Part II

4. Tropical (De)Formations

Gilberto Freyre (1900-1987) wrote *Casa Grande & Senzala* (The Big House & the Slave Quarters), *Sobrados e Mucambos* (The Mansions and the Shanties)[91] and *Ordem e Progresso* (Order and Progress) as part of an "introduction to the history of the patriarchal society in Brazil".[92] In the preface to the first English edition of *The Big House & the Slave Quarters,* Gilberto said that this was the first essay in a series "in which I have undertaken to study the *formation* and disintegration of patriarchal society in Brazil, a society that grew up around the first sugar-mills or sugar plantations established by the Europeans in our country, in the sixteenth century" (Freyre, 1986, p.xi, italics added). The subtitles of each of these texts point to their main concerns: the first one is subtitled "formation of the Brazilian family under the patriarchal economy"; the second, "decay of the rural patriarchate and development of the urban"; finally, the third one, "disintegration process of the patriarchal and semi-patriarchal societies in Brazil under the free labor regime: aspects of almost half a century of transition from the slave labor to the free labor; and from the Monarchy to the Republic".[93]

Casa Grande & Senzala (The Big Houses & the Slave Quarters, henceforth CGS),[94] published in 1933, is defined as "an essay of genetic sociology and social history, aiming at fixing and sometimes interpreting some of the most significant

[91] *Sobrados e Mucambos* was translated into English as *The Mansion and the Shanties: The Making of Modern Brazil* (translated by Harriet de Onis, published by University of California Press, 1987).
[92] To this English edition, the title was translated as *The Masters and the Slaves: A Study in the Development of Brazilian Civilization*. I have consulted this translation as a support for specific terms of the Portuguese edition used here.
[93] In 1971, these three texts were published together in English as a three-volume text entitled *The History of Brazil* (London: Secker & Warburg, distributed by the Oxford University Press). Gilberto had said that these three texts would be followed by a fourth volume entitled *Jazigos e Covas Rasas: Sepultamento e Celebração dos Mortos no Brasil Patriarcal e Semipatriarcal* (Tombstones and Shallow Holes: Burial and Celebration of the Dead in Patriarchal and Semi-patriarchal Brazil) and three other volumes containing manuscripts, documents, images and references. The fourth and subsequent volumes were not concluded. I should note that three texts were not conceived already in 1933 as part of a single sequence; according to Elide Rugai Bastos (2012) it was only in 1959, when Gilberto published *Order and Progress*, that these texts were considered as an ensemble (ver Bastos, 2012, p.81).
[94] In 2013, the 52nd edtion of CGS was published. The data on the editions of the text selected were search mainly in the website of *Fundacão Biblioteca Nacional* (https://www.bn.br/busca-acervo/tipo-acervo).

aspects of the *formation* of the Brazilian family" (CGS, p.50, italics added). Gilberto highlights that miscegenation is the problem that disturbs him the most (see CGS, p.31). To tackle this question, he says it is necessary to understand the difference between race and culture: "In Brazil, the relations between white people and the colored races were, since the first half of the sixteenth century, conditioned on the one hand by the economic production system - the monoculture in big land proprieties [monoculture in large estates, *monocultura latifundiária*] -; on the other hand, by the shortage of white women among the conquerors" (CGS, p.32). [95] This shortage was a decisive variable in the reduction of the social distance between the big house and the slave quarters, since the conquerors have sought in the Indian (*índias*) and black women the satisfaction of their sexual desires. Not free of violence, this miscegenation is one of the constitutive traces not only of the possibility of upward mobility by the "inferiors", but also of the family itself. The family is, indeed, the colonizing unit in Brazil, since the Portuguese colonization was initially basically conducted by the private initiative, and not by the state, according to Gilberto.

Similarly to the English colony in other parts of the Americas, but very different from the Spanish and French colonies, family was the center here, in detriment to the individual, the state and the church.[96] The patriarchalism of the Portuguese colonization in Brazil is represented by the big houses and is defined by Gilberto as "a system of plastic contemporization between two tendencies": first, the imperialist imposition of the advanced race on the backward race, "an imposition of European forms (already modified by the Asian and African experiences of the colonizer) on the tropical environment", second, the

[95] He says: "in this criterion of fundamental differentiation [between race and culture]... lies all the plan of this essay" (CGS, p.32). Examining the notion of race in CGS, Ricardo Benzaquen de Araújo (2005 [1994]) stated that Gilberto works with a "neoLamarckian" definition of race which conserves a "racial logic" in many moments of the text. Although I am profoundly indebted to Araújo's interpreation, I will tackle the use of the concept of "formation" by Gilberto from a different, but not opposing, angle.

[96] In the preface written in 1961 to the third edition of *Sobrados e Mucambos* [The Mansions and the Shanties, henceforth SM], Gilberto says that Brazil formed "a civilization in which the sociologically Christian-centered Family was the *civilizing unit*, the main economic factor, the base of an expansion that the state only sanctioned or confirmed" (SM, p.xxxiii. italics added); elsewhere in the same preface, he says that this family was "civilized and civilizing" (SM, p.xxxiv). This reinforces how the formation of the Brazilian family is, to him, a process at once of colonization and civilization. Later I will note that this similarity with the other English colonies does not mean that Brazil is not also different from them, that is, singular.

"condescension with the new conditions of life and environment" (CGS, p.35).[97] Imposition and condescension former the spectrum that constituted the complex big-house-&-slave-quarters through which the colonizer and the tropical conditions of the colony influenced each other. The Portuguese imprinted their plasticity in colonization and demonstrated what I would be inclined to name as a double-personality: "The terrible enslaver... was, on the other side, the European colonizer that better fraternized with the so-called inferior races" (CGS, p.265).[98] In-between Europe and Africa, Portugal was defined by its "bi-continentality", its "ethnical and cultural indecision" (CGS, p.67);[99] its "cosmopolitanism" (CGS, p.276).[100] The Portuguese colonizer had neither absolute ideals nor inflexible prejudices, which enabled a colonization that, besides being based on slavery, was also hybrid, tropicalized: "Brazilian society is, among all of the American societies, the one that came to be most harmoniously constituted in relation to racial relations" (CGS, p.160).[101]

---

[97] Gilberto, in a comparative tone once again, says that "intercourse [*cruzamento*]" and "miscegenation" are a "tendency that seems to derive from social plasticity, greater in the Portuguese than in any other European colonizer" (CGS, p.265) And, later: "The almost permanent state of war that Portugal lived in, for a long a time, situated between Africa and Europe, provided it with a volcanic social constitution that is reflected in the hot and plastic aspects of its national character, of its classes and institutions, never rigidified nor definitely stratified" (CGS, p.278). In this second citation, it seems plausible to interpret the use "volcanic" as a way to reinforce the location of plasticity as a constitutive feature of social, political and sexual relations. It also highlights the potential social mobility that characterizes the Portuguese and that would be transmitted through colonization; in this sense, Gilberto points out that "in none of the modern countries, the mobility from one social class to another and, so to speak, from one race to another has been greater than in Portugal" (CGS, p.286).

[98] Jessé Souza (2003a) argues, in turn, that this plasticity is what enables the Portuguese to transform himself through the contact with other cultures, while also remaining essentially the same plastic people; in other words, "[t]he Portuguese is himself and the other at the same time" (Souza, 2003, p.108). According to Jessé this plasticity is the base of an "ideological trans-valorization" Gilberto puts in place in CGS and that will be present in his later works on "Luso-tropicology" (see Souza, 2003, p.108). It is not my purpose here to discuss Jessé's perspective; suffice to say that I agree with his interpretation that the Portuguese, in Gilberto's text, is defined by this antagonism , but I do not endorse the view that Gilberto's use of plasticity is exclusively "ideological" as opposed to "scientific".

[99] The sexist analogies pervasive in Gilberto's text gain here another instance: to him, this bi-continentality in a population corresponds to the bisexuality in the individual (see CGS, p.67).

[100] Concerning the latter, Gilberto says: "And there is no social antecedent to be considered more important in the Portuguese colonizer than his extraordinary richness and variety of ethnic and cultural antagonisms; than his cosmopolitanism" (CGS, p.276). Ricardo Benzaquen de Araújo (2005 [1994]; 2003) notes that, according to Gilberto in CGS, even before coming to the New World, the Portuguese were already "impure" or hybrid; these hybrid people always conserves the traces of those races that have come together, not synthetically, to form them.

[101] Even in relation to slavery, Gilberto says that it would seem "unfair" to accuse the Portuguese of cruelty in this aspect, since, in the case of Brazil, "[t]he environment and the circumstances required the slave" (CGS, p.322). Regarding the Catholic priests and missionaries, Gilberto stipulates that, from the Church point of view, they demonstrated "heroism" and "faithfulness towards their principles", while, from an alternative point of view, theirs was a "deleterious influence", to the same

The complex big-houses--&-slave-quarters is the core of patriarchal and religious cohesion, "footholds to the national organization" (CGS, p.36). Patriarchalism in Brazil has always enabled an intimate, personal relations with the saints (see CGS, pp.38-9), since the Church that operates in Brazilian formation is the one situated under the patriarchal systemic order (see CGS, p.271), shaping Christian values in a much less "clerical", "ascetic" or "orthodox" way than in the Calvinist or the rigidly Catholic versions (see CGS, p.438).[102] In addition to that, it is to that systemic order that one must look, in order to grasp the influence of the blacks upon the social and economic formation of Brazil, and upon the intimate life of Brazilians. In other words, it is the slave, and not the black him/herself that acts; it is the slave (mainly the women enslaved) that is absorbed by the dominant religion and by the domestic life of the big houses.[103]

The systemic operation is a crucial aspect to Gilberto's interpretation. I want to point out, however, a qualification in this respect. Gilberto is quite unhesitating: "it is an absurd to make the black or the Indian responsible for the work that was not theirs, but of the social and economic system, within which they functioned passively and mechanically" (CGS, p.399). At the same time, when it comes to the Portuguese, the systemic approach seems to gain a certain nuance. It is the case, no doubt, that the patriarch corresponds to a systemic position, as well as the slave; it is also the case that the Indians and the Africans also bring their inherent dispositions to the way the system operates.[104] Nevertheless, it is not the case that

extent of the settlers' influence (see CGS, pp.178-9). According to Gilberto, the Jesuit missions played a major role precluding the Portuguese from maintaining with the natives the same kind of harsh and pernicious treatment observed among the English Protestants (see CGS, p.217); the monoculture, mainly the dedicated to sugar, completely uprooted the natives from their environment - "sugar killed the native" (CGS, p.229) -, and the missionaries saved them, by isolating them in villages.

[102] In *The Mansions and Shanties*, Gilberto says that although Catholicism was a powerful element in Brazilian integration, it was different from the European one: it "has became kind of brownish and *mulato* [*como que se amorenou e se amulatou*]; the saints were given by the men on earth [*homens da terra*] a warmer color or a color closer to the flesh color than to the European color. [Catholicism] has been adapted, therefore, to our conditions of tropical life and of people with hybrid *formation*" (SM, p.652, italics added).

[103] In Gilberto's words: "It is impossible to separate the black introduced in Brazil from its enslaved condition" (CGS, p.398). In *The Mansions and the Shanties*, Gilberto reinforces the notion that the blacks and also the women must be seen as parts of a system, and not in terms of racial or sexual inferiority (see, for example, SM, p.106).

[104] For example, opposing himself to the interpretations that the colonizers' resorted to the African slave as a consequence of the natives brave resistance against colonization, Gilberto says: "[The replacement of the natives by the blacks]... did not occur due to the moral reasons that the Indianphile [*indianófilos* are those strongly inclined to praise the Indians] allege with such delightfulness" (CGS, p.322); the Indian were simply inferior to the blacks, culturally speaking, therefore inapt to the

the Portuguese is a "passive" and "mechanic" component in this system; ultimately, the balance of antagonisms that constitutes the core of its functioning is intrinsic to the dispositions the Portuguese have acquired before arriving at the "New World". His contemporizing behavior is not dependent upon the system of which he is part, even if the actual product of this contemporization cannot be understood apart from this system. In other words, he occupies a position in a system that would not unfold the way it does had it not emerged from a Portuguese - and no other - colonization. The Portuguese seems to be *inside and outside* the patriarchal system in Gilberto's interpretation

The scope of this economic, social and political system is multidimensional. It is a system: of production, of labor, of transport, of religion, of sexual and familial life, of body and household hygiene, and of politics. The master (*senhor de engenho*) was the "owner of Brazil" (CGS, p.38), superseding the vice-kings nominated by the metropolitan administration and the bishops, as well as subordinating the slaves. To put it differently, the familial organization was above the Portuguese state and the (Catholic) church, and also conditioned the abused lives of the black-as-slave. Within this configuration, Gilberto judges that "around the masters it was created the most stable civilization in the Hispanic America" (CGS, p.43), the big houses being the site where the "Brazilian character [and] our social continuity" were best expressed "down to this day" (CGS, p.45). The indecisive condition of the Portuguese turned him[105] predisposed to life in the tropics, arranging the "very special character that made the colonization in Brazil, the *sui generis formation* of Brazilian society, equally balanced on its antagonisms, *in its beginnings and still today*" (CGS, p.69, italics added). This greater

sedentary labor required to the agricultural stability; they remain "[f]lattened in their cultural inferiority. Useless and incapable within the colonizing system that would create Brazilian economy" (CGS, p.342). In chapter IV, Gilberto attributes to the blacks some of the same traces previously used to define the Portuguese; for example, the blacks "are predisposed, biologically and psychically, to life in the tropics" (CGS, p.370), they are "plastic", "adaptable" (CGS, p.371). Without denying the importance of these psychic and biological traces, however, he puts into relief that they should not be seen as absolute criteria to understand why they have been massively enslaved, as opposed to the Amerindians, since it is also crucial to observe the Amerindians "social and technical" (CGS, p.371) incapacity to the regular agricultural labor, mainly because of their nomadism. Overall, the hierarchy identified by Gilberto, in-between the racial and the systemic criterion, puts, at the bottom, the natives and, at the top, the Portuguese, the blacks being in the middle.

[105] Not "her", as there was a shortage of Portuguese women and the colonization was majorly a white men enterprise. And, even more precisely: in case a woman ended up assuming the power in a family, she would occupy the systemic position of the patriarch. There was no matriarchalism in Brazil, according to Gilberto.

civilizational stability, according to Gilberto, led the Portuguese to be successful before the other Europeans: "the *first modern society constituted in the tropics* with national characteristics and qualities of permanence is a Portuguese *formation*" (CGS, p.73, italics added). More than that, Brazil was the "greatest *modern civilization* in the tropics" (CGS, p.267, italics added).

This Portuguese way of intermingling and reducing the distance from the tropical life was conveyed to the *bandeirante*[106] - most of them, according to Gilberto, a miscegenation between whites and Indians - that would, then, become himself "the founder of subcolonies" - "with the *bandeirante*, Brazil is self-colonized" (CGS, p.88-9).[107] The *bandeirantes'* nomadism is contrasted by the masters' stability in the big houses, who represented, "in Brazilian *formation*, the most characteristically Portuguese tendency" (CGS, p.42), a patriarchal stability. This regional differentiation between the Brazil of the big houses (coast) and the Brazil of the *bandeirantes* (interior) coexist with another one. *Bandeirantes*' expansionism to the west of the territory threatened the political unity of Brazil, but was firmly opposed - fortunately, according to Gilberto - by "almost equally aggressive forces that neutralized or at least attenuated them [that is, the impulses of dispersion and the corresponding dangers of separatism and differentiation coming from this expansionism]" (CGS, p.89). Colonization in Brazil enabled regional differences, but never succumbing to separatism.[108]

Gilberto contrasts the singularity of the colonization in Brazil to other ones: "the Portuguese bring to Brazil neither political separatisms, like the Spanish to their American dominium, nor religious divergences, like the English and the

[106] *Bandeirantes* were people composing the *bandeiras*, armed expeditions that searched for gold, silver and wealth in general in the interior or backlands. The *bandeirantes* sometimes also sold *Indians* to be enslaved and destroied *quilombos*, sites where black slaves took refuge.

[107] In SM, Gilberto says the "Brazilian formation" occurs through "the expansion, in America, of Portugal, first, and then of Brazil itself, in this case mainly through the efforts of the *Bandeirante*" (p.lix).

[108] Gilberto notes that the big houses, despite often associated with the sugar cane production in the Northern half of Brazilian territory, were not exclusively linked to sugar, but, more generally, to the monoculture in large estates and based on slavery; this arrangement could also be observed in the cultivation of coffee in the Southern half of Brazil. By stating that, Gilberto is claiming that his interpretation of Brazil is not valid only to a certain part of the country, but to Brazil as whole. In his words, "[the] social history of the big house is the intimate history of almost every Brazilian" (CGS, p.44); in the preface written in 1961 to the third edition of *The Mansion and the Shanties*, Gilberto reinforces that the "familial [patriarchal] constant" has almost always remained in Brazil as a whole, coexisting with significant regional differences; in the introduction to the second edition, he had already stressed the same point regarding the generalized character of the patriarchal system (see SM, for example, p.lxxx and the following).

French to their colonies" (CGS, p.90). Portuguese Catholicism fostered an indifference in relation to race and an openness to foreigners, provided that they were also Catholics.[109] Gilberto praises once more the Portuguese "dispositions of fraternization", compared to what the "people of Anglo-Saxon origin" (CGS, p.89) have supposedly been revealing since their kind of colonization was established. Earlier in the text, he had compared the huge difficulties regarding the tropical environment the Portuguese have met in Brazil with the favorable conditions met by the colonizers of the territory that would become the "formidable civilization of the United States" (CGS, p.78), in order to stress the Portuguese achievements in the Americas. He had also said that the study of the Brazilian patriarchal society and slave economy must take into account the comparable situation of the slavery in the "deep south" of the United States.

Ricardo Benzaquen de Araújo (2005 [1994]) stresses that CGS is "all permeated by a *negative* and rarely-explicitly-stated reference to *Puritanism*; a reference that works as if it was a sort of thread, almost invisible, that seeks to sew practically all the parts of the author's reasoning, without its presence being too much vaunted" (p.95). The reference to the "deep south" of the United States approximates Brazil to this region, at the same time that distances the former from the North of the United States, characteristically Puritan and bourgeois. The comparative tone becomes "an absolutely inspiring example to the whole analysis of CGS, but working in reverse" (p.97). Jessé Souza (2000b) notes, however, that the similarity between Brazil and the "deep south" does not exclude differences in Gilberto's comparison: in Brazil, slavery was, after all, less violent than any other one in the world.[110] In other words, the balance of antagonisms that constitute the *singularity* of Brazil is identified also by a comparison with both what is its similar

[109] According to Gilberto, Catholicism formed a solidarity in Brazil, keeping the country apart from other European religious confessions and being the "actual cement of our unity" (CGS, p.92).

[110]Jessé Souza (2000b; 2003a, especially part II, pp.109-21) highlights that, to Gilberto, this difference is due to the Oriental influences the Portuguese had already had even before going to the New World. Jessé develops this argument in detail, contrasting his interpretation with Ricardo Benzaquen's (2005 [1994]); for my purpose here, suffice to say, following Jessé, that, although the "deep south" works, indeed, as a similar place in Gilberto's comparison, it is also different from Brazil, since the Portuguese colonization was different than the English one, therefore the formation of Brazil expresses elements that were not found in the "deep south". Gilberto's words in CGS: "[the 'deep south' is a region where] the economic patriarchal regime has created *almost* the same kind of aristocracy and big house, *almost* the same kind of slaveery and slave quarters, as those of the Northern Brazil and of certain parts of the Southern Brazil" (Freyre *apud* Araújo, 2005 [1994], p.96, italics added).

and different arrangement (the "deep south" of the United States) and with what is its reverse arrangement (the Puritan, bourgeois North of the United States).

Another instance of this balance refers to a linguistic sphere. According to Gilberto, one of the most fascinating dynamics emerging from the encounter between the master and the slave refers to the softening of the Portuguese language. Another Portuguese language was created - a Brazilian language: "Black mothers and slave girls, together with the boys, the girls and the young white ladies of the big houses , created a Portuguese different from the stiff and grammatical one that the Jesuits have tried to teach to the Indian and semi-white boys in their schools and the Portuguese of the Kingdom that priests in vain dreamed of conserving in Brazil" (CGS, p.415). This has grown the disparity between the written and the spoken languages; the former refused the contact with the latter, "the popular one" (CGS, p.415). Herein lies another encounter between two opposing tendencies and another peculiarity of Brazil: "our national language resulted from the interpenetration" (CGS, p.417) of the most spontaneous one, spoken in the slave quarters, and the formal one, taught in the schools. Brazilian Portuguese was enriched through this balance of antagonisms that formed the national language by deforming the colonizers'. [111]

Gilberto is much more pessimistic, however, regarding the perverse implications of the practice of monoculture to the physical development and the economic efficiency of the Brazilian people. Apart from the individuals situated in the social extremes (the whites of the big houses and the slaves), the colonizer's eating habits were so poor that their nourishment was impaired. On the one hand, the massive prevalence of monoculture in the coast and the disconnected cattle raising in the interior precluded any variety of food production; on the other hand,

[111] Following the topic of this linguistic dynamics, Gilberto puts into relief the example of the use made in Brazil of the pronouns. While the Portuguese admits only the imperative way of placing the pronouns (the examples given are "*diga-me, faça-me, espere-me*"), in Brazil another one was created ("*me diga, me faça, me espere*") - "entirely new and characteristically Brazilian" (CGS, p.418). These two modalities of the use of pronouns express salient features of the country's patriarchal formation; the imperative way is associated with ceremonial and command tones, while the other use has been linked to situations of intimacy and supplication. The example of this use of pronouns is considered by Gilberto to reinforce the coexistence of "two fraternizing halves [*metades confraternizantes*]" that constitute Brazilians: "The strength, or rather, the potentiality of Brazilian culture seems to me to lie entirely in the richness of balanced antagonisms" (CGS, p.418). It is less relevant for me here to discuss whether the Portuguese language spoken in Portugal ignores, indeed, this softened version of the Brazilian language; the point is to highlight the role played by this claim (concerning the creation of a Brazilian way of speaking Portuguese) in Gilberto's interpretation.

the former provided a stable social arrangement. The great proprieties and the slavery regime were, at once, what made possible country's stability and what perverted the health of part of its own people: the antagonism operated, at once, in the benefit of some aspects and in detriment to others.[112]

A further instance of these antagonisms was, as said above, the miscegenation, without which the monoculture in large estates would not be counterbalanced, creating two very distant extremes (the masters and the slaves) in Brazilian society. If, however, on the one hand, miscegenation is responsible for the reduction of distances, on the other hand, it brings about physical and cultural violence to colonial relations, as well as the spread of syphilis: "they [miscegenation and syphilis] started together, one *forming* Brazilian people - perhaps the ideal type of modern man to the tropics, European with black or Indian blood to stir his energy up -; the other one, *deforming* him" (CGS, p.110, italics added).[113] Brazilian peculiarity is that this modern man in the tropics was syphilized before he was civilized, with more unfavorable conditions to women (Indian or black) and also to little boys, when submitted to the master. According to Gilberto, the sadism of the master to the slave, of the conqueror to the conquered and of the man to the woman was complemented by the masochism of the weaker side. All this was part neither of intrinsic racial attributes of the black, the Portuguese or the Indian, nor of determinant climatic tropical conditions, but it was a dynamic of the slavery system itself. More precisely, the aristocratization linked to the monoculture was balanced by the democratization linked to miscegenation (see CGS, p.33).

He notes that every encounter between a superior race and an inferior one provides the same result: "extermination or degradation". (CGS, p.178).[114] In

[112] In *The Mansions and the Shanties*, Gilberto repeats that the slave was the best nourished in Brazilian patriarchal society (see SM, pp.283-4).

[113] Elsewhere in the text: "Syphilis has always done what it wanted in the patriarchal Brazil. It killed, blinded, deformed freely [*à vontade*]" (CGS, p.401). Ricardo Benzaquen de Araújo (2005 [1994]) goes exactly to the point I am making here, that is, that Gilberto's interpretation of colonization in CGS is not exclusively positive: "we can realize that, despite miscegenation, tolerance, and flexibility, hell seems to live together pretty well with paradise in our colonial experience" (p.46).

[114] Gilberto says that the "European intrusion" disorganized the balance between men and environment that existed among the indigenous people; at the same time, he says that this intrusion, and its accompanying interracial contact, lead to the "degradation of the backward race [the indigenous] in face of the advanced one [the European]" (CGS, p.157; see also p.515). Later in the text, he notes that it is mistaken the all-too-common imagination that portraits the American savages as having been completely free before colonization: "the America savage... lived immersed in shadows of prejudice and fear; many of these shadows, our hybridized culture [*cultura mestiça*] absorbed, depurating it from its most rude and indigestible part" (CGS, p.172).

Brazil's case, another peculiarity is stressed: on the one hand, the Portuguese were less orthodox than the Spanish and less prejudiced than the English in terms of skin color and Christian morality; on the other hand, the natives the Portuguese encountered in this part of the Americas were one of the most primitive in the continent: here, the encounter was not between "one exuberantly mature culture and another one, already in the adolescence stage... [There were in this part of the Americas] something close to bands of big children; an immature and incipient culture, still in its first dentition, without the bones, the development or the resistance of the great American semi-civilizations" (CGS, p.158). Portuguese dispositions were responsible for the hybridism verified since the first colonizing steps and for the greater level of racial harmony already mentioned.

Fernando Henrique Cardoso (2013 [2005]) notes that Gilberto's interpretation, although conservative, "was, deep down, the history that Brazilians, or at least the elite that read and wrote about Brazil, wanted to hear" (p.83). Bernardo Ricupero (2008b) goes in the same direction, saying that he helped "Brazilians in formulating the image they like to have of themselves" (p.99) These statements deserve some qualification. Gilberto's accounts on miscegenation and its relation with democratization have been triggering a great amount of the controversies surrounding CGS, which are also related to Gilberto's political positions in many moments of the XX century, as I will briefly note below. To many of his interlocutors, his political positions and his essays have remained largely undetachable from each other. Hence, if, on the one hand, it is indeed the case that his interpretation acquired much resonance, mainly because it told a sort of beautiful story about Brazil, on the other hand, it is important to have in mind that his was not *only* a beautiful story, despite being not rarely interpreted as such. Ricardo Benzaquen de Araújo (2005 [1994]) stresses that Gilberto operates in two concomitant ways: on the one hand, he tightens the bonds with the popular dimension of Brazilian society; on the other hand, he never ceases to claim his own aristocratic ascendency. Mario Helio Gomes de Lima (2014) remarks that his "taste for popular culture has never excluded the fascination towards aristocracy, expressed many times in a nostalgic empathy" (Lima, 2014, p.153). Balance of antagonisms.[115]

[115] Cardoso, presenting CGS's 50th edition (2005), noted that Gilberto's text assumes "the white's and master's perspective" and that, even if he emphasizes black culture and miscegenation as

The process of formation of Brazil is also a process of deformation of Brazil. For example, "the whole savage life, throughout all its stages, was permeated by animism, by totemism, by sexual magic; these traces would forcibly communicate with the invader's culture: the latter has only *deformed* them. It has not destroyed them" (CGS, p.211, italics added). Or, repeating Gilberto's words above: civilization and syphilis "started together, one *forming* the Brazilian... the other one, *deforming* him". Or, in the case of the African people: "the blacks are presented to us, during all our colonial life and our first phase of independent life, *deformed* by slavery" (CGS, p.397, italics added) and also as a major contribution to the formation of contemporary Brazil. Or also in the linguistic aspect, *deforming* the colonizer's Portuguese language while *forming* the Brazilian one.

The balance of antagonisms traversed the sexual and the domestic spheres, marking also the social and the political formation of Brazil, configuring a situation of *mandonismo* - a latent will to command, a kind of Brazilian way of authoritarianism. This Brazilian authoritarianism expresses an underlying systemic connection between the micro-social daily life and the macro-political relations. According to Elide Rugai Bastos (1999), this connection enables a cultural account of political organization and, therefore, reinforces this peculiar authoritarianism witnessed in Brazil (see Bastos, 1999, p.222). It seems plausible to say that Gilberto interprets modernity in Brazil through the power relations that connect, in a systemic way, different subjectivities across the public and private spheres, the political and sexual relations, ultimately blurring the boundaries that supposedly mark a clear-cut separation between them. These political-sexual power relations mark, at once, the *social body and* the *bodies of society*.

At the end of the discussion of the politico-sexual *mandonismo*, Gilberto extends his historical considerations to his present, exposing his political position: "our revolutionary, liberal, demagogic tradition is first of all superficial and limited to points of easy political prophylaxis: intimately, what the major part of what could

something positive, "one gets the general feeling of a certain nostalgia of 'our grandparents' and great-grandparents' times. No doubt bad times for most of the Brazilians" (Cardoso, 2013 [2005]). Bernardo Ricupero (2010) also states that, despite recognizing positive aspects in the decline of the patriarchal family, Gilberto expresses, in general, a negative evaluation of this historical evolution. Although it seems plausible, indeed, to define Gilberto's text as somehow nostalgic, this cannot erase the considerable ambivalence in relation to "the past". More precisely, it seems exaggerated to claim, as Bernardo Ricupero (2010) does, that Gilberto has "an unequivocally positive evaluation of the past" or that the decline of the patriarchal family means to him that Brazil ceases to have "an original contribution to provide the world with" (see Ricupero, 2010, pp.88-90).

be called the 'Brazilian people' still enjoys is the pressure on itself from a manful and courageously autocratic government" (CGS, p.114).[116] It is felt, in this dynamic, not the will to fix or reform vices of political or economic organization, but the "pure indulgence for suffering, for being victim, or for sacrificing himself" (CGS, p.114). To this liberal tradition, Gilberto opposes a conservative one, always supported by the sadism of the command - *mandonismo* - "disguised as a 'principle of Authority' or as a 'defense of the Order'" (CGS, p.114). To him, it is in the balance of both mysticisms - between Order and Liberty, Authority and Democracy - that the political life of his post-slavery times is equalized. The balance of antagonisms remains present among our "traditional and profound realities: sadists and masochists, masters and slaves, those with doctorate degree [*doutores*] and the illiterate, individuals with predominantly European culture and others with mainly African and Amerindian ones" (CGS, p.115). Herein lies, according to him, "the potentiality of Brazilian culture" (CGS, p.418): instead of two enemy halves, as it happens in the Anglo-American world, "[we] are two fraternizing halves [*metades confraternizantes*] that have been enriching each other with diverse values and experiences" (p.418). Hence, if, on the one hand, these relations were prejudicial to the development of the capitalist state and to the organization of the patriarchal economy in Brazil, they were, on the other hand, beneficial to the "development of Brazilian society in democratic lines" (CGS, p.535).[117]

It seems plausible to interpret the "balance of antagonisms" in CGS as operating both as an analytical and a normative frame. To the peculiarity of the Portuguese colonization in Brazil, Gilberto associates a favorable judgment that does not exclude the negative evaluations of Brazilian colonial life. Hell and paradise were balanced, not synthesized. The formation and deformation of contemporary Brazil are inseparably inscribed through political and sexual relations, through the public to the private spheres. In-between Europe, Africa and

[116] I have translated as "enjoys" the Portuguese word "*goza*", which also means "ejaculate".

[117] More precisely, Gilberto is talking about the quick and easy dispersion of wealth occurred during the colonial times in Brazil, to the detriment of the patriarchal economic organization and of the capitalist state, but also to the benefit of the democratic aspects of Brazilian society (see CGS, p.535). In the preface to the first English edition, one reads that "our social history, despite the grievous and persisting imprint left upon it by the experiences of a feudal economic system, is undergoing a process whose direction is that of a broad democratization" (Freyre, 1986, pp.xiii-xiv). In this preface, Gilberto's use of "feudal" as an adjective to the aristocratic system established in the colonial times seems more systematic than in the Portuguese edition; nevertheless, he qualifies it as a "Brazilian feudalism", as I will note below.

Amerindian, in-between science and imagination, in-between politics and sex: this is the (dis)location of Brazilian (de)formation.

The way Gilberto faces the transformation of the order constituted by the prevalence of the balance of antagonisms gives a good sense of his position towards the formation of Brazil. Already in the preface of CGS, mentioning the changes in the old order and announcing a second text on the topic (which I will interpret below), one reads that patriarchalism, dismantled in 1888, when slavery was officially abolished in Brazil, had sheltered the slaves, feeding them and "providing their sons with possibility of upward social mobility. The slave was replaced by the pariah in the factory; the slave quarters, by the shanties; the master by the owner of the factory or by the absent capitalist" (CGS, pp.51-2).[118] In the preface to the first English edition, Gilberto says that the social-economic system centered on the production of sugar "represented, in a way, a revival of feudalism in the American tropics" (Freyre, 1986, p.xi) and that Brazilian feudalism was a "combination of aristocracy, democracy, and even anarchy" (1986, p.xv). He also noted that this system would pass through a transformation in the XIX century, when coffee started to prevail in Brazil.[119]

In 1936, Gilberto published *Sobrados e Mucambos* (The Mansions and the Shanties, henceforth SM), a text compromised with the interpretation of the changes alluded to in CGS;[120] or, more precisely, of the "[w]hole ensemble of re-

[118] Gilberto asserts, in CGS, that favoring the social upward mobility of the black people is a genuinely Portuguese and Brazilian tendency (CGS, p.503); in the preface to the first edition of SM (dated from 1936-1949-1961), he says, in a comparative tone, that the upward mobility from one class to another "despite much less hard than in old European and Asian countries, did not and could not occur so easily in an Empire such as the Brazilian, based on slavery and agriculture" (SM, p.xl).
[119] This transformation is not, however, a complete rupture. In the preface to the second English edition (amalgamating a series of previous prefaces written between the years of 1933 and 1955), Gilberto says that his attempt was to put forward "a study of Brazilian patriarchal society and culture in which social reality is sees as a constant flow of the past and present into the future - a constant flow of time that never stops to allow for definitive sociological conclusions about rigid 'historical periods'" (Freyre, 1986, pp.lix-x). In *Order and Progress*, first published in 1959, Gilberto says that it is only with "profound restrictions" and in the interest of systematization of the bibliographical material, following a "more generally accepted convention", that he concedes in dealing with epochs in relation to the history of a country (see OP, p.xlvii).
[120] In 2006, the 16th edition of SM was published. In 1980, in the preface to the sixth Portuguese edition of SM, Gilberto defined SM and *Order and Progress* as the "immediate continuation[s]" of CGS (SM, p.xxx). Gilberto also said that the bigger repercussion of CGS in relation to the other two seemed to him to derive from its "charisma" (SM, p.xxx) (in 1980, CGS already had 24 editions, while SM had 6 and *Order and Progress* 3). Years before that, in the introduction to the second edition, dated from 1949-1961, Gilberto had said that SM represented "a logical, more than

Europeanized transitions, changes, peculiar to the Brazilian epoch that, in terms of architectural symbology, can be presented as the beginning of the replacement of the rural big house by the urban mansion in the Brazilian social landscape" (SM, p.xxxii).[121] To put it differently, the complex big-houses-&-slave-quarters was being replaced by the unbalanced antagonism between the mansions and the shanties: "the masters [*senhores*] of the mansions and the freed, or escaped, blacks, living in the shanties, were becoming antagonist extremes" (SM, p.xl).[122] Or, the "big house, completed by the slave quarters, represented, among us, a truly wonderful accommodation that the mansion and the shanty have come to break or disturb" (SM, p.573).[123]

This transition is situated in a century in which Brazil witnessed major events, such as the transference of the Portuguese Crown (1808), the abolition of slavery (1888) and the proclamation of the Republic (1889). In an expression of Gilberto's political position concerning the last part of this century, he mentions that

> some free blacks, reduced to this condition of proletariats [living in the shanties] - and, in addition to that, unassisted, including by the Church, and often reduced to pariahs - have repudiated the liberal Republic - liberal, but indifferent to the future of these 'free' blacks -, but have also been loyal to Princess Isabel. Therefore, [loyal] to the patriarchal Monarchy (SM, p.XXXII).[124]

chronological, continuation [of CGS]" (SM, p.lviii), stressing that neither intended to be chronologically situated in precise and rigid dates. The second edition of SM was considerably modified, including the addition of five chapters, as Sandra Vasconcelos (2006, p.184, n.4) notes. I will not deal with the modifications, however.

[121] It is worth recalling that SM's subtitle: "decay of the rural patriarchate and development of the urban".

[122] Recalling, the CGS's title is *Big Houses* **&** *Slave Quarters*, while SM's is *The Mansions* **and** *the Shanties*. The replacement of the"&" by the "and" is far from incidental in the mutual relations between Gilberto's interpretation of Brazil and his political position. The decay of the patriarchal family and the unbalancing of the antagonisms have led the complex big-house-&-slave-quarters to be replaced by the mansion and the shanty. Jacques Leenhardt (2006b, p.153) and Sandra Jatahy Pesavento (2006c, p.291) have also noted this change.

[123] In the preface to the first edition, Gilberto gives a slightly different formulation: "[t]he big-house-slave-quarter system... had come to be - at least in some aspects - an almost wonderful accommodation: of the slave to the master, of the black to the white, of the son to the father, of the wife to the husband. Also an almost wonderful adaptation of the man, through the house, to the physical environment, although, in this particular case, maybe the mansion and the shanty have supplanted the initial system" (SM, p.xli).

[124] Princess Isabel signed *Lei Áurea* (the Golden Law) on 13 May 1888, marking the complete cessation of legal slavery. Let me note that this date should not obliterate the history of fierce

SM reinforces the notion that patriarchalism in Brazil has always been combined with democracy; the text also reiterates the permanence of certain "constants of existence and norms of coexistence", acting upon the "life and the character" of Brazilian people, and the "feudal qualities" of power possessed by the great patriarchal families in the "*formation* of Brazil" (SM, p.xxxiii, italics added).[125] The text puts into relief the unceasing desire of Brazilians for an ideal combination between urban and rural, development and stabilization, order and progress (see SM, p.xxxiv).

Gilberto claims to himself the condition of the pioneer in the attention to the interpenetration of the characteristics comprised by the Brazilian patriarchal system: "*patriarchal, monocultural, based on large estate ownership and slavery*, and, sociologically, *feudal*, although being already mixed, semifeudal, semicapitalist, in its economy" (SM, p.lix, italics in the original).[126] And, in another part expressing his position towards the political debates of his times, Gilberto says that Brazilians are flawed in their negligence towards their past, a flaw that "from the point of view of the enthusiasts of Progress, with a capital P, is presented perhaps as a virtue" (SM, p.lx).[127] In *Order and Progress*, Gilberto reinforces that opposition to this position, saying that it produces a mysticism around Progress, full of "grotesque exaggerations", and a desire to be even more advanced that the people living in "great industrial countries" (see OP, p.lxi). This mysticism have lead to the diffusion of the "conviction... that we are a shamefully backward country, in terms of technical, scientific and industrial progress" (OP, p.lxii). This negligence in relation to the past is misleading both in analytical terms (since it becomes incapable of describing the contemporary Brazil) and in normative terms (since it

struggles of slaves against slavery, and that the end of slavery must not be conceived as a concession from the elites to passive subjects.

[125] Elsewhere in the text, Gilberto states that this patriarchal system have spread familism and personalism through Brazil, being "the most constant and generalized prevalence of power and influence... in our *formation*" (SM, p.lxxiv, italics added).

[126] Gilberto is once more positioning himself against the interpretations that defend the absence of feudalism in the past *and* in the present of Brazil. Feudalism is a formal characteristic Gilberto attributes to the formation of Brazil, despite conceding that Brazil was also capitalist since its first steps as a Portuguese colony. It is worth noting, however, that Gilberto says that Brazil has experienced feudalism, but not of exactly the same kind as the European one.

[127] Later in the text, Gilberto highlights that these "progressists", or "reformers", often ascend from the same shanties they afterwards disdain in order to erase their origins.

leads to a mistaken political position, for example the one endorsed by the enthusiasts of Progress).

As always, there is no complete rupture taking place. Even if the privilege of the house is reduced by the street (and by the hotel, the cathedral, the factory, the school), "the house of the XIX century kept exerting influence, more than any of these other forces, upon the social *formation* of the urban Brazilian" (SM, p.xlvi, italics added). Or, even if the family is undergoing a reconfiguration, almost leaving behind its patriarchal form, it is likely to keep being a powerful element in Brazilian formation, since its reminiscences will perhaps have an eternal life: "[the] patriarchal tends to be prolonged into the paternal, paternalist, in the sentimental or mystic cult of the Father still identified among us with the images of a protector man, a providential man, a man necessary to the general government of society" (SM, p.xci). According to Gilberto, the "form" of the patriarchal system is alive in the Republic, if only under different "appearances and substances", expressed, for instance, in the servile work and in "the despotism or the authoritarianism of the presidents of the Republic" (see SM, p.cx).

In sum, contemporary Brazil, to Gilberto, exposes a society in transition "from the rural patriarchalism to the urban and capitalist industrialism; from familism to individualism" (SM, p.xcvii), characterized by a conflict inscribed in the coexistence of an incipient "liberal" with the reminiscent "feudal" system (see SM, p.ci). The liberal and the feudal, the new and the old, the street and the house, the present and the past. A series of coexistences have been in place since Brazil encountered another kind of Europe.

As I have pointed out above, the XIX century would expose Brazil to major changes, according to Gilberto. The immense territory kept under a single unity and the unequal contacts with other peoples and cultures have been creating undeniable regional differences. Southern Brazil became in XIX century, for instance, the focal, but not the exclusive, point of contact with Europe; or, the encounter between a patriarchal Brazil and a bourgeois Europe.[128] Indeed, taking into account this internal differentiation, it would be more precise to say that SM is exposing the tensions within the national dimension of the multiple *encounters* with

[128] Gilberto says that the re-Europeanization occurred, first, in the Northeast (in the XVII century), then in the mining areas (in the XVIII century), finally in Rio de Janeiro, Salvador, São Luís, São Paulo and then again in Recife (in the first half of the XIX century) (see SM, p.302).

modernity. To Gilberto, Brazilian formation exposes a *yet incomplete national integration* (see SM, p.31).

It is important to keep in mind that it is not my purpose to discuss how Gilberto interprets "Europe" in SM, but the way a certain Europe (industrial and bourgeois; French and mostly English) was transplanted to Brazil. That is to say, it is not relevant for me here to expose the inclinations or sympathies Gilberto had to an English Europe (or to any other Europe), but how he interpreted the encounter between Brazil and this industrialized and bourgeois Europe. And, since, according to Gilberto, this encounter is still unfinished - since the national integration is yet incomplete and the transitional moment is still present -, these encounters with modernity constitute contemporary Brazil.

The "European spirit" mentioned above affected the interpenetration of the patriarchal aristocracy and the democratic (even anarchic) amalgamation of races and cultures that have always constituted Brazilian feudalism. And it was a very specific spirit: it was a "[r]e-Europeanization... in the English and French way, and not in the Portuguese one. To the contrary: an almost-always anti-Portuguese re-Europeanization, as if, to the more exaggerated Anglophile and Francophile, the Portuguese tradition was only outwardly European" (SM, p.137).[129] There was a deterioration in the condition of slaves, in the general quality of nourishment in Brazil and even in the health conditions inside the wealthy houses.

Gilberto says that to deny that the conditions of slaves had deteriorated is to succumb to the "anti-slavery sentimentalism" or the "doctrinaire furor" of those that do not realize or refuse to see that the slave in areas of an orthodox patriarchalism had a better treatment than those of industrial and commercial areas that kept slavery. These latter "tended towards impersonalization or depersonalization of the master-slave relations, reducing slaves to an impersonal condition of machines, and not only animals" (SM, p.284). The most Europeanized areas of the patriarchal Brazil were exactly the ones that witnessed this combination of contrasts

[129] Gilberto states that this "re-Europeanization" is, in a certain way, a "re-conquest" or "renaissance", since Brazil had previously acquired, in the colonial moment, very "exotic life conditions", from the European standards (see SM, p.309). The industrial and bourgeois Europe Gilberto is referring is not exclusively correspondent to England and France, although these are the most cited countries in SM in this aspect. In other parts, he also mentions Italian, German and, later, American (United States) influences (for example, SM, p.336). Nevertheless, it does not matter here the countries mentioned by Gilberto - often grouped under the notion of "an industrial and bourgeois Europe" -, but how he interprets the encounter.

unfavorable to slaves. They were still patriarchal and already urban areas, places in which the balance of antagonisms was replaced by the "violent exclusion of differences", favoring, on the one hand, the domination of "bourgeois", "capitalist", "French" and "English" values (see SM, p.392), and, on the other hand, the insurgence of slaves, now increasingly unprotected and pending towards criminal activities and insubordination (see SM, p.525).[130]

To reinforce: with the dismantling of the big-house-&-slave-quarters complex, the antagonisms were now unbalanced and intensified. A new adjustment of values, recovering the lost balance, would take a long time to reappear. The "re-conquest of Brazil by Europe, once initiated, has not ceased; and *still today* it suffocates us, although the European from Europe was replaced by the almost-European from the Unites States of America" (SM, p.311, italics added). Contemporary Brazil is still patriarchal and already bourgeois: "[Brazilian] society and its culture are still in *formation*" (SM, p.474, italics added).

It would be imprecise to ascribe to Gilberto a purely nostalgic sentiment regarding the patriarchal system and a completely negative sentiment regarding European modernity in Brazil (that is, the French and English influence in Brazil). His position is more one of an ambivalence. For instance, he states that the French and English ideas have been both beneficial and detrimental. They were beneficial because they have brought "more exact notions about the world and the tropical nature itself", but they have also brought Brazilians a "false liberalism" (see SM, pp.316-7) and the sharpening of the old oppressing pattern that characterized the relations between those considered superiors and those considered inferiors: masters and slaves; rich and poor; urban values and rural values; and those possessing a European culture and the Indigenous and African people (see SM, p.389). One of the most damaging consequences of this re-Europeanization was that the Oriental values brought by the Portuguese colonization were depreciated by an important part of the Brazilian elite, now taking France and England as parameters of the civilization to be attained. The cultural richness of being indecisive in-

[130] I agree with Ricardo Benzaquen de Araújo's impression (2005 [1994]; 2003; 2009) that Gilberto's resistance towards this re-Europeanization is not a defense of a substantial and fixed nation against the threat supposedly represented by external influences, but a defense of the Brazilian capacity to balance the antagonisms that was reduced after the industrial and bourgeois Europe started to be appropriated in, and mainly imposed upon, Brazil. In other words, plasticity has been in danger since the rigid modernity has been encountered. One should recall that Gilberto's critique of industrial modernity was already formulated in CGS, as I have discussed above.

between the Orient and Occident was replaced in many parts by this depreciation of "non-European kinds of man and cultural values" (SM, p.433), transforming the Oriental values into remote reminiscences. This is not to say, however, that the patriarchal moment was completely overcome. It is worth mentioning that, besides the regional differentiation of the encounters with modernity in Brazil, there are also different forms of re-Europeanization, according to Gilberto: few people have assimilated Europe; most have imitated it; and some others have been coerced by it (for example, through the way the English imposition on Portugal was transmitted to Brazil). These were adaptations of the patriarchal life-style to the new conditions of social interaction, which enabled a "combination of contrasts" (SM, p.281), such as, on the one hand, industries, arts and trade, and, on the other hand, the maintenance of slavery.[131]

Therefore, Gilberto is not simply narrating and lamenting the rupture of the balanced antagonisms. At the same time, new opportunities of upward social mobility emerged. In addition to that, miscegenation, as frequent in the cities as it had been in the large estates, have softened in the long term the extreme antagonisms associated with the process of re-Europeanization. Subjects and later citizens have started to be formed where previously there was only loyalty to the patriarch. The absorptions of women by their husbands, of individuals by their families and of slaves by their masters have also been questioned. The *pater familias*, at once the husband, the center of the family and the master, had to struggle on many fronts: to keep the women at home most of the time, to constrain the bourgeois impetus of their sons, to curtail the slaves' resistance and stronger solidarity.[132] The transference of the patriarchal power exerted within the big houses to the city mansions has reduced the social and physical distance between

[131] Ricardo Benzquen de Araújo (2009) is precise when he says that, to Freyre, "[i]t was not a matter of refusing modernity as a whole - he admires, for instance, the aesthetic achievements of international modernism as well as the improvements in Medicine and Engineering, not to mention his decisive support to the limits finally imposed upon the 'patriarchal eroticism' -; but, instead, to question the narrow and linear form that it seemed to have assumed in the country" (p.248). This reinforces my interpretation that, in order to interpret the uses Gilberto advances of the concept of "formation" in relation to contemporary Brazil, one should be careful in grasping not exactly how Gilberto evaluates modernity (English, French or any other) and its insertion in Brazil, but, instead, how he interprets what I am naming here the *encounters with modernity*.

[132] In Gilberto's words: "[t]he *pater familias* absolutism in Brazilian life... was being dissolved as other figures of man acquired prestige in the society based on slavery: the physician, for example; the instructor [*mestre-régio*]; the school director; the president of the province; the police chief; the judge; the trade representative" (SM, p.122).

the masters and the activities increasingly independent from them, but which they often made use of. The mansions resisted being overcome by the street, but the "city and European spirit" were getting robust (see SM, p.77). The "[p]atriarchalism got urbanized" (SM, p.22), but the urban form would not be easily consolidated - the process is *still* incomplete, after all.[133]

The gradual constitution of fraternizing moments and zones between the social extremes were attenuating the class and race antagonisms "*forming*... a Brazilian way of hybrid contemporization [*uma contemporização mestiçamente brasileira*] of life styles, cultural patterns and physical and psychological expression of the people" (SM, p.xlvi, italics added).[134] These moments have had one particular impact in the context of social interaction: they have turned the larger streets and squares into "fraternizing zones", ascribing prestige to the street (SM, p.xliii). This happened mainly after the beginning of the XIX century. Before then, the streets were places dominated by the private use of the big houses (turned into the new form of the urban mansions). Gilberto is narrating here the creation of a public space, challenging and limiting the all-mighty patriarchal system, and the emergence of "middle classes" (or intermediary layers), of a "petite bourgeoisie", of a "medium-scale industry and agriculture" (see SM, p.lxvii).[135]

The protection enjoyed by the patriarchs against the bourgeois and the capitalists interests would then be seriously challenged, experiencing a "profound alteration" (SM, p.7) to the extent that this new, middle, bourgeois class started to emerge. It was in-between the hard and unbalanced antagonisms emerging from the decline of patriarchalism, "softening them, that the most socially *plastic* and, in a certain way, most dynamic element of our *formation* acted: the *mulato*. Especially the *mulato* valorized by the intellectual or technical culture" (SM, pp.xl-xli, italics

[133] Gilberto affirms that "for a long time, the mansion and the street were enemies to each other" (SM, p.34). Sandra Jatahy Pesavento (2006a) stresses three main tensions in SM: one in the urbanization of patriarchalism; another one between the house and the street, which is also a tension between the private and the pubic; and a third one linked to the increase in the number of social agents interacting in the public life (see Pesavento, 2006, pp.209-11). Elsewhere, Sandra also notes that the mansion, in SM, is, at the same time, an expression of a transitional moment (from the urban to the rural, from slavery to free labor) and a timeless image of the reminiscences inscribed in the formation of Brazil (see Pesavento, 2006c, p.293).

[134] The examples cited by Gilberto are the procession, the church party, the carnival and the *entrudo* (this last one is a sort of carnival, taken to Brazil by the Portuguese) (see SM, p.xlii).

[135] In his words: "The decline of the private and rich's political power [*poder político do particular rico*] corresponded to the increase of the public political power" (SM, p.lxxi). Gilberto states that the discovery of the mines and the arrival of the Portuguese Crown in 1808 stand as markers to the Crown's increase of attention towards its colony (see SM, p.3).

added), who has gradually become a priest, a physician, a bachelor (*bacharel*). The academic degree or the post as military chief often operated as his "letter of whiteness" in a society in which the racial features were never isolated from the classist and the regional dimensions (SM, p.308).[136] In sum, the *mulato* was first and foremost plastic, "[c]haracteristically Brazilian, that is, hybrid [*mestiço*]; or culturally plural" (SM, p.591).

The bachelor (*mulato* or not) is telling to the interpretation of this transition: most often a man, son (legitimate or not) of an aristocratic master, he received a formal education either in the schools created in Brazil in the XIX century, after the Crown was established in the colony, or in Europe.[137] These men would increasingly detach themselves from the aristocratic values and tastes, becoming "Europeanized doctors", "French-appearing", "urbanized" and "civilized (*policiado*)": "[t]he bachelor... would be a Government's ally against his own Father or Grandfather, in the almost-mortal clash between the imperial justice and the rural *pater familias*' justice" (SM, p.18).[138] These traces have led many of these bachelors and doctors to imagine that they would be able to reproduce their favored Europe in Brazil: "romantic" and "bookish", they thought they governed a "purely [*castiçamente*] European country, and not a *mulata*, hybrid [*mestiça*], plural population" (SM, p.582). In the first moments of this ascension, it was mostly the case of the son trying a parricide, where as the following decades would witness more frequent examples of bachelors that pertained originally neither to the big house (the rural patriarchate) nor to the mansion (the noble bourgeoisie).

It would be imprecise to interpret this re-Europeanization unilaterally, as if it derived either from the external reconfigurations of the so-called modernity *or* from an internal rearrangement that had supposedly begun to be inclined towards another kind of Europe. The re-Europeanization of Brazil and its different encounters with modernity, according to Gilberto, are inscribed *both* in the

[136] Elsewhere in the text, Gilberto says that "the colored man, civilized and Christianized, could be socially Portuguese as any Portuguese and Christian as any Christian", and that regional configurations of culture have conditioned different types of national integration (SM, p.366). In relation to the military positions, Gilberto discusses more carefully their role as facilitators of upward mobility in *Order and Progress*, where he also defends that the importance of the National Army as a supra-partidary ordering actor increased after the proclamation of the Republic.

[137] Gilberto notes that, even before the XIX century, the schools ran by priests had already been educating boys that would become central elements in the process of urbanization (see SM, pp.575-6).

[138] These bachelors started being absorbed by professions such as diplomacy, industry and politics, moving from the large estates to the cities.

European industrialization process *and* in the internal differentiation and mobility in Brazil. In sum, the transitional moment contains, therefore, not only the external pressures associated with the movement from outside to the inside of Brazil, but also the internal reconfiguration across regions, classes and races. To put it differently, the formation of contemporary Brazil expresses a dislocation of the boundaries between the inside and the outside.

The bachelor, the *mulato* and the freed slave have all played a major role since the beginning of the XIX century: their capacity to master the machines of industrialization have conferred them the possibility of upward social mobility, potentially giving them the "letter of whiteness".[139] It was taking place, in different degrees according to the inequality among regions, a technical and social revolution in Brazil, with the emergence of a middle class and its accompanying new values. It is plausible to say that mobility, in Gilberto's interpretation, is *both* a national *and* an international dislocation. The increasing incorporation of Europeans into the Brazilian proletariat and bourgeoisie has intensified the marks of the re-Europeanization in the national formation. If, on the one hand, these machines have reduced the importance of both the slave and the master and have been Europeanizing Brazil, the importance of those plastic figures, on the other hand, has increased as well.[140] According to Jessé Souza (2000b), the incorporation of the machines and its consequent valorization of the individual talent and knowledge, despite being an external influence (derived from the re-Europeanization), was enabled also because of the plasticity of the Portuguese colonization. To put it differently, this democratic dimension of the upward social mobility was not something completely new in the formation of Brazil; it has always been present, balanced by the authoritarian dimension, as a singularity of this formation.

Gilberto points out that Brazil is perhaps the country in which the upward social mobility is the quickest one: from a class to another, that is, from the shanties to the mansions; and from a race to another, that is, from black to white or hybrid

[139] Gilberto also mentions the social mobility of the poor white that was well placed in this revolution in Brazil. He notes, however, the this mobility was not completely indifferent to skin color: the "[freed *mulato*'s] urbanization was quicker than the freed black's, since social selection is always driven towards not only the individual with a lighter skin color and a more European appearance, but also towards those with more European formation and ability as well" (SM, p.606).

[140] Mary Del Priore (2003) puts into relief the way Gilberto interprets the appropriation of the elements from the bourgeois Europe and its consequences upon the bodies, and upon the daily lives in general, of the Brazilian people, from hairstyle and clothing to the general religious and cultural habits.

[*mestiço*] (see SM, p.654). The disparities within the country are predominantly related to "the conflict between the cultural stages or moments" (SM, p.658), themselves referring to different social kinds of man, to different regional levels of technical progress, and to the varied degrees of contacts between the groups with each other and with foreigners. In addition to the interpenetration of past, present and future, one also sees an interpenetration of classes, races and region.[141] The above-mentioned "letter of whiteness" is intrinsic to these modalities of interpenetration. Jessé Souza (2000b) goes straight to point when he claims that the link between modernization, upward mobility and re-Europeanization of Brazil works in many directions in Gilberto's text: outside-inside (through the appropriation of external inputs), bottom-up (through the acquisition of knowledge to operate the machines, for example) and top-bottom (through the occupation of public offices and, one should add, military posts) (see Souza, 2000b, especially pp.89-92; and 2000a, especially ch.8).[142] The formation of Brazil is peculiarly plastic.

Historically, the balance of antagonisms of the patriarchal regime had been decaying before the end of the XVIII century and mainly the beginning of XIX century, whereas the extreme antagonisms started being softened again. The precise dates are, to my purpose here, less relevant than the interpretation Gilberto gave to this historical dynamic. The encounters with European modernity have had profound consequences, but it seems to Gilberto that Europe is destined to be only part of Brazil. The encounter of cultures and races, when not defined in terms of an exclusive domain of one or the other, "seems particularly favorable to the development of new and richer cultures, compared to the so-called pure ones, or considered to be so" (SM, p.659). Miscegenation is, above all, an path towards cultural enrichment; in Brazil, the regions of more intense miscegenation are also those richer in "great men" (SM, p.660), men who are wise in their contemporizing

[141] According to Brasilio Sallum Jr. (2000), this latter interpenetration is intrinsic, following Gilberto, both to what is peculiar to Brazil as a form of society and to the different regional contents.
[142] At least two other kinds of mobility are mentioned by Gilberto: firstly, the downward social mobility, that is, from a superior condition to an inferior one; and, secondly, the horizontal mobility, that is, across different regions (see, for example, SM, p..654) It is interesting to observe that these three kinds of mobility (the two vertical ones, the upward and the downward, and the horizontal one) occur across different and unequal situations - of race, class and/or region.

and pacifying ability.[143] In his words, "[i]t seems that Brazil will never be, unlike Argentina, an almost-European country; nor, unlike Mexico and Paraguay, an almost-Amerindian one. The African culture substance will remain within us throughout all our *formation* and consolidation as a nation" (SM, p.650, italics added). The men from these regions, then, bring to many spheres of the country "a contemporizing wisdom, a sense of opportunity, a balance that make them the best pacifiers, the best bishops, the most sophisticated diplomats, the most efficient politicians" (SM, p.661). Analytical and normative dimensions are hardly separable here.

The third essay of the series on the introduction to the history of the patriarchal society in Brazil would be published in 1959, entitled *Ordem e Progresso* (Order and Progress, henceforth OP).[144] Gilberto's general concern remains being the interpretation of the past, in order to understand the present and the future of Brazil. These three "times" are considered in their "interpenetration" as "social times", which means that inequalities mark the different and coexistent "regions, classes, races, cultures" (see OP, pp.xxiii-iv) . In the terms I am proposing in this text, this interpenetration is interpreted as the constitutive feature of contemporary Brazil.

To Sergio Tavolaro, the comparative move that supports Gilberto's definition of the formation of Brazil as a singular and original one relies on three aspects: firstly, Gilberto claims that modernity is not an exclusive attribute of Europe (Brazil is also modern, "the first modern society constituted in the tropics", as he puts in CGS); secondly, he stresses that the peculiarity of the tropics has led to an original experience of Brazilian society, irreproducible by any European country; thirdly, what enables Gilberto to define Brazil as singular and original is exactly the fact that his criteria are ultimately based on European references (see Tavolaro, 2013, pp.286-7).[145] This comparative parameter mobilizing other

[143]The men from these regions, in Gilberto's words, bring to many spheres of the country "a contemporizing wisdom, a sense of opportunity, a balance that make them the best pacifiers, the best bishops, the most sophisticated diplomats, the most efficient politicians" (SM, p.661).

[144] In 2004, the 6th edition of OP was published.

[145] Sergio Tavolaro argues that, while Gilberto ascribes to this singularity and this originality a positive evaluation, he also reproduces the notion that modernity in Brazil is incomplete, a deviation from the central modern societies, therefore also reproducing a sociological discourse of modernity that names these deviant experiences as "pre-", "quasi-" or "semi-modern" (see Tavolaro, 2013, p.314). It is not my purpose here to advance my position in relation to Sergio's interpretation of

"modernities" and other "colonizations", already operating in CGS and SM, remains at work in OP.

Contemporaneity, in Brazil, is expressed by the combination of reminiscences (from the past) with dynamic and progressist aspects (pointing to the future). Indeed, Brazilian progress, to Gilberto, is a relative one; it does not mean "the realization, or even manifestation, of a truly messianic process of national development; [they are not] an example of what a Darwinist, applying his biology in a Marxist way to sociology, would call 'evolution'" (OP, p.xxiv). Instead of Progress, with the capital P that Gilberto had already opposed to in SM, and a single Order, in Brazil there are "progresses" and "orders" that "have been assembled to *form*, sometimes contradictorily, the national system" (OP, p.xxiv, italics added). Thus, this system is constituted by the unequal progresses under a "seemingly unique progress: the Luso-American, the Brazilian, the national" (OP, p.xxv).

Historically speaking, OP is devoted to the transition from the Monarchy to the Republic and from slavery to free labor. But this transition, as it is case in all of Gilberto's essays I have dealing with here, this is not a complete rupture. The Republican political regime would not overcome certain constants. On the one hand, Brazilians "have become less similar to their ancestors and a little more similar to their contemporaries" after the Abolition (1888) and the proclamation of Republic (1889), which is an indicator of the changes taking place in the country; on the other hand, there was no "radical transformation" in the way the Brazilian people is "more characterized by their similarities with its ancestors than by the similarities with its contemporaries" (OP, p.xxvi). Brazilians, following Gilberto's definition, have a peculiar sense of time, opened to the interference of the future into the present, as long as this does not mean the complete denial of the past (see OP. p.142).

To a great extent, the nexus between past, present and future was enabled by the role "Positivists" played in the transition from Monarchy to Republic.

Gilberto; I just want to note that, if, on the one hand, it is plausible to say that, to Gilberto, the formation of Brazil is original and singular, when compared to the modern European countries, on the other hand, it seems imprecise to say that this originality is a deviance, marked by an incompleteness and an inferiority. I am trying to argue in my interpretation of CGS, SM and OP that his position is much more ambivalent, perhaps itself a constant attempt to balance antagonisms. That said, instead of a peremptory position that Brazilian modernity is a deviant case, I think Gilberto holds an ambivalent position towards the formation of Brazil as a parallel case - no doubt singular and original -, in relation to the North American and the European (mainly the English and French) modernity. Parallel and comparable, needless to say.

According to Gilberto, instead of utterly revolutionaries establishing an epochal replacement, they are rather those that rearticulated the ever tension between changes and constants (or ruptures and continuities) in the formation of Brazil. To Gilberto, this Positivist influence confirmed, rather than invented, in Brazil the notion that a sense of progress is conditioned by a sense of order (see OP, p.xxvi). Through positivism, Brazilian Monarchic symbols and values were renovated, but not abandoned. "Order and Progress", before being Auguste Comte's motto and even if not formulated in these terms, were already "Brazilian social or psycho-social constants" (OP, p.xxxiv).[146] During the Monarchy, according to Gilberto, Brazilians have grown an "affection for order" that was transmitted to the Republic by their military founders, as the motto "Order and Progress" in the national flag would manifest (see OP, p.15).

With Auguste Comte's influence in Brazil, this motto gained the utmost visibility in the national flag; but, more importantly, it expressed this precedence of order in relation to progress. Gilberto stresses that this order contains an authoritarian tone, but not a messianic one. To specify this kind of order at stake, he compares Brazil to the other Latin American countries, in order to reinforce that, whereas national order ultimately prevailed in Brazil in the XIX century transition, these other countries tended to succumb to disaggregation and to charismatic movements (*caudilhistas*) inspired by the French Revolution, but sometimes suffocated by despotic impositions.[147] In Brazil, the prevalence of order is enabled by the balance between "the monarchical or authoritarian form of government... and the patriarchal organization of the family", a symbiotic relation that "in many respects favored, instead of hampering, the development of the population in a society in many respects democratic" (OP, p.xxxv).[148] In this sense, the Republic brought more of the concern with progress, whereas Monarchy had had an almost exclusive concern with order. This provided the country with the "fruitful play

[146] It is worth noting that the epigraph of OP comes from Auguste Comte: "Le progrès est le développment de l'ordre [Progress is the development of order]".
[147] *Caudilhismo* refers to political movements in "Latin America" whose leaders are often linked to rulling elites, political and/or military, holding charismatic features of leadership.
[148] The comparisons with the other Latin American countries are numerous in the text. In another instance of that, Gilberto says that the Brazilian singularity of maintaining a Monarchic regime even in the midst so many "exceedingly 'progressists' Republics" during most of the XIX century was fundamental to keep the country away from the continental turbulence (see OP, pp.11-2). Gilberto also states that "Monarchy saved Brazil" from the fragmentation stimulated by the "Republican adventure" in Latin America (see OP, p.36).

between two seeming contraries" (see OP, p.36), forming, by this time, "the most important among those predominantly European civilizations that were being developed in a tropical space" (OP, p.53). This is clear in another comparison, in which Brazilian people is defined by being more intensely connected to its past than the Anglo-American people, "although also being sensible, in an American way, to the present and the future, that, among us and among the Anglo-Americans, represent requests of a progressive, utopian, messianic time, associated with requests of a space yet to be dominated" (OP, p.xl). Sensibility in face of progress; but never compromising national order and national unity.[149]

These two comparatives observations reinforce the notion that the formation of Brazil is peculiar, in the sense that the historical periods here are not arranged in a linear development or by mutually excluding conceptions of order. Not even the Abolition or the Republic provoked a clear-cut delimitation between the past and the present, taking into account that several patriarchal reminiscences are seen "still today" in areas less affected by the "neo-European and Japanese immigration" and by "industrialization" (see OP, p.xlviii). In other words, the anti-patriarchal effects of the Republican times have produced developmental inequalities among regions.

If, on the one hand, industrial activities have fostered a greater communication between regions previously isolated by their agrarian self-sufficiency, on the other hand, the agrarian activities were neglected and there was a lack of a comprehensive plan towards national development (see OP, p.486). If, on the one hand, the Republic enabled a closer contact with developed techniques, facilitating the upward mobility of many people, on the other hand, its biggest error was the lack of attention to the lag between this technical advance and the cultural and human element of most of the population that did not follow the same path (see OP, p.615). If, on the one hand, the transitional moment that had promoted the Abolition allowed Brazilian insertion in the concert of the civilized nations as a tropical civilization, on the other hand, a mass of former slaves and their descendents and of poor whites has become nearly completely abandoned and unprotected since the end of the Monarchy. The identification of ambivalent consequences is the main characteristic of Gilberto's interpretation of the years following the end of formal slavery and the end of the Monarchic regime.

[149] Later in the text, Gilberto says that the Republic did represent a change, but less so than what the adepts of a messianic position had imagined (see OP, p.688).

Urbanization, immigration and industrialization have become major goals among Republicans struggling against the Luso and African traces of the nation and in favor of reproducing in Brazil the most civilized modernity they saw mainly in England, in France, and in the United States. In his words: the relations of "social time" between Brazil, on the one hand, and Europe and the United States, on the other hand,

> provided Brazilian life of this epoch [the end of the XIX and the beginning of the XX century] with temporal features framed, in some respects, under the European living historical rhythm, despite the kind of volcanic eruptions of the still-colonial past that were felt, sometimes dramatically, in social, cultural, psychological times that coincided in nothing with what prevailed in Occidental Europe and in the United States. (OP, p.lxvi).

Gilberto mentions, then, a number of texts from this moment, whose relevance comes from the way they characterize this epoch not as being composed by "one single time, but by several, and sometimes contradictory, times" (OP, p.lxvi).[150] In the terms I am mobilizing in my interpretation, I would say that Gilberto is interpreting the inequalities constitutive of the encounters with modernity in contemporary Brazil.[151]

The summary Gilberto provides of the main features concerning the moment under scrutiny in OP includes various aspects: the decline of the patriarchate as the dominant institution in society; the Aryanization of the population; bigger protection of the Amerindian component of this population (through state protection); intensification of urbanization; increasing social and psycho-cultural distance between the defenders of the urban values and the defenders of the rural

[150] Later in the text: "Brazil has never been a country of only one social, psychological or cultural time" (OP, p.390). The encounters with modernity in Brazil in the beginning of the Republic have generated, in certain areas, according to Gilberto, a "third time", produced from the approximation between a "Brazilian" time (that is, agrarian, aristocratic, based on slavery, slow) and a "European" or "American" one (see OP, pp.471-2).

[151] Opposing himself to the interpretation that the Republic was simply passively accepted or adhered to by Brazilians, Gilberto says that the way the new political regime was accepted, even by the "more lucid and more connected-to-the-Empire conservatives", expresses not only this apathy, but much more importantly a "capacity or wisdom to contemporize: a Britannic virtue, amazingly developed by those plastic conservatives,... in the American tropic" (OP, p.8).

values; reduction of the sizes of the families; less disparity in the ages between men and women getting married; separation between Church and state; increasing valorization of the hybrid people [*mestiços*]; more frequent assimilation of French and English vocabularies into Portuguese language; more solidarity with the other America nations (especially the United States); increasing participation of the military in national politics; idealization of diplomacy as a way to project Brazil abroad; among many other ones (see OP, pp.cxlii and the following).

Facing all these profound changes, Gilberto sets as his aim the identification of the "synthetic Brazilian" (or "average Brazilian") of this moment (the end of the Monarchy and first decades of the Republic), defined as the "social expression of a set of spaces fused within a set of times; and *forming*, through this fusion, a seemingly single system, although complex and even contradictory" (OP, p.cliv, italics added). The "*formation* [of this synthetic Brazilian] remained in process, after the proclamation of the Republic, under the influence of forces of unification of the national life, sentiment and culture that came from the Monarchy" (OP, p.clxvi, italics added). By this moment in the formation of Brazil, national unity was already so robust that the political regime change would not be able to dismantle it. And, despite all the progresses brought by the Republic under the order inherited from the Monarchy, the new political regime has now yet closed the gap between the "modern and even ultra modern things" imported from Europe and from the United States, and the human development in the country (see OP, p.740).

In other words, past, present and future interpenetrate. The final words of the "attempt to synthesize" included in OP express once more this interpenetration, when they reinforce that

> from the reminiscences of the past in the present and from the anticipations of the present and even of the future; from the past of a society such as the Brazilian, founded by Europeans in extra-Europeans space and time; [the techniques and methods used in the text seemed to have enabled us to capture] the possible stabilizing or ordering constants of this society within a development that, without this stabilization and ordering, would not be more than a chaos of diverse progresses, opposed or cancelled out by various and contradictories regressions (OP, p.clcix).

Order is taken as crucial to condition (or delimit) progresses that otherwise would be chaotic; the enthusiasts of Progress are taken as (mis)readers of history that end up holding or supporting political and/or intellectual positions that are damaging to the formation of contemporary Brazil.

As Elide Rugai Bastos (2000) mentions, OP not only advances the study already initiated in CGS and SM, but also serves to Gilberto as an intervention in the debates on social sciences (see Bastos, 2000, p.360). When Gilberto criticizes the enthusiasts of Progress and those that want to eradicate any inheritance from the Iberian past, he is positioning himself both in the academic disputes and in the political scene of mid-XX century in Brazil. More broadly, Gilberto is situating himself in relation to a number of intellectual and political movements in Brazil, all of them posterior to the end of *Estado Novo* in Brazil (that is, after 1945). The preface to the first English edition of CGS is also very significant in this aspect. It is dated from 1945, the last year of Getúlio Vargas' government (*Estado Novo*), defined by Gilberto as a "dictatorship... at once near-fascist in its ideology and Brazilian and paternalistic in fact" (Freyre, 1986, p.xv).[152] While Brazilian feudalism represented a union of opposites - democratic, in ethnic, social and cultural terms, and aristocratic, "in its cult of superior individuals and superior families, and in the tolerance that it accords to differing personalities" (p.xv) -, Getúlio Vargas' government, on the contrary, represented a crisis of political democracy.

In relation to Getúlio's government, it is important to mention that, in 1930, when the "revolution" took place, Gilberto was Head of the Office (1927-1930) in Estácio Coimbra's government at his home state, Pernambuco. Coimbra was overthrown by Getúlio, and Gilberto then spent a period of two years of exile in Portugal, returning to Recife, capital of Pernambuco, in 1932. In 1937, Getúlio established a dictatorship, *Estado Novo,* and designated Agamenon de Magalhães as Head of the state of Pernambuco. João Alberto da Costa Pinto (2008) says that Agamenon was Gilberto's "major political enemy", representing in the state the

[152] For more on Gilberto's relation with Getúlio's government, see Weffort (2006, pp.277-8) and Pinto (2008). Getúlio Vargas established the dictatorship named *Estado Novo* in 1937 (remaining until 1945). This name, *Estado Novo*, was inspired in Portugal's fascist regime *Estado Novo*, led by Antonio Salazar.

"urban-industrial modernization, in genuinely capitalist models" (Pinto, 2008, p.3). According to Túlio Velho Barreto (2004), Gilberto Freyre was closer to a political left during 1940s, participating in the re-democratization against the *Estado Novo* in Brazil, even if he had been previously invited by Vargas to the Ministry of Education and to be Ambassador in London and Lisbon, declining all these invitations. At the same time, João Pinto (2008) reminds that Gilberto vehemently supported Brazil's engagement in the Second World War against Nazism and, when *Estado Novo* in Brazil finished in 1945, and he was elected Federal Deputy (1946-1950), he received a mass support from students, a considerable part of which was linked to the Communist Party in Brazil (PCB) (see Pinto, 2008, pp.4-5).[153]

It is worth noting, in addition, that OP was written some years after his connections with the Portuguese politician Antônio de Oliveira Salazar, a major figure of the *Estado Novo* in Portugal (1933-1974), had been the most intense.[154] In 1951-2, Gilberto travelled around most Portuguese colonies, invited and funded by the Portuguese state, and, after that, published his main positions on "Lusotropicology", which are neither completely alien to his 1933 text, CGS, nor any kind of natural or inevitable unfolding of previous ideas (see Meucci, 2010, pp.318 and the following).[155] In OP, as I have already said, the comparison between Portuguese colonization and other kinds of colonization, especially the English one, has led Gilberto to emphasize the potentiality of Brazilian culture.

In "On the Iberian Concept of Time", published in 1963, Gilberto abandons the focus on the comparison between Brazil and the other Latin American countries, in favor of a major comparison between two conceptions of time, the Iberian and the Protestant one (see Freyre, 1963). The conception of "time" performs a central role in this text, as it had performed in OP; it is also a major element in Gilberto's

[153] It is telling that, in 1946, elected as federal congressman, Gilberto put forward the efforts to create the *Instituto de Pesquisas Sociais Joaquim Nabuco* (nowadays *Fundação Joaquim Nabuco*), in Recife, whose original purpose was linked to the study of the rural environment in Northern Brazil autonomously from the University domain that had begun to be consolidated by that time (see Meucci, 2010, pp.316-7; and Maio, 1999b, pp.118-9). Túlio Velho Barreto (2004) and Simone Meucci (2010) notes the use Gilberto has made of newspapers since the 1940s, in order diffuse his perspective on various issues, nor least of those the political ones.

[154] *Estado Novo*, in Portugal, was a fascist-inspired political regime, based, among other things, on a Catholic perspective, on a corporatist state and on the importance of the family and the social hierarchy. For a more careful account of the relations between Gilberto and the *Estado Novo* in Portugal, and also with the Brazilian Foreign Policy at that time, see Meucci (2010) and Amaral Jr. (2002).

[155] I will not deal with the texts associated with Lusotropicology here, limiting myself to some suggestions about it.

notion that Brazil represents an alternative to both the industrial modernity and to a purely authoritarian path towards modernization. The association of a conception of "time" with a concept of "formation" is also present in the "Lusotropicology" perspective that is articulated in other texts and which has become one of the main reasons of the antagonist receptions Gilberto's figure has had since then.

Luiz Costa Lima recalls that Gilberto's proposal of a "Lusotropicology" seemed to many of his contemporaries a "shameless opportunism [*oportunismo descarado*]" that benefitted from Salazar's regime: "he seemed to us to represent a conspiratorial Brazil [*um Brasil de conchavos*] that ended up always keeping it backward" (Lima, 2005, p.9). Mario Helio Gomes de Lima (2014) notes that Gilberto's Lustropicology became "a science to be denied among the intellectuals from the left in Brazil and in Portugal; almost as a guilt complex because they were never able to see it dissociated from Salazar's colonialism" (Lima, 2014, p.160). Simone Meucci (2010) emphasizes this aspect from a different angle, when she says that the 1950s witnessed a series of initiatives that professed that Brazil needed to get rid of its Iberian heritage, in order to overcome its obstacles to modernization, as I have mentioned above. Freyre was, then, criticized for his "culturalist" perspective, for his lack of scientific rigor and for its essayist writing, who would all collaborate to imprison Brazil behind the schedule of science and modernization.[156] Luiz Costa Lima (2005) mentions that the figure of Gilberto Freyre - his "self-stylization" - was also decisive in the way his texts were received and the way he managed, in a personalist way, the names and the institutional privileges circling around his influence (see p.10).

Gilberto has always emphasized the peaceful characteristic of Brazilians and the Portuguese colonization when compared to other colonized peoples. In this vein, OP extends this to the Armed Forces: "[t]hat the Brazilian tradition contrasts with the Bolivarian one [related to the Independence movements in Latin America] seems to be evident to us; and this contrast has been manifesting itself in the pacifist constant that has been stimulating in Brazil the Armed Forces; almost always, [they

[156] Ricardo Benzaquen de Araújo (2005 [1994]; 2003; 2009) discusses the importance of the language used in Gilberto's writing style in the 1930s; João Cezar de Castro Rocha (2003a) and Mario Helio Gomes de Lima (2014, p.163) point out how his writing style is linked to a process of institutionalization of academic disciplines at that time, very often resisting the kind of scientific rigor propagated by them; and Jacques Leenhardt (2006b), Sandra Vasconcelos (2006) and Sandra Jatahy Pesavento (2006d) shed light on the relevance Gilberto's "prefaces" have in his texts.

are] forces of pacification or conciliation in our country's national political crisis" (OP, p.81, n.4). The National Army, after the proclamation of the Republic, remained exerting "supra-partidary and superiorly national functions of conciliation and pacification of the Brazilians divided by partidary hates or antagonisms of sub-national interests" (OP, pp.300-1). In this sense, the Army represented a crucial reminiscence from the Monarchic moment, providing stabilization and order to what could otherwise succumb to generalized disorder. The military's prestige increased after 1889, and the Army became another opportunity for the social valorization and upward mobility of hybrid people (*mestiços*), as it was already happening to bachelors (see OP, p.306). This interpretation was reinforced in 1964. Túlio Velho Barreto (2004) recalls that, in 1964 (therefore, one year after the publication of "On the Iberian Concept of Time"), Gilberto gave his support to the Military Coup in Brazil (the Military regime would remain in place until 1985) and was invited to be the Ministry of Education by the first Military President, Humberto de Allencar Castello Branco (1964-1967), but declined it. Gilberto said that the presence of the Armed Forces in Brazilian public life was "healthy" and supra-partidary, being capable of superimposing the "authentically national interest or convenience" on interests that were "sectarian, conflicting or in extreme clash" (Freyre [1964] apud Barreto, 2004). João Pinto (2008) says that Castello Branco was constantly present at the *Instituto Joaquim Nabuco de Pesquisas Sociais*, which then became a center of "political offensive from agrarian dominant classes against peasant struggles" (Pinto, 2008, p.6).[157]

Bernardo Ricupero observes, following Elide Rugai Bastos, that Gilberto's nostalgia is accompanied by his defense of a conservative Brazilian modernization (see Ricupero, 2008b, p.79). Luiz Costa Lima observes that Gilberto's political positions in relation to the Military coup intensified the resistance against his texts, observable since his connection with Salazar in Portugal (see, Lima, 2005, p.10). In other words, despite being considered conservative since at least his participation in the I Brazilian Congress of Regionalism, of which he was one of the protagonists, the interpretation of Gilberto as a conservative thinker was intensified in the 1940s

[157] One of the most expressive among those peasant struggles were the *Ligas Camponesas* (Peasant Leagues), organized in the Northeast of Brazil and lead by Francisco Julião, who struggled against large land properties and for rural workers' rights.

and mainly in the 1950s and 1960s.[158] This happened to a great measure due to the intellectual controversies linked to the Unesco Project and to the *Escola Paulista de Sociologia* (State of São Paulo School of Sociology), devoted to a revision on the studies of racial relations and that reached conclusions in conflict with Gilberto's interpretation.[159] Fernando Henrique Cardoso (2013 [2010]) notes that the academic controversies and the conservative political position were not the only reasons why Gilberto was resisted in the 1950s and 1960s; his opposition to a "developmental" project emerging among intellectual and political progressist and modernizing groups has also played a crucial role in his marginalization. Simone Meucci (2010) and Fernando Henrique (2013 [2010]) mention that, while Gilberto wanted to conserve a certain past in a certain way, in order to modernize Brazil, other intellectual and political groups in the 1950s onwards defended, in different manners, that Brazilian or Latin American past should be completely overcome through a modernizing project.[160]

[158] Despite Gilberto's early statement that the Regionalist Manifesto, published in 1952, was written in 1926 to the I Brazilian Congress of Regionalism, Gilberto Mendonça Teles, relying on Joaquiam Inojosa's research and on Gilberto's own later declaration, notes that the text read during the Congress is not the same as the one published as a Manifesto in 1952 (see Teles, 1999, p.278, n.4). In the "bibliographical note" to *Order and Progress*, Gilberto states that, the "regionalism" articulated in this Congress (that took place in Recife) was "modernist in its own way, although also traditionalist" (OP, p.lvii); this movement had been criticized as conservative by "modernists" in Rio de Janeiro and mainly by those from São Paulo, that had previously organized, in 1922, the *Semana de Arte Moderna* (Modern Art Week). João Cezar de Castro Rocha (2004; 2012) provides an account on some of the regional, intellectual and literary rivalries around Gilberto Freyre, including the more general intellectual and artistic controversies that stimulated the engagement with the question of "modernism" since the 1920s and with the more specific question of the social sciences since the 1950s in Brazil. According to João Cezar those tensions were inevitable, since their participants were "all interested in the study of the *formation* of Brazilian society" (Rocha, 2004, p.242, italics added). On Gilberto's relation with modernism, see also Ricardo Benzaquen de Araújo (2005 [1994]). It is important to have in mind that Gilberto's relation with the so-called "modernists" from São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro and even Minas Gerais is neither one of complete opposition and antagonism, nor one that is stable throughout the decades. I cannot deal with that here, however. For an overview of "Brazilian modernism" away from an exclusive focus on Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo, see, for instance, Monica Pimenta Velloso (2010).

[159] For instance, in a newspaper article published in May 11, 1958, Gilberto, reviewing Roger Bastide's text *Brésil, Terre des Contrastes*, says that the "renowned sociologist" has not been able in this text to "untangle himself from the influence of the intellectuals from São Paulo, with whom he had relationships during his long stay in Brazil", therefore his text generated a "deformation of Brazil in a South entirely progressive, dynamic, but in contrast to a North only picturesque and folkloric, lost in its routine and in its affection for the Luso-African or Luso-Amerindian traditions" (Freyre *apud* Lemeire, 2006, pp.90-1). Roger Bastide was one of the main figures involved in the creation and consolidation of the University of São Paulo (USP). Gildo Marçal Brandão once said that Gilberto Freyre and Oliveira Vianna (to which I will come back later) were the two main figures with which the "tradition of USP" struggled for some time (see Brandão, 2007, p.123, p.127).

[160] Among these groups, Simone Meucci (2010) cites the *Comissão Econômica para América Latina* (Cepal), founded in 1949 in Chile; the *Instituto Superior de Estudos Brasileiros* (Iseb), founded in 1955, linked to the Ministry of Education and Culture of Brazil; the *Centro Latino-Americano de Pesquisas em Ciências Sociais*, created in 1957 and funded by Unesco; and the *Faculdade de*

At the same time, however, Sandra Jatahy Pesavento (2006b) recalls that, while his texts were received by the intellectuals of the so-called left with strong rejection until at least the 1980s, considered to be contributing to the conservatism in Brazil, they were largely read abroad.[161] Gilberto's conception of miscegenation and the balance of antagonisms between different races impacted, for instance, upon Unesco's initiative in 1940s and 1950s, following the racial studies organized by the United Nations after the Second World War, which then decided, in 1950, to put forward a Project to study the racial relations in Brazil. Gilberto Freyre became the first Brazilian to occupy the position of Director of the Department of Social Sciences of Unesco (see Maio, 1999a). Ironically, Unesco Project was concomitant to Gilberto's travel to the Portuguese colonies and his engagement in the support of Portuguese colonialism. Marcos Chor Maio (1999b) notes that, in the 1950s, Gilberto experienced a paradoxical situation, being, at the same time, an inspiration and influential figure in the studies by Unesco on possibilities of an anti-racist policy, and intellectually associated with the colonial policies advanced by Portugal (see pp.112-3). Two of the most resounding examples of Gilberto's intellectual and political prestige.[162] Balance of antagonisms?

In sum, I have tried to highlight above how those blurred demarcations between a historical account and a political intervention operate in Gilberto's interpretation of contemporary Brazil, focusing on his uses of the concept of "formation". I would now like to recall that the five traces of "formation" identified in my interpretation are expressed by: (1) the central concern with the relation between order and nation, mainly through the notion of "balance of antagonisms" and through the nexus between order and progress; (2) the incomplete transition of

Filosofia, Letras e Ciências Humanas of USP, that was consolidating a scientifically rigorous approach to social sciences in the 1950s. Fernando Henrique Cardoso (2013 [2010]) also cites the Brazilian Communist Party (former Communist Party of Brazil). Maria Arminda do Nascimento Arruda (2009; 2010) recalls the creation, in 1962, of the *Centro de Sociologia Industrial e do Trabalho* and, previously, of the course on sociology and politics of the *Faculdade de Ciências Econômicas* of the University of Minas Gerais (UFMG). All that expressed the general mood of an open bet on the possibility of development on Latin American countries, overcoming its past.

[161] Gilberto's reception abroad, mainly in France, is discussed by Sandra Jatahy Pesavento (2006b); Ria Lemaire (2006); and Jacques Leenhardt (2006a). Sandra (2006b) also mentions that the connections Gilberto established with the French intellectual scene were also an alternative he found to the cultural hegemony of Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo (see Pesavento, 2006, pp.60-2).

[162] For the details of Gilberto's involvement with the Unesco Project, see Maio (1999b) and Dimas (2006). For the links between this Project and the scenario of the incipient institutionalization of the social sciences in Brazil, see Maio (2003). Mario Helio Gomes de Lima (2014) attenuates the supposed ruptures in Gilberto's texts before and after the explicit proposition of "Lusotropicolgy" (see for example, Lima, 2014, p.156-7).

the Brazilian civilization in the tropics, already urban and still patriarchal; (3) the internal inequalities across different regions and different social times; (4) the external comparison with the revolutionary aspects of the other Latin American countries and through the encounters with modernities in Europe and in the United States; and (5) the singularity of this first modern civilization in the tropics, capable of appropriating progresses from the outside without dismantling the order and stabilization inside.

Before moving to another interpretation of Brazil, I would like to lay out three suggestions. Firstly, I want to point out that one should not take for granted that Gilberto's texts, like his interpretations of Brazil in the three essays discussed above, are completely fractured between those endorsing Lusotropicology and those not endorsing it (written either before Lusotropicology was formulated or at approximately the same time). In other words, even if his texts express important inflexions (textually, politically), it is important not to beg the question in relation to the tensions between ruptures and continuities across each other. Gilberto's innumerable prefaces to his own texts, constantly rewritten throughout the decades, work in favor of these tensions. Secondly, one should be aware of the complex relation between a text and a political position of his writer. Attributing to texts a retroactive coherence, based on the information that they were all written by the same "author", can be as misleading as assuming that texts are completely different, since they were written by different "authors". In this same vein, thirdly, I have also tried to reiterate that texts and political positions are not easily separable, but that this does not mean that they are automatically attached to each other. Very different political positions can be articulated, intentionally or not, with different textual formulations.

Let me reiterate: the relation between the analytical and the normative is a complex one, not easily separable; the lines demarcating what is found in history and how history is judged are blurred in many crucial instances, as it is the case in the three essays comprising Gilberto's "introduction to the history of the patriarchal society in Brazil".