Brazilians in a world that, however, is being modernized through the imitation of what is foreign. Yes, cordiality is a weapon; it is a 'piece of resistance', it is the 'defense [of the individual] against society'" (Santiago, 2006, p.246).

<sup>538</sup> "Survival" is in English in the original.

Another instance of this Brazilian peculiarity is given by the omission of the family names in social relationships, where, then, the use of given names prevails. Despite the fact that this example is given in all editions of RB, it is only in the second that a hypothesis to explain it is provided. In this sense, Sérgio says that "[i]t would perhaps be possible to relate this fact to the suggestion that the use of someone's first name implies psychologically abolishing the barriers that result from the existence of families different and independent from each other" (RB2, p.218; RB3, pp.213-4). In this interpretation, this behavior would correspond to a natural attitude of people that accept a "discipline of sympathy, of 'harmony'" and reject the discipline of "abstract reasoning" or the discipline that is not based, "to use [Ferdinand] Tonnies's terminology, on communities of blood, place or spirit", that is, kinship, neighborhood and friendship (RB2, pp.218-9; RB3, p.214).<sup>539</sup>

In the last paragraph of the chapter, Sérgio summarizes what all the instances mentioned before have to say about the relation between the traits of Brazilian people and the configuration of Brazilian society. But here some important modifications are made in later editions. So, let me first quote the last paragraph as it appears in the first edition.

*[t]he instinctive antipathy towards the ritualistic forms, that we have been noting in many spheres of our social life, can be in part justified by the fact that such forms are ultimately unnecessary for us. Normally, our reaction to the environment in which we live is not defensive. The intimate life of the Brazilian is neither cohesive nor disciplined enough to envelop and dominate the whole personality, adjusting it, as a conscious element, to social environment. Brazilians are free, thus, to give in to all the repertory of ideas and gestures they encounter in their environment, even when these ideas and gestures follow the most rigorous formalism. This point is relevant, mainly because it elucidates another*

---

<sup>539</sup> A last example given by Sérgio refers to religion, more precisely to Catholicism. Here, the peculiarity is expressed by the intimacy the saints are dealt with. This "almost disrespectful intimacy" represents a transposition to the religious sphere of the "horror for distance that seems to constitute, at least until our times, the most specific trait of the Brazilian spirit" (RB1, p.105, p.107; RB2, p.219; p.221; RB3, p.214, pp.215-6). That is one of the reasons why, in RB, religion, in Brazil, is said to have been unable to provide society with social order and discipline.

*interesting aspect of the question that concerns us. Our assimilation of these gestures and ideas, for the precise reason that they are unnecessary for us, has a purely mechanical character. By the way, don't we find here a precious element to explain rastaquerismo [behavior of a parvenu, mannerisms of the nouveau riche], the specific vice of the South Americans? (RB1, p.110)*

In later editions, some parts are modified, while others are dislocated or even suppressed:

*[t]he glorification of the cordial values and of the concrete and sensible forms of religion seems to represent, in the Catholicism of the Council of Trent, a requirement that an effort is made towards spiritual recovery and the propagation of faith in the face of the offensive of Reformation. This glorification encountered among us a favorable land [terreno de eleição] and accommodated itself well to other typical aspects of our social behavior. In a place deemed by the first European observers a "remiss and somewhat melancholic land", our aversion to ritualism in particular is to a certain extent explainable due to the fact that ritualism is ultimately unnecessary for us. Normally, our reaction to the environment in which we live is not defensive. The intimate life of the Brazilian is neither cohesive nor disciplined enough to envelop and dominate the whole personality, integrating it, as a conscious element, into the social structure [edifício social]. Brazilians are free, thus, to give in to all the repertory of ideas, gestures and forms they may encounter in their way, assimilating them often without major difficulties (RB2, p.224; RB3, p.219).*

It is significant to see in these modifications that, in later editions, one does not read anymore that our assimilation of gestures and ideas linked to ritualistic forms "has a purely mechanical character". Moreover, later editions include explicit references to "the cordial values" (well-accommodated in Brazil), to Reformation,

and to the supposed reaction of Europeans towards a "remiss and somewhat melancholic land"; it seems that these references, together with the suppression mentioned above, imply a more favorable stance towards the assimilation, at least to a certain extent, of ritual forms - which can also be said to bring along the other aspects of modern society and state order this chapter discussed in the beginning.<sup>540</sup> This impression is reinforced with the suppression of the final question in the quotation, when "rastaquerismo" is unequivocally condemned as a South American vice. Room is opened to the assimilation of modernity in Brazil.

In sum, chapter five advances, in its play of identifications and differentiations, a comparison between Brazilian cordiality and the civility (or politeness) of other peoples (the explicit example given is the Japanese people). In this sense, Brazilians are different even from the Portuguese, however close to each other they are considered to be by Sérgio in many other aspects. The aversion of ritualism, the horror towards social distance and the obstacles to a rigid social discipline connect the discussion about cordiality with the previous discussion of the chapter, about the relation between the public and the private, the state order and the family order. Hence, this chapter puts into relief an aspect of the formation of contemporary Brazil that is far from completely rooted in the formation of Portugal or in Portuguese traits.

Chapter six, "New Times", indicates in its title the main problem at stake: the relation between the old and the new in contemporary Brazil.<sup>541</sup> The beginning of the chapter reinforces Brazilian traits, such as the reluctance in accepting principles of organization over the individual, the attachment to values of personality formed in the domestic sphere, the resistance against the submission to

---

<sup>540</sup> Before concluding the discussion on this chapter, let me note, following Pedro Meira Monteiro, the connection between cordiality and adventure: "[a]dventure... enables the understanding of the development and the success of an attitude of someone who is not oriented towards the abstraction of calculus and prediction, being rather oriented by the concreteness of the enormous and immediate reward" ; cordiality, in turn, "also marks the permanence and the success among us of the coexisting patterns originated in the rural world, oriented towards the concreteness of personal and family relations, without the abstract mediation of the political sphere" (Monteiro, 1999, p.173). Later, Pedro claims that "with some imagination, but without theoretical loss, it is possible to see the cordial man as a kind of extension of the adventurer in Brazilian social history": if adventure relates to the people's behavior in relation to environment and wealth, cordiality relates to their behavior in social relations (Monteiro, 1999, p.233). From this approximation of cordiality and adventure, it is possible to say that the material (linked to the kind of colonization advanced in the tropical environment), the (inter-)personal and the political are closely related in RB's interpretation of Brazil.

<sup>541</sup> This chapter has received four more paragraphs to the second edition, while twenty-six were modified (Eugênio, 2010, pp.272-3).



a strict discipline, and the transference of personal interests to professional activities (see RB1, pp.113-4; RB2, pp.227-8; RB3, pp.223-4).

Regarding the professional activities more specifically, RB points out a certain "plague of degree-granting [*praga do bacharelismo*]", which is intimately connected to the larger problem of the social transition from the rural domain to the urban life. In Sérgio's words,

[t]he general inclination towards liberal professions, which, in the previous chapter, we have already tried to interpret *as symptomatic* [*as an ally*, RB2 and RB3] of our colonial and agrarian formation and related to the abrupt transition from the rural domain to the urban life, is not a phenomenon peculiar to us. Few countries seem to have been as infected by the 'plague of degree-granting' as, for example, the United States during the years after the War of Independence (RB1, pp.115-6; RB2, pp.230-1; RB3, p.226).

Perhaps surprisingly, this passage compares Brazil with the United States, but not in order to differentiate them, but to identify something they share: the "plague of degree-granting" or, in the Portuguese word, *bacharelismo*.<sup>542</sup> But, later, Sérgio stipulated what is a peculiarity of *bacharelismo* in Brazil:

still speaking about *bacharelismo*, it also stands out our tendency to glorify, above all, individual personality as a value in itself, beyond all contingencies... If, in current days, our social environment no longer permits the continuation of this privileged situation [*as before*, RB2 and RB3], and if the prestige of the graduate is *today* above all a reminiscence of

---

<sup>542</sup> Sérgio's stance towards the United States has considerably changed over time. In 1920, for instance, in "*A Quimera do Monroísmo*" ("The Chimera of Monroism"), he warned against the imperialist inclinations expressed in the Monroe Doctrine: "either we lose forever the condition of a sovereign state, or, in accordance with traditions of a free people, we repel, with dignity and self-assurance, the lures with which the *friends* of the North wish to attract us" (Holanda, 2011a [1920], p.10); in that same year, in "Ariel", he lamented the way Latin American countries were trying to culturally imitate the United States, mainly its utilitarianism, considered by him the nation that was "the least deserving of our sympathies, the most inadequate to be imitated" (Holanda, 1989 [1920], p.43). Twenty-one years later, it seemed unquestionable to Sérgio that "aspects of solidarity or, at least, possible spheres of understanding" could be explored between the United States and Brazil; he even identified then a "promise of moral and spiritual comprehension" between the countries (Holanda, 2011a [1941], p.244, p.247).

certain conditions of material life that are not fully reproduced anymore, *constituting, exactly for this reason, what the American sociologists would call a cultural lag*, what is certain is that most people among us seem to still think about this aspect in a way that is little diverse from our grandparents'. What is important to emphasize here is that the origin of the seductiveness offered by the liberal *professions* [*careers*, RB2 and RB3] is closely linked to the nearly exclusive preference for values of the personality (RB1, p.117; RB2, p.233; RB3, pp.228-9).<sup>543</sup>

The passage indicates that new times raise obstacles against the continuation of certain aspects of the old times and that these obstacles have not yet reached a point of complete rupture, which implies that the old is living in the new. The inclusion of "as before" and the suppressions of "today" and of the reference to a "cultural lag" reinforce that the situation linked to the past persists in force in the present. "New times" are thus both new and old.

Hence, what RB is narrating is a formative process of Brazilian character that exposes the weight of *bacharelismo* and, in general, of personalism, and the attraction for new ideas that, not necessarily in conformity at first with Brazilian reality, would, however, work towards the future consolidation of the new times.<sup>544</sup> Mentioning the success of the positivists inspired by Auguste Comte in Brazil (and in other places, such as Chile and Mexico), Sérgio formulates the following question: "this confidence in the miraculous power of ideas, wouldn't it rely on a secret horror towards our national reality?" (RB1, p.120; RB2, p.236; RB3, p.231).

---

<sup>543</sup> "As before" is included since the second edition; "today" is suppressed in the second and later editions, as well as "constituting, exactly for this reason, what the American sociologists would call a *cultural lag* [in English in the first edition]".

<sup>544</sup> In a text from 1946 (two years before the second edition of RB), Sérgio stresses "a constant trait in our social life: the supreme position often occupied in it by certain qualities of imagination and intelligence, to the detriment of the manifestations of the so-called practical or positive spirit". This "intelligence" is not, however, linked to a esteem for intellectual speculations and it does not work as a means to knowledge and action; rather, it is "simply ornamental", and "it corresponds, in a society of aristocratic and personalist foundation, to the necessity each individual has of distinguishing oneself from the others by some virtue that is apparently congenital and not transferable, similar in this sense to the nature of blood". This intelligence is, therefore, "an essentially anti-modern principle. Nothing indeed more opposite to all that drives the economic thinking derived from the Industrial Revolution" (All quotations from Holanda, 2011a [1946], pp.267-8).

This horror is what lies behind a very specific, but also very common, kind of person, exemplified by the positivists. Sérgio, then, identifies throughout the recent historical formation of Brazil "a human *species* [*race*, RB2 and RB3] that considerably prospered in our country as soon as it started to have self-consciousness"; this kind of human is characterized by the constant escape from the reality and by the persisting attempt to import ideas from other places to Brazil. In his words:

[o]f all the forms of evasion from reality, *the commitment [convívio] to ideas and speculations* seemed to us *the easiest and the most dignifying* during our difficult political and social adolescence. We brought from strange lands a *complete* and ready system of precepts, without knowing to what extent they fit Brazilian life. In fact, the impersonal *and anti-natural* ideology of the democratic liberalism, *with its impressive capital letters and its abstract formulas*, has never become naturalized among us. We have effectively assimilated these principles only to the extent that they coincided with the pure and simple negation of an uncomfortable authority, confirming our instinctive horror towards hierarchies and allowing us to treat rulers in a familiar mode. Democracy, in Brazil, was always a lamentable misunderstanding. *A rural and semi-feudal aristocracy imported it and managed to accommodate itself to its rules in the way it was possible. This only happened this way because these rules* seemed [to this aristocracy] to be the most appropriate for the epoch and were glorified in the books and in the speeches. *These rules had been exactly what the European bourgeoisie defended in its fight against the aristocrats* (RB1, p.122).<sup>545</sup>

This passage is modified in later editions:

---

<sup>545</sup> In the already-mentioned "Corpo e Alma do Brasil..." (1935), there is a very similar paragraph, that begins with "In fact, the impersonal and anti-natural ideology...". However, the end of the paragraph was modified and some phrases were dislocated in the first edition of RB. In the 1935 text, the paragraph contained the following statement: "[t]he original sin of this bookish attitude has never been extinguished from our public life" (Holanda, 2011a [1935], pp.66-7).

[o]f all the forms of evasion from reality, *the belief in the miraculous power of ideas* seemed to us the most dignifying during our difficult political and social adolescence. We brought from strange lands a *complex* and ready system of precepts, without knowing to what extent they fit *the conditions of Brazilian life and without considering the changes that such conditions would impose on them*. In fact, the impersonal ideology of the democratic liberalism has never become naturalized among us. We have effectively assimilated these principles only to the extent that they coincided with the pure and simple negation of an uncomfortable authority, confirming our instinctive horror towards hierarchies and allowing us to treat rulers in a familiar mode. Democracy, in Brazil, was always a lamentable misunderstanding. *A rural and semi-feudal aristocracy imported it and managed to accommodate it, wherever possible, to its rights and privileges; the same rights and privileges that, in the Old World, had been targeted by the bourgeoisie in its fight against aristocrats. Thus, this aristocracy was able to incorporate into the traditional situation, at least as an external façade or ornament, some slogans that seemed the most appropriate for the epoch and were glorified in the books and in the speeches* (RB2, pp.238-9; RB3, pp.233-4).

This passage, in all its versions, contains most of the problems RB identifies in its interpretation of contemporary Brazil. It isolates a kind of Brazilian that persistently tries to avoid Brazilian reality, or at least tries to transform it through the importation of foreign ready-made models.<sup>546</sup> It also makes the diagnostic of the difficulties faced by democracy due to Brazilian reality. And it stresses that the

---

<sup>546</sup> It is worth noting that this problem of importation of foreign models appears very early among Sérgio's concerns; in 1920, he wrote that "[i]n Brazil, the habit of imitating [*macaquear*] everything that is foreign is, one can say, the only habit that we did not take from any other nation. This is, thus, the only peculiar trait that can already be perceived in this society being formed [*em formação*] that is called 'Brazilian people'" (Holanda, 1989 [1920], p.43).

importation of democracy to Brazil lead to an arrangement in which the old and the new coexisted, provoking neither a major rupture nor the defeat of the aristocracy by the bourgeoisie.

But the modifications across the editions insert some moves on these general aspects. In later editions, Sérgio seems to specify that the problem is not exactly the "commitment to ideas and speculations", but the "belief in the miraculous power of ideas" and the corresponding neglect of the adaptation these ideas must pass through in order to succeed in a different land. In this sense, later editions are opened to a possibility that was not considered in the first edition: if, in 1936, the act of bringing a foreign system of precepts must take into account "to what extent they fit Brazilian life"; since 1948, this act must also consider "the changes" that are necessary in order for these precepts to "fit the conditions of Brazilian life". As Luiz Feldman notes, this implies that the system - now "complex", rather than "complete" - can be somehow adjusted to the "conditions of Brazilian life" (see Feldman, 2013, p.126).<sup>547</sup> All that gives a different connotation to the statement that "democracy, in Brazil, is a lamentable misunderstanding": in 1936, the problem seems to be an incompatibility between democracy and Brazilian life, despite, or perhaps as a consequence of, the importation of this political regime; since 1948, the problem seems to be formulated by a combination of the belief in the miraculous power of ideas with the lack of attention to the required adjustments of democracy to Brazilian conditions.<sup>548</sup> Finally, the final lines of the passage give a twist to the process of accommodation: in 1936, "aristocracy 'managed to accommodate itself' to the democratic principles"; since 1948, however, this same aristocracy "'managed to accommodate it', [that is,] democracy, to the aristocratic privileges" (Feldman,

---

<sup>547</sup> As Leopoldo Waizbort highlights based on the first edition of RB, "all solutions that are not in accordance with the structure of personality will remain as misunderstandings, as it is the case of democracy" (Waizbort, 2011, pp.49-50).

<sup>548</sup> It also seems plausible to add that the replacement of "complete" by "complex" goes in line with another modification I have stressed above. To recall: in the first edition, Sérgio says that the form of large agricultural lands in Brazil "came ready and complete" from Portugal, being only refined in the tropics "due to peculiar conditions, such as the abundance of lands, the scarcity of goods, the necessity of continuous surveillance against the enemy" (RB1, p.26). In later editions, one reads that this particular form "arose in large part from foreign elements and due to production and market conveniences" linked to European configurations (RB2, pp.42-3; RB3, p.41) and that "the methods [the Portuguese] put in practice in Brazil do not represent a major progress in relation to what the indigenous people already practiced before them" (RB2, p.51; RB3, p.49). What I mean by the approximation of these modifications is that later editions emphasize the modifications of Iberian and Portuguese traits once they arrived in Brazil. To be clear: it is an emphasis, rather than an inclusion as if the first edition had not already pointed out some aspects of the Iberian heritage that were transformed in the tropics.

2013, p.126). So, if neither edition interprets the process as a rupture with the past, the difference relies in who or what has changed through the process of accommodation: aristocracy, in the first edition; democracy, in later ones. In both cases, if only in different ways, the evasion from Brazilian reality remained a characteristic of a certain Brazilian elite.

The scenario for all these points approached in chapter six is the XIX century in Brazil, when the rural world began to be deeply affected by ideas other than the Iberian or the Portuguese ones that crucially constituted it in the first place. The old colonial patterns are now challenged by new ideas, new times. According to Sérgio, the main problem this brings is that "our men of ideas were [*in general*, RB2 and RB3] pure men of words and books; they did not leave themselves, their dreams and imaginations. Thus, everything worked towards the fabrication of an artificial and bookish reality, where our true life died of asphyxiation" (RB1, p.126; RB2, p.243; RB3, p.238). The continuation of this passage proposes an analogy that has been intriguingly modified in later editions. In the first edition, one reads that, like "Plotinus of Alexandria, who was ashamed of his own body", "we would end up forgetting everything *that made us think of our own emotional richness, the only creative force that still left for us, in order to submit ourselves to the written word, the rhetoric, the grammar, the abstract law*" (RB1, p.126). In the new version of the analogy, the "creative force" that Brazilians still had, is not mentioned anymore. Now, like "Plotinus of Alexandria, who was ashamed of his own body", "we would end up forgetting *thus the prosaic facts that make up the real web of daily existence, in order to dedicate ourselves to more ennobling activities: the written word, the rhetoric, the grammar, the formal law*" (RB2, p.243; RB3, pp.238-9). It seems that the problem regarding the actions of the men of ideas remain fundamentally the same in later editions; but the possibility of relying upon an emotional richness as a creative force is out of the table.

This modification in the analogy gains a different tone when interpreted together with the following change in RB. In all editions, Sérgio compares the Emperor Dom Pedro II of Brazil<sup>549</sup> to the positivists, due to his taste for books,

---

<sup>549</sup> Dom Pedro II was born in Rio de Janeiro, in 1825, and died in Paris, in 1891. Son of the first emperor of Brazil, Dom Pedro I, he was the second and last emperor. He reigned from 1831 to 1889, but his coronation happened only in 1841, after he was formally declared of age by the General Assembly of the Second Reign.

where he, as the positivists themselves, learned how Brazilian reality could be transformed in conformity with his idea. But, then, this behavior is considered, in the first edition, a "perversion", while, in later ones, it is said that "there is nothing really unusual in such attitude". The full quotations will give a clear sense of what is at stake.

In the first edition:

[t]his Emperor, who has been *rightly* compared to a Protestant pastor officiating in a Catholic temple, is comparable, in many of his traits, to those positivists discussed above: they, too, great friends of *reading*, where they learned to *transform* reality in conformity with their taste. *This perversion took shape, indeed, only over time. Our theoreticians and erudite speak, until today, the same language they did fifty or a hundred years ago, only with different words. Thus, the thoughts and advice they provide us would aim at the creation, when the final stage of our evolution arrives, of a social framework miraculously detached from our Portuguese and mixed-race traditions. The modern and likely ephemeral prestige of liberal and Protestant superstitions seemed to them definitive, eternal, undisputable and universal; they stand as parameters to judge our backwardness or our progress* (RB1, p.128).

In later editions:

[t]his Emperor, who has been compared to a Protestant pastor officiating in a Catholic temple, *is not, in fact, a unique figure in XIX century Brazil*. He is comparable, in many of his traits, to the positivists mentioned above: they, too, great friends of *the printed page*, where they learned to *recreate* reality in conformity with their taste *and judgment*. *There is nothing really unusual in such attitude: Dom Pedro II of Brazil represents his time and country well, so well that, paradoxically, he was one of the pioneers of this transformation through which the old colonial nobility, nobility of agrarian landlords - our men of the manor house*

-, *tends to yield its position to this other nobility, above all urban, characterized by talent and a devotion to letters* (RB2, p.245; RB3, p.240).

Well, in the first edition, Sérgio is positioning himself strongly against the perverse attitude reproduced by the Emperor ("rightly" compared to a Protestant in a Catholic temple), by the positivists and, in general, by the men of ideas of the XIX century. This opposition is accompanied by the questioning regarding the likely ephemeral prestigious superstitions linked to Protestantism and liberalism, and regarding the attempt to eradicate, through the transplantation of these superstitions to Brazil, our Portuguese and mixed-race traditions. When it comes to later editions, however, the first thing to be noted is that the comparison of the Emperor to a Protestant does not seem to Sérgio to be correct ("rightly" is suppressed). In addition to that, the clash between the above-mentioned ephemeral Protestant and liberal superstitions, on the one hand, and Portuguese and mixed-race traditions, on the other hand, is not considered anymore; instead, the Emperor is now interpreted as a pioneer of the transformations of the new times, when the old, rural, nobility is giving place to the new, urban, one.<sup>550</sup> It is worth recalling, however, that this new nobility does not represent a complete break in time, as I have stressed above and as Sérgio insists in later editions: "[n]o other group was so well equipped to preserve, to the possible extent, the essentially aristocratic quality of our traditional society as those persons of cultivated imagination who had French readings" (RB2, p.245; RB3, p.240-1) - it is worth remembering also the accommodation of democracy advanced by aristocracy, as expressed in later editions.

---

<sup>550</sup> It is worth mentioning that, in 1920 (sixteen years before the first edition of RB1), Sérgio lamented, in one of his first texts published, entitled "*Viva o Imperador*" ("Long Live the Emperor"), the expulsion of Dom Pedro II "from the country that he loved so much, by the people that owed him so many benefits"; he "who had deserved the admiration of Victor Hugo, Pasteur, Lamartine, Alexandre Dumas, Gladstone and Darwin was a victim of the ingratitude of his fellow countrymen" (Holanda, 2011a [1920], p.5). In this text, the eighteen-year-old Sérgio defends the return of Dom Pedro II's remains to Brazil and the revocation of the ban of the imperial family in Brazil. In the same year, in "*A Bandeira Nacional*" ("The National Flag"), Sérgio claimed that the motto inserted in the national flag of Brazil, "Order and Progress", belonged to a "sect [the positivist] whose members are a minority", and, moreover, that this motto was in accordance "neither with [our] traditions nor with our beliefs" (Holanda, 2011a [1920], p.14). He also defended that Brazil's national flag (the same model that is still used in the country, established in 1889 by the republican government) disdained or ignored Brazilian historical tradition, was astronomically mistaken, and was aesthetically ugly. Hence, the opposition to the positivists has a long history in Sérgio's stance, while his position towards the emperor is not so constant.



In this same vein, Sérgio modifies also the last paragraphs of the chapter. For instance, in the first edition, it is stated that

*[o]ur men keep thus attached to fictions and deceptive predictions that serve to disguise an unbeatable disenchantment with our reality and our tradition... Many of those who criticize the Imperial period in Brazil for diffusing a grotesque and fastidious national Bovarism, forget that this evil, on the contrary, has grown over time and that this growth was perhaps accompanied by the increase only in our insensibility to its effects (RB1, p.130).*

Later editions, in turn, instead of "fictions and deceptive predictions", state the existence of "panaceas". Then, they claim that,

*if, on the one hand, [these panaceas] seem to indicate a vicious reasoning by their preachers, on the other hand, they serve to disguise an unbeatable disenchantment towards our real conditions... Many of those who criticize the Imperial period in Brazil for diffusing a kind of grotesque and fastidious national Bovarism, forget that this evil has not decreased over time; what has decreased, perhaps, was only our sensibility to its effects (RB2, p.249; RB3, p.244).*

Once more, Luiz Feldman traces the main implications of the changes highlighted above: "[o]n the one hand, it disappears the reserve in relation to modernizing itineraries that disregarded the 'Portuguese and mixed-race' references"; on the other hand, "it is excluded precisely the critique against those that revealed themselves disenchanted with 'our tradition'" (Feldman, 2013, p.127), remaining only the critique against those that were disenchanted with our "real conditions".

All that said, Sérgio concludes by saying that, taking into account the formation of this national Bovarism over time, not only the Republic is not a progressive rupture in relation to the Empire, but, on the contrary, the former deepened the problem already found in the latter. In his words:

*[w]hen the propaganda supporting the republic was made, the aim was certainly the introduction, following the new regime,*

of a system that was more in accord with the supposed aspirations of nationality: the country was finally going to live by its own, without the need to exhibit, only in America, capricious and old-fashioned political forms. In reality, however, it was still a negative motivation that inspired the propagandists: Brazil should enter in a new direction because "it was ashamed" of itself, of its *biological* reality. Those that fought for a new life represented, perhaps even more than their predecessors, the idea that the country cannot grow by its own natural forces; it must be formed from the outside, it must deserve the approval of *others*. Precisely in this respect, it is no exaggeration to say that our republic surpassed the empire [*in more than one aspect*, RB2 and RB3] (RB1, p.130; RB2, p.249-50; RB3, pp.244-5. All italics in the original).<sup>551</sup>

To put it differently, the proclamation of the republic is not interpreted by this passage as a step forward in the progressive history of the formative process of Brazil; rather, it exposes the increase (or, as later editions put, the lack of decrease) of an evil still permeating contemporary Brazil. But, as I have stressed above, the characterization of this evil has changed as the editions were modified.

In sum, Sérgio approaches, in this chapter, something already tackled before in RB, that is, the multiple changes-within-continuity taking place in Brazil since

---

<sup>551</sup> A very similar passage is found in the 1935 text, but some words that were modified or suppressed from the first edition of RB seem worth noting. For instance, in this passage, one reads that "[t]he Republic, despite making the country pulse as one with the rest of the continent, did not improve the prevailing political habits". Later in the same paragraph: "it does not mean that the empire represented in all the senses a definitive form, or even a germ of an organic system with the substratum of nationality. It is unquestionable, however, that it was less distant from that than the Republic". Finally, the final lines of the paragraph (also the final lines of the text) bring: "[t]hus, Brazilian monarchy brought in itself some truly affirmative and constructive elements, and there was a certain greatness in the ideal it proposed. Today, we are only a tedious [*endomingado*] people. A periphery without a center." (All the quotations are from Holanda, 2011a [1935], pp.77-8). If one goes even further back in time, one will read, in a 1920 text, that "the importation of the republican regime" to Brazil derives from "our natural tendency to imitate everything that is foreign" and that "Strauss realized the superiority of the monarchy in comparison with the republic in the formation and the intellectual development of a nationality" (Holanda, 1989 [1920], p.44). Moving ahead, one reads, in a text from 1948, that the republican period showed "immense and repeated errors, accumulated over long decades of misrule [*desgoverno*]" (Holanda, 2011a [1948], p.508). It is possible to see, then, that the positive tone in relation to the empire was softened over time until RB was published, although the negative tone regarding the republic remained.

the XIX century, since the "New Times" arrived. It is plausible to say that, after the colonial encounter with the Portuguese, this century exposes another major encounter between "Brazil" and "Europe". This time, however, "Europe" does not stand for "Iberian countries" or "Portugal", but for the liberal democratic Europe that have supposedly been formed with the rise of the bourgeoisie and its liberal democratic principles. Nevertheless, this does not mean that this encounter is free of Iberian, Portuguese and native traces, since the formative process of this "Brazil" encountering this "modern Europe" is already marked by these roots.

The seventh, and last, chapter of RB is called "Our Revolution."<sup>552</sup> I have already stressed that, in RB, changes are not complete ruptures; and, among the changes, the abolition of slavery is one of the most expressive, a dividing line, according to Sérgio. It was also said how the XIX century witnesses the emergence of a social dispute between two coexisting, but distinct worlds and mentalities. All that serve as a background when, in the very first lines of the last chapter, Sérgio states that

[i]f the Abolition marks in Brazil the end of the agrarian prevalence, the political framework established in the following year [1889, the year of the proclamation of the republic] aims at adequately responding to the demands of a new social composition. There is a secret link connecting these two events and several others to a slow, but sure and planned, revolution; the only one we have truly experienced

---

<sup>552</sup> This chapter received eleven more paragraphs to the second edition, while thirty-nine were modified (Eugênio, 2010, pp.272-3). The first edition brings an epigraph, in German, by Friedrich Nietzsche, suppressed in the later ones: "*Ein Volk geht zugrunde, wenn es seine Pflicht mit dem Pflichtbegriff überhaupt verwechselt* [Um povo desmorona quando troca seu dever particular pela ideia de dever em geral]" (I have relied on the translation proposed in Eugênio, 2010, p.281). According to João Kennedy Eugênio, the epigraph emphasizes the relevance of cultural particularity and the potential harm inscribed in its negligence in the benefit of general laws - one of the main problems Sérgio ascribes to Brazilian elites (Eugênio, 2010, p.284). Leopoldo Waizbort claims that this epigraph expresses Sérgio's affinities with the conservative thinking of the 1920-1930 and that its erasure to the second edition exposes a displacement in Sérgio's political position (see Waizbort, 2011, p.53). I agree with Leopoldo's point, but, following João Kennedy, I would be careful in taking the erasure of this epigraph as if it represented the complete erasure of every single trace of Friedrich Nietzsche's thinking or of the organicist thinking from RB. It is not my purpose here, however, to develop this discussion on the presence of various German thinkers and XIX century currents of thought in RB. For more on organicism in RB, see Eugênio (2010) and Waizbort (2011).

over the course of our national life (RB1, p.136; RB2, p.253; RB3, p.249).

Brazilian revolution is, therefore, spread in time. The point to be considered next, however, is whether this revolution has already taken place, being consummated, or not. If one reads the first edition, one gets the sense it belongs to the past: "[t]he great Brazilian revolution *was* not a fact that could be *traced* in a precise moment. Rather, it *was* a lengthy process that *lasted* at least three-quarters of a century" (RB1, p.136). In later editions, the interpretation of contemporary Brazil encompasses this same revolution as a living process: "[t]he great Brazilian revolution *is* not a fact that could be *registered* in a precise moment. Rather, it *is* a lengthy process that *has lasted for* at least three-quarters of a century" (RB2, p.254; RB3, p.250). That said, the dividing line exposed by 1888 (Abolition) is not, as I have already noted, a complete break in time, but a moment since which "[**some of**, RB3] the traditional constraints against the emergence of a new state of affairs have ceased to operate; this new state of affairs only then becomes inevitable" (RB1, p.136; RB2, p.254; RB3, p.250). In this sense, the inclusion of "some of" in the third edition strengthens the point of the second edition, that is, that Brazilian revolution exposes a living past in the present, conditioning the future.<sup>553</sup>

This gets even more evident in a ulterior modification of the text. In the first edition, the movement that, since the empire, has continuously challenged the old fundamentals of Brazilian society is said to be yet incomplete, but, at the same time, "it seems unquestionable, *however*, that we have already *transposed* its acute phase" (RB1, p.137). In later editions, this same movement remains being considered incomplete, but now "it seems unquestionable that we have already *entered* its acute phase" (RB2, p.255; RB3, p.251). So, later versions depict Brazil as living the acute phase of its revolution, that is, the phase the first edition said to have been already transposed. In all editions, the waning of agrarianism corresponds to the emergence

---

<sup>553</sup> Another inclusion, in the following paragraph, works the same way. In the first edition, 1888 is said to be the moment after which "the terrain for the new system was prepared, with its **base** no longer on the rural domains, but on the urban centers" (RB1, p.136). Later editions qualify that, saying that "the terrain for the new system was *better* prepared, with its **base** [**center of gravity**, RB3] no longer on the rural domains, but on the urban centers" (RB2, p.255; RB3, pp.250-1). Let me push a little further, and suggest that the change from "base" to "center of gravity" gives a more dynamic connotation to the interpretation, not to mention a reinforcement of the transitional condition of the urban centers, not yet consolidated. Here, one should recall the modifications made to the third chapter, providing another account to the year 1888 - see pages 399-402.

of urbanism and the "eradication of the Iberian roots of our culture": "[i]f the form of our culture is still **clearly** [**broadly**, RB3] Iberian and Portuguese, this fact stems above all from the insufficiencies of 'Americanism' [which corresponds to the new style, linked to urbanism], which can be largely summed up until now in a kind of exacerbation of strange manifestations, of decisions imposed from outside, external to the land. The American is still internally inexistent" (RB1, p.137; RB2, pp.255; RB3, p.251). This passage ascribes an additional frame to the clash between the old and the new: they coexist in Brazil also in terms of Iberism and Americanism.

Contemporary Brazil is thus differently interpreted in RB, depending on whether or not the formative process still goes through the acute phase of Brazilian revolution. It is crucial to have in mind that Sérgio's stance towards this revolutionary movement - to recall, a slow, sure and planned revolution - is far from being one of simple praise or simple condemnation. It would be exceedingly partial to interpret his position as it is exposed in all the editions of RB as either wholly nostalgic or wholly iconoclast; as either supporting a complete preservation or recovery of the old, or as supporting a complete eradication of the old, the Iberian, in favor of the new. In this sense, RB is both identifying a certain coexistence of the old and the new, and exposing a position that implies, as the better path to Brazil, the improvement of this coexistence through the formative process of contemporary Brazil.

By now, I hope it is clear that both the identification and the position just mentioned are differently articulated in the editions of RB. Nevertheless, the passage below expresses a continuous trace permeating all the editions. Sérgio says that

[o]nce the old rural *landlords* [*proprietors*, RB2 and RB3] have become impotent by the deadly blow of Abolition and by other *decisive* factors, they had no ways of intervening in the new institutions. The republic, which has not created an aristocracy [*patriciado*], but only a plutocracy - if one may say so -, ignored them completely. It derives from that the melancholic silence to which it was reduced the cast of men that, during the empire, directed and inspired the institutions, ensuring to the national whole a certain *organic solidity* [*harmony*, RB2 and RB3], that has since never been restored.

*Those conditions [That situation, RB2 and RB3] resulted less from the monarchic regime and more from the structure on which it relied, and that irreversibly [forever, RB2 and RB3] disappeared. The continuous, progressive and overwhelming urbanization, social phenomenon of which the republican institutions should represent the complementary exterior form, destroyed this powerful rural anchor that was the force behind the decayed regime, without succeeding in replacing it [so far, RB2 and RB3] by anything new (RB1, p.141; RB, p.262; RB3, p.258)<sup>554</sup>*

The passage attests the decay of a regime, of the old, without the establishment of another regime, of the new. The republic has not marched the way it was supposed to, that is, as an institutional and exterior form complementing (organically, as in RB1, or harmoniously, as in RB2 and RB3) the social dynamics. The old structure is in a certain sense gone; but only in a certain sense, since its effects are alive in the present. The inclusion of "so far" emphasizes, once more, the transitional perspective on contemporary Brazil.

This situation resonates in the Brazilian politically-independent-and-republican state itself, since it "preserves some of the exterior forms of the traditional system as respectable relics, after the base that supported them disappeared. A periphery without a center. The precocious maturity, the strange extravagance of our state machinery, is one of the *most typical* consequences of this situation" (RB1, p.141; RB2, p.263; RB3, pp.258-9).<sup>555</sup> So, clearly to Sérgio, Brazilian state needs to acquire a different form. I have already said that he does

<sup>554</sup> "Decisive" and "powerful" are suppressed in later editions, while "so far", included.

<sup>555</sup> "Most typical" is suppressed in later editions. I have already quoted above a passage from a 1935 text, entitled "Corpo e Alma do Brasil..." ("Body and Soul of Brazil..."), stating that "Brazilian monarchy brought in itself some truly affirmative and constructive elements, and there was a certain greatness in the ideal it proposed. Today, we are only a tedious [*endomingado*] people. A periphery without a center" (Holanda, 2011a [1935], pp.77-8). This same expression, "periphery without a center", is found in all editions of RB, as I have stressed, and appears again in a text from 1952, where one reads that "one of the evident symptoms of a rupture with the vital bond linking to the past is found in this sentimental and regressive eagerness, an eagerness of antiquarians that think they can resuscitate dead forms while they know well how to copy their epidermal traits and ephemeral profile. To the outcome of these fabrications, it will always lack that organic integrity of the authentic creations. The outcome will be like a periphery without a center, like a body without soul" (Holanda, 2011b [1952b], p.221). Note how the relation between "body" and "soul" is reiterated in this text, once more in respect to the articulation of past, present and future.

not defend the liberal democratic as the best, or even as a feasible, alternative to Brazilian future - at least not as model to be imported without adjustment, as later editions stress. Neither he defends the despotic form. To him,

[t]he State, among us, does not need to be, and should not be, in fact, despotic - despotism does not match well with the sweetness of our ethos [*gênio*] -, but it needs vigor and composure, as well as greatness and solicitude, if it wishes to gain some strength and also that respectability that our Iberian forefathers have taught us to consider the supreme virtue of all. It can [*still*, RB2 and RB3] attain, in this way, *and only in this way*, a truly impressive force in all sectors of national life. But it is indispensable that the parts of its mechanism work with certain harmony and elegance. Brazilian empire to a great extent achieved that... [T]he conception of the state expressed in this ideal is not only valid to the internal life of nationality, but it is also still impossible for us to conceive in a very diverse way our greater projection on international life. Whether ostensibly or not, the idea that we preferably form to our prestige abroad is one of a giant full of elevated goodwill towards all the nations of the world (RB1, pp.142-3; RB2, pp.263-4; RB3, p.259).<sup>556</sup>

Hence, the state, in Brazil, should be neither liberal nor despotic. It should match the sweetness of Brazilian people, at the same time that it is strong, elegant and harmonious. Moreover, this is an ideal of state that should operate both inside and outside, as the continuation of the chapter will reinforce.

The following paragraph opens with another declaration about Brazilian behavior: "[w]e have no ambition for the prestige of a conquering country and we notoriously detest violent solutions. We want to be the most gentle and well-behaved people in the world. We fight constantly for the principles universally held to be the most moderate and rational" (RB1, p.143; RB2, pp.264-5; RB3, p.260). What seems to be a praise for the way Brazilians are and behave gains another tone

---

<sup>556</sup> "And only in this way" is suppressed in later editions. This phrase becomes: "It can still attain, in this way a truly impressive force in all sectors of national life".

as the paragraph continues: "[w]e model our conduct among nations according to the conduct that the most cultivated countries follow or seem to follow, and then we become proud of the excellent company. All of them are characteristic features of our political apparatus, which engage in disarming all the *genuine and* less harmonious expressions of our society, in rejecting any social spontaneity" (RB1, p.144; RB2, p.265; RB3, p.260).<sup>557</sup> This has generated, according to Sérgio, a "unique instability" that corresponds to the separation of politics from society. To put it differently, politics became foreign to society, once the former tried to impose on the latter laws and formulas that disconnected from national spontaneity.

As I have been stressing here, RB takes a route of interpretation of Brazil through the mobilization of many comparisons and relations (such as the abstract and the corporeal, the worker and the adventurer, the builder and the sower, the urban and the agrarian, among others) that ultimately advance a constant play of differentiations and identifications. In this sense, what is crucial to have in mind is that the text does not opt for one side of the pair, or the opposition, to the detriment of the other. Regarding the relation between the rational and the spontaneous, and its corresponding relation between laws and reality, for instance, Sérgio states that "the necessity of a good order among citizens and the stability of society made necessary the creation of certain mandatory precepts and effective sanctions" (RB1, p.147; RB2, p.267; RB3, p.262). Moreover, in his point of view, it is "often indispensable to abstract from life, in order to live, and only the absolutism of reason can aim at a life that is completely devoid of any purely rational element" (RB1, p.147; RB2, p.267; RB3, p.262). The crucial thing to RB, then, is not the suppression of rationality in name of a pure spontaneity or the eradication of abstraction in name of a pure life. Both extremes are rejected, although this rejection takes different forms depending on the edition at hand.

The focus devoted in RB to one of the extremes, the one that believes in the miraculous power of ideas, stems from the fact that, according to Sérgio, "[t]his was the belief that has governed all the history of Iberian-American nations since they became independent" (RB1, p.148).<sup>558</sup> One of the political expressions of that belief

---

<sup>557</sup> "And genuine" is suppressed in later editions. This suppression seems in accordance with other modifications that can give an essentialist connotation to Brazilian tradition or to the national character (recall, for instance, the modifications in the discussion on the cordial man).

<sup>558</sup> In later editions: "[t]his was the belief, *partly inspired by the ideals of the French revolution*, that has governed all the history of Iberian-American nations since they became independent" (RB2,



is the attempt to establish in South America the liberal principles of modern democracy.<sup>559</sup> But, as I have already stressed above, the solution envisaged by Sérgio is not in the opposite pole. In his view, *caudilhismo*,<sup>560</sup> the opposite of the democratic depersonalization represented by liberalism, "is often found in the same circle of ideas to which the principles of liberalism belong" (RB1, p.149; RB2, p.269; RB3, p.264). This same circle also contains European fascism, the other kind of negation of liberalism. Hence, to RB, "[t]he overcoming of the democratic doctrine will only be effectively possible among us when the antithesis *impersonalism-caudilhismo* [*liberalism-caudilhismo*, RB2 and RB3] has been defeated" (RB1, pp.149-50; RB2, p.269; RB3, p.265).

In later editions, Sérgio adds a crucial consideration on what is necessary in order to overcome this antithesis in "our revolution":

This victory will never be consummated until the personalistic and, even if they do not seem so, aristocratic fundamentals on which our social life is still based are eliminated. If the revolutionary process that we are witnessing, the most important stages of which have been suggested in these pages, has a clear meaning, then it will be that of the slow but irrevocable dissolution of the archaic reminiscences that our status as an independent country has not yet eradicated. More precisely, it is only through such a process that we will finally revoke the old colonial and patriarchal order, with all the moral, social and political

---

p.268; RB3, p.263). The paragraph in which this phrase is located is interestingly modified: while the first edition approximated the French-inspired belief to "the ideals preached by the Third International" (that were resorted to at that time by "colonial and semi-colonial peoples"), later editions erase this approximation, by erasing the reference to these peoples and to the Third International. What is left, then, is only the reference to French revolutionary ideals.

<sup>559</sup> In the already-mentioned 1935 text, "Corpo e Alma do Brasil...", one reads that "[a] certain understandable complex of inferiority lead these people [the Iberian-American nations] to praise a system of ideas that is absolutely in contrast to the most positive element in their temperament, and that, well understood, would lead to the total depersonalization" (Holanda, 2011a [1935], p.69). In the first edition, one reads that "[t]hus the peoples from our America were led to praise a system of ideas that were absolutely in contrast to the most positive element in their temperament, and that, well understood, would lead to the total depersonalization" (RB1, p.149).

<sup>560</sup> *Caudilhismo* here can stand for a kind of leadership sustained on a personalist basis, which is used often to refer to certain political regimes of Latin American countries during the XIX and the XX centuries.

consequences it implied and continues to imply" (RB2, pp.269-70; RB3, p.265).

Here, after the lines above were added to chapter seven, Sérgio states that "[r]esorting to Mathew Arnold's expressions, we would be living thus between two worlds: one definitively dead and the other struggling to be born" (RB2, p.270; RB3, pp.265-6).<sup>561</sup> Luiz Feldman notes that, in Mathew's original text, one reads "Wandering between two worlds, one dead/ The other powerless to be born" (Arnold *apud* Feldman, 2013, p.137, n.7). Sérgio's translation - "*vivendo entre dois mundos: um definitivamente morto e outro que luta por vir à luz*" - emphasizes what, in the original, is a "dead world", making it "definitively dead"; it also reduces the pessimism in face of a world "powerless to be born", making it a world "struggling to be born" (see Feldman, 2013, p.130; and Feldman, 2015, pp.110-2).<sup>562</sup>

It is important to note that the modifications and additions above delineate an importantly different account on the past and expose a different political position from what was exposed in the first edition. In 1936, the antithesis to be superseded is formed between "impersonalism" and "*caudilhismo*", while in later editions the first side is replaced by "liberalism". This already suggests that "impersonalism" is not exactly the problem. In fact, the lines added below identify its opposite, "personalism", as the problem: the personalistic and aristocratic fundamentals must be eliminated, in order for the desirable profound transformations to take place. As João Kennedy Eugênio highlights, this is one of the instances in which the second edition makes room for the emergence of a politically progressist position and its corresponding negative value attributed to the Portuguese heritage in the formative process of Brazil (see Eugênio, 2010, pp.285-92): "[i]ndeed, the reasoning that postulates a radical separation between two worlds - the old and the new, the past and the future - is typically progressist" (Eugênio, 2010, p.288). By saying that this

---

<sup>561</sup> Recall that, in later editions, chapter five depicts a clash between two worlds and two mentalities emerging in the XIX century - "there were two distinct worlds that were hostile to each other with a growing rancor; two mentalities in opposition, as the rational opposes the traditional, as the abstract opposes the corporeal and the sensitive, and as the urban and cosmopolitan opposes the regional or parochial" (RB2, p.98; RB3, p.96).

<sup>562</sup> Sérgio warns, however, that this emerging world is likely to face the reaction from those trying to defend an increasingly waning past, and that this reaction will possibly "restrain or compromise hopes for any profound transformation" (RB2, p.273; RB3, p.268).

progressist position "emerges" in the second edition, João Kennedy is arguing that, despite the fact that some reservations towards Portuguese colonization were already in the first edition, it is only in the 1948 edition that they are coupled with a different political position.<sup>563</sup>

All that becomes even clearer when the modified ways through which RB mentions Herbert Smith's considerations are tackled.<sup>564</sup> In the first edition, one reads that his critique of "our partisan spirit during the Empire... is really valid from the strictly liberal-democratic point of view that, in theory, was and still is one of our institutions. Only in theory, however. Ultimately, what this critique denounces is the intolerant incomprehension that necessarily exists between two radically diverse lifestyles" (RB1, p.151). All that is suppressed from later editions, and Herbert Smith is mobilized in a considerably different manner:

Writing sixty years ago, and with truly prophetic intuition, a North America naturalist was able to announce, in terms of an aspiration, what is perhaps not far from reality. Colored at times by that optimistic progressivism that was the supreme characteristic of his century and of his country, Herbert Smith's words nevertheless represent more an invitation than a mere dream, and are thus worthy of reflection. "A revolution", he said, "is perhaps what South America needs. Not a horizontal revolution, in the sense of a surface whirlpool of political strife, which serve only to engulf some hundreds or thousands of less fortunate people. The world is full of these movements. The ideal would be a good and honest revolution, a vertical revolution, one to bring stronger elements to the fore, forever destructing the old and incapable ones" (RB2, pp.270-1; RB3, p.266).

---

<sup>563</sup> Later in the same text, referring to the modifications to the second edition of RB, João Kennedy says that they work "attenuating the organicist perspective and stressing [*realçando*] the progressist bias, which emerges in part to compensate the idea of an organic development" (Eugênio, 2010, p.323). Taking into account that his more detailed discussion on the progressist bias in the text speaks in terms of its "emergence", it seems plausible to say that potential aspects of this position were already in the first edition, but a consolidated progressist bias has been established only since the second edition. At least this is what I mean by "emergence" myself.

<sup>564</sup> It is irrelevant to my purpose here to discuss Herbert Smith's considerations in themselves; the point, rather, is to interpret how they are mobilized by Sérgio in the editions of RB.

Following that, Sérgio also mentions his answer to the following question: "[h]ow would this revolution take place?" (RB2, p.271; RB3, p.266):

"I hope", answers Smith, "that when the revolution does come, it may come peaceably, and results in the amalgamation, not the wiping out, of the upper class; a class that, with all its faults and mistakes, has many good and noble men in it. Remember that Brazilians are expiating the sins of their fathers as well as their own. Society here was wrongly constituted in the outset; it is not the fault, but the misfortune of the educated class that they are separated from the rest of the nation. I do not mean to say that the mechanics and shopkeepers are better, as a class, than the merchants and gentlemen. The truth is that they are ignorant, dirty, and degraded; that is obvious enough to any stranger. But their work gives them brawn, and their poverty protects them, in a measure, from immorality; physically, they are the superiors of the upper class; mentally, they might be, if they had a chance" (Smith *apud* RB2, p.271; RB3, pp.266-7).

If, in the 1936 text, Herbert Smith was mobilized as an example to the intolerant misunderstanding between two radically different lifestyles, later editions resort to him in order to reflect upon the revolution in Brazil.<sup>565</sup> Then, what one gets is a "prophetic intuition" and a future-oriented invitation to be thought through: what is needed in South America, according to the conflated voices of Herbert and Sérgio, is a "vertical revolution" bringing deep social transformations.<sup>566</sup> Very helpfully to my purpose here, Luiz Feldman points out that where, in the original, Herbet Smith's text brings "Society here was wrongly constituted in the outset", Sérgio translates it into Portuguese as "*A sociedade foi mal formada nesta terra, desde suas raízes*" (see Feldman, 2013, p.130; and Feldman, 2015, p.111). The

<sup>565</sup> Luiz Feldman highlights that, while the first edition resorts to Herbert's 1922 text, *Do Rio de Janeiro a Cuiabá* (From Rio de Janeiro to Cuiabá), later editions cite his 1879 *Brazil: the Amazons and the Coast* (see Feldman, 2013, p.130).

<sup>566</sup> In 1976, Sérgio mentioned this "vertical revolution" again, answering a question on what he would have changed in RB: "[m]any things... The basic idea was that democracy has never happened in Brazil and that we needed a vertical revolution, that really implied the participation of popular layers" (see Coelho, 1976, p.3). I will get back to this interview below.

words chosen by Sérgio, particularly "*mal formada*" and "*roots*" reinforce the interpretative focus of RB, that is, the roots of the formation of contemporary Brazil. In this sense, if I had to propose a translation to the Portuguese phrase, it would be the following: "Society was malformed in this land since its roots". As Luiz puts, "[i]t stands out the metaphorical effort in the options made: *here for this land; wrongly constituted for malformed; in the outset for the symbolic since its roots*" (Feldman, 2013, p.130, italics in the original).

The inclusion of the lines above becomes more telling and complex if further modifications are taken into account. In the first edition, Sérgio says that

*personalism, among us, is a positive notion - maybe the only truly positive notion we know. Alongside personalism, all the slogans of liberal democracy are purely ornamental concepts, without deep roots in reality. That explains well how in the Latin American countries, where personalism - or even oligarchy, which is the extension of personalism in space and in time - has managed to abolish the resistances coming from liberal demagogy, waking up the most alive instincts and sentiments of the people, a political stability, which would otherwise not be possible, was assured. The formation of ruling elites around prestigious personalities has been, at least for the time being, the most fruitful political principle in our America"* (RB1, p.152).<sup>567</sup>

Now, when it comes to later editions, one reads that

*[i]t is undeniable that, in our political life, personalism can be in many cases a positive force and that, alongside it, the slogans of liberal democracy seem purely ornamental or declamatory concepts, without deep roots in reality.*

That explains how, *among us and in the Latin-American countries in general, wherever personalism - or even oligarchy, which is the extension of personalism in space and in time - has managed to abolish the liberal resistances, an apparent political stability was assured, but*

---

<sup>567</sup> In the 1935 text, Sérgio had said: "[f]or psychological reasons, personalism, among us, is a positive notion - maybe the only truly positive notion we know..." (Holanda, 2011a [1935], p.77).

which would otherwise not be possible" (RB2, pp.275-6; RB3, p.271).

The importance of personalism to Brazilian political life is considerably downgraded as two modifications imply: firstly, in later editions it "can be a positive force", while, in 1936, it "is a positive notion"; and, secondly, "the formation of ruling elites around prestigious personalities", which was considered "the most fruitful political principle in our America", at least until that moment in history (1936), is now deeply problematized, as the passage below will evidence.

The political stability brought by personalism is qualified, in later editions, as being "apparent". When, in the first edition, Sérgio mentions right after the passage quoted above the cases of Chile and Costa Rica; according to him "*Chile had the happiest decades [os decênios mais felizes]* of its history under the regime established by Diego Portales, *who knew how to eliminate the danger of dictatorship or of anarchy through a sharply oligarchic power*" (RB1, pp.152-3). The same case is mentioned by later editions, but differently interpreted: "[t]o the Chilean people, the three decades of the regime established by Diego Portales, *who eliminated the danger of anarchy through a sharply oligarchic power*, still stand as the most fortunate [*os mais ditosos*] in their history" (RB2, p.276; RB3, p.271). First of all, it is intriguing to see that Diego Portales' regime was said to eliminate both anarchy and dictatorship in the first edition, while in later ones it has only eliminated the former, but not the latter. This at least suggests that, in later editions, his oligarchic regime was seen as being closer to dictatorship, or at least not sufficiently against it so as to eliminate its possibility. After the cases of Chile and Costa Rica are mentioned, one reads only in later editions that "[t]he existence of these situations, in fact exceptional ones, succeed in making us forget that arbitrary regimes in the hands of 'providential' and irresponsible leaders represent at best a gross disguise for, but not an alternative to, anarchy" (RB2, p.276; RB3, p.271).<sup>568</sup>

---

<sup>568</sup> As Leopoldo Waizbord claims, the first edition of RB takes oligarchy as an expression of a certain "popular soul", making concrete "a constitutive character of the people", that is, personalism (Waizbord, 2011, p.42). The passage quoted above from the first edition leads Leopoldo to identify Sérgio with the "conservative and anti-liberal cultural and political critique" of the time, recognizing, however, that this position has never become a defense of tyranny, dictatorship or *caudilhismo* (see Waizbord, 2011, pp.42-4).

But one should not be too quick in concluding that later editions simply reject personalism entirely. It is crucial to be careful here. In the first edition, it is stated that

"[t]he idea of an immaterial and impersonal entity, hovering over the individuals and presiding over their destinies is hardly intelligible to the mentality of Latin American peoples. *From all that comes the confirmation of what is being said here on the adoption of democratic formulas in Brazil and in other countries of the continent, that is, it simply stems from a misunderstanding.* We often imagine that we prize democratic and liberal principles when we are actually fighting in favor of one personalism or against another. An intricate political and electoral machinery is continually occupied with hiding that fact from us. But when the welcoming laws of personalism are supported by a respectable tradition or have not been placed in doubt, it [personalism] appears without disguise" (RB1, p.153)

Later editions suppress the part in italics and preserves all the rest (see RB2, pp.276-7; RB3, pp.271-2).<sup>569</sup> The suppression can be read in the same direction of the interpretation expressed in later editions regarding democracy as a "lamentable misunderstanding".<sup>570</sup>

What I want to emphasize, however, is that this considerably modified part of the text still expresses a certain positivity - no doubt deeply mitigated - in respect to personalism: "it is undeniable that, in our political life, personalism can be in many cases a positive force"; and, "when the welcoming laws of personalism are supported by a respectable tradition or have not been placed in doubt, it appears without disguise". Hence, what the modifications bring to the fore is a different - considerably less positive or, from another angle, a mostly negative - stance

---

<sup>569</sup> With a minor modification in the first lines: [t]he idea of an immaterial and impersonal *kind of* entity, hovering over the individuals and presiding over their destinies is hardly intelligible to the mentality of Latin American peoples...".

<sup>570</sup> See pages 426-9.

regarding the political implications of personalism. But it is not a complete rejection.

Later editions also preserve the statement regarding the foreign character of liberal democracy ("without deep roots in reality") - recall, however, that this foreign character becomes in later editions adaptable, as I have stressed above when I addressed, for instance, the modifications that lead to the following formulation: "[w]e brought from strange lands a complex and ready system of precepts, without knowing to what extent they fit the conditions of Brazilian life and without considering the changes that such conditions would impose on them".<sup>571</sup> Being "without deep roots in reality" does not mean in principle that democracy is incompatible with Brazil. In fact, according to Sérgio, "[d]espite everything, it is not fair to state unreservedly that *liberal democracy is [the democratic ideals are, RB2 and RB3] absolutely incompatible with us. It would not even be hard to stress zones of confluence and sympathy between the ideas it preaches [these ideals, RB2 and RB3] and certain phenomena deriving from the peculiar conditions of our national formation*" (RB1, p.153; RB2, p.277; RB3, p.272).<sup>572</sup>

Some factors that would have worked in this direction in Brazil are, then, cited. In the first edition, they are two: "the *instinctive* rejection by the peoples of America, descendants of colonizers and of *aboriginal* population, of all rational hierarchy, of any composition of society that becomes an obstacle to individual

---

<sup>571</sup> See pages 426.

<sup>572</sup> "Peculiar" is suppressed from later editions. To be clear: in the first edition, the zones of confluence and sympathy (or agreement) take place between the "ideas preached by liberal democracy" and certain peculiar aspects of our national formation; in later editions, they take place between "democratic ideals" and certain aspects of our national formation. In the already-mentioned 1935 text, "Corpo e Alma do Brasil...", the beginning of the paragraph is different: "[i]n a way, it would be an exaggeration to consider the dissonance between politics and nation as a symptom of an absolutely illegitimate intrusion of the principles of 1789 [French Revolution] in our social structure. It would even be possible to stress some really noteworthy zones of convergence and sympathy between some ideals of liberalism and peculiar conditions of our national formation" (Holanda, 2011a [1935], pp.71-2). Sérgio, then, cites the same two factors cited in the first edition of RB (and that I will mention below). The replacement of the reference to French revolutionary principles by the reference to "liberal democracy", and later to "democratic ideals", widens the historical and political scope of the argument. Moreover, the replacement of "liberal democracy" by "democratic ideals" seems linked, for instance, to Sérgio's claim in a text from 1949: "[s]peaking in terms of 'liberal democracy', as a way to replace one of the rejected designations, 'western democracies', is to attribute little relevance to the doubtlessly significant fact that the liberal systems, originated from the American Revolution and the French Revolution, are not practiced anymore with an orthodox rigor in any of the States that are historically affiliated to those systems" (Holanda, 2011a [1949], p.556). In 1949, the United Nations (through UNESCO) gathered thinkers from different parts of the world to discuss the concept of democracy; Sérgio was the Brazilian intellectual that took part in this initiative (see Costa, 2011a, pp.xxii-v). His texts reflecting upon the concept of democracy and his participation in the UNESCO discussions are published in Costa (2011a).



autonomy"; and "the impossibility of an effective resistance against certain new influences (for instance, the primacy of the urban life, of cosmopolitanism) that, *in modern times*, were everywhere allied with the liberal-democratic ideas" (RB1, pp.153-4). In later editions, a third factor is added, the other two, modified: "the repulsion of the peoples of America, descendants of colonizers and of *indigenous* population, of all rational hierarchy, of any composition of society that becomes a *serious* [grave] obstacle to individual autonomy"; "the impossibility of an effective resistance against certain new influences (for instance, the primacy of the urban life, of cosmopolitanism) that, *at least until recently*, were everywhere *naturally* allied with the liberal-democratic ideas"; and, the "relative inconsistency of the prejudices related to race and skin-color" (RB2, pp.277-8; RB3, pp.272-3). RB refers to the "ideas of the French Revolution", in order to put into relief another dimension of these potential zones of confluence. It states in all editions that "[t]he notion of the natural goodness of *man* matches in a unique way our already-mentioned 'cordiality'... It is here that our 'cordial man' would encounter a possibility of articulation of its sentiments with the dogmatic constructions of liberal democracy" (RB1, p.154; RB2, p.278; RB3, p.273).<sup>573</sup>

Nevertheless, after pointing that out, Sérgio stresses once more the distinction between Brazilian political and social configuration, and the emotional base prevailing in Brazilian people. This leads him to say that, "in liberalism, the idea of the natural goodness of man is simply an argument; it would be *deceptive* [enganoso] to *imagine* that this conviction rests on some sympathy for the humankind, considered as a whole or in each of the individuals. It is an essentially neutral theory, stripped of *emotionalism* and framed into formulas" (RB1, p.155). In later editions: "in liberalism, the idea of the natural goodness of man is simply an argument; it would be *illusory* [ilusório] to *suppose* that this conviction rests on some *particular* sympathy for the humankind, considered as a whole or in each of the individuals. It is an essentially neutral theory, stripped of *emotion* [emotividade] and *that is easily* framed into formulas" (RB2, p.278; RB3, p.273). In other words, goodness, in liberalism, is conceived as impersonal; it is comparable to politeness, not to cordiality (to recall, chapter five work through the differentiation between cordiality and civility, or politeness).

---

<sup>573</sup> "Of man" is suppressed in later editions.

The fact that politeness and liberal democracy are impersonal enables the production of broader bonds of solidarity. The notion of "cordiality" could not be more different from them. I have already mentioned that aspect above, discussing chapter five. Now, almost at the end of RB, one reads that "a human love that is *asphyxiated and dies* outside of its limited circle cannot serve as a foundation of any human organization conceived on a broader scale. The good principles are not created by cordiality, *goodness*" (RB1, p.156). The most important modification in this passage is the one already stressed before impacting on the very definition of cordiality; in later editions, "goodness" is suppressed and "simple" is added: "[t]he good principles are not created by *simple* cordiality" (RB2, p.279; RB3, p.274).<sup>574</sup> In any case, what is said in all editions is that "cordiality" is not enough to the creation of good principles, which means, to RB, that, "for social crystallization, it is necessary some solid normative element, innate in the soul of the people or [*even*, RB2 and RB3] implanted by tyranny " (RB1, pp.156-7; RB2, pp.279-80; RB3, p.274).<sup>575</sup>

But, regarding tyranny, Sérgio is very explicit:

the thesis that defends that tyranny does not bring about anything that is lasting is just one of the many *fraudulent inventions* of the liberal mythology that history is far from confirming. It is true that *these inventions do* not constitute in *themselves* a serious argument against liberalism and that there are other *resources*, besides tyranny, that can bring about the consolidation and stabilization of a social and national **organism**" (RB1, p.157).<sup>576</sup>

<sup>574</sup> In later editions, the passage quoted comes as follows: "A human love that is *subject to asphyxiation and death* outside its limited circle cannot serve as a foundation of any human organization conceived on a broader scale. The good principles are not created by *simple* cordiality" (RB2, p.279; RB3, p.274).

<sup>575</sup> Luiz Feldman stresses that this need for "some solid normative element" expresses a tension, already present in the first edition, between the positive evaluation of the colonial heritage and the need for some impersonal order based on civility (Feldman, 2015b).

<sup>576</sup> In a similar passage of the 1935 text ("Corpo e Alma do Brasil..."), one reads that "the thesis that defends that tyranny does not bring about anything that is lasting is just one of the many *fraudulent inventions* of the liberal mythology that history has never confirmed. Liberalism, committed to justify and reinforce its concepts, has made men unlearn this truth. It seems to us nowadays definitively impossible to imagine that the trust in the greatness, or even in the absolute efficiency, of the liberal processes relies in evident facts" (Holanda, 2011a [1935], pp.73-4). As João Kennedy Eugênio observes, Sérgio's considerations on fascism (and tyranny), on the one hand, and on liberalism, on the other hand, do not mean his support of either kind of regime; rather, it is a way to

Well, in later editions, Sérgio softened the point against liberal mythology: its "fraudulent inventions" becomes its "illusions".<sup>577</sup> Tyranny, however, remains a possible alternative to liberalism.<sup>578</sup>

It is worth recalling, however, that Sérgio has positioned himself explicitly against despotism: liberalism and despotism, or also fascism, are part of the same circle of ideas. He reiterates that before the end of RB, when he says that the system established by fascism, instead of a positive triumph over liberalism, is, in fact, nothing more than a "subtle counter-reform", a "disciplined negation", instead, therefore, of a system brought about from the emotional base and the spontaneity of the people. That is the claim behind the question he poses: "[w]ho does not have the sense, however, that its reform is essentially a subtle counter-reform?" (RB1, p.158; RB2, p.282; RB3, p.276). And, when it comes to Brazil, fascism, as well as communism, acquire certain traces that make them even less attractive to Sérgio. In relation to the latter, RB states that it

attracts among us precisely those who seem less capable of realizing the principles of the Third International. Everything Marxism offers them that is attractive - that irrepressible tension toward an ideal and necessary future, the rebellion against bourgeois morality, capitalist exploitation, and imperialism - comes together under the "anarchist mentality" of our communism, rather than under the rigid discipline that Moscow demands from its supporters (RB1, p.159; RB2, pp.282-3; RB3, p.277).

---

position himself in relation to the political positions in dispute at that time (see Eugênio, 2010, pp.103-5).

<sup>577</sup> The passage, then, becomes: "the thesis that defends that tyranny does not bring about anything that is lasting is just one of the many *illusions* of the liberal mythology that history is far from confirming. It is true that *the presence of these illusions* does not constitute in itself a serious argument against liberalism and that there are other *remedies*, besides tyranny, that can bring about the consolidation and stabilization of a social and national **organism [aggregate, RB3]**" (RB2, p.280; RB3, pp.274-5). In the original in Portuguese, the first two editions bring "organism" ("*organismo*"), while the third, "aggregate" ("*conjunto*"). Recall that, above, "illusory" replaced "deceptive" in respect to the liberal idea of the natural goodness of man.

<sup>578</sup> In this vein, as Pedro Meira Monteiro notes, "even the innumerable modifications in the text since the second edition does take out from it the sense of doubt... Sérgio Buarque often reveals himself doubtful in relation to the liberal option, even recalling the fallacious character of the affirmation that the tyrannical measures do not realize any lasting thing" (Monteiro, 2008b, p.360, n.14).

In respect to fascism, the point is that "the Brazilian variety brought an additional aggravation, since it can pass as a merely conservative theory, committed to the strengthening of social, moral and religious institutions of unquestionable prestige; it thus tends to become practically inoffensive to the powerful, sometimes only their instrument" (RB1, pp.159-60; RB2, p.283; RB3, pp.277-8).

In the very last paragraph of RB, Sérgio reinforces his resistance against liberalism and provides a general interpretation of Brazil, articulating past, present and future, as well as inside and outside.

*The essence of all manifestations, of all the original creations as well as all the fabricated things, is the form. The complete realization of a society also depends on its form. If, in the political and social sphere, liberalism revealed itself to be, among us, destructive of the preexisting forms rather than creative of new ones; if it was, above all, a useless and costly excrescence [superfetação], it will not be through the experimentation of other ingenious elaborations that we will encounter someday our reality. We can try to organize our disorder following wise schemes of proven virtue, but a world of more intimate essences will continue to exist, remaining always intact, irreducible and disdainful of human inventions. To wish to ignore this world will be to renounce our own spontaneous rhythm, the law of ebb and flow, in favor of a mechanical beat and false harmony. We have already seen that the State, a spiritual creation, is opposed to and transcends natural order. But it is also true that this opposition must be resolved through counterpoint, if the social framework is to be internally coherent. There is only one possible economy, superior to our calculations and imaginations for making a perfect whole out of such antagonistic parts. The spirit is not a normative force, except where it can serve social life and where it corresponds to it. The exterior [higher, RB2 and RB3] forms of society must be like a congenital contour to, and inseparable from, society: they continually emerge from its specific necessities, and*

never from capricious choices. There is, however, a perfidious and pretentious demon that is busy obscuring these simple truths from our eyes. Inspired by this demon, men see themselves as different from how they are and create new likes and dislikes. Only rarely do they choose good ones (RB1, pp.160-1)<sup>579</sup>

The beginning of the paragraph in later editions does not bring the first lines quoted above and modifies the verb tense related to liberalism in Brazil:

If, in the political and social sphere, *the principles of liberalism have been* a useless and costly excrescence [*superfetação*], it will not be through the experimentation of other ingenious elaborations that we will encounter someday our reality... (RB2, pp.278-9; RB3, pp.284-5).<sup>580</sup>

The modifications stressed above are important in at least two ways. Firstly, it is plausible to say that the suppression of the first lines - "the essence of all manifestations, of all the original creations as well as all the fabricated things, is the form. The complete realization of a society also depends on its form" - excludes the explicit reference to an organicist perspective. In João Kennedy's words,

[t]his was a key-passage to evoke the notion of entelechy; a decisive passage to avoid a superficially aporetic reading of the organicist matrix of *Roots of Brazil*: either one has a form or not... With this passage, the aporia is overcome: society has a form, but one that needs to mature; [one that needs] to become fully what it already is. Thus, *form* implies a process of formation (*Bildung*). The realization of this process is the entelechy (Eugênio, 2010, p.278, italics in the original).

João Kennedy is thus emphasizing that, by erasing those lines, Sérgio reduces the weight of the organicist perspective on the formative process of Brazil. But this

<sup>579</sup> The first occurrence of "form" is in italics in the original. "And imaginations" is suppressed from later editions.

<sup>580</sup> The first occurrence of "form" is in italics in the original.

does not mean that an organicist conception is all-together excluded from the text - as it can be attested, for instance, some lines below, where "a world of more intimate essences" and "our own spontaneous rhythm" are emphasized.<sup>581</sup>

Secondly, the resistance against liberalism is somehow qualified. In the first edition, one reads that "[i]f, in the political and social sphere, *the principles of liberalism have been* a useless and costly excrescence [*superfetação*], it will not be through the experimentation of other ingenious elaborations that we will encounter someday our reality..." (RB2, pp.284-5; RB3, pp.278-9). What is at stake, then, is that a previous harsher position against liberalism is now softened. In the first edition, liberalism "*revealed itself*" destructive of preexisting forms and "*was*" an excrescence throughout the formative process of Brazil. The use of the past tense gives the sense that the destructive and the excrescent characters of liberalism in Brazil are definitive, making it a completely harmful option to the future of the country. More precisely, liberalism is a barrier to "our future encounter with our reality", in order to "make a perfect whole out of such antagonistic parts", that is, a "social framework that is internally coherent". In later editions, however, liberalism's condition as an excrescence is displaced: instead of reading that liberalism "*was, above all, a useless and costly excrescence*", one reads that "*the principles of liberalism have been a useless and costly excrescence*". In other words, it now seems that the resistance against liberalism is not peremptory, being specifically related to the ways its principles have been mobilized so far in the formative process of Brazil. These principles have not been useful to the resolution of the opposition at stake through "counterpoint", and therefore have not worked in favor of "making a perfect whole out of such antagonistic parts". To put it differently, liberalism, in later editions, is not necessarily one of the demons to be exorcised, although, depending on the form it takes, it can become one of the most dangerous among them.

---

<sup>581</sup> I will get back to João Kennedy's text later. Here, let me note that when he talks about an "aporetic" reading, it seems more precise to say that he is referring to the Aristotelian principle of non-contradiction; so, the lines suppressed helped in avoiding the reading that takes the presence of "form" in terms of an either/or logic. Focusing on the first edition, Leopoldo Waizbort sees in this paragraph the reiteration of "recurrent topics of the conservative thinking", such as "the mismatch with reality; the supra-historical essence; the mechanical versus the organic; the maturation; interior and exterior etc. To them, it is added another theme that characterizes the conservative thinking of 1920-1930: the counterposition between life and spirit" (Waizbort, 2011, p.51).

In sum, chapter seven is focused on the revolution in progress in Brazil and the question of democracy remains a central one in the text, a pressing problem in the formation of contemporary Brazil. In later editions, however, the misunderstanding involving democracy is differently conceived and more possibilities are opened to adjustments between this political regime and the conditions of Brazilian reality. The attenuation of the positive tone regarding cordiality does not mean its complete rejection, as personalism is also not completely rejected as a potentially positive force. But the sense of the new times in later editions point to a scenario of transformations that Sérgio expects now to be deep, constituting a vertical revolution. In any case, the chapter tackles, from an angle that is more focused on the present, the possibilities and impossibilities of the future moments of a revolution that is conditioned by the past, rooted as it is in certain malformations.

So far, after this sequential reading, some general traces can be identified in the uses of "formation" in RB: (1) the centrality ascribed to the "nation", not only in relation to its formation and to how this process articulates the inside and the outside, but also in relation to the possibilities and impossibilities of a Brazilian revolution that would close the gap between politics and society; (2) the stress of the reminiscences of certain aspects of the past in the present, exposing the specific and ongoing revolution mentioned before, in which there is a coexistence between the old and the new; (3) the attention brought to an internal divide linked to the agrarian and the urban, and to the Iberian and the American aspects of contemporary Brazil; (4) the diverse comparisons with external parameters, such as the Protestant countries and the Spanish colonization; and (5) the highlight of certain peculiarities coming from the formative process of the country, such as the notion of cordiality. I have also stressed how each of these traces are differently expressed depending on the edition of RB one considers.

It is plausible to say that, in all its editions, the interpretations of contemporary Brazil RB proposes expose different political positions Sérgio holds towards the old and the new, the agrarian and the urban, the Iberian and the American. Through these interpretations, many angles of "roots" come to the fore, and, ultimately, they work through a play of identifications and differentiations that continuously reiterates and dislocates the traces (or limits) of past, present and

future, as well as of inside and outside, in the formative process of Brazil.<sup>582</sup> The modifications across the editions of RB are also relevant to the interpretation of the links between the text and the political positions it exposes.

In order to avoid misunderstandings, let me be clear that, in my interpretation, the modifications across the editions do not make the text into its diametrical opposite, as if both a negative tone in relation to Brazilian reality and tradition, and a positive tone in relation to modern and bourgeois society had fully replaced opposite stances supposedly held in the first edition. I would even suggest that, similarly to what each edition of RB taken separately proposes, what it is seen when the editions are compared to each other is not a complete rupture, but a series of displacements in its play of identifications and differentiations. To advance this interpretation, I will now make some general considerations about RB, resorting to some other interpreters of the text, so that my point can be clear.

To being with, it is worth pointing out how Sérgio himself retrospectively interpreted RB. For instance, in the preface to the second edition (written in 1947, a year before the text was published), he said:

this book comes out substantially modified in the present version. To reproduce it in its original form, without any corrections, would lead to the repetition of opinions and thoughts that, in many aspects, do not satisfy me anymore. If, at times, I have felt apprehension about making a truly radical revision of the text - in which case it would be better to write a new book -, I have not hesitated, however, to profusely alter it where it seemed necessary to correct, to make more precise or to extend its substance (RB2, p.11).

As Robert Wegner notes, the preface to the second edition exposes both Sérgio's dissatisfaction with some opinions and thoughts and his awareness that a radical revision of the text was not put forward - "as if the author became, to a great extent,

---

<sup>582</sup> Pedro Meira Monteiro notes that RB "brings to its readers an explanation of the national order, reinventing, so to speak, Brazilian past. At the same time, without impairing the localized gaze, it brought to the table crucial questions of the interwar period, such as the crisis of the liberal values, the discussion on democracy and the popular participation in the orientation of governments. The local and the global [*o local e o mundial*] was thus revised, without becoming exclusive" (Monteiro, 1999, p.149). The interpretation of the formative process of contemporary Brazil in RB raises questions to the more general contemporary relation between "tradition" and "modernity".



hostage of his own text" (Wegner, 2000, p.53).<sup>583</sup> This condition is reinforced later in the same preface, where Sérgio confesses to have "deliberately escaped the temptation to examine, in the final part of the work, some specific problems implied by the events of the past decade. In particular, those related to the implantation among us of a regime of personal dictatorship inspired by totalitarianism" (RB2, p.11). The regime referred to is the *Estado Novo*, in force from 1937 to 1945 - so, coming to an end two years before the preface was written. In any case, Sérgio believes that "the analysis outlined in this work on our social and political life in the past and in the present would not need to be revised in light of the aforementioned events" (RB2, pp.11-2).

Another instance in which Sérgio commented RB comes in a text published in 1948 (the year the second edition came out). He begins this text, entitled "Novos Rumos da Sociologia" ("New Trends of Sociology"), making reference to the strong interest in studies of "Social History" during the interwar period. Associated with these studies, it is the notion that

every people has to discern and carefully cultivate its essential and irreducible personality, formed by traditions that are of its own and that, above all, it does not share with any other people. It is a personality that finds its *raison d'être*, its justification, its support, not anymore in the rational and universal values, that before [that period] seemed to dominate almost exclusively, but in the simple fact of being singular and unique (Holanda, 2011a [1948], p.513).

This notion is linked to organic conceptions of society that had been formulated since the end of the XIX century and that, "in their extreme and more crude or primitive form, lead to fascisms of all kinds" (Holanda, 2011a [1948], p.513). Moreover, these conceptions are also expressed in attitudes articulated with "the pathetic of the traditional, the sense of continuity in relation to the past, understood not as a simple fate, but rather as a serious duty. The past serves, in this case, the

---

<sup>583</sup> In the preface to the third edition (written in 1955, a year before the text was published), it is stated: "[w]ith some modifications that do not affect the essential content [of the text], this edition keeps that text of the second edition" (RB3, p.9). If one recalls some of the modifications I have dealt with above, however, Sérgio's affirmation would be importantly qualified - one can have in mind above all the modifications to the opening paragraphs of the third edition - see pages 379-83.

purpose of providing indispensable elements to the fabrication of some ideal future, which will naturally vary according to particular tastes and inclinations" (Holanda, 2011a [1948], p.513).<sup>584</sup>

These conceptions constitute, to Sérgio, a sort of "climate of opinion", in which many texts have taken part, some of which in a "clearly subjective and almost always apologetic attitude". Here, he cites Gilberto Freyre and Oliveira Vianna as some of "the most respectable members of this big family"; then, he mentions the case of

a certain poor relative of this family, a book that the author of this article published around twelve years ago and in which he proposed to study nothing less than our national personality through its historical roots. Having tried, in the second edition, to correct what could be too ambitions in this project, [the author] waived from the complete erasure of its mark of origin, so as to avoid having to rewrite the entire work, written and printed when that attitude dominated almost alone (Holanda, 2011a [1948], p.514)

---

<sup>584</sup> In one of its first published texts, in 1920, Sérgio talks about "literary originality" and concludes it stating that "Brazil will have a national literature, will achieve, sooner or later, the literary originality. The inspiration in national themes, the respect for our traditions and the submission to the deep voices of the race will accelerate this final outcome" (Holanda, 1989 [1920], p.42). In that same year: "[o]ur *desideratum* is the path that nature traced for us; only this path will make us prosperous and happy, and only this path will give us a national character that we so much lack today" (Holanda, 1989 [1920], p.46). Four years later: "I do not know if I had insisted enough in the importance of Graça Aranha's contribution to this higher affirmation of our national individuality, of a greater intimacy that the 'modern spirit' already tries to accomplish within our race and our cosmic environment... The 'modern spirit' provides us in this moment with an unforgettable *affirmation*. If this affirmation has not yet been revealed through works of an exceptional merit..., it will worth at least as a negation of negations that are the obstacles to a higher affirmation" (Holanda, 1989 [1924], p.61). In 1925: "[t]o the more significant wise people, a certain amplitude of thought implies the unbeatable sacrifice of everything that escapes the logic of continuity; of everything that is glorified and that affirms, for the simple fact of *being*, a right to existence, to its essential difference in relation to everything around, and, thus, implicitly, to its *singularity*"; later in the same text, "I will just say that life, despite everything, continues to nourish, surreptitiously and through a kind of secrete input [*verba*], the most hidden regions of our ideologies" (Holanda, 1989 [1925], pp.66-7, p.69, italics in the original). Statements such the above - defending originality and the search for a nationality through the resort to tradition and an affirmative attitude (against negations towards Brazil); focusing on the singularity and the irreducible difference of Brazil in relation to other nations; paying attention to a world of intimate essences that resists human inventions and words - could be multiplied in texts that precede RB. These texts contain a lot of the aspects that later would be exposed in RB and, yet later, would be the target of Sérgio's assessment of his own position.

In other words, Sérgio is questioning a certain attitude - "subjective and almost always apologetic" - and, more generally, a certain climate of opinion that he sees being reproduced in the first edition of RB and whose mark of origin remains after the modifications to which he submitted the text to the second edition.<sup>585</sup> This revision carries with it the revision of the organic conceptions of society themselves, but Sérgio's considerations do not leave room to a definitive conclusion in terms of whether this revision means a complete rejection of the previous attitude or not. It seems plausible to say, however, that, not only this attitude and this climate of opinion, but also, and even more generally, the role of history and the articulations of past, present and future in the interpretation of a country are problematized.<sup>586</sup>

---

<sup>585</sup> A more detailed discussion about the traces of this "climate of opinion" in RB would require a careful discussion about Sérgio's engagements with the so-called "modernism" in Brazil; these engagements expose his persistent concern with the attitude towards the "past" and the "traditional", as well as with the interpretations of "order" and "disorder" in Brazilian society. In any case, I do think that RB exposes concerns Sérgio was dealing with since his very first texts and will keep exploring throughout his entire trajectory. In this sense, I resist both extremes: on the one hand, the attempt to provide an unchanging coherence to his concerns and interpretations (not to mention his political positions); and, on the other hand, the attempt to cut his trajectory into very different phases. As Sérgio later started to define himself as a "historian" and as his name became over time associated to the institutionalization of the historical studies in Brazil, it is sometimes neglected the impacts his engagement with "modernism" had to his lifetime concerns. For some efforts to explore the impact of "modernism" in Sérgio's trajectory, particularly in RB, see Barbosa (1989), Prado (1998), Wegner (2008; 2009), Carvalho (2008), Cavalcante (2008), Castro (2008), Dias (2008), Vecchi (2005; 2008), Eugênio (2008; 2010), Monteiro (2009; 2012a). These texts are helpful in advancing in various ways what Conrado Pires de Castro proposes: "[i]t is not enough to inquire how *Roots of Brazil* is situated within the horizon of Modernism or even how it acts towards it. It is also fundamental to investigate how the modernist tensions are objectified in the body of this essay" (Castro, 2008, p.183). João Kennedy Eugênio notes that "the distinction between Portuguese and Spanish, Iberian tradition and Anglo-Saxon tradition, the valorization of the singularity of cultures, the critique of the rationalization of life and of cultural mimicry, the praise of the monarchic regime, the plea for a science of the particular, the emphasis on spontaneity - all these motives are recurrently expressed in the articles of the young Sérgio. Some will appear again in *Roots of Brazil*" (Eugênio, 2008, p.426). I will tackle that in another opportunity.

<sup>586</sup> Along with this deep concern with the approach of the past comes, needless to say, the concern with the role of the historian and with history as a "discipline". In 1950, Sérgio defines that "the great mission of the historical studies, according to the wise Goethean conception, [is to] serve to the present and to the future, emancipating from the past" (Holanda, 2011b [1950], p.17). In another text of the same year, he develops a little further what he meant by that: "to the true historian, what must be important in the first place is the effort towards the good understanding [*boa inteligência*] of the present time, if he/she wants to understand the past. And, on the other hand, any sentimental valorization of the past - valorization that can only be fragmenting and capricious - would lead us to see it with the tones of our nostalgia" (Holanda, 2011b [1950], pp.19-20). He adds that, "exactly among peoples like us, without a long past, it becomes often tyrannical, precisely for this reason, the ambition of forging an artificial past" (Holanda, 2011b [1950], p.20). In the preface to the second edition of *Visão do Paraíso* (Vision of Paradise), Sérgio states that the role of the historian is neither the resurrection of a mythical past nor the erection of "altars to the cult of the Past, of this past taken in the singular, that is a sacred word, but empty. If it was necessary to push some similitude, I would oppose here the figure of the thaumaturge to that of the exorcist" (Holanda, 2000 [1968], p.xvii). His concerns with the "discipline of history" and the role of the "historian" have increased over time,

This problematization appears in other texts, without explicit reference to RB. In 1949, for instance, Sérgio writes that

traditions are not artificially reconstructed,... bonds with the past cannot be deliberately remade where they seem already broken down,... historical reconstructions, when fabricated to the image of our passions, of our prejudices, of our fears and suspicions, do not lead to the genuine national sentiment, but can be, to the contrary, the way to collective hysteria, without real roots in tradition. As judge Holmes wisely said, 'the continuity with the past is only a necessity, not a duty'" (Holanda, 2011a [1949], pp.546-7).

Hence, the accounts above on the "climate of opinion" to which Sérgio would later associate RB already gives a sense of his uneasiness with certain aspects of the text. It is important to recall, however, that, in all editions of RB, Sérgio rejects the position that defends a return to a certain tradition as a solution to social disorder in Brazil: "[t]he lack of social cohesion in our social life does not represent a modern phenomenon. And this is why those who imagine that the only possible defense

---

as these texts, among others, expose. For instance, also in 1950, he verifies in historiography a "decline of studies above all interpretative, in favor of the objective and largely documented exposition"; this would express an ambition "to attribute to each discipline a peculiar, limited, non-transferable content" (Holanda, 2011b [1950], p.22). Sérgio warns, however, that the exclusive focus on "pure and measurable facts", neglecting "imagination", can represent "in certain cases a regress" (Holanda, 2011b [1950], p.23). To him, in words from 1952, the historian, in face of "the material facts that form the structure of history", not only proceeds to their "registration", but also "elaborates" on them, "animating" them (see Holanda, 2011b [1952a], p.179). But, if Sérgio was concerned with the exclusive focus on facts and objectivity, the other extreme was not less harmful to him, as one can read in a text from 1973: "[i]n our days, it seems definitively condemned the exclusively factual History"; the problem is that "the old superstition of the pure fact was replaced by the new superstition of the pure word, that is, perfectly unequivocal, petrified and forever valid" (Holanda 2011b [1973], p.421, p.422). In other words, to him, documentation and imagination, facts and words, are both indispensable to historiography. He tackles again the discussion about the mission of the historian in 1952, when he says that what is specific to the historian is not "to see or to praise the past in the present, or the other way around...; one of the great and grateful missions of the historian is to conserve, to restore, to try to understand the historical heritage of each people. Nevertheless, to rebuild the present along the molds of the past, of a past that we choose and arbitrarily isolate, in order to convert it into an insistent norm, is to contradict and to betray this mission" (Holanda, 2011b [1952c], p.218). A little later, in this same text, he says: "[t]he sense of the past is a necessity. It is not a duty" (Holanda, 2011b [1952c], p.219). Or, in another text from 1952: "the historical sense is not opposed to the legitimate renovations; rather, it is their true substratum and fundament" (Holanda, 2011b [1952b], p.222). In sum, the discussion on "history" in RB exposes concerns and political positions related both to the broader political scenario and to institutional disputes in the academic field.

against our disorder lies in a return to the tradition, to a certain tradition, are wrong" (RB1, p.6; RB2, p.19; RB3, p.18).<sup>587</sup>

It is in 1967, in a lecture given at the *Escola Superior de Guerra* (Higher War College), entitled "Elementos Básicos da Nacionalidade: Homem" ("Basic Elements of Nationality: Man"), that Sérgio devotes a more extended comment to RB.<sup>588</sup> He, then, includes RB among those efforts that, during that same period, had tried to study the configurations of the national present and the national future through an investigation of the national past. These kinds of efforts were "in fashion"; it was "an era of furious nationalist passions, in which each people seemed to wish its independence from everything but its own energies or potentialities, not rarely seeking to forge of itself and to itself some fallacious image allegedly taken from a sacrosanct past" (Holanda, 2008 [1967], p.618). In this scenario, RB proposed "a new interpretation of Brazil, largely based, as many others before or after it, in arguments not only from the history of our country, but also from the forms of association [*convívio*], the institutions and the ideas we may have inherited" (Holanda, 2008 [1967], p.619).

Sérgio stresses that RB has never been "seduced by regimes of force", being, rather, "an unequivocal denunciation of fascism, both in its European manifestations and in its indigenous variation" (Holanda, 2008 [1967], p.619). Nevertheless, he demonstrates in this lecture a clear discomfort in relation to the text, including in what regards its stance towards dictatorships. Hence, if, on the one hand, he states that much of what is written in RB is still valid to him, on the other hand, he states that, thirty years later, "there was... such a change in my perspectives that it would be better, perhaps, to write a new book" (Holanda, 2008 [1967], p.619). The example he gives to this change of perspective - a very significant one, if one takes into account that he was then giving a lecture in a War College, in the third year after the military coup was given in Brazil - is the

---

<sup>587</sup> In 1951, referring to the "historical bibliography of the 1930s" in Brazil, he says that it is "largely occupied by writings where the elucidative interpretation, also sometimes interested and even fact-deforming, aims at explaining or characterizing those facts from their specifically national configuration" (Holanda, 2008 [1951], p.611). To Sérgio, an insistent call on the past is expressed "in numerous studies on 'formation', published by that time [1930s]" and whose objective is the "composition of exciting frameworks that present themselves at the same time as an ideal therapy to all our ills" (Holanda, 2008 [1951], p.611).

<sup>588</sup> The *Escola Superior de Guerra* promoted annual conferences given by renown intellectuals, such as San Tiago Dantas (1953), Alceu Amoroso Lima (1954 and 1963), Alberto Guerreiro Ramos (1955), Marcos Almir Madeira (1956), José Honório Rodrigues (1957), Gilberto Freyre (1969), among others (see Eugênio, 2010, p.304).

following: "I still think it is plausible and, more than that, timely what is said [in RB] about the frequent attraction provoked by dictatorships. I only ask myself whether the arguments I have resorted to in order to fight against this attraction do not belong strictly to the same terrain from where others, at that same time, extracted their motivations to praise it" (Holanda, 2008 [1967], p.619).<sup>589</sup>

To give an account on his own motivations in RB, Sérgio affirms that, "in 1936, I wrote as an essayist; later, I would define myself better as a historian"; it is only the essayist, continues Sérgio, that "can allow him/herself to choose, among a thousand aspects that the study of the past brings up, those that he thinks are the most respectable or sympathetic, and, moreover, those that help him to reinforce well his personal theories, in case he/she has them" (Holanda, 2008 [1967], p.619). Once a self-defined historian, he becomes a self-critic: "[i]ndeed, in other editions of the above-mentioned book I have already sketched this self-critique" (Holanda, 2008 [1967], p.619).<sup>590</sup>

---

<sup>589</sup> João Kennedy Eugênio mentions that Sérgio knew that the invitation from the *Escola Superior de Guerra* was based on the discussion developed in RB, so that he remarks: "[i]nvited to speak to you about the 'Brazilian man', it should come as no surprise that I must begin by this self-critical attempt, affecting opinions that probably suggested this invitation" (Holanda *apud* Eugênio, 2010, p.305; Holanda, 2008 [1967], p.619). The reference to dictatorships gets even more timely when it is taken in account that Brazil had already witnessed the dictatorship of the *Estado Novo*, established one year after the first edition of RB was published. Also, by the time this lecture was given, Brazil had been living under a military dictatorship for three years. Sérgio has opposed himself to Getúlio Vargas's dictatorship (1937-1945) and, in 1969, asked his retirement in solidarity with the forced retirements of his university colleagues due to the 1964-1984 military dictatorship. Still in relation to Sérgio's stance towards Getúlio's government, it is worth noting his active role during the *I Congresso Brasileiro de Escritores* (I Brazilian Congress of Writers) in 1945 (he had also took part in the foundation of the *Associação Brasileira dos Escritores* [Brazilian Association of Writers]). He and his colleagues (such as Mário de Andrade and Antonio Candido) took the chance to give a political tone to the event, positioning themselves against Getúlio's *Estado Novo*. Sérgio would, then, contribute to the creation of the *Esquerda Democrática* movement (Democratic Left) and, in 1947, to the foundation of the *Partido Socialista Brasileiro* (Brazilian Socialist Party). (see, for instance, Candido, 1998, p.82; Candido 1989 [1982], pp.127-8; Guimarães, 2008, p.48; Galvão, 2008, p.124; Nicodemo, 2014, pp.140-1)

<sup>590</sup> Thiago Lima Nicodemo puts into relief that Sérgio's texts after the first edition of RB expose different interpretative models: instead of the dual models of RB, one has "fluid method, concerned with the escape from generalizations and with the apprehension of the diverse temporalities of the events. In addition to that, the typically essayist scope of his first book - the ambition to encompass in its theme the history of adaptation of the European to a new world - is replaced by considerably more circumscribed delimitations, in a great consonance with the avant-garde in the international historiography of the period" (Nicodemo, 2014, p.142). The new interpretative models cannot obliterate the point, however, that some concerns remain being crucial to Sérgio's entire trajectory: his self-critique is never a complete self-rejection. Thiago refers to this continuity when he says that "[t]he lines of force of the interpretation of Brazil developed in his first essay remain alive, but are re-codified by the technical apparatus of the professional historian" (Nicodemo, 2014, p.142). It is worth noting that Sérgio was a professor of History of the Brazilian Civilization at the University of São Paulo from 1956 to 1968 (when, as the Head of the Department of History of Brazil, he asked

At some point in the 1967 lecture, he gets back once more to RB, more precisely to a passage he says to be "still willing to subscribe, among many others that I would be tempted to deny completely, or at least to reformulate":

I asked then: "[i]n any case, would it be legitimate this resort to the past, in search for a stimulus to better organize our society? Would it not mean, on the contrary, merely an evidence of our incapacity for spontaneous creation?". And I immediately added: "The really active [*vivas*] epoch were never deliberately traditionalists" (Holanda, 2008 [1967], pp.622-3).<sup>591</sup>

If the question remains valid and pressing, now the approach to this question is not anymore of an essayist, but of a historian.<sup>592</sup> This lecture also reinforces his opposition to those that resort to the past in order to restore it. As I have already stressed, this opposition had been made in all editions of RB, but the way Sérgio, the early essayist, formulated it seemed to Sérgio, the late historian, too dangerously close to what was done by those who resorted to the past, or to the tradition, to glorify and restore it. That does not imply the inexistence of continuities, as Sérgio insists on many occasions - continuity with the past, let me recall, is a fate, not a duty.

The self-critique in relation to RB has never been made as an attempt to show that the past is dead. On the contrary, Sérgio says that

---

his retirement in solidarity of other professors compulsorily retired by dictatorship); in 1958, he submitted his dissertation entitled "Visão do Paraíso" (later extended and published as a book under the same title) to get the tenure position in "History of Civilization" at the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of São Paulo (USP); in 1962, he created the *Instituto de Estudos Brasileiros* (Institute of Brazilian Studies); from 1960 to 1972, he directed the collection *História Geral da Civilização Brasileira* (General History of Brazilian Civilization) (see, for instance, Ricupero, 2008b, pp.103-6; Wegner, 2008, pp.482-3; Guimarães, 2008, pp.53-4; Caldeira, 2008, pp.87-97). Mainly since the 1940s, Sérgio also published extensively on topics linked to deep historical research and lectured on history of Brazil in many places. As Robert Wegner notes, he "participates in an active way of the institutionalization of the historical studies in Brazil" (Wegner, 2008, p.482).

<sup>591</sup> In RB: "[i]n any case, will it be legitimate this resort to the past, in search for a stimulus to better organize society? Would it not mean, on the contrary, merely an evidence of our incapacity for spontaneous creation? The really active [*vivas*] epochs were never deliberately traditionalists" (RB1, p.7; RB2, p.19; RB3, p.19).

<sup>592</sup> Or, I should say, not of an essayist in Sérgio's definition, but of a historian according now to his definition: "[t]o history or to the historian, what matters first and foremost is to capture the course of time in its own mobility and temporariness, obviously without disregarding, however, the solidarity or continuity that may exist across successive generations" (Holanda, 2008 [1967], p.623).

between the supposed democratic vocation of the more cosmopolitan, or metropolitan, areas, and the immobility [*imobilismo*] of most of the country and most of its population, the big difference is perhaps of degree, not of essence; that is, the old rural and colonial patterns have gained among us over time such vigor and influence that they largely prevail until our days, with changes that are more superficial than profound in those very areas that, apparently, would be the most unsubmitive to their absorbing tutelage (Holanda, 2008 [1967], p.636).

Instead of a break in time, separating the past from the present, and instead of a break in space, separating areas of backwardness and areas of progress, what Sérgio exposes in this passage, and had already exposed in different ways in RB, is the coexistence of the old and the new, of the colonial and the cosmopolitan, in contemporary Brazil.<sup>593</sup>

In an interview from 1976, Sérgio addresses *Roots of Brazil* again. The question asked about the changes he would make in the text, to which he replied as follows: "[m]any things... The basic idea was that democracy has never happened in Brazil and that we needed a vertical revolution, that really implied the participation of popular layers. Never a superficial revolution, as were all revolutions in the History of Brazil, but one that really moved all the prevalent social and political structure" (see Coelho, 1976, p.3).<sup>594</sup> Later, he said: "The book is surpassed and fully outdated. I had different concerns" (see Coelho, 1976, pp.3-4). Yet, the interviewer mentioned that a common critique made to the Brazilian intellectual was that he moved very quickly from the empirical reality to the essayist interpretation, without solid bases; to that comment, Sérgio replied in the following way: "I agree completely, and this is why I would never write again 'Roots of

---

<sup>593</sup> This time, his hopes regarding the eradications of the "evils" of Brazilian formative process seemed to be deeply shaken: "is it within the reach of the current generations the eradication in a short term of the evils that throughout the centuries, and not only in the last four or three decades, have already been able to lay deep roots in our land? I am not pessimist, and I want to believe it is; but I have to admit that it is a matter of an act of faith that I would not be able to convey to others" (Holanda, 2008 [1967], p.634).

<sup>594</sup> Let me recall, however, that the notion that "we needed a vertical revolution" is only present since the second edition, not before that, in spite of what Sérgio seems to suggest in this answer - see pages 442-54.



Brazil'. Mainly because the book stayed at the level of the essay. I am not against essayism or interpretation, even today. But research must be rigorous and exhausting, otherwise the outcome is only speculations (*elucubrações*), sometimes brilliant, but detached from reality" (see Coelho, 1976, p.6).<sup>595</sup>

These instances of self-critique expose Sérgio's uneasiness in relation to RB; or, as João Kennedy Eugênio observes, the way he "disagreed with himself [*se desentendeu consigo próprio*], with his history and with *Roots of Brazil*" (Eugênio, 2010, p.29). If, on the one hand, Sérgio's later interpretation of RB was perhaps too harsh regarding its essayist character, he seemed to be more ambiguous in relation to the political implications of the text: in the 1967 lecture, he warns that RB was mobilized in ways that were too close to the conservative positions he claimed to have tried to avoid in the first place, while in the 1976 interview he identifies a defense of a "vertical revolution" in the text without mentioning that this is a product of the revisions made to the second edition.

Sérgio's disagreements with himself highlight some aspects of RB that potentially problematize those interpretations that consider the text an example of a progressist political position and/or a radical democrat interpretation of Brazil. It comes as no surprise that the main reference I have in mind here is Antonio Candido. In many of his engagements with RB, Antonio proposed some readings of the text that became considerably influential. The most cited interpretation of RB is probably the text he wrote to RB in 1967, included in the fifth edition (1969), entitled "O Significado de *Raízes do Brasil* [The Significance of *Roots of Brazil*]". There, Antonio Candido considered RB one of the three crucial texts, "the ones that seem to express the mentality linked to the blow of intellectual radicalism and social analysis that broke out after the 1930 Revolution, and that was not, despite everything, suffocated by the *Estado Novo* [1937-1945]" (Candido, 1995 [1967], p.9).<sup>596</sup> Antonio Candido, then, claims that RB "is constructed on an admirable

<sup>595</sup> Needless to say, I am not agreeing with Sérgio's distinction between an essay and a "rigorous and exhausting research" that is not "detached from reality".

<sup>596</sup> The other two texts were *Casa Grande & Senzala* (Gilberto Freyre) and *Formação do Brasil Contemporâneo* (Caio Prado Jr.). After establishing this triad, Antonio Candido adds that "[c]ompared to these books, Oliveira Vianna's work, in so many aspects penetrating and prescient, already seemed superseded, full of ideological prejudices and with an excessive wish to adapt the real to conventional purposes"; or, as he puts few lines below, his work (as well as Alberto Torres') served as a source to "right-wing young people", in order to argue in favor of "hierarchical and authoritarian perspective of society, exactly the perspective that Sérgio Buarque de Holanda criticized in *Roots of Brazil*" (Candido, 1995 [1967], p.9, p.11). Hence, Oliveira Vianna's interpretation seem superseded, following Antonio's words, to "men that are today [1967]"

methodology of contraries [*metodologia dos contrários*]", exploring "polar concepts", in a way that neither pole is chosen, the focus being "the dialectical play among both": "the perspective of a specific aspect of historical reality is *obtained*, in the strong sense of the term, from the simultaneous focus on both; one leads to the other, both are interpenetrated and the outcome has a great enlightening power" (Candido, 1995 [1967], pp.12-3, italics in the original). The conceptual pairs in RB are emphasized in the Brazilian's "way of being" and in the Brazilian "social and political structure" (Candido, 1995 [1967], p.13).

Regarding Antonio's interpretation of RB's account on "our revolution" (the main topic of RB's last chapter), one reads that "[i]t is a matter of eliminating the past, of adopting the urban rhythm and of providing the emergence of the oppressed layers of the population, the only ones capable of revitalizing society and giving a new direction to political life" (Candido, 1995 [1967], p.19). Concluding the text, Antonio says that,

from the political point of view, [Sérgio] suggested that, as our past was an obstacle, the elimination of the 'roots' was an imperative of the historical development. Furthermore: exactly in a time when the Lusitanian components were appraised sentimentally, he perceived the modern direction of the Brazilian evolution, showing that it would develop along the increasing loss of the Iberian characteristics, benefitting the paths opened by the urban and cosmopolitan civilization (Candido, 1995 [1967], p.20).

In a short *post-scriptum* to RB written in 1986, Antonio Candido talks briefly again about the triad established in his 1967 text, this time adding that RB was unique in the following aspect:

[it] expresses a little known, rarely posited and under-appreciated vein of our political-social thinking, which

---

approximately in their fifties"; and, more precisely, "that adopted leftist positions, such as myself: coherently militant communists and socialists, or taking part only through the ideas" (Candido, 1995 [1967], p.9, p.11). This political, intellectual generational testimony has come to be widely reproduced, and sometimes also contested, in the subsequent history of the interpretations of Brazil - both from what is generally called the "left" and the "right". My point, however, is not to problematize the triad or the distinction between "radical" and "conservative" thinkers, but the kind of "radicalism" Antonio attributes to RB.

appears either as recessive, intermixed with, or as the exception to the predominant liberal and conservative discourse. I am referring to what could be called the potential radicalism of middle classes, which in Sérgio's case gains a different mark since it is decisively oriented to the people. Maybe he has been the first Brazilian thinker to abandon the "enlightened" position, according to which it is up to enlightened intellectuals, politicians and rulers the administration of people's interests and the orientation of its action. A half century ago, in this book, Sérgio made clear that only people themselves, by taking initiative, could take charge of their destiny. This makes him a coherent radical democrat (Candido, 1995 [1986], p.23).<sup>597</sup>

In 1988, reinforcing that Sérgio rejected the fascist or authoritarian alternatives, Antonio Candido says that RB embraces the alternative of a "popular government": "political improvement, in *Roots of Brazil*, means meeting popular claims through a regime where people itself has the control" (Candido, 1990 [1988], p.18). And, in relation to Sérgio himself, he pays the following tribute: "I think Sérgio Buarque de Holanda was the first eminent Brazilian intellectual that made a clear option in the political terrain in favor of the people, making explicit that it should take charge of its own destiny, since it was a bearer of qualities that were eventually better than those of the elites" (Candido, 1990 [1988], p.18).

---

<sup>597</sup> In 1982, Antonio Candido said that RB expresses Sérgio's "personal formula of progressist interpretation of his country, combining in an exemplary way the demystifying interpretation of the past with the democratic sense of the present... [it became] an open, extremely critical and radical interpretation... It was the only 'portrait of Brazil' to finish premeditatedly in a radical political position in view of the present"; and, later in the text, Antonio ascribes to Sérgio's entire trajectory "an advanced democratic consciousness" (Candido, 1989 [1982], pp.124-5). In a lecture six years later, Antonio approached again the occurrence of radical ideas in Brazil, opposing them to conservative thinking: radicalism, in Brazil, is "the set of ideas and attitudes forming a counterbalance to the conservative movement, which has always predominated"; it is "a progressist way of reacting to the stimulus of the pressing social problems, as opposed to the conservative way" (Candido, 1990 [1988], p.4). When it comes to "underdeveloped countries" such as Brazil, where "the level of political consciousness of the people does not correspond to its revolutionary potentiality", the radical can "serve the cause of the feasible transformations in conservative societies such as ours, full of archaic reminiscences" (Candido, 1990 [1988], p.5). It is worth recalling that, in 1980, both Antonio and Sérgio were founding members of the *Partido dos Trabalhadores* (Workers' Party, PT), officially recognized as a political party in 1982. In fact, together with Apolonio de Carvalho and Mário Pedrosa, they were the very first affiliated members of PT, which was founded based on a democratic socialist orientation. For more on Sérgio's relation with PT, see Dulci (1998, pp.89-91).

Neither liberal nor conservative: radical. The coherence ascribed to Sérgio's political position comes again in a text from 1998, when Antonio Candido focuses his reading on RB's last chapter ("Our Revolution"). To begin with, he says that, "since he was young", Sérgio "had political consciousness and ideological positions defined along the left" (Candido, 1998, p.81). The above-mentioned chapter, in Antonio's view, suggests "a popular-democratic solution", linked to "the end of the Luso-Brazilian colonial tradition (that is, our original formula)" and to "the emergence of the popular masses" (Candido, 1998, p.84). So, instead of focusing on the continuity of the Luso-Brazilian colonial tradition, Sérgio "focused above all on its rupture" through Brazilian revolution (Candido, 1998, p.86) which situates him "in a radical democratic position, criticizing the conventional liberalism of the oligarchies, as well as fascism and communism" (Candido, 1998, p.88).<sup>598</sup>

Based on my previous discussion, I want to problematize below the unchanging bond Antonio Candido established between the "methodology of contraries" of RB and the radical democrat political position it supposedly exposes. It is important to note that, at least in the texts I had access to, Antonio has never devoted any attention to the modifications to which RB's editions were submitted.<sup>599</sup> In my view, to put it briefly, Antonio's interpretation of RB is double-faced. On the one hand, it emphasizes that the text makes use of a "methodology of contraries" (for instance, sowers and builders, adventure ethic and work ethic, rural and urban, affective impulse and impersonal norm) in order to interpret the historical formation of contemporary Brazil. On the other hand, it emphasizes that, through this methodology, the text seeks to point towards future moments of this

---

<sup>598</sup> See also Candido (1989 [1982], pp.125-7). A careful reading of the conditions under which Antonio developed this kind of interpretation of RB would lead me to approach aspects related to the political situation in Brazil and to the institutional events in the formation of the academic environment in the country - two spheres Antonio Candido and Sérgio Buarque de Holanda became directly engaged with.

<sup>599</sup> It is true that in the 1998 text, for instance, Antonio gives a glimpse of a possible extrapolation in his interpretation of RB: "[m]y intention is to propose a relatively free, but not arbitrary I think, reading of the final chapter of *Roots of Brazil*"; or, as he puts later, "perhaps I will escape a little bit from the letter of the chapter, interpreting Sérgio's thought in order to make it more explicit, but without betraying its insertion in the context of the book"; or, yet later, "[i]f I am extrapolating more than what the intellectual speculation allows..." (Candido, 1998, p.81, p.84, p.87). It is even possible to say that Antonio Candido was well aware that Sérgio's political position was not that coherent - or, at least, was not strictly the same "since he was young" -, otherwise maybe he would not have said, almost at the end of his text, after defining RB for the last time as a radically democratic text, that "[w]ith the easy science time provides us with, it is as if [Sérgio] was foreseeing the position that he would formally assume in 1945, when he adhered to a socialist democratic party" (Candido, 1998, p.88). For more on Antonio Candido's interpretation of Sérgio's text, focusing on the last chapter, see Feldman (2015a).

modernizing formative process, when the old would be replaced by the new; the traditional, by the modern. Pushing a little bit, this could imply that, as soon as this formative process reaches a certain (advanced) stage, the characteristics linked to the past - and that were brought to light by the methodology of contraries - would cease to exist, and, therefore, perhaps even this methodology itself would lose its interpretative force. This double-faced interpretation is oriented by the identification of Sérgio's political position as a coherent radical democratic in favor of a popular democracy in Brazil.

In what follows, I will move with and against Antonio's interpretation. In order to do that, I resort to other interpreters of RB that have stressed, in different ways, aspects of the text that help me to advance my own problematization. Let me remind that the overall purpose of my discussion is to interpret the links between the uses of "formation" in RB and the political position it exposes, taking into account the modifications across its editions.

As Pedro Meira Monteiro claims, RB "suspends the place of the 'roots', before imagining them in the service of an identity affirmation" (Monteiro, 2012a, p.199). In this sense, "[i]nstead of looking for the more or less solid terrain of a 'national culture' that precedes the researcher and the observer, Sérgio goes after a space in which forms have not been fixed, in a moment in which *crystallization* itself is still an unknown"; Sérgio was satisfied with "the *boundary* as a livable space" (Monteiro, 2012a, p.217, p.323, italics in the original).<sup>600</sup> In the terms I am using here, being satisfied with the boundary condition of living implies bringing to the fore the production of boundaries between past, present and future, and between inside and outside. It is in this sense that I interpret the "suspension of roots" Pedro talks about. And, giving Sérgio voice again, it is also in this sense that one can take his words about the bonds between the personal and the national:

[i]n order to understand any lifestyle strange to my original one, without renouncing to the latter, without eschewing the

---

<sup>600</sup> As Pedro puts elsewhere, "[a]s with all metaphors, the 'roots' of the tile transport us to a particular imaginary country. When reading *Raízes do Brasil*, we realize that this country, or this territory, is above all transcontinental and transcultural. It is part America, part Europe, part Africa" (Monteiro, 2008a, p.73).

implications of a formation - that, in me, would be almost converted into a second nature -, it was necessary first of all to try to study this formation. The point is that, the word 'formation' itself already implies that, to such an attempt, it is important first and foremost to excavate from our own origins, from our national past, the real reasons of our present and - who knows? - of our future; it is important thus to investigate these reasons from what seemed to me to represent their sources or their roots (Holanda, 2008 [1967], p.618).

The discussion of the chapters above show multiple comparisons throughout the text: adventure and work, Protestant and Iberian peoples, Spanish and Portuguese colonization, Dutch and Portuguese colonization, cordiality and civility, sowers and builders, Brazilians and Portuguese. Referring to some of these pairs, Pedro Meira Monteiro says that "in its contrary, the truth of the type is found; in what it is not, relies what it is" (Monteiro, 2008b, p.353). Moreover, as Roberto Vecchi notes, two closely related parts compose RB: the first five chapters being historically oriented and the final two focused on more immediate circumstances ("new times", "our revolution"). Those parts stand in mutual relations: "the historical part ideologically connoted and the ideological part, historically formulated" (Vecchi, 2008, p.372). It is also worth noting the temporal and spatial incisions throughout the text. With different emphases, many periodizations are implicitly or explicitly brought up: for instance, before and after Portuguese colonization, before and after XIX century (culminating in 1888, the dividing line to "our revolution"), before and after the expeditions of the *bandeirantes* ("first autonomous gesture that took place in the colony"). Spatially, the coastal colonization and the expeditions towards the interior of the country lead to different formative processes. But, as I have stressed, this before/after frame, as well as these variations in the spatial dynamics do not express complete ruptures or detachments, but different coexistences. Through these comparative operations and the intrinsic links between history and politics and between time and space, the play of differentiations and identifications articulates past, present and future, as well as of inside and outside, inscribing substantive accounts which vary across the editions.

According to João Kennedy Eugênio, three major directions governing the modifications of RB from the first to the second edition can be isolated. Firstly, in the most evident direction, he observes "the extension of the historical erudition: sense of concreteness, huge quantity of information, use of various sources". Secondly, the organicist matrix is attenuated, which is observable, "for instance, in the elimination of the epigraphs, in the suppression of organicist passages and/or of passages criticizing revolutionary ideas, in the reformulation (or change) of passages that acquire an opposite sense in relation to the 1936 edition"; in this sense, "the attenuation of organicism is notorious in the additions that introduce the progressist political bias in *Roots of Brazil*".<sup>601</sup> Finally, "there is a third direction, that contradicts that previous one: Sérgio Buarque's sympathetic perspective in relation to the conservatism and the sense of reality of the Portuguese around the XV, XVI and XVII centuries. This direction represents the reinforcement of the organic vision in *Roots of Brazil*" (all the previous quotations are in Eugênio, 2010, pp.27-8). In other words, the emergence of a progressist political position in the second edition of RB does not exclude the organicist perspective - it attenuates it.

João Cezar de Castro Rocha verifies four main points related to the modifications of the text and classifies them as either "hermeneutical" or "political": the progressive erasure of the explicit presence of Gilberto Freyre from the text (mainly for political reasons); the elimination or dislocation of the presence of Carl Schmitt (also mainly for political reasons); the inclusion of the disagreement with Cassiano Ricardo (for hermeneutical reasons); and the modification in the opening paragraph of the text (also for hermeneutical reasons) (see Rocha, 2012, pp.16-24).<sup>602</sup> Luiz Feldman, in turn, highlights three lines of change: first, "the variation

---

<sup>601</sup> In relation to the suppression of the epigraphs, João Kennedy Eugênio states that "[t]he three epigraphs form a coherent web from the positive value they attribute to plasticity, spontaneity and cultural peculiarity. If the argument of *Roots of Brazil* is made of oppositions and contrasts, this is not what happens in the epigraphs, which are inclined to only one side. They are unilateral, not exclusivist: none of them suppose the disjunctive *either...or...* They accentuate that which is thought to be more valuable, indispensable, forming a suggestive path to *Roots of Brazil*. They were excluded because they unveil the heart of the essay and the love of the writer. Double operation: bewildering of the readers and Sérgio's (partial) move away from organicism" (Eugênio, 2010, p.285). I am not sure whether the epigraphs really unveil "the heart" of RB or "the love" in Sérgio's heart, but I do agree that their exclusion exposes a different stance towards organicism and, above all, helps in avoiding the erasure of the tensions running through RB. See notes 492, 521 and 552 above for the epigraphs.

<sup>602</sup> In relation to the repositioning of Carl Schmitt in RB, Leopoldo Waizbort remarks that this is intimately related to Sérgio's move away from a conservative political position (see Waizbort, 2011, pp.53-4): from a political theoretician that "Sérgio respects and is close to", Carl Schmitt becomes, since the second edition, "a innocuous confirmation of a statement" (Waizbort, 2011, p.54).

of [Sérgio's] axiological position in relation to tradition"; second, "the replacement of personalism by democracy as a political solution to the emerging urban order"; and, third, "the reformulation of the statement on the exile as the characteristic condition of the Brazilian" (Feldman, 2013, p.120).

The directions pointed out above reinforce that the modifications made to the editions of RB expose variations on the articulations between at least three different dimensions: Sérgio's stance towards the essayist and towards the professional historian; his interpretation of Brazil through a play of differentiations and identifications; and his political position.<sup>603</sup> I am concerned here mainly with the second and the third dimensions and, more precisely, with two general, and interrelated, aspects: firstly, I will reinforce that the progressist and radically democratic political position emerges only in later editions of RB; and, secondly, I will tackle this progressist tone, claiming that it can be interpreted as expressing, at once, a modernizing perspective and a critique of modernization.<sup>604</sup>

According to Luiz Dantas, RB endorses a modernizing narrative to the extent that the text expresses "a line of separation between a before and an after", in order to account for "the political and cultural situation of Brazil" of that time; then, "the solutions to our evils" come from the elimination of certain elements, that is, "the prestige of the liberal professions, the democratic misunderstanding, romanticism, the bookish prestige, the Bovarist escape etc, all of them obstacles that smell ancestry" (Dantas, 1999, pp.17-8). But Luiz also brings another dimension of text, in line with what I want to put into relief here:

[w]ith the exception of the great line of fracture between the before and the after, that culminates in the last chapter of *Roots*, when the 'good and honest' revolution is in charge of dissolving, vertically, the 'archaic reminiscences', in an unqualified valorization of the new, the other and numerous poles of opposition are always put in a non-exclusivist way.

---

Leopoldo is referring to the Carl Schmitt's quotation included in the footnote added on the cordial man in reply to Cassiano Ricardo - see pages 413-8.

<sup>603</sup> I have already alluded above to some things at stake in the first dimension, especially those things raised from Sérgio's engagement with RB. Here, however, it is not possible to extend this discussion.

<sup>604</sup> To that aim, I will appropriate some considerations developed by other interpreters of RB, without detailing my agreements and disagreements with their overall position, which would side-track me from my discussion.



Rather, they acquire an 'enlightening' power in virtue of their own dialogical nature, as Antonio Candido's classic preface on the significance of *Roots of Brazil* recalls. Never a simple option within a dual system, but an uninterrupted tension, providing the entire essay with a very particular impression of unsolved dissonance, of a perpetually fruitful discomfort (Dantas, 1999, p.19).<sup>605</sup>

As said above, the depiction of the Brazilian revolution as a vertical dissolution of archaic reminiscences and an unqualified valorization of the new is much more an outcome of the second edition than a position already articulated in the first one. Nevertheless, what Luiz brings that deserves attention is the "unsolved dissonance" and the "perpetually fruitful discomfort" of this "uninterrupted tension" that he identifies in the other poles of opposition (following Antonio Candido's notion of the "methodology of contraries"). In this sense, besides the modernizing dimension, the reasoning permeating RB gives rise to "the contradiction, the opposite movement, the ambivalent negation of the desired thing, and, when the book was supposed to be a prognosis, it silences the liberating voice because it knows the frightening background of the so-called 'roots'" (Dantas, 1999, p.19). The rise of this "opposite movement" and mainly the "negation of the desired thing" touches upon what I want to emphasize: RB is not an unqualified modernizing interpretation of Brazil. In any case, Luiz Dantas seems to ascribe the obstacles to modernization stressed in the text as barriers against the emergence of the "liberating voice", which implies a negative valence to the "roots" excavated.

Robert Wegner is helpful here. According to him, RB exposes "the dilemmas of Brazilian modernization" through two major axes in tension with each other: the one related to "our traditionalism" deals with the "genesis of the obstacles to our modernization"; and the other one, related to "our revolution", points towards "the urbanization and the constitution of a bureaucratic State in Brazil" (Wegner, 2000, pp.28-9; see also Wegner, 2009).<sup>606</sup> Robert claims that the Iberian heritage,

<sup>605</sup> "Antonio Candido's classic preface" is not, in fact, written as a "preface", but came to be referred as such since it was included in the sixth edition of RB (1969).

<sup>606</sup> Italics suppressed from the original. The first axis relates to the culture of personality (and the corresponding anarchical individualism); to the adventure as the basis of the colonization of Brazil (as opposed to a work ethic involving a planned and continuous effort); to the social plasticity of the

the culture of personality, the notion of cordiality, the phenomenon of ruralism and the adventure that characterizes the colonization of Brazil are the traits that Sérgio uses to describe "the peculiar *traditionalism* of Brazilian society" (Wegner, 2000, p.33, italics in the original). This axis coexists, in tension, with the second axis, "our revolution", which, "characterized by the strengthening of the cities, disintegrated ruralism and its mentality, without, however, replacing it by civility" (Wegner, 2000, p.47).<sup>607</sup>

As I said, Robert Wegner claims that these axes are in tension with each other. RB's last chapter, instead of presenting solutions to the problems previously discussed, becomes "an almost tragic end" (Wegner, 2000, p.49): "the tension oscillates between the collapse of Iberian traits and their permanence" (Wegner, 2000, p.50), marking an incompatibility between Iberism and Americanism (expressed, for instance, in the incompatibility between cordiality and civility, raising barriers to the constitution of a public sphere in Brazil). In other words, "it is as if tradition referred to a notion of culture that is almost motionless, and modernization ultimately pointed towards movement and the annulment of tradition" (Wegner, 2000, p.57). In this vein, Robert argues that the modifications to the second edition seem to be an attempt from Sérgio to stress the movement of modernization in relation to the permanence of tradition (see Wegner, 2000, p.66).

Appropriating these axes outlined by Robert Wegner to my own purposes, I would like to propose that it is helpful to specify the role tradition and modernization perform in the text through two different, but interrelated angles. In what regards tradition, this axis contains *both* how RB defines the past *and* the stance from which it judges it. Take, for instance, the example of personalism. It seems plausible to say that the definition of personalism and the weight Sérgio

---

Portuguese; to the ruralism as the main phenomenon produced in the colonization of Brazil; and to the cordial man (and his hostility towards abstract rules and impersonal order) (see Wegner, 2000, pp.30-40). The second axis relates to the transformations of Brazilian society; to the agony of ruralism; to urbanization; to the rise of a different kind of individualism (a modern individualism, linked to civility rather than to the anarchical trait of cordiality); and to Americanization (as opposed to the Iberism of the first axis) (see Wegner, 2000, pp.40-9). I will not develop the characteristics Robert attributed to each axis, since I have already discussed them above. Also, Robert's text is devoted as well to explore the operation of these axes in Sérgio's texts during the 1940s and 1950s, tackling the influences of his "North-American phase", that is, after he spent, in 1941, some months in United States.

<sup>607</sup> Or, as he affirms later, "the Americanization in Brazil knocks down the rural aristocracy and dilutes cordiality, but, on the other hand, it does not automatically bring along civility or new political institutions" (Wegner, 2000, p.49).

ascribes to it in the formative process of Brazil remain fundamentally the same in the first and in later editions; at the same time, the position held in relation to its social, cultural and political implications is considerably displaced to a more negative tone - or at least skeptic. Suffice to remind, in this sense, that the 1936 sentence "personalism, among us, is a positive notion - maybe the only truly positive notion we know" becomes, in 1948, "[i]t is undeniable that, in our political life, personalism can be in many cases a positive force".<sup>608</sup>

The axis of modernization also brings two dimensions. On the one hand, it is possible to explore whether RB's narrative of the formative process of contemporary Brazil projects a modernizing history to the country or not. In other words, it is a matter of assessing how the text articulates past, present and future. As I have highlighted, all editions of RB stress the coexistence of the old and the new, the tradition and the modern, particularly when it comes to the discussion on Brazilian revolution. The main difference between the editions comes to be the way this coexistence is framed. Take the case of democracy, for example. In the first edition, RB depicts an almost-fundamental incompatibility emerging in the formation of contemporary Brazil between liberal-democracy, and Brazilian tradition and reality; later editions, however, depicts this relation through the notion of a conflict between two worlds and two mentalities, opening room to adjustments of democratic ideals to Brazilian reality.

This leads me to the second dimension in the axis of modernization, which refers more explicitly to the political position exposed in the editions of RB. Take, for instance, the discussion on the political organization of Brazil in relation to "the peculiarity of Brazilian life", that is, the "singularly strong emphasis on the affectionate, the irrational, and the passionate, as well as a stagnation, or rather a corresponding atrophy, of the qualities linked to order, discipline, rationalization" In the first edition, this peculiarity and its corresponding "amorphous and invertebrate organism" is considered "the opposite of what may be appropriate for a population in the process of organizing itself politically, according to the modern conceptions" (RB1, p.32-3); in later editions, this peculiarity has basically the same reference ("the singularly strong emphasis..."), but it is now linked to the outcome

---

<sup>608</sup> The definition of "cordiality", however, does not seem to work in the same way, since its very definition is impacted by the modifications to the second edition. I will get back to the notion of "cordiality" below.

of an "incoherent and amorphous whole" that is intrinsically associated with a "clearly personalistic" society and is considered the "the opposite of what seems to be appropriate for a population in the process of organizing itself politically (RB2, p.68; RB3, pp.66-7). As I have already stressed above, the suppression of "according to modern conceptions" and the addition of the reference to "personalism" in the passage express a different political position regarding what it means to be politically organized: in the first edition, personalism appeared as an alternative to "modern conceptions", while in later editions there is no alternative to what "may be appropriate" as a political organization.<sup>609</sup>

To put it briefly, what I am suggesting here is that the relation between tradition and modernization in RB is constituted by two dimensions in each axis. In the axis of tradition, one dimension is fundamentally linked to how the past is defined and the other dimension, how it is judged. In the axis of modernization, one dimension is linked to how past, present and future are articulated in the formation of contemporary Brazil and the other one, to the position RB holds in relation to the desirable modernizing trajectory to the country.

Luiz Guilherme Piva's interpretation of RB can be appropriated here in a fruitful way. In his view, Sérgio diagnoses in the present and in the past "elements of backwardness that need to be removed/overcome", at the same time that he has a certain expectation or desire inscribed in the "possibilities of advance towards a stage of culture and political and social organization diametrically better than what he witnesses" (Piva, 2000, p.153). In Luiz Guilherme's words, "backwardness" is referring the "Iberian formation and the consequent prevalence of rural life (the private rural life, but above all the social and political rural life), with its patrimonialist, privatistic and particularistic bonds; the personal privileges and the emotion (cordiality), instead of norms and rationality, as the source of social relation". Modernization, on the other hand, refers to "the rupture/overcoming of Iberism and the establishment (an incremental one, but revolutionary in its effects) of what is called 'Americanism', which is basically the urban and democratic life" founded on impersonal and abstract norms (all previous quotations from Piva, 2000, p.154).

---

<sup>609</sup> If one recalls the discussion on Brazilian revolution and the modifications that lead to Sérgio's expectation of a "vertical revolution" with "deep transformations", the point being made here is reinforced - see pages 442-54.

But Luiz Guilherme Piva does not miss a certain ambiguity, or tension, in RB. If modernization is linked to rupture and overcoming, Sérgio defends, at the same time, that "Americanization/modernization must be based on the Brazilian type, on its reality, on internal elements..., potentializing his qualities and abandoning the external and artificial formulas (purely formalist, abstract and rational) with which we have been deluding ourselves throughout our political formation (the alienation of the elites from the social reality)" (Piva, 2000, p.154).<sup>610</sup> What arises from that is a complex configuration. First of all, Sérgio desires both what he defines as the "modern" (that is, the impersonal and abstract institutional framework) and what he defines as the peculiarly "national" (that is, "the Iberian-Brazilian spontaneity"); nevertheless, spontaneity is also identified with backwardness, while modernization is identified with external and sometimes artificial elements (Piva, 2000, p.155). In this vein, Iberian heritage occupies a multidimensional place in RB: it is what was once imported from Europe, but became constitutive of Brazilian nationality; it is also the background that contains, on the one hand, the negative aspects of Brazilian reality that need to be overcome and, on the other hand, the positive aspects of Brazilian reality that need to be explored. Then, according to Luiz Guilherme, RB targets the rural and political elites that are held responsible for the backwardness of the nation and its implicit claim seems to defend the nationalization of the external element, "improving it and, through this 'Brazilianizing' fusion, improving the positive parcel of the existing nationality" (Piva, 2000, 156).

Luiz Guilherme Piva and Robert Wegner interpret RB from a tension between two poles, or axes, expressed mainly in the relation between Iberism and Americanism. Recently, João Kennedy Eugênio also explored the tensions of RB in detail, paying more attention to the first edition and to some modifications to the second edition. He claims that the 1936 text is composed of rival discursive matrices: "[t]he first discursive matrix has a 'sociological' bias, it is generalizing and points towards a strong historical tendency, whose sense would be the overcoming of Iberian roots"; while "[t]he second discursive matrix has an 'organicist' bias, it is singularizing, attributes a positive value to spontaneity and suggests the necessity of harmonizing the rationalization in progress with the values

---

<sup>610</sup> Luiz Guilherme Piva interprets this ambiguity as a tension between "ordering reason" (linked to modernization) and "determinism" (linked to Brazilian reality) (see Piva, 2000, ch.5).

of tradition, the basis of Brazilian singularity" (Eugênio, 2010, p.55). If, from the first matrix, rationalization is given a positive value and spontaneity is taken as "an obstacle to the full insertion of society in the modern world and to the constitution of the democratic public sphere"; from the second matrix, spontaneity is given a positive value in terms of Brazilian cultural identity, and the Portuguese heritage becomes a criterion to "orient the insertion of our culture in modernity", at the same time that rationalization is taken with some reservation (see Eugênio, 2010, pp.112-3).<sup>611</sup>

The point is that, taken separately, these matrices would lead to imprecise conclusions. The sociological one alone would imply the adherence to a universal parameter of social and political organization that Sérgio would like to see reproduced in Brazil. At the same time, the organicist one alone would imply the valorization of Brazilian singularity and the exclusion of any external input in the formative process of the nation.<sup>612</sup> Thus, according to João Kennedy, the relation between the matrices should be understood through the notion of "counterpoint" ("*contraponto*"), which allows RB to avoid a "dualism of exclusion", that is, the necessity to choose one side to the exclusion of the other. Hence, "[n]either pacification nor synthesis, but polarity: *balance of opposites*" (Eugênio, 2010, p.203).<sup>613</sup>

It should be clear that this balance is neither already verified in the present nor is it attributed to an already-gone past; RB wishes neither to preserve the status quo nor to restore a dead past. Thus, this balance is to be attained in the future, despite the fact that no clear political program is provided by the text. Nevertheless, as I have been insisting, this future does not imply the eradication of the past or the present. The past alive in the present is both an obstacle and an opportunity to the achievement of this future balance. Hence, if one recalls the two dimensions I have

---

<sup>611</sup> It is beyond the scope of this text to go into the details of João Kennedy's interpretation of the first edition of RB, but it should be noted that he develops a multilevel approach to the text, focusing on its sections and on its vocabularies. This allows him to stress a contrast between an organicist and a sociological matrix at the macro level, and a contrast between a sociological, a vitalist and an organicist matrix at the micro level. For João Kennedy's take on this topic, see Eugênio (2010, especially chs.3 and 4).

<sup>612</sup> The exclusion of any external input, except the Iberian traits that are already constitutive of Brazilian singularity.

<sup>613</sup> Paulo Esteves had already raised this point when he claimed that "whatever path modernization takes, its success depends on taking into account the particular aspects of tradition" (Esteves, 1998, p.8).

proposed to the interpretation of tradition and modernization, it is possible to say that RB does not operate in an either/or logic in relation to either pole.

Nevertheless, as I have stressed above, the modifications to the second and the third editions do have crucial implications to the play of differentiations and identifications that articulates past, present and future, as well as inside and outside, in its interpretation of Brazil. Moreover, these implications are linked to the political position held, in particular to the emergence of the progressist and radical democrat position in the second edition.

Going back for a moment to Antonio Candido's interpretation that highlights the "methodology of contraries" and the "radically democratic" political position, it seems plausible to say, following João Kennedy Eugênio, that "[b]oth the progressist reading of *Roots of Brazil*... and the prominent place occupied by Antonio Candido in the debate on the work and memory of the *paulista* historian and critic, created the feeling that Sérgio's image diffused by Antonio Candido in the texts after the [1967 text] was too clean, too smooth. It was lacking irregularity, dissonance and contrast to the frame" (Eugênio, 2010, p.293). As Leopoldo Waizbort notes, Antonio's interpretation "roots the text retrospectively in an intellectual and social context, and aims through this rooting at dissipating ambiguities that are above all political, converting the text into a pioneer of the democratic radicalism" (Waizbort, 2011, p.40).

Here I reach a crucial step in my discussion. I am assuming that two points are already clear by now: first, that the emergence of a progressist and radically democratic political position comes only in later editions of RB; and, second, that this progressist tone does not correspond to an unqualified embracement of a modernizing process that should promote the unrestricted eradication of everything related to the past in the formation of contemporary Brazil. To put it briefly, in my view, RB provides an interpretation of Brazil that is both modernizing and a critique of modernization. What I will do now is to reinforce exactly that point, by recovering two passages of the text.<sup>614</sup>

To begin with, I want to recapture a passage that opens the text. In the first edition, the very first lines the reader faces are the following:

---

<sup>614</sup> If I isolate these passages below, it is only because they are helpful in expressing my general claim more clearly. My previous discussion of each chapter of RB should serve as a background to the points advanced below.

Every comprehensive study of Brazilian society has to highlight the truly fundamental fact that we constitute the only large scale and well-succeed effort of transplantation of the European culture to a tropical and subtropical climate zone. If Brazilian territory had the same population density seen in Belgium, it would reach the same number of inhabitants one verifies in the entire globe. We live a unique experience [*uma experiência sem simile*]. Bringing from distant countries **our forms of life**, our institutions and **our worldview**, and being proud of maintaining all of them in an often unfavorable and hostile environment, **we are still exiles in our own land**. We can make great accomplishments, enrich our humanity with new and unexpected aspects, elevate to perfection the type of culture we represent: what is certain is that all the fruits of our work and of our laziness *inevitably belong to a style and to a system of evolutions that are natural to* another climate and another landscape.

This way, **before inquiring** [*antes de investigar*] **to what extent we will be able to feed in our environment a kind of culture of our own**, it would be necessary to ascertain how far **we represent** in this environment **the forms of life**, the institutions and **the worldview we inherited and which we are proud of** (RB1, p.3).

In the 1956 text, that passage becomes:

**The attempt at implantation of the European culture in a large territory under natural conditions that are foreign, if not adverse, to its thousand-year tradition is the dominant fact in the origins of Brazilian society and the one that has yielded the most valuable consequences.** Bringing from distant countries **our forms of association**, our institutions, **our ideas**, and being proud of maintaining



all of them in an often unfavorable and hostile environment, **we are still today exiles in our own land.** We can make great accomplishments, enrich our humanity with new and unexpected aspects, elevate to perfection the type of culture we represent: what is certain is that all the fruits of our work and of our laziness *seem to inevitably belong to a system of evolution that is proper of* another climate and another landscape.

This way, **before asking** [*antes de perguntar*] **to what extent such attempt will be able to succeed**, it would be necessary to ascertain how far **we have been able to represent those forms of association**, institutions and **ideas we inherited** (RB3, p.15).

I have proposed above five considerations on this passage (and its modifications). Firstly, that the successful transplantation becomes a persistent and full-of-consequences attempt at implantation. Secondly, that in all editions "we" remain "exiles in our own land", that is, situated in a certain sense both inside and outside the nation, this one formed itself through the articulation of the inside and the outside. Thirdly, that, despite the reiteration of the exile condition, in the third edition this condition results from an experience that is interpreted not as a well-succeeded enterprise anymore, but as a persistent and continuous attempt at implantation of a foreign culture. Fourthly, that the ufanist tone alluded to in the first edition is at least downgraded, if not wholly suppressed, in the third. And, finally, that the Portuguese heritage, something to be proud of in the first edition, loses this qualification to the third.

These modifications lead João Cezar de Casto Rocha to identify the loss of a "paradox" in later editions. Referring to the third edition, when the "only well-succeeded effort" of transplantation of the European culture becomes "[t]he effort of implantation of the European culture in a large territory under natural conditions that are foreign, if not adverse, to its thousand-year tradition", this being "the dominant fact in the origins of Brazilian society and the one that has yielded the most valuable consequences", João Cesar states that "[t]he modification could not be bigger, since, now, the Brazilian historical experience seems condemned to the

mismatch between ideas and its place... [it is a matter of] *the complete suppression of the key idea, replaced by its opposite*" (Rocha, 2004, p.113, italics in the original). At the same time, the exile condition is maintained, and even reinforced with the inclusion of "today": "we are still today exiles in our own land". From this configuration emerges the paradox in the first two editions: "Brazilians had a unique, because well-succeeded, experience, but, at the same time, as a consequence of that, they live as exiles in their own country. This paradox has not been properly assessed. How can one be well-succeeded *and* exile at the same time?" (Rocha, 2004, p.114, italics in the original).<sup>615</sup>

With the definitive version, after all modifications, João Cezar claims that "the paradox was solved and no doubt the final text became more coherent, although less disturbing" (Rocha, 2004, p.116). This means that, instead of a paradoxical combination of success and exile, Brazilian society exposes a mismatch between ideas and place that is more coherent with the exile condition of Brazilians. The problematic implication of solving this paradox, in his point of view, is that the dialectical force is lost, "as if Sérgio had opted from one of the poles, impoverishing the equation" (Rocha, 2004, p.118) - the pole chosen being the one embracing a negative tone regarding the formation of Brazil.

Hence, the solution of the paradox, reaffirming the exile condition, erases what João Cezar thinks is a characteristic observed in the most fruitful interpretations of Brazil, where the search for the specificity of the Brazilian and for the origin of Brazilian society ends up affirming "its problematic character as an autonomous formation" (Rocha, 2004, p.131).<sup>616</sup> To put it differently, what João Cezar is proposing is that the paradox of the first edition avoids two harmful kinds of interpretation of Brazil: on the one hand, the kind that idealizes the country,

---

<sup>615</sup> In this more recent text, however, João Cezar seems less convinced about the interpretation he provided in 2004. After posing the question again - "[h]ow can one be well-succeeded *and* exile at the same time?" - he said: "[h]ere I recognize that I do not have a fully satisfying answer yet. I should thus limit myself to pointing the difficulty out, since even what I have already written about the theme still seems to me insufficient" (Rocha, 2012, p.21).

<sup>616</sup> Let me quote the passage, even being unable to retrace all the steps of his argumentation: "[i]sn't it true that the most interesting interpreters of Brazil, those whose texts still today instigate us, actualize [*atualizam*] the structure of Gonçalves Dias' poem? It is as if their works ended up contradicting the project that stimulated them, since, if they search for the specificity of the Brazilian or for the origin of society, they ultimately affirm its problematic trait as an autonomous formation" (Rocha, 2004, pp.130-1). João Cezar's text deserved a much more careful consideration, but, for now, I will just say that this "structure of Gonçalves Dias' poem" refers to a continuous search for the definition of what is "Brazil" without ever reaching the definitive (solid and motionless) answer.

obliterating or neglecting the huge internal inequality; on the other hand, the kind of interpretation that neglects the potentialities traceable in the formative process of Brazil. In his words:

to point out exclusively the building of the perverse machine of social exclusion makes the scholar myopic towards the really creative forms of association developed in Brazilian historical process. At the same time, overvaluing these forms of proximity, considering them as uniquely positive in themselves, makes the researcher a hostage of the ideal image projected by the hegemonic sectors of society (Rocha, 2004, p.139).

As it is clear from the above, João Cezar de Castro Rocha is relying basically on the first lines of RB, in order to advance his considerations on the loss of the allegedly fruitful paradox. But, if one recalls what was said about the first two passages interpreted above - that is, that they expose at once a modernizing perspective and a critique of modernization -, it becomes necessary to question whether João Cezar's interpretation is not obliterating other dimensions of RB that would perhaps shed light on different aspects of the problematization at stake.

This is, indeed, Luiz Feldman's suggestion.<sup>617</sup> In Luiz's words, "[t]he well-succeeded 'transplantation' of the Iberian culture complements, rather than contradicts, the exile condition. The success of the transplantation is precisely the reason why the Brazilians that seek to nourish, in Brazilian soil, a stillbirth implantation are 'still exiles in their own land'" (Feldman, 2013, pp.133-4). So, to him, the exile is the outcome of a disenchantment towards tradition, most often expressed by those Brazilians taken by liberal-democratic principles: "the sentence on the exile contrasts the present vicissitude (uprooting) with the past success (rooting), and announces to the reader the dilemma of a scholarly [*bacharelesca*] political practice mismatched in relation to Iberian culture" (Feldman, 2013, p.133). Recalling that Sérgio's stance towards "tradition" in the first edition was more favorable and that his critique of liberalism in Brazil was harsher, it becomes plausible to interpret the exile as a trait of those elites - criticized throughout the

---

<sup>617</sup> I am profoundly indebted to Luiz Feldman's text and suggestions regarding the interpretation of RB.

text - that reject Brazilian tradition and reality in name of external models (this is in line with the "lamentable misunderstanding" of democracy identified in the 1936 text). Luiz Feldman claims, then, that there is no paradoxical situation in the first edition, but a complementary relation between the successful transplantation and the exile condition of those rejecting Brazilian reality and tradition (both being a successful outcome of the process of transplantation itself).

When the modifications to the third edition are considered, this scenario changes in important ways: "[t]he work 'implantation' refers to the presence of a foreign body, different than a 'transplantation' which implies an organic insertion. Furthermore, it is a matter of an 'attempt [at implantation]', which is largely downgraded in relation to the 1936 'well-succeeded effort'" (Feldman, 2013, p.135). Now, the exile is the outcome of a constant, but not yet fully and satisfactorily accomplished, implantation of the European culture linked to modernity. In his words, "the alignment between 'attempt at implantation' and 'exile' is decisive to the play of enunciation. Now, exile takes place precisely because the implantation of civility is, for the time being - the duration is indeterminable -, an attempt. The lack of paradoxes in the formulation of the opening paragraph does not reduce the interest of the book..., but increases it" (Feldman, 2013, pp.135-6).

The conclusions Luiz Feldman reaches are enabled by a careful comparative study of the editions of RB that does not lose sight from the combined effect of the modifications. In respect to the relation between tradition and modernization, Luiz Feldman claims that, in the 1936 text, it is expressed a "reluctance towards the perspectives of the implantation of modernization (to which it would be necessary at least a composition with the existing structures)", while, in the 1948 text, one gets "the necessity of some kind of rupture with the traditional to the implantation of the modern" (Feldman, 2013, p.123). Moreover, the second edition proposes democracy as a political solution, rather than personalism, as the first edition had done (see Feldman, 2013, p.129). In this sense, while in the first edition the Iberian heritage was "a firm obstacle to modernization, which imposed the necessity of a composition, if not an obstinate resistance from the traditional framework", after the modifications to both the second and the third editions, it is seen as "reconfigured... by an increasingly fast disaggregation" (Feldman, 2013, p.125). Through this reconfiguration, "[m]odernization points towards the consolidation of the public sphere, of depersonalization and of rationalization - different dimensions

of civility that do not manage, however, to project, in their antithetical relation with the constitutive elements of cordiality, some form of synthesis" (Feldman, 2013, p.125).<sup>618</sup> In this depiction, civility leads in a certain sense to a process of a "Westernization of Brazil", rather than the development of a specific culture, which means that "[p]rogress... became dependent upon the overcoming of the past and the implantation of the modern" (Feldman, 2013, p.129).

In relation to the combined effects of the modifications across the editions of RB, I would like to warn against the risk of ultimately inverting the valences of tradition and of modernization when later editions of RB are compared to the first one, making the former completely negative - implying, therefore, a pressing need of the eradication of tradition - and the latter completely positive - therefore pointing towards a supposedly desired Westernization of Brazil.<sup>619</sup>

It can be said that later editions of RB reconfigure the spatio-temporal frame of its interpretation of Brazil. In terms of the temporal dimension, the relation between an old order and a new order - where the former is defined by a lack of a broader solidarity due to the prevalence of personalism and the latter points to the possibility of expanding this solidarity beyond family relationships and friendships towards a national basis - is depicted as two worlds and mentalities in conflict, that is, the traditional and the modernizing. In terms of the spatial dimension, internal disparities in Brazil come to the fore, particularly in relation to the persistent exclusion of the masses from a protagonist role in the formation of the country. Later editions, then, associate the presence of this old order and this internal disparity to the resistance posed by the inheritances inscribed in the formative process of Brazil. All that leads to a modernizing narrative. "Modernizing" in two senses: on the one hand, it interprets the formative process as a modernizing process (although one in which the old and the new coexist) and, on the other hand, it defends a certain modernization to come.

---

<sup>618</sup> Previously, Luiz argues that in later editions "a pragmatic resignation towards cordiality gives space to a promise of civility, approached with skepticism" (Feldman, 2013, p.120).

<sup>619</sup> In fact, it seems that Luiz Feldman's text itself opens up the possibility of a different interpretation. For instance, if he claims at some point, as quoted above, that, after the modifications of RB, "[p]rogress... became dependent upon the overcoming of the past and the implantation of the modern" and that personalism is replaced by democracy, he also states that the 1948 text expresses "the necessity of some kind of rupture with the traditional to the implantation of the modern". In a way, I am exploring what this "some kind of rupture" implies in RB.

But this is one side of the story. This modernizing perspective does not represent an unequivocal endorsement of a universal linear historical development, according to which the future would eliminate the past through the importation of a foreign model to deal with the problems of internal reality. In this sense, RB is also a critique of the modernizing perspective that attempts to reproduce a fixed and foreign model in Brazil, aiming at the complete elimination of the past.

The second passage I want to recapture expresses what I am proposing here. It talks about the relation between natural order and state order, and about the relation between preexisting forms (such as liberalism) and Brazilian reality. It is the last paragraph of RB:

*The essence of all manifestations, of all the original creations as well as all the fabricated things, is the form. The complete realization of a society also depends on its form. If, in the political and social sphere, liberalism revealed itself to be, among us, destructive of the preexisting forms rather than creative of new ones; if it was, above all, a useless and costly excrescence [superfetação], it will not be through the experimentation of other ingenious elaborations that we will encounter someday our reality. We can try to organize our disorder following wise schemes of proven virtue, but a world of more intimate essences will continue to exist, remaining always intact, irreducible and disdainful of human inventions. To wish to ignore this world will be to renounce our own spontaneous rhythm, the law of ebb and flow, in favor of a mechanical beat and false harmony. We have already seen that the State, a spiritual creation, is opposed to and transcends natural order. But it is also true that this opposition must be resolved through counterpoint, if the social framework is to be internally coherent. There is only one possible economy, superior to our calculations and imaginations for making a perfect whole out of such antagonistic parts. The spirit is not a normative force, except where it can serve social life and where it corresponds to it. The exterior [higher, RB2 and RB3] forms of society must*

be like a congenital contour to, and inseparable from, society: they continually emerge from its specific necessities, and never from capricious choices. There is, however, a perfidious and pretentious demon that is busy obscuring these simple truths from our eyes. Inspired by this demon, men see themselves as different from how they are and create new likes and dislikes. Only rarely do they choose good ones (RB1, pp.160-1).<sup>620</sup>

To recall, later editions suppress the beginning of the paragraph quoted above and modifies the assessment of liberalism in Brazil:

If, in the political and social sphere, *the principles of liberalism have been* a useless and costly excrescence [*superfetação*], it will not be through the experimentation of other ingenious elaborations that we will encounter someday our reality. We can try... (RB2, pp.278-9; RB3, pp.284-5).

The passage above concludes the last chapter of RB, "Our Revolution", which is the main source for Antonio Candido's interpretation of the text as a progressist and radically democrat text defending the eradication of the past (that is, of the Iberian and Portuguese roots of Brazil). I have already commented above the implications of the erasure of the first lines. Here I want to insist on other aspects.

The relation established in the passage between transcendence and counterpoint seems crucial. I have showed that, to Sérgio, the creation of the state requires the consolidation of broader bonds of solidarity that are opposed to those linked to family and friends - "[t]here is no gradation between the family circle and the State, but rather a discontinuity and even an opposition... The family order, in its pure form, is abolished through a transcendence" (RB1, pp.93-4; RB2, pp.203-4; RB3, pp.199-200). The notion of transcendence comes back in the passage quoted above: the creation of the state requires the transcendence of the natural order. Moreover, it is worth remembering that the bonds of solidarity related to family and friends (those, therefore, that are opposed to the creation of the state)

---

<sup>620</sup> The first occurrence of "form" is in italics in the original. "And imaginations" is suppressed from later editions.

rely on personalism - and, in later editions, one reads that "in a society as clearly personalistic in its origins as ours, it is understandable that the simple person-to-person links, independent and even exclusive of any tendency toward authentic cooperation among individuals, have almost always been the most decisive ones" (RB2, p.68; RB3, pp.66-7). The combined effect of these statements points to a desirable Brazilian revolution characterized by "the slow but irrevocable dissolution of the archaic reminiscences that our status as an independent country has not yet eradicated... only through such a process that we will finally revoke the old colonial and patriarchal order, with all the moral, social and political consequences it implied and continues to imply" (RB2, pp.269-70; RB3, p.265). Hence, it is no doubt tempting to conclude that the progressist and radical democrat position exposed in later editions of RB is inseparable from the desire of that vertical revolution as defined above.

Nevertheless, the traces of this political position get more complex if, resorting again to the passage quoted above, one recalls that there is "a world of more intimate essences" - "always intact, irreducible and disdainful of human inventions" - that must not be ignored, otherwise "our own spontaneous rhythm" would be renounced.<sup>621</sup> Because of that, the opposition of the state, as a spiritual creation, to the natural order "must be resolved through counterpoint, if the social framework is to be internally coherent", since the state, to be "a normative force", must "serve" and "correspond to social life". As João Kennedy Eugênio puts, the notion of "counterpoint" is Sérgio's way of incorporating the oppositions without reducing them to an either/or logic, that is,

either the erasure of the past or its idealization. The counterpoint contains the possibility of encompassing the antitheses... that have marked the intellectual debate and the political practice in Brazil and in Europe in a complex arrangement, that would enshrine the singular voices and

---

<sup>621</sup> Pedro Meira Monteiro notes that this "world of more intimate essences" cannot be ignored in favor of an exclusive focus on the "revolution": "[t]he implicit teleology in an inexorable 'revolution' is a possible reading, but perhaps mistaken. It is true that a subterranean revolution erode the rural anchor that enables the existence of the cordial man, but it is not less true that the 'world of more intimate essences' remains, disturbing, despite each and every capricious solution in the political sphere or even in the interpretative sphere" (Monteiro, 2008b, p.356; see also Monteiro, 2009, pp.174-5).



would engage them with one another (Eugênio, 2010, pp.109-10).

It is important to have always in mind that RB proposes no political program to Brazil and that this engagement of singular voices with one another does not seem to be, in my view, a path leading to a cosmopolitan modernity. So, instead of "a supposed openness to the new, or to the entirely new", this programmatic irresolution is rather the expression of some conservation before modernity (see Monteiro, 2008b, p.355; and Feldman, 2015).<sup>622</sup> Despite being aware that the use of "conservation", without extensive qualifications, can provoke serious misunderstandings (as serious as the misunderstanding RB stresses in relation to democracy in Brazil), it is crucial to insist that RB (in all editions) does express some reluctance before modern times, especially in relation to their implantation in Brazil. Suffice to remind his critique against a certain "we" in Brazil that, by modeling "our" conduct among nations following what "the most cultivated

---

<sup>622</sup> Pedro Meira Monteiro specifies that this conservation, or conservatism (*conservantismo*), should not be confounded with conservatism (*conservadorismo*) (see Monteiro, 2008b, p.355). Luiz Feldman (2015a) has recently used the expression "conservative radical" (*conservador radical*) to interpret Sérgio's position in RB. It would be interesting to advance a comparative account on Pedro Meira Monteiro's (2008b, 2012a), João Kennedy Eugênio's (2010), Leopoldo Waizbort's (2011) and Luiz Feldman's (2013, 2015a) interpretations regarding Sérgio's political position through the editions of RB, that is, the emergence of a democratic position that will be expressed in the modifications of the text. As this is not my purpose here, let me just position myself in this aspect: it should be already clear by now that I endorse the claim that later editions expose a different political position. Nevertheless, I think that Leopoldo's position seems to isolate only one dimension of the problem, relegating other relevant aspects; to Leopoldo, Pedro Meira Monteiro (2008b) is aware that the textual alterations, however complex, work towards the shading of political foundations and diagnosis of Brazilian reality previously exposed (in the first edition). However, Pedro, according to Leopoldo, indicated the problem in a "reluctant way"; to the latter, "the main aspect of the alterations is not a historical deepening or the evidence of a historian's work..., but indeed the political problem. The historical deepening is functional in the shading of the political dimension, as well as the discourse on the conversion into a historian is functional in the shading of the political problem" (Waizbort, 2011, p.59, n.21). Leopoldo's statement is, in my view, somehow reductionist in respect to the aspects permeating the alterations of the text to later editions, running the risk of implying that they were simply an outcome of a different political stance, all the other dimensions being secondary and even functional derivations of the former. In this sense, I think that Pedro's "reluctance" is more fruitful in order to explore all the possible dimensions (and their interrelations) of the comparative study of the editions of RB. Maybe the difference between Leopoldo's and Pedro's interpretations is that the latter, as well as João Kennedy's, pays much more attention to the "modernist" traces in RB, while the former is focused almost exclusively in the presence of a conservativist thinking in the text. In any case, the site in-between radicalism and conservatism, as Luiz Feldman has pointed out, and the "modernist" traces, as Pedro Meira Monteiro and João Kennedy Eugênio have stressed, are crucial elements of RB as an interpretation of contemporary Brazil.

countries follow or seem to follow", ultimately reject "any social spontaneity" (RB1, p.144; RB2, p.265; RB3, p.260).<sup>623</sup>

If I may appropriate Roberto Vecchi's words, all the above "marks a specific peculiarity, which is modernity reinterpreted within the frenetic flow of modernization not from the opposite side of the Old World, but from the other side, that is, from the peripheral, post-colonial side" (Vecchi, 2008, p.380).<sup>624</sup> Hence, "transcendence", "revolution" and "counterpoint" are inseparable from the spatio-temporal articulations permeating RB. The conservation before modernity is not conceived as a motionless resistance against any implantation of foreign elements: the "forms of society" must "continually emerge from the specific necessities" of society itself.<sup>625</sup> Or, in other words, the future revolutionary resolution of transcendence through counterpoint fosters the continuous play of identifications and differentiations articulating past, present and future, as well as of inside and outside, in the formation of contemporary Brazil.

Here, however, I encounter the limits of my interpretation. While later editions of RB provide reasonably well-defined representations of modernity - linked to civility and its social and political dimensions of rationalization and impersonalization - and of personalism - linked to family relations and friendships as the possible bonds of solidarity -, it is not clear what could arise from the vertical revolution operated through counterpoint. It is true that later editions expose a political position that desires the adjustment of democratic ideals to Brazilian conditions. But, if statements such as "it is undeniable that, in our political life, personalism can be in many cases a positive force" and "the good principles are not created by simple cordiality" represent, on the one hand, a downgrade of the positive evaluation of tradition, on the other hand they do not express any complete

---

<sup>623</sup> I know a touch upon an intellectually, politically complex problem by emphasizing Sérgio's considerations on "social spontaneity" or "spontaneous rhythm" and it hardly seems a very responsible position to simply mention my awareness of that. In any case, for the time being and for the scope of this text, this is my dangerous-but-livable boundary.

<sup>624</sup> Roberto Vecchi's discussion of this paragraph is focused on the musical metaphors it brings: spontaneous rhythm, false harmony, counterpoint (see Vecchi, 2008, pp.377-81; see also Vecchi, 2005, pp.177-82).

<sup>625</sup> I am indebted here to Pedro Meira Monteiro's account: "[i]n defense of Sérgio Buarque, one should remind that these 'higher forms of society' are not conceived as an 'order' that is finally attained and revealed. To the contrary, still in the spirit of the young modernist, such forms 'continually emerge from its specific necessities, and never from capricious choices'. There is something alive and restless in these never-sufficiently-explained 'specific necessities'" (Monteiro, 2009, p.178).

rejection of either personalism or cordiality. Ultimately, the role they should perform in the so-called vertical revolution remains indecisive, and, in the case of cordiality, Brazil remains providing a potential contribution to civilization.

The political position exposed in later editions of RB is, indeed, a progressist and radically democratic one. But its potential relies not in any unequivocal definition of how Brazil must be in the future, but, to the contrary, in its unceasing openness to that play mentioned above. In RB, Brazil becomes a place from which modernization must be both endorsed and criticized. Its weakness is its strength.

*We need to discover Brazil!  
Hidden behind the forests  
with the water of the rivers in-between,  
Brazil is sleeping, poor Brazil.  
We need to colonize Brazil.*

*What we will do by importing French women  
very blond, soft skin,  
fat German women, nostalgic Russian ones to be  
waitresses in the night restaurants.*

*And most-faithful Syrian women will come.  
We should not despise the Japanese.*

*We need to educate Brazil.  
We will purchase professors and books,  
assimilate fine cultures,  
open dancings and subsidize the elites.*

*Each Brazilian will have a home  
with electric oven and heat, swimming pool,  
room for scientific conferences.  
And we will take care of the Technical State.*

*We need to praise Brazil.  
It is not only a country as no other.  
Our revolutions are much bigger  
than any other; our errors, too.  
And what about our virtues? The land of sublime passions...  
the unspeakable Amazons... the unbelievable João-Pessoas...*

*We need to adore Brazil.  
Although it is hard to fit so much ocean and so much loneliness  
in the poor heart already full of compromises...  
although it is hard to comprehend what those men want,  
why have they gathered themselves and the reason of their sufferings.*

*We need, we need to forget Brazil!  
So majestic, so unlimited, so disproportionate,  
it wants to rest from our terrible affections [carinhos].  
Brazil does not want us. It is sick of us!  
Our Brazil is in the otherworld. This is not Brazil.  
No Brazil exists. And, by chance, would Brazilians exist?*

**Carlos Drummond de Andrade, Hino Nacional** [National Anthem]