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This dissertation is a case study in the international exchange of ideas. It begins with the 1934-1940 French University Mission to establish the University of São Paulo—Brazil's premier institution of higher learning. I argue that the experiences and intellectual networks that French intellectuals formed with Brazilian social scientists in the 1930s provided a conceptual framework for thinking about France and its role in a postcolonial world. Brazil and its intellectual traditions forced thinkers such as Claude Lévi-Strauss, Fernand Braudel, and Roger Bastide to engage race and racial politics in a new key. By demonstrating the substantial links between Brazilian and French intellectuals as well as the influence of Brazilian ideas on French intellectuals, I make the argument that Brazil exported ideas about race-relations and what it means to be a modern multi-racial and post-colonial state.

The argument is significant because it challenges the traditional, if simplified, view, of colonial economies and the relationship between the developed and developing world. This standard view held that the West produced knowledge, technical know-how,
and manufactured goods out of raw materials supplied by the rest of globe. As a result of the French University Mission, well-defined intellectual networks developed between French and Brazilian intellectuals that were not defined by an easy power differential. By demonstrating the substantial links between Brazilian and French intellectuals, and documenting the influence of Brazilian social scientists on French intellectuals, I invert this traditional model and show that Brazil was a source for thinking about France and its global role going forward.

The purpose served by the Franco-Brazilian intellectual network differed according to nationality. This is why I adopt a transnational perspective on the international circulation of ideas. For Brazil, but more specifically, São Paulo, the establishment of the University of São Paulo provided Brazilian thinkers with access to the international social scientific community. While the U.S. certainly supplanted France post-war, Brazilian intellectuals retained affection for French thinkers that they did not confer on U.S. social scientists. As for France, this intellectual network provided French intellectuals with the resources to reinvigorate its own social scientific traditions in an era of increasing specialization. This is an argument that runs counter to the argument of the influential intellectual historian, H. Stuart Hughes, who argued that French social science between 1930 and 1960 suffered from being self-enclosed within a national tradition.

What makes the story of Franco-Brazilian intellectual and cultural relations from the interwar era through the mid-1960s particularly compelling, however, is that the interest in Brazil as a model for France's future did not remain a matter of academic interest. Between 1959 and 1964, a brief period of time in which Charles de Gaulle radically shifted gears from waging a bloody colonial war in Algeria to developing a
politics of cooperation with the developing world, Brazil became an important site of contention between the French left and right.

During this period, André Malraux, Jean-Paul Sartre, and de Gaulle himself visited Brazil. I argue that these visits, which were highly visible international spectacles, call attention to overlooked dimensions of geopolitics. Because most American-based French and Latin American scholars who work on international relations focus their attention on colonial relationships, or interactions with the United States, the relationship between mid-level powers, such as France and Brazil are neglected. In this dissertation, I argue that the cultural policy France developed with Brazil and other Latin American nations is integral to understanding what de Gaulle meant by an independent foreign policy in the Cold War era. This does not deny American hegemony, but rather shows how "soft power" provided room for challenging that dominance. I also argue that the shift to a politics of cooperation with the developing world was only possible given the French government's earlier efforts, such as the French University Mission to Brazil, to establish closer ties to Latin America.
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CHAPTER 1

A TRANSMATIONAL CULTURAL POLITICS:
THE FRENCH UNIVERSITY MISSION TO BRAZIL, RACIAL THEORY AND THE FORMATION OF A NEW SOCIAL SCIENCE PARADIGM

Introduction

This chapter evaluates the writings produced by the French University Mission to Brazil of the 1930s together with some of the basic institutional, diplomatic, and political frameworks at play in the 1930s. It argues that the power relations between the state and intellectual production as well as between France and Brazil are considerably more complicated than they have been treated thus far. While the power dynamic between France and Brazil played an important role in circumscribing the actions of the French professors, their perceptions and experiences of Brazil suggest that both they and their intellectual disciplines were transformed through the process. In short, the impact of the French University Mission on the French social sciences makes this mission a curious hybrid of cultural imposition and humility.

Pierre Bourdieu’s influential article, "The Social Conditions of the International Circulation of Ideas," provides the basis for the approach I take in this chapter. According to Bourdieu, intellectual life may seem inherently international because of both the ease with which ideas cross borders and the long tradition of a Republic of Letters that aspires to the universal. But, he argues that there is nothing further from the truth. For Bourdieu, intellectuals have no in-born immunity from the nationalist, ethnic, and regional prejudices to which they have been exposed and
convey these prejudices—some more explicitly than others—in the work they produce. As he puts it, "texts circulate without their context," and so "don't bring with them the field of production of which they are a product." Likewise, the readers of these texts who are immersed in a different field of intellectual production, "re-interpret the texts in accordance with the structure of the field of reception." This, of course, leads to considerable misunderstandings.

Clearing away the resulting confusion is an arduous task, and while complete transparency may be an impossible dream, Bourdieu suggests that to achieve some rational dialogue on the subject, we need to acquire knowledge of how the various national fields function. In his view, a "reconstruction of the different national histories," combined with "a history of educational institutions and the fields of cultural production," permits us to "unveil the historical foundations of various categories of thought" and thus come to an understanding of how ideas travel across borders.

The French University Mission to aid in the establishment of Brazil’s first universities in the 1930s is an ideal case study to explore Bourdieu's diagnosis of cross-border misapprehension and his proposed analytic corrective. As such, it serves as a logical starting point for this dissertation on Franco-Brazilian intellectual exchange in the period stretching roughly from 1930 to 1960. The reciprocity of Brazilian and French intellectual exchange, combined with the intersection of

---


academic institutions and national cultures, make the University Mission a truly transnational space. To fully appreciate the dynamics of the Mission and the ideas that emerged from it requires not only an analytic lens that comprehends the institutions, structures, politics, individuals, and ideas within both the French and Brazilian cultural fields, but also the changes produced within both fields through this exchange. This is what the dissertation as a whole aims to do.

Foremost among the reasons why the French University Mission serves as an ideal case study is that this episode in Franco-Brazilian history brought the intellectual vanguard of both countries into contact with one another. Among the French professors sent to help establish Universities in São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, and Porto Alegre were Claude Lévi-Strauss, Fernand Braudel, Pierre Monbeig, Henry Hauser, Émile Coornaert, Henri Tronchon, and Roger Bastide. In Brazil, these professors encountered as students, assistants, peers, or administrators, Florestan Fernandes, Gilberto Freyre, Sergio Buarque de Holanda, Fernando de Azevedo, João Cruz Costa, Caio Prado Junior, Afonso Arions de Mello Franco, and Antônio Carneiro Leão.

Besides the prominence of the intellectuals involved, the episode is also noteworthy because it constitutes what Thomas Skidmore has called a case of mutual influence. Clearly, this exchange impacted the development of the social sciences and humanities in Brazil. Additionally, given the youth of figures like Lévi-Strauss, Braudel, Monbeig, and Bastide at the time of their stay in Brazil and later prominence in the French academy, the University Mission also raises the question of how this experience influenced the development of the humanities and social
sciences in France—a question that will be pursued in Chapters 3, 4, and 5 of this dissertation. This case of mutual influence adds to the problematic drawn above because in this case we have two national fields intersecting and informing one another—it is not simply ideas crossing national boundaries, but intellectuals, research paradigms, and practices.

This first chapter will provide an overview of the University Mission and provide a historical context for it on both the Brazilian and French sides. In the course of doing so, the most important readings of the Mission’s significance will be considered. These prior analyses of the University Mission have generally employed a national lens. That is, they tend to view this episode in Franco-Brazilian cooperation as it relates to Brazilian national development or in terms of international French diplomacy. The majority of these analyses view it through the lens of dependency theory. In other words, they have analyzed French involvement in the founding of Brazilian universities in São Paulo, Rio and Porto Alegre in terms of an imbalance of power and cultural achievement. The general argument is that given France’s higher level of industrialization, its revolutionary tradition (often equated with political modernity), and cultural pedigree, its role in Brazilian higher education is yet another example of cultural imperialism.

My analysis in this and subsequent chapters departs from previous analyses not so much by critiquing them, but by synthesizing and building upon them in

---

order to show the transnational dimensions of the University Mission. It operates along the lines of what Sanjeev Khagram and Peggy Levitt have identified as methodological transnationalism by "reclassifying existing data, evidence, and historical and ethnographic accounts that are based on bounded or bordered units so that transnational forms and processes are revealed." As a result of this approach, I argue that the French faculty’s high regard for Brazilian intellectuals and the reciprocity between Brazilian and French thinkers make the overall legacy of the French University Mission much more complex than a straightforward case of cultural imperialism.

A central feature of my approach in this chapter and the dissertation more broadly is that my analysis engages the actual exchange of ideas that took place between Brazilian and French intellectuals. Generally speaking, historians and sociologists writing about the University Mission have focused on the institutional and diplomatic structures involved and have left the history of ideas untouched. As Patrick Petitjean acknowledges,

Il reste que l’influence des missions étrangères, en particulier françaises, sur l’histoire des idées au Brésil, comme, inversement, l’influence de leur séjour brésilien pour ceux d’entre eux qui ont poursuivi leur carrière en Europe, restent encore largement à étudier de manière systématique.


5 Patrick Petitjean, "Autour de la Mission Française pour la Création de l'Université de São Paulo," in Science and Empires: Historical Studies about Scientific Development and European Expansion, ed. Patrick Petitjean, Catherine Jasi and Anne Marie Moulin, 339-364 (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1992), 355. This translates as: "The influence of foreign missions, especially French, on the history of ideas in Brazil, and conversely, how this time in Brazil influenced those who continued their careers in Europe, has yet to be studied systematically."
Analyzing the intellectual connections made between French and Brazilian thinkers adds to the existing literature by showing how intellectuals engaged one another's work. These engagements sometimes involve transnational comparisons that reveal what Robert Stam and Ella Shohat have identified as "ego-reinforcing national narration."\(^6\) The overall record of the Mission is, however, somewhat more ambivalent as we also see what Stam and Shohat refer to as interventions within narcissistic national narratives. The ambivalence of the French University Mission to Brazil on the plane of ideas permits a reading of this transnational episode that transcends the dependency paradigm. What we see is that engagement with Brazil's intellectuals, its people, and landscape forced the French participants to rethink previous methods, concepts, and stimulated the development of the social sciences in France.

In this first chapter, my focus is on how French faculty engaged the topics of race, immigration, economic development and social structure in Brazil of the 1930s. With a few exceptions, the works considered were published either during or shortly after the University Mission (reviews, articles, and books, published after the war are the focus of Chapters 3 and 4). Generally speaking, these works indicate a vibrant intellectual exchange of ideas about Brazilian development and educational theory between the French professors and Brazilian intellectuals. It is worth restating that the dialogue of the French professorate with the work Brazilian social scientists, historians and educational theorists such as Gilberto Freyre, Sergio

Buarque de Hollanda, Affonso Arianos de Mello Franco, and Antônio Carneiro Leão makes it difficult to argue that the French University Mission was *tut court* cultural colonialism. Further, these sources demonstrate that French thinkers revised their basic conceptions of race, society, and history as a result of their confrontation with Brazilian realities.

In terms of structuring this argument, I begin by considering the diplomatic and institutional connections responsible for the Franco-Brazilian cooperation in the area of higher education. Here the backdrop for the mission will be considered along with some of the perspectives previously taken on this episode. Then I will move on to examine articles appearing in the *Annales* or in related journals by figures associated with the movement and consider the impact of these works on the subsequent careers and development of the social sciences in France.

**The University Mission: Motives, Institutional Structures, Actors, and Interpretations**

On January 25, 1934, São Paulo State Decree Number 6238 created the University of São Paulo (USP). This was the first university in Brazil to combine engineering, law, and medical faculties and integrate them with a central faculty of philosophy, sciences, and letters. While the historical backdrop to USP's creation is considerable, the actual decision to create USP, was made hastily between mid-

---

7 This precise of USP's creation is based on a number of secondary sources: Simon Schwartzman, Thomas Skidmore, Hugo Rogério Suppo, and Patrick Petitjean.

8 Simon Schwartzman notes that the first Brazilian university created was in the state of Paraná in 1912, but lasted only until 1915. He also points out that the University of Rio de Janeiro was created in 1920, however, notes that this was a simple merger of professional schools. See Simon Schwartzman, *A Space for Science: The Development of the Scientific Community in Brazil* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991), 117-8.
December of 1933 and the decree of January 1934. Fernando de Azevedo, the Secretary of Education for São Paulo State, at the urging of Julio de Mesquita, the editor and owner of the São Paulo daily, O Estado de São Paulo, and Armando de Salles Oliveira, the Interventor of São Paulo State, drew up the plan for the university. São Paulo took the initiative in creating Brazil’s first university as a result of its defeat in a 1932 civil war that began as a challenge to the coup that established Gétulio Vargas as President of Brazil. In the aftermath of defeat, there was consensus among São Paulo’s agricultural and industrial elite that the state needed a modern university to build a broader elite class that was scientifically and culturally proficient and thus capable of serving as Brazil’s vanguard.

How did it come to pass that France played a significant role in establishing USP and Brazilian higher education more generally? The answer to this question has a number of parts. To begin with, the needs, motivation, and players on the Brazilian side of the equation need to be identified. Secondly, the motives, institutional structures, and players involved in French cooperation must be recognized. While there is little dispute about who was involved in the mission and the basic institutions involved in this exchange, divergent interpretations have been offered with regard to the degree to which activities on the official level directed the behavior of principals involved in terms of thought and action. This section will articulate the basic features of the university mission and evaluate some of the basic

---

9 During the First Vargas Regime, intervenitors were governors appointed by Vargas and reporting directly to him.

10 Regional politics in Brazil and the 1932 Constitutionalist Revolution that led to the creation of USP will be treated extensively in Chapter 2.
conflicts in the historiography over the state’s role the production of knowledge and
the degree to which power differential between France and Brazil impacted the
exchange of ideas between individuals.

On the Brazilian side, the creation of USP was a response to Brazil’s
industrialization in general, and São Paulo’s in particular. The Revolution of 1930 in
Brazil in which Gétulio Vargas took power, has been interpreted as Brazil’s
bourgeois Revolution.\textsuperscript{11} During the first Vargas era, spanning 1930-1945, the state
became active in promoting a national culture and viewed education as the ideal
instrument for creating cultural unity. The powerful minister of education, Gustavo
Capanema, created a "Napoleon" model of public education with the aim of unifying
and centralizing the state. Within this general context:

\begin{quote}
L’USP est le fruit direct de cette mouvement tendant à l’éducation populaire et à la
préparation des élites, objectifs considérés en dernière analyse, comme les deux
phases d’un seul problème: la formation de la culture nationale. Le groupe autour
du journal OESP sera le porte-parole de ce mouvement à la recherche de la
formation du "caractère national" et de la "conscience nationale", comme éléments
d'affirmation de la nationalité brésilienne.\textsuperscript{12}
\end{quote}

The group that Suppo indicates as being centered around \textit{O Estado de São Paulo} was
led by Julio de Mesquita, the paper’s owner and editor, and Fernando de Azevedo,
the Minister of Education for São Paulo State. Patrick Petitjean has identified a
group of eleven prominent intellectuals who participated in this circle and were
involved in the creation of USP. This group resisted Mesquita’s francophilism and

\textsuperscript{11} Hugo Rogélio Suppo, \textit{La Politique culturelle française au Brésil entre les années 1920-1950}, 42.

\textsuperscript{12} Hugo Rogélio Suppo, \textit{La Politique culturelle française au Brésil entre les années 1920-1950}, 141.
This may be roughly translated as: "USP is the direct result of the desire to create a new elite and a
system of popular education. These two objectives are, in the last analysis, two phases of the same
problem—the creation of a national culture. The group around \textit{O Estado de São Paulo} was the
mouthpiece of the movement that sought the formation of a "national character" and "national
conscience" as elements of Brazilian nationality.
advocated diversifying the faculty brought in to help establish the Faculty of Philosophy, Science and Letters. Nonetheless, they opted for calling on Europeans to come and teach in the University rather than sending the Brazilians to Europe to get trained and come back.\textsuperscript{13} While Germans and Italians participated in the creation of USP, it was the French that were called on for the social sciences and humanities. Petitjean cites Mesquita and Paulo Duarte as sources for the reasoning behind the Brazilians decision—they wanted those chairs responsible for teaching Brazilian students how to think to come from a liberal democracy rather than from totalitarian societies.\textsuperscript{14}

Turning from Brazil to France in the 1930s, we see a country with a government characterized by instability, scandal and violence. According to Jean-Baptiste Duroselle, from June 1932 to March 1940 France had 17 cabinets—an average of 5 months and 24 days each.\textsuperscript{15} Following Suppo, this was also a period in which France recognized that the only area where it could continue to be triumphant was in the area of culture.\textsuperscript{16} France's basic foreign policy aims during this period were to advance a new international politics focused on the rule of law.

\textsuperscript{13} Petitjean attributes this to the tendency of the Brazilian grão fino that was "plus tourné vers une Europe mythifiée que vers les réalités de la société brésilienne." See Patrick Petitjean, "Autour de la Mission Française pour la Création de l'Université de São Paulo," 347.

\textsuperscript{14} Patrick Petitjean, “Autour de la Mission Française pour la Création de l'Université de São Paulo, 347.


\textsuperscript{16} Suppo argues that with the London Conference of 1924, the Dawes Plan effectively meant that U.S. took control of German reparation payments to France and was effectively the date where French power ended.
with the League of Nations and the rapprochement of France with Germany for the formation of a new European federation.\textsuperscript{17}

The French government felt that it could be dominant in the area of culture because, beyond the longstanding prominence of French letters, it was the first country to organize its cultural propaganda. In 1883, France created the Alliance Française to support the growth and propagation of the French language. In 1910, the Alliance was subsumed into the Bureau des Écoles and the Œuvres Françaises à l’Étranger. With the First World War, cultural activities were organized into "un vrai politique culturelle" under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Once the Great War ended the government reorganized the Bureau des Écoles and the Œuvres Françaises à l’Étranger and created the Service des Œuvres Françaises à l’Étranger. In addition to professional diplomats, this department had a circuit of intellectuals tied to it. With the creation of the Service des Œuvres Françaises à l’Étranger, France began to establish secular institutions abroad (Instituts français, Lycées et Maisons françaises, and French chairs in foreign universities) and shifted its geopolitical focus towards Central and Eastern Europe, Latin America and the United States.\textsuperscript{18}

France was particularly interested in closer ties to Brazil because of its geographic and demographic size, and the potential market for pharmaceuticals, clothes, perfumes and wines.\textsuperscript{19} The roots of French involvement in Brazilian higher

\textsuperscript{17} Again, this is Suppo’s interpretation.

\textsuperscript{18} The institutional history of SOFE can be found in the first section of Suppo’s \textit{La Politique culturelle française au Brésil entre les années 1920-1950}.

\textsuperscript{19} See Suppo, \textit{La Politique culturelle française au Brésil entre les années 1920-1950}, 50.
education extend back to the work of George Dumas and Henri Louis Le Châtelier in establishing the Groupement des Universités et Grandes Écoles de France pour les relations avec l’Amérique latine in 1908. The Groupement was eventually folded into the Service des Œuvres Françaises à l’Étranger. The aim of the Groupement was, according to Jacques Chonchol and Guy Martinère:

Maintenir et développer les affinités intellectuelles existant entre les latins d’Amérique et ceux de France, organiser une collaboration méthodique des universités et grandes écoles françaises et américaines, faire connaître en France l’Amérique latine.

Towards this end, participants established a review, the Bulletin de la Bibliothèque américaine, and organized a series of conferences for intellectual exchange. Dumas took the lead with Brazil. He went to Rio and São Paulo for the first time in 1908. In 1909, he organized an academic congress in São Paulo and helped to establish the Union Scolaire Franco-Pauliste (USFP), which consisted of Brazilian intellectuals from the Faculty of Law, the École Polytechnique and some doctors. The USFP helped send Brazilian students to France, helped to create a Chair of Brazilian studies at the Sorbonne, and a Chair of French Studies in São Paulo with costs shared by USFP and Groupement. During the First World War, USFP dissolved, but after the war in the 1920s and 1930s, this organization collaborated with Dumas and the French government in creating a French lycée in São Paulo that was established in 1924 and was an essential precursor to the establishment of USP. By

---


21 Jacques Chonchol and Guy Martinère, L’Amérique latine et le latino-américanisme en France, p. 63. This translates as: "To maintain and develop existing intellectual affinities between the Latin peoples of the Americas and France, to organize a regular and methodic collaboration between Universities and major intellectual institutions in France and the America, and to make France and the Americas better acquainted with one another."
1931, Dumas was confident that a university would be established in São Paulo with something resembling the École Normale Supérieure.\textsuperscript{22}

Once the decision was made and the decree to create USP issued in January of 1934, the Paulista government sent the mathematician, Theodore Augusto Ramos abroad to recruit foreign faculty. Although Ramos's starting point was Rome, George Dumas managed to meet with him before the Italian government because of a tip from Júlio de Mesquita—who was very much in favor of the French. Dumas was successful in negotiating eight chairs for the French—in geography, sociology, history, philosophy, French literature, Classical philology, mathematics and Classical literature. Germany was to have two and Italy three.\textsuperscript{23}

Despite this initial success, Dumas had some difficulty finding faculty to fill the positions because the Brazilian government wanted three-year commitments and Dumas's previous experience had been recruiting established academics for lectures or short sojourns in Brazil. He was able to negotiate with Ramos a special clause that allowed for the French professors to return after a year and the French government to replace that professor with a scholar of equivalent ability and promise. When the French mission was finally assembled, it had lost two of the chairs it had negotiated due to this recruiting problem and six professors arrived in São Paulo: Émile Coornaert (History), Robert Garric (French literature), Pierre Deffontaines (Geography), Paul Arbousse-Bastide (Sociology), Etienne Borne

\textsuperscript{22} In speaking of Dumas, I am following Petitjean's account. See Patrick Petitjean, “Autour de la Mission Française pour la Création de l’Université de São Paulo,” 340-1.

\textsuperscript{23} I am following here Petitjean’s account. See Patrick Petitjean, “Autour de la Mission Française pour la Création de l’Université de São Paulo,” 2.
(Philosophy), and Michel Berveiller (Classical literature). Some of the more famous participants in the University Mission arrived as part of the second mission of 1935. Claude Lévi-Strauss occupied a second chair created in sociology, Fernand Braudel replaced Coornaert and Pierre Monbeig replaced Pierre Deffontaines. The success of the USP University Mission led to similar collaborative efforts with the creation of the University of the Federal District in Rio de Janeiro and the University of Porto Alegre.

At the heart of disagreement about the modality of the French University Mission is the degree to which the diplomatic apparatus and institutional framework of French cultural diplomacy influenced the individual actors. Was this moment of intellectual exchange pervaded by a subtle but distinct politics of dominance? On this question, Hugo Rogélio Suppo and Patrick Petitjean fiercely disagree. Suppo answers in the positive, whereas Petitjean discounts the institutional framework and contends that the French professors in Brazil were relatively autonomous and not compromised by the state.

Suppo's position is that with the foundation of USP, "les premiers fondations furent placées, la "colonisation culturelle' a commencé." He argues that France engaged in power politics in Brazil through its cultural politics and that intellectuals actively disseminated cultural propaganda. Operating within SOFE was the Commissaire Général à l'Information et à la Propagande which made it a priority to

24 For a fuller discussion of the changes between the first and second mission, see Patrick Petitjean, “Autour de la Mission Française pour la Création de l'Université de São Paulo,” 352-4 and Hugo Rogélio Suppo, La Politique culturelle française au Brésil entre les années 1920-1950, 160-165.

organize intellectual propaganda. Citing documents from the Archives of the
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Suppo writes that the Commissaire called for "l'action
métodique auprès des universitaires, des collèges, et, en général, de tous les
professeurs français ou professeurs de français, hors de France."\footnote{Hugo Rogélio Suppo, \textit{La Politique culturelle française au Brésil entre les années 1920-1950}, 27. This translates as: "methodical action among academics, colleges, and, in general, all French teachers, or teachers of French outside France."}

As tensions with Germany heightened in the 1930s, the Ministry of Foreign
Affairs efforts in the realm of political and cultural propaganda only increased.
Suppo cites as evidence a note sent to all French diplomats abroad that they were to
c onsider themselves as ambassadors—this applied to professors, merchants and
industry leaders. As far as possible, the French government attempted to keep its
propaganda efforts as clandestine as possible—particular in regards to cultural
propaganda that aimed to increase admiration for French culture and stimulate the
consumption of French products.\footnote{In terms of the effort to keep the government's propaganda efforts discreet, Suppo cites the defeat of a proposal to create a Haut Commissariat à l’Information by the Assemblée Nationale in 1934. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs shot it down for both budgetary and strategic reasons. Evidence of the strategic purpose is provided in a letter by Paul Bastide, a member of the Chamber of Deputies and the head of the Commission des Affaires Étrangères de la Chambre des Députés. The letter reads: "Une telle centralisation systématique a pour inconvénient d'attirer les regards, de donner au monde l'impression d'un effort voulu, méthodique, de captation d'opinions. Pour être effective, la propagande doit rester discrète, voilée. Le public doit être aussi peu informé que possible de son mécanisme, de ses moyens d'action, de son centre moteur et des déclenchements. En Amérique, notamment, toute révélation d'un plan d'action étrangère aux fins de propagande, même par simple voie d'informations, suscite immédiatement une réaction de défiance, qui peut aller jusqu'à l'hostilité la plus violente." See Hugo Rogélio Suppo, \textit{La Politique culturelle française au Brésil entre les années 1920-1950}, 35. This translates as: "Such a systematic centralization would put us at a disadvantage given that it's bound to attract attention and provide the world with the impression of a willful and methodical attempt to manipulate opinion. To be effective, propaganda must remain discreetly veiled. The public must know as little as possible of its mechanism, its means of action, the engine that drives and triggers it. In America, in particular, any revelation of a plan of action for foreign propaganda, even the knowledge of such an intent, would immediately provoke a reaction of distrust, which could blow up in the most violent hostility."}
In the case of Brazil, Georges Dumas coordinated activities with the head of SOFE, Jean Marx and ran an effective policy. In Brazil, Suppo argues, France knew the number of nationals was limited so the next best thing to do was to create an elite cadre of Francophiles who would speak French as a second language, consume French products and ask France for assistance. Besides Mesquita, some of the key francophiles were Paulo Duarte, Migueal Osório de Almeida and J.P. de Souza-Dantos. In Suppo's telling, the French University Mission was an expertly executed plan of cultural propaganda. French professors reports to Jean Marx and Dumas serve as proof of the extent to which faculty members were aware of their role and eager to promote France's interest abroad.

Patrick Petitjean's view of the French University Mission departs from Suppo's in the weight he grants the diplomatic structures. While aware of the activities of the Groupement des Universités et Grands Ecoles de France pour les Relations avec l'Amérique Latine and the activities of SOFE, Petitjean highlights personal connections and ties over government directives. In terms of the creation of USP, he argues:

L'origine de ces liens et leur mode d'existence relèvent avant tout de liens personnels, voire informels, plus que directement étatiques, notamment avec d'anciens étudiants, formés en France, dans les écoles d'ingénieurs ou en médecine. Les relations ont été épisodiques, jamais stabilisées.28

Petitjean thus asserts that although an institutional structure had been created to carry out cultural diplomacy, the friendship between George Dumas and Júlio de Mesquita mattered more in the creation of USP. He further argues that the

28 Patrick Petitjean, “Autour de la Mission Francaise pour la Création de l'Université de São Paulo,” 343. This translates as: "The origin of these connections and their mode of being were above all personal, and should be seen as informal, rather than governmental. In particular the ties formed with Brazilians who were former students, trained in France, in schools of engineering or medicine. The French/Brazilian connections were episodic, and not stabilized at the official level."
diplomatic correspondence of SOFE does not provide a reliable picture of the situation because of the tergiversations between the Paulistas themselves as well as the Vargas government. He concludes that:

La situation des relations universitaires franco-paulistes en janvier 1934 n'est donc pas aussi favorable qu'il y paraît à la lecture de la correspondance diplomatique officielle.29

Thus, he argues that considering the Brazilian side of the documentation forces one to question the degree to which the French documentation can be relied on.

But even if it is admitted that the French misperceived the situation and were too sanguine in their view of the role they would be assigned in USP’s creation, does this allow us to conclude that governmental structures and institutions played an insignificant role and that Franco-Brazilian cooperation resulted from purely personal relations? This seems doubtful. The mass of documentation that Suppo has analyzed and marshaled to support the role of the state in the University mission seems too much to simply dismiss.

When it comes to the role of the intellectuals who participated in the Mission, Petitjean likewise argues that the state played very little role in influencing their behavior and attitudes in Brazil. His view is that:

La finalité de leur travail est dirigée vers l'USP, et non pas vers le prestige culturel du pays d'où ils viennent: non plus "représenter" la haute culture française et être ainsi des ambassadeurs intellectuels, mais au contraire, aider les étudiants à connaître le pays, à réduire leur dépendance intellectuelle.30

29 Patrick Petitjean, “Autour de la Mission Française pour la Création de l’Université de São Paulo,” 345. This translates as: ”The situation for Franco-Paulista university relations in January 1934 was not as favorable as it seems from reading the official [French] diplomatic correspondence.”

30 Patrick Petitjean, “Autour de la Mission Française pour la Création de l’Université de São Paulo,” 355. This translates as: ”The purpose of their work was directed to the USP, and not to the cultural prestige of France: neither to represent French culture nor to be intellectual ambassadors, but to help students to know their country, and to reduce their intellectual dependence.”
This view that the professors acted primarily as free agents unmotivated by the activity of the French state is completely at odds with Suppo's research. Suppo's extensive review of the documentation of SOFE, that includes letters and reports on the activities of French professors as well as his interviews with figures like Claude Lévi-Strauss, make it hard to accept the position Petitjean takes.

Using Lévi-Strauss as an example, who was continually at odds with Paul Arbousse-Bastide and on the defensive with Dumas and SOFE as a result on his instance over teaching ethnography rather than Durkheimian sociology, Suppo provides evidence that the French faculty did indeed play a diplomatic role. Lévi-Strauss's first foray into the Brazilian outback in 1937 was funded partly by SOFE and partly by the State of São Paulo. The French consul thought this a great success, writing that:

_Mais surtout -- l'expédition étant officiellement organisée comme expédition brésilienne -- la ville de São Paulo en assume vis à vis des Autorités fédérales l'entiè蝶 responsabilité après avoir amicalement fourni à nos compatriotes des moyens administratifs de la réaliser. On peut par conséquent retenir à l'avantage de la propagande française ici que des pouvoirs publics brésiliens aient fait appel à Claude Lévi-Strauss pour diriger l'expédition, à Mme Lévi-Strauss pour les y représenter._

The reason this state of affairs was such a success was that in this case, French propaganda was acting precisely as it was supposed to—under the surface and behind the conscious motives of actors.

Besides this evidence, it is clear from Magué's _Les Dents Agacées_ that professors understood their diplomatic role. Even if many, like Braudel chose to

---

31 Hugo Rogélio Suppo, _La Politique culturelle française au Brésil entre les années 1920-1950_, 175. This translates as: "But above all - the expedition was officially organized as a Brazilian expedition - the city of São Paulo assumed full responsibility for having kindly supplied our countryman the administrative means to achieve it. We can therefore claim a success of French propaganda here that Brazilian authorities have turned to Claude Levi-Strauss to lead the expedition, Ms. Levi-Strauss to represent them."
eschew diplomatic functions and spend most of their time engaging their students and keeping company with Brazilian intellectuals, they undoubtedly understood their role as representatives of France when they faced political pressures. This was particularly likely once the Popular Front government came to power in 1936. This caused tensions to rise because of the anti-communist program of the Vargas government. Further, although Pierre Monbieg, Lévi-Strauss, and Braudel may have discounted their roles as diplomats, it is clear from the archival record that Paul Arbousse-Bastide was not alone in engaging with SOFE, Émile Coornaert reflected that the Mission was important because São Paulo would become one of the great cities of the world and it would owe this in part to French influence.32

Perhaps some middle-ground can be found between Suppo’s and Petitjean’s views when one considers that Suppo argues that the propaganda of the University Mission was intended to be persuasive and softer than straightforward political propaganda. For this type of propaganda to work, it was necessary to have highly articulate representatives who were multilingual and had access to intellectual and political elites of the home society. This softened view of French cultural diplomacy comes close to the view put forth in Suzanne Balous’ broad assessment of French cultural activities on a global level. Balous stresses the cooperative elements of French cultural policy and in particular in its linguistic policy to spread the French language.33

32 See Suppo, La Politique culturelle française au Brésil entre les années 1920-1950, 151.

Whatever their differences, both Suppo and Petitjean are concerned primarily with analyzing the institutional aspects of the University Mission. What happens when the intellectual field is considered? As noted above, Petitjean points out that a systematic study of the ideas that emerged from the University Mission has yet to be conducted. In what follows, I will concern myself with early publications of the French professors affiliated with the Annales school. The writings suggest a view that is a composite of Petitjean's and Suppo's. On the one hand, these academics engage Brazilian social scientists and essayists as peers and demonstrate a genuine interest in cross-cultural comparisons. They were fascinated with race and the role it plays in Brazilian society. On the other hand, Braudel's, Hauser's and Magüé's writings tend to reframe the work of Brazilian social scientists. Braudel and Hauser do this on this historical plane while Magüé does this on a more formal level.

**From the Existential to the Global: Fernand Braudel on Gilberto Freyre's Brazil**

In 1943, Fernand Braudel wrote a review in the *Mélanges d'histoire sociale* that helped introduce the works of the Brazilian sociologist, Gilberto Freyre, to a French audience. Braudel's review, "A Travers une Continent d'Histoire: Le Brésil et l'oeuvre de Gilberto Freyre," offers a synopsis in addition to insight and critique of Freyre's methodology and theories of Brazilian civilization.34 Besides elucidating

---

profond dans le sol natal et constitue un lien indispensable avec la culture traditionnelle de la collectivité à laquelle il appartient," 13. This translates as: "Moreover, French cultural activity is based on the fundamental principle that teaching French should not interfere with the knowledge of the native language that allows for an individual’s deep connection with their native country and is an indispensable link with the traditional culture of the community to which he belongs."

34 The *Mélanges d'histoire sociale* was a wartime substitute for the *Annales* after the French defeat that was published sporadically. Ultimately, German censors did not permit publication of the
Freyre’s work, this review illustrates Braudel’s continuing interest in Brazil after his return from serving as professor at the University of São Paulo from 1935 to 1937. It also is suggestive of the role that Braudel’s experience in Brazil played in the maturation of his conception of historical method. Braudel acknowledged Brazil’s importance in his personal development later in life when he remarked that «C’est au Brésil que je suis devenu intelligent.»

From the opening salvos of his review, Braudel acclaims Freyre’s work as a means of discovering Brazil in its geographic enormity and poetic depth. For Braudel, Freyre—although trained as a sociologist under Franz Boas—represents a passionate new breed of historian who is capable of bringing color, sound and taste to his subject. With Freyre:

L’occasion est donc excellente, en disant leurs richesses, de parcourir un vaste horizon d’histoire, peu familier aux chercheurs de ce côté de l’Atlantique: nous n’avons que trop l’habitude de le négliger ou, ce qui revient à peu près de même, de ne le regarder, le cas échéant, qu’à travers les ouvrages anciens de Southey, d’Handelsman, de Roch Pombo et, surtout, de Varnhagen: ouvrages vénérables et utiles, certes, mais à la façon des classiques indispensables et grises histoires générales; on ne se douterait point à les lire que la vie passée, qu’ils présentent de façon monotone et, pour tout dire, si scolaire -- cette vie qu’ils ne montrent que bornée par le traditionnel horizon politique -- est celle d’un étonnant, d’un savoureux pays, original, varié et vaste à lui seul comme un continent; on ne se douterait pas non plus, à les parcourir, que cette histoire est une somme d’expériences multiples, historiques et humaines, toutes du plus haut intérêt.

Annales despite the Vichy government’s support for the publication. For a fuller account of this episode in the Annales history, which also involves a dispute between Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre on whether to continue the publication under the auspices of the Vichy regime, see André Burguière, The Annales School: An Intellectual History (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009), 43–49.


36 Fernand Braudel, "A Travers une continent d’histoire: Le Brésil et l’oeuvre de Gilberto Freyre," Mélanges d’histoire sociale 4 (1943), 3. This translates as follows: Thus, the occasion is fortuitous for traveling along a vast horizon of history that is unfamiliar to researchers on this side of the Atlantic.
This is evidence that Braudel sees in Freyre a fellow traveler—a thinker willing to engage historical problems in a new key by bringing the experimental methods of the social sciences to bear on historical inquiry. Braudel shares Freyre’s taste for exploring the world of human values; applauds him for his ability to combine discrete types of analysis within a historical analysis; and fully considers him as both sociologist and historian even though Freyre was trained as a sociologist.

Besides the new methods that Freyre brings to historical inquiry, what resonates most for Braudel is the existential urgency that Freyre brings to his oeuvre. Braudel intimates that for a thinker like Freyre, Brazil is a presence one cannot avoid or ignore, as well as «une personne qu’il faut comprendre une bonne fois, si l’on veut se comprendre soi-même».37 As a Brazilian, Freyre is able to infuse personal reminiscences, memory, and the knowledge of experience into his work. While this allows Freyre to construct Brazil and its institutions through an intimate knowledge of Brazil’s singular characteristics, it provokes foreign readers to question what Freyre’s work holds for them. Given that Freyre was part of the intelligenza of a country that was—as Braudel puts it—«en quête fiévreuse de lui-même, de son essence et de son être», and whose vocation was animated by the

---

37 See Fernand Braudel, "A Travers une continent d’histoire: Le Brésil et l’oeuvre de Gilberto Freyre," 4-5. This translates as "A person one should understand well, if one wants to understand oneself."
desire to understand the present national reality and gain insight into the nation’s future, of what importance could this work be to a French reader whose destiny lay outside that national interest? 

Speaking of Freyre’s warnings and admonishments to his compatriots, Braudel writes, "[e]lle ne sont pas pour nous, étrangers, si attachés que nous puissions être à la vie brésilienne." Given Braudel's recognition of this rhetorical structure, on what basis does he as a foreign author engage Freyre critically?

Rather than offering him reason to recuse himself from a thoroughly critical analysis of Freyre's vision of Brazilian history, Braudel recognizes the bias he brings while simultaneously building a critique and articulating a historical methodology on the basis of that perspective. He writes that:

Pour nous, Européens, le Brésil est d'abord une Europe américaine, une Europe appuyée sur cette Méditerranée moderne qu’aura été l’Atlantique, vivant de sa vie plus ou moins animée, participant à son histoire générale et à la vie mêlée des Europes qui l’entourent, les vieilles et les nouvelles.

This Braudelian perspective on Brazil—as a part of world history that resulted from the 'closing of the Mediterranean'—is what informs his careful demarcation of the limits of Freyre's work. More than anything else, Braudel believes that Freyre's work needs a 'horizontal enlargement' where besides the seigneurial past of Recife's sugar age, Freyre would account for the age of gold in Minas Gerais and the coffee age in Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo. Braudel's foreign eyes see Brazil in the plural--

---


Fernand Braudel, "A Travers une continent d'histoire: Le Brésil et l'oeuvre de Gilberto Freyre," 19. This translates as: "For us Europeans, Brazil is above all an American Europe. A Europe reclining on that modern Mediterranean, the Atlantic, that lives an animated life through participating in the general history of the Atlantic. This life combines the Europes that surround it, both the old and the new."
as a country of powerful contrasts and multiple civilizations. He takes Freyre to task "pour généraliser et étendre au Brésil entier les couleurs de son Brésil à lui."41 Along the same lines, making an analogy with France, he writes, "La Lorraine n'est pas, n'a jamais été la Bourgogne. São Paulo n'est pas, n'a jamais été Bahia ou Recife."42

Besides the general problem of Freyre's framing of the study, Braudel makes a number of points, both critical and laudatory, that help elucidate his conceptualization of historical method on the eve of writing his master work. Among the most important are those concerning Freyre's analysis of the role of race in history and the use of architecture as a historical document.

One of the merits of Casa grande e senzala is that Freyre breaks with previous historiographic treatments of race in Brazilian history. Braudel acknowledges this and commends Freyre for deviating from the simplistic practice of simply picking a racial strand in Brazil and demonstrating its merits and importance in Brazilian history. In discussing race, Braudel congratulates for deviating from the conventional method of speaking of institutions. When Freyre speaks of institutions—whether those of slavery, of government, of aristocracy—they are always cast in social terms, i.e., in terms of how human beings conceive, adapt and collide with these institutions. The intimate portrait of domestic life on the seigneurial estate in Pernambuco drawn by Freyre integrates race, sexuality, gender and patriarchy into the narrative of Brazilian history. In so far as Freyre considers new factors and patterns undergirding Brazil’s historical legacy, he can be

---

41 Fernand Braudel, "A Travers une continent d’histoire: Le Brésil et l’oeuvre de Gilberto Freyre," 18. Roughly: "For generalizing and extending to the whole of Brazil the colors of his own Brazil."

seen as a fellow traveler to the early contributors to the *Annales* who were intent on transcending traditional political and economic history by identifying new types of patterns and constructing new models to understand historical development.\(^{43}\)

At the same time that Braudel sees a kindred spirit in Freyre's methodological innovation with regard to race, he is highly suspicious of his conclusions. Freyre cast the seigneurial estate as the location for a benign form of patriarchy that included promiscuous sexual exchanges between white masters and their slaves. In Freyre's view, miscegenation that resulted from this promiscuity helped to soften relations between the Casa Grande and Senzala (Slave hut).

Braudel finds this conclusion highly dubious and argues that:

> Le problème à retenir (si je n’accentue pas trop la pensée de l’auteur) c’est que, chaque fois qu’une civilisation nouvelle, vraiment cohérente, s’est développée au Brésil — du moins lorsqu’il s’agit d’une de ces civilisations rurales, et surtout de celles qui poussèrent sur la forêt brûlée — on la voit débuter régulièrement par un paysage et un système plus ou moins identiques à celui du Nordeste, conformément aux règles de la Casa Grande... Même la plus récente, celle du café.\(^{44}\)

What Braudel sees here is a repetition of the same configuration of racial relations albeit with varying appearance. Despite Freyre's claim for a national culture built upon the relatively harmonious racial relations resulting from miscegenation,

\(^{43}\) André Burguière argues that the pioneering figures of the Annales school sought "to identify patterns, if not laws, in the way society functions, to construct models of development that ought to guide action in and on society." See André Burguière, *The Annales School: An intellectual History*, 20. They had to search for these new patterns and distrusted trying to read meaning from a simple reconstruction of political events because, in his view, the First World War had so fundamentally shattered a notion of linear progress, that "the historian could no longer claim to extract the meaning of history from the mere reconstitution or succession of facts: he had to attempt an explanation as well," 37.

\(^{44}\) Fernand Braudel, "A Travers une continent d'histoire: Le Brésil et l’œuvre de Gilberto Freyre," 13. This translates as: "The problem that remains (if I don't overstress the thought of the author) is that each time a new civilization develops in Brazil that is truly coherent--at least when it's a matter of agricultural society, and especially of those pushing on the frontiers--one sees the regular debut of countryside and system more or less identical to the northeast, conforming to the rules of the Casa Grande--even the most recent...the coffee culture of the south."
Braudel saw Brazil trapped in a rigidly hierarchical pattern of race relations. He maintained this view throughout his life; at one point commenting in an interview that Brazil did not have a "social" question, but rather a "racial" question.

Besides disagreeing with Freyre's treatment of racial relations in Brazil, Braudel objects to the generalizations that Freyre makes about the whole of Brazil on the basis of an isolated structure. This relates to the methodological criticisms discussed above, specifically, Braudel suggests that Freyre's work needs to be expanded 'horizontally.' On top of this broad methodological critique, Braudel offers a more specific analysis of Freyre's use of architectural structures as historical documents. Given that Freyre chose to present the colonial period through the 19th century in architectural terms with Casa grande e senzala and Sobrados e mucambos, Braudel jokingly asks if Freyre would entitle his book on the 20th century would be "Buildings et maisons à bon marché?" In suggesting this, Braudel points out that this title would signal the intervention of the United States, the flourishing of great cities and the anonymity they bring, as well as large banking

45 Braudel's reading bears some relation to a more recent critical review of Freyre offered by Jeffrey Needell. Needell, however, is much more explicit in pointing out the Freyre's contradictory treatment of the sexual relations between white masters and their servants as being a sadistic form of rape and as a means of softening racial relations. See Jeffrey Needell, "Identity, Race, Gender, and Modernity in the Origins of Gilberto Freyre's Oeuvre," American Historical Review 100 (1995): 51-77.

46 Pierre Daix cites Braudel as saying on the subject of Brazil: " On voyait une étrange haute société, peu consciente de sa situation et pleine d'illusions. Je crois qu'une haute société, une alta sociedad, c'est une société qui ne se rend pas compte de la position qu'elle occupe dans le monde. Ils disaient: «Chez nous, pas de question sociale.» Tu te levais de bon matin, tu allais dans les gares de Saint-Paul. Tu voyais débarquer des fleuves de gens de couleur. Il n'y avait pas de question sociale, mais il y avait une question noire...La société brésiliene était tenue au point de vue économique que les capitaux étrangers." See Pierre Daix, Braudel, (Paris: Flammerion, 1995), 111.

47 Fernand Braudel, "A Travers une continent d'historie: Le Brésil et l'oeuvre de Gilberto Freyre," 16. The titles translate, respectively, as 'Plantation houses and slave huts,' 'Mansions and shanties,' and 'Buildings and cheap houses.'
conglomerates. Braudel’s critique of Freyre’s overreliance on architectural forms is a starting point for taking Freyre to task for leaving out dynamic sectors of the economy—such as domestic producers, merchants, bankers, and others involved in international trade—in his historical treatment of the Brazilian past. For Braudel, Freyre’s fixation on architecture dovetails with Freyre’s focus on only the most sedentary aspects of Brazilian civilization. Perhaps the most basic divergence between Braudel’s and Freyre’s vision of Brazil is that Braudel is struck by the nomadic (sertanejos, guarimpeixios, seringaleiros, bandeirantes, tropeiros, Mascates, and domestic migration from the north) and the dynamic (capitalists, merchants, retailers, doctors, lawyers, etc.) aspects of the country in addition to its role in the Atlantic economy.48

Despite his differences with Freyre, his departure from Brazil, and his capture during the Second World War, Braudel was clearly influenced by his work and continued to meditate upon Freyre’s oeuvre as he composed his masterpiece La Méditerranée from a Nazi prison camp. We can see evidence of this in the text of La Méditerranée itself as Braudel cites Freyre no less than three times. The first

---

48 The Portuguese terms listed above translate as follows: sertanejos=herders of the north, guarimpeixios=diamond hunters, seringaleiros=rubber collectors, bandeirantes=slave hunters and frontiersmen, tropeiros=mule owners, Mascates=peddlers. Interestingly, while Braudel points out Freyre’s neglect of the dynamic aspects of Brazilian society, he generally excuses his oversights as due to Freyre’s existential need to discover himself in the Brazilian past. His analysis suggests Freyre’s anti-modern comportment but doesn’t do much by way of explanation. Needell’s more recent analysis offers a much more trenchant criticism of Freyre’s motives while also making explicit Freyre’s anti-Semitism. Needell concludes of Freyre that: “While profoundly ‘modern’ in his training and his experience of personal and social antithesis, he could not truly sustain a balance; and he hungered for the security of the past. “Modernity,” liberalism, homosexuality, and Jewry were discarded or disdained. Although his work is punctuated with criticisms of patriarchy’s sadism and cruelty to Africans, women, and children, his identification with his forefathers is manifest. See Jeffrey Needell, “Identity, Race, Gender, and Modernity in the Origins of Gilberto Freyre’s Oeuvre,” American Historical Review 100 (1995), 75.
instance appears in Braudel’s Chapter, "The Mediterranean as a Human Unit: Communications and Cities," where Braudel advances an argument against defining the Mediterranean simply in physical terms. Rather, it should be defined in terms of "where its influence is felt."49 This brings Braudel to consider the far ranging influence of the peoples of the Mediterranean outside of its waters. He cites Freyre for providing evidence of the existence of a Genoese colony that existed in Brazil.

A second mention of Freyre follows relatively closely as Braudel argues that immigration is not simply a phenomenon linked to poverty and/or necessity. He cites an example involving Florence to show the motivation behind the movement of wealthy landowners and then cites Freyre to drive home the point:

The brilliant work of the Brazilian sociological historian, Gilberto Freyre, affords a valuable comparison. The first Brazilian towns eventually attracted the fazendeiros, house and all. There was a total removal to the town. In the Mediterranean, too, it is as if the town absorbed both lord and manor at once. A lord of Sienna would have his country seat in the Maremma and his palazzo Siena, as Bandello [Matteo] has described it for us, with its hardly-used ground floor and its state rooms where silk was making its triumphant first appearance.50

Here we can see Freyre’s work being employed to offer a comparison that helps explain a phenomenon of the Mediterranean world. A third reference to Freyre serves a similar function. Braudel cites Freyre’s Sobrados e mucambos to illustrate banditry’s function in the Mediterranean world. As in Italy, France, Turkey, and Rome, Braudel writes that "In Brazil at the beginning of the nineteenth century,

---


bandits were the henchmen, the cabras, of wealthy landowners, all threatened to some extent by modern development and obliged to defend themselves."51

**Henri Tronchon’s review of Brazilian social science**

Like Fernand Braudel, Henri Tronchon, who served as a professor at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro during the inaugural year of the French University Mission in Rio in 1936, engaged Brazilian ideas about the nature and development of Brazilian civilization. Unlike Braudel, Tronchon was established in France’s university system at the University of Strasbourg and, although a professor of literature who specialized on the influence of Herder in France, was a fellow traveler of the *Annales* school through his association with Lucien Febvre while Febvre was a professor at Strasbourg.52 Tronchon’s *Huit mois au Brésil* documents his engagement with three Brazilian social theorists: the historian Sérgio Buarque de Holanda (who served as an assistant professor under him at the Federal University of Rio), Afonso Arinos de Melo Franco (who at the time was a young history professor at the university), and Antônio Carneiro Leão (a more established educational theorist). The dialogue Tronchon initiates with these authors, who share the distinction of having published notable books in 1936, shares with Braudel’s critique of Freyre a recognition of the problem of seeing Brazil through foreign eyes. While Tronchon places himself above the common traveler who makes hasty judgments about Brazil without any real engagement with the language

---


and the people, he admits that his personal impressions would not teach the Brazilians anything. In presenting this work to his colleagues and students at the University of Strasbour in 1937, Tronchon addresses European concerns and interests in relating his impression of Brazil and its scholars.

*Huit Mois au Brésil* contains eight chapters, with the first two devoted to summary and analysis of the work of Afonso Arinos de Mello Franco, Sérgio Buarque de Hollanda, and Antônio Carneiro Leão. Throughout the rest of the book—which with the exception of the last chapter is devoted to specific locales in Brazil such as Rio, Minas Gerais, and Bahia—Tronchon refers to these authors' works as he describes his own impressions of Brazil. The final chapter entitled, "Creuset de Races: Le Gouvernement et Les Trois Pouvoirs," serves as a conclusion where Tronchon once again draws on these authors and makes some generalizations about Brazilian history, its contemporary place in the world and its future.

The first of the three books that Tronchon discusses is Afonso Arinos de Mello Franco's *Conceito da Civilisação brasileira* (*The Idea of Brazilian Civilization*).

Mello Franco's book is written from the point of view of what Tronchon identifies as

---

53 Tronchon remarks that: "Au jugement des Brésiliens cultivés, trop d'étrangers venus chez eux ces temps derniers ont trop voulu, laissé entendre qu'ils voulaient surtout faire lever des images d'un sol neuf, les capturer dans leur filet subtil, et puis en avoir l'honneur par-delà le Pot au Noir. Faut-il avouer? Je pensé parfois comme eux, lisant, au retour, certains récits français de voyages au Brésil. Ce pays, qu'il est malaisé de bien connaître, garde l'impression que plus d'un visiteur hâtif, ignorant la langue, l'a simplement pris pour thème a variations ingénieuses, distantes." See Henri Tronchon, *Huit Mois au Brésil: Activité Sociale-Le Décor et la vie-Orientations Intellectuelles* (Strasbourg: Publications de la Faculté des lettres de l'université de Strasbourg, 1937), 9. The passage translates as: "In the judgment of refined Brazilians, too many foreigners have come to their country lately seeking the exotic and leave thinking they've captured it and truly understand this tropic. Should I confess to this? Perhaps sometimes I think like them; I can recognize this from having read travelers tales upon my return to France. This country that is difficult to know well gives me the impression that more than a few hasty visitors who were ignorant of the language and customs returned from it with some made up and far-fetched conclusions."
social psychology; that is, *Conceito da Civilização brasileira* attempts to understand how Brazilians have come to think the way they do particularly in terms of the values they consciously affirm. Understanding this process implies an analysis of the basic structures and micro-processes undergirding Brazilian history. In short, Mello Franco rejects a positivist model of history based simply on the mere accumulation of fact in favor a more philosophically sophisticated model that approaches something like what the early Annalists would refer to as *mentalités*.

Tronchon characterizes Mello Franco's intent in the following terms:

> Il est temps que ce qui s'appelait bonnement Histoire du Brésil, collection de faits imposante mais sans rien d'organique ni synthétique, d'un peu oriente philosophiquement, devienne Histoire de la Civilisation brésilienne: c'est-à-dire (selon la terminologie allemande, voire marxiste), l'histoire d'une de ces «superstructures apparentes qui résultent de l’élaboration invisible, profonde, causale, des cultures."

A key distinction Mello Franco employs throughout his analysis is Spengler’s distinction between a civilization and a culture. He defines civilization as self-conscious of its values and culture while a culture is naive with its values defined by material circumstances.

> When Mello Franco applies this distinction to Brazilian history, what he intends becomes clearer. For him, Brazil is an interpenetration of culture where two cultures, African and indigenous, collided with the civilization of Portugal. Although he sees the Portuguese civilization as victorious, the victors adopted the most important cultural elements of the vanquished to form a civilization unique to

---

54 Henri Tronchon, *Huit Mois au Brésil: Activité Sociale-Le Décor et la vie-Orientations Intellectuelles*, 16. This translates as: "The time has come for that which has been called the History of Brazil--a mere collection of facts assembled without any organic or synthetic design and distrustful of any philosophical considerations--becomes the History of Brazilian Civilization, that is to say (according to Marxist terminology), the history of one of these "apparent superstructures that was resulted from the invisible interaction of cultures taken place beneath the surface."
Brazil. In his account of the ascendancy of Portuguese culture, Mello Franco appears to follow Freyre in arguing that "la plus sûre épée de conquête du Portugais, son outil de travail le plus efficace, aux temps primitifs, fut "o seu priape, inexaurível e ardente." Thus genetically as well as culturally, Brazilian civilization represented a fusion of African, indigenous, and European elements. The task for Mello Franco is to study these elements scientifically, and transpose what has formerly been done only in the realm of literary studies into historical, sociological, and anthropological studies.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of Mello Franco’s work is that despite analyzing Brazilian history as an amalgamation of cultures, he recognizes that the technical revolution of the late Empire has essentially created two Brazils with an abyss between agricultural and industrial civilization. Mello Franco identifies the existence of these two Brazils and the disparity between them as the fundamental challenge in the 1930s. For Mello Franco, deficiencies in economic, scientific and technical areas were responsible for a situation in which Brazil lacked the

---

55 This is Tronchon paraphrasing and directly quoting Mello Franco; see Henri Tronchon, *Huit Mois au Brésil*, 19. This translates roughly as: "The true sword of the Portuguese conquest, its most effective tool, was the penis, inexhaustible and ardent."

56 Tronchon summarizes Mello Franco’s observation as follows: "Entre campagne et grandes cités, dès la République, les conditions de vie diffèrent "épouvantablement", plus qu’en nul autre pays au monde. Différence de niveau de civilisation, dès lors, "impressionnante"; et c’est, paraît-il, selon Trotzki, un fait caractéristique des pays à évolution économique et sociale retardée. Abîme ouvert entre les deux nations brésiliennes, la rurale, l’urbaine. Toute cette civilisation à base "indiscutablement agraire" se désaxe, à mesure que le meilleur des attentions administratives passe aux villes, dont quelques-unes, surtout Rio, São Paulo, s’accroissent démesurément." See Tronchon, *Huit Mois au Brésil*, 23. This translates as: "The difference between living conditions in the countryside and in the city differ "appallingy"—more so than in any other country in the world. The difference in the level of civilization is simply "awe inspiring" and appears to be, at least according to Trotsky, a characteristic that defines countries whose economic and social development has been delayed. An abyss opened between the two Brazils—urban and rural. This entire civilization at its roots "unquestionably agrarian," fell off its axels, in so far as the political and administrative focus shifted to the cities, some of which, like Rio and São Paulo grew disproportionately."
productive capacities to meet demand. In order to meet these challenges, Mello Franco argues that a new class of political leaders will have to emerge and the educational system will have to be revamped to transcend empty theoretical discussions that he dismisses as 'les exagérations de l'éducationnisme'.

Tronchon's criticisms of Mello Franco are generally stylistic and methodological. Generally speaking, he feels the distinctions that Mello Franco makes with regard to 'civilisation' and 'culture' are fuzzy. This may have to do with the Mello Franco treading on Tronchon's expertise—Tronchon was an expert on German Romanticism and the influence of German ideas in France. Tronchon also felt that Mello Franco was scattered and unsystematic in his presentation and had a tendency to highlight his own erudition at the expense of the matter at hand. Nonetheless, despite these deficiencies, Tronchon own personal observations of Brazil dovetail with the Mello Franco's own analysis.

In the final chapter of the work, Tronchon concludes with some observations on Brazil that are consonant with Mello Franco's analysis of Brazil and its history. To begin with, like Mello Franco, he sees an objective analysis of the amalgamation of races in Brazil as a fundamental component of its history and present development. Speaking of race, he comments "Comment considérer la question, désormais, sous un autre aspect que celui d'avenir? Economique, politique, intellectuelle aussi, elle est d'un intérêt pressant." Tronchon also ascribes to Mello


58 Henri Tronchon, *Huit Mois au Brésil: Activité Sociale-Le Décor et la vie-Orientations Intellectuelles*, 98. This translates as: "How do we evaluate the question of race, from here on out, except as an aspect which is the key to the future? Economically, politically, and intellectually, it is a pressing interest."
Franco's contention that 'la sensualité portugaise,' factored into the "gentleness" of Brazilian slavery.

What is most interesting, however, about Tronchon's observations is not their basic agreement with Mello Franco's analysis of Brazilian culture, but the way in which he applies this analysis of Brazilian civilization to contemporary European and world affairs. He does this through engaging a few European travelers reflections on Brazil—specifically those of Abel Bonnard, Jacques de Lauwe, and Herman Keyserling.

While engaging the ideas of these Europeans, Tronchon sets himself apart from them through distancing himself from their conclusions. He seems more intrigued by the issues they raise than by the conclusions they draw. Once again, he suggests that as a foreigner, it is difficult to contribute to an understanding of Brazilian civilization beyond that adopted by its intellectual representatives.

Speaking of race in Brazil, he writes that:

Elle réserve peut-être des surprises. En attendant qu'elle s'éclaire, l'Européen sans préjugés qui demeure au Brésil assez longtemps pour étudier de près tous ces visages, avoue n'être pas beaucoup plus avancé après quelques mois, à part certains indices très accusés parfois; mais ce sont choses curieuses, et d'un attrait constant.59

This reticence to come to any general conclusion about race provides him with critical distance as he considers Abel Bonnard’s reflections on race in Brazil. Bonnard was a French poet and novelist who visited Brazil in the 1920s and

59 Henri Tronchon, Huit Mois au Brésil, 98-9. Roughly translated as: "Race keeps in reserve, possibly, some surprises. In waiting for clarity on the issue, the European without prejudices who lives in Brazil long enough to study up close all the faces, would swear to not have advanced their understanding of it after several months apart from certain aspects that are obvious; but these are curious things that warrant constant attention."
produced a book—*Océan et Brasil*. He would become notorious for serving his support and service as Minister of Education in the Vichy government. His reflections on Brazil are indicative of his political identification with integralism as he registers shock and unease with the predominance of *métissage* in Brazil. Tronchon, in contrast to Bonnard, finds *métissage* charming, writing that "le regard est beau presque toujours, moelleux, comme chargé de vie et de puissance, pupille lumineuse, chaude sur la cornée très blanche." Nonetheless, Tronchon agrees with Bonnard about the centrality of race in history when he quotes Bonnard and asks: "Y a-t-il «lutte sournoise, où les différents génies de l’humanité s’enlacent comme des serpents?»"

Despite recognizing the importance of race in global historical terms, Tronchon defers making any predictions as to how this will play out. He reproduces this critical distance when evaluating the work of Jacques de Lauwe, an amateur sociologist who authored *L’Amérique Ibérique*, a synthesis of observations from his travels throughout South America. Tronchon considers J. de Lauwe's idea that Brazil, and Latin America more generally, was threatened by the wave of Japanese immigration to the country in the early part of the twentieth century. M. de Lauwe argued that because of racial affinities between Asiatic and indigenous South

---


61 Henri Tronchon, *Huit Mois au Brésil*, 98. This translates as: "The look is almost always beautiful, soft with the gleam of life and power including luminous pupils which are shimmer on top of the very white cornea."

62 Henri Tronchon, *Huit Mois au Brésil*, 98: "Is there a surreptitious struggle where the different geniuses of humanity intertwine like serpents?"

Americans, the influx of Japanese into South America threatened to pull South America out of the influence of the West and ally it with Asia.\textsuperscript{64} Tronchon’s response to this speculation is to discount it by arguing that "La faiblesse actuelle d’élément indien au Brésil y fait moins urgent, moins grave, l’aspect national et politique de la question japonaise. L’avenir dira-t-il que défiance était sagesse."\textsuperscript{65} What this demonstrates once again, is Tronchon’s awareness of the ways in which race is being theorized outside Brazil and his care not to indulge careless speculations about how issues of race will play out historically.

The same holds true in Tronchon’s treatment of Herman Keyserling’s theories as they were expounded in Keyserling’s \textit{Méditations Sud-Américaines}.\textsuperscript{66} Keyserling, a philosopher who traveled extensively during the early part of the Twentieth Century, theorized that Brazil was in the process of forming a superior race. For Keyserling, Brazil’s racial history involved:

\begin{quotation}
la vitalité orageuse et chaleur émotionnelle du sang noir ont dominé l’inertie du sang indien; le Brésil qui <<déviant d’année en année plus blanc, et non plus noir>>,
\end{quotation}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[64] Tronchon characterizes M. de Lauwe’s view in the following terms: "la mentalité indienne est infiniment moins proche de la mentalité occidentale que de l’asiatique, et tournée vers l’Asie par sa race, sa religion, ses tendances, ses habitudes; ou le Jaune apparaît au Blanc comme un intrus, à l’indien Presque comme un frère; ou déjà cette question se pose: de la civilisation blanche ou de l’asiatique indienne, laquelle l’emportera?" See Henri Tronchon, \textit{Huit Mois au Brésil}, 100. This translates as: "The Indian mindset is infinitely less close to the Western mindset than it is to an Asian one. Thus, indigenous peoples will turn toward Asia on the basis of race, religion, tendencies, habits. Where the Asian appears to the white man as an intruder, to the Indian he appears as a brother. Already, this question is prevalent--European civilization or Asian/Indigenous...which will carry the day."
\item[65] Henri Tronchon, \textit{Huit Mois au Brésil}, 100. This translates as: "The current weakness of the indigenous element in Brazil makes less urgent and serious the political and national aspects of this Japanese question. The future will dispute this piece of wisdom."
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
montre par son exemple qu’un <faible> apport de sang noir peut mener à la formation d’une race nouvelle et supérieure.  

Tronchon meets this with his usual skepticism about grand pronouncements by asking how one makes a survey of the various blood types within the national blood supply and evaluates them according to racial and ethnic composition. He also takes issue with Keyserling argument that the infusion of black blood lends energy and vitality to the Brazilian. Tronchon counters by arguing that despite what Keyserling has to say, Brazilians belong to a mixed race that is somewhat lethargic. While we see Tronchon attribute some emotional, or moral, characteristics to race, he nonetheless resists the grand prognostication in favor of a more careful evaluation.

In terms of the intellectual work, Tronchon seems most at home with Sérgio Buarque de Holanda’s Raízes do Brasil—the second important Brazilian book of 1936 that he evaluates. Tronchon prefers the political approach Buarque de Holanda adapts towards Brazilian history to Mello Franco’s social psychological approach. In addition to the contemporary relevance of Raízes do Brasil, Tronchon

67 Henri Tronchon, Huit Mois au Brésil: Activité Sociale-Le Décor et la vie-Orientations Intellectuelles, 102. This translates as: “the emotional vitality and warmth of the black blood dominating the inertia of Indian blood; Brazil became each year more white, and not more black shows by example that a bit of black blood added to the mix can lead to the formation of a new and higher race.”

68 Tronchon writes: ”Mais cet optimisme futuriste du penseur allemande mérite d’être opposé, en vigoureux contraste, aux exagérations de Brésiliens trop nombreux: mêmé aujourd’hui, le fait qu’ils appartiennent à une race métisse, qu’ils sont un people métis, les encourage à la déploration qui agit peu.” See Henri Tronchon, Huit Mois au Brésil, 102. This translates roughly as: “But this optimistic futurist should be opposed, by contrasting him to the exaggerations of so many Brazilians: even today, the fact that they belong to a mixed race, that they are a mixed people, encourages them to the lament which does little.”

69 This approach with its concern for present day development and problems is consistent with the approach the Annales pioneers and their fellow travelers, like Tronchon, were adapting back in France.
admires Buarque de Holanda for the breadth of his knowledge and ability to relate it to Brazilian history.

_Raízes do Brasil_ shares with Mello Franco's and Freyre's works a sense of the uniqueness of Brazilian civilization. Buarque de Holanda writes that the experience of Brazil is without precedent; essentially, European culture has been transplanted in a tropical zone resulting in a surreal juxtaposition where the "Formes de vie, institutions, vision du monde, y sont empruntées à des pays lointains, maintenues au sein d'une ambiance souvent défavorable et hostile." Like Freyre and Mello Franco, Buarque de Holanda considers Portuguese colonialism as 'softer' than the other European varieties. In particular, vis-à-vis the Spanish variety, Portugal was more liberal and commercial and less anxious about asserting its religious and metropolitan culture. He makes much of the Portuguese quality of 'cordiality.'

Likewise, Buarque de Holanda's Brazilian culture is novel because it results from the intermingling of three chords--Portuguese, Indigenous and African. Unlike Mello Franco, Buarque de Holanda does not employ a differentiation between civilization and culture and departs from both Mello Franco and Freyre in so far as he valorizes the indigenous contribution by arguing that it gives profundity and depth to the Brazilian character. He does follow them in acknowledging that the African

---

70 Henri Tronchon, _Huit Mois au Brésil_, 17. This translates as: "the forms of life, the institutions, and world view, are borrowed from a country far away and maintained in an environment often inhospitable and hostile."

71 Tronchon paraphrases Buarque de Holanda--"Le Brésilien, "d'âme vaste", n'a pas la rudesse ni le plébéisme des Portugais, ni "rien de ce qui fait leur petitesse et leur mesquinerie." This translates as: "The Brazilian, whose vast soul hasn't the rudeness nor the plebianism of the Portuguese, nor anything of their smallness or pettiness."
influence abounds and that from very early on métissage was a normal process that allowed for the foundation of a new country and civilization.

What sets *Raízes do Brasil* apart from contemporary pieces in the social sciences is Buarque de Holanda's skill in isolating factors in Brazil's historical development that explain the contemporary political and cultural scene. Like Mello Franco, Buarque de Holanda sees two Brazils—one agricultural and the other industrial—that are profoundly disconnected and can be traced to end of the Brazilian Empire. In his view, 1888 marks the ascendency of an 'urbanocratie' that led to a massive dislocation and terrible social disequilibrium. But unlike Mello Franco, and certainly someone like Freyre, Buarque de Holanda does not bemoan the end of an agrarian way of life. Rather, he criticizes the primary institution of the Colonial Brazil—the fazenda—as being responsible for retarding Brazil's growth as a democratic state. Tronchon notes that for Buarque de Holanda, democracy has always been an illusion in Brazil and that this can be traced to the hierarchical and authoritarian fazenda.

For Buarque de Holanda, the Revolution of 1930, which brought Vargas to power, symbolizes the degree to which Brazil has abandon the principles of law and has become a country governed solely by force. Quoting Buarque de Holanda, Tronchon characterizes his position on contemporary affairs succinctly:

> Aujourd'hui la sainteté de la loi, jadis la meilleure arme des oppositions diverses, et cette inaltérable virginité de la Constitution brésilienne, «como a das mulheres que posuem aquillo a que os especialistas chamam hymen complacente», ne passionnent plus guère; on s'accommode fort bien d'un 'véritable état permanent d'illégalité.'

---

72 Henri Tronchon, *Huit Mois au Brésil: Activité Sociale-Le Décor et la vie-Orientation Intellectuelles*, 28. This translates as: "Today the sanctity of law, formerly the best weapon for various opposition
Ironically, the explanation for the abandonment of legal principle involves not a lack of legal professionals but a surfeit. Brazil, for Buarque, suffers from the plague of *bacharelismo*—or, the tendency to produce too many lawyers. This created a culture whereby the ethic of work was degraded and formulas and theories—raw abstractions—were elevated. The practical consequence was a ruling elite completely out of touch with those they were governing. This completely ineffective bureaucracy that could not deliver the basic goods and services it was intended to deliver: as a result, the only effective governance was the rule of force. Dictatorship and the military became the only way to keep the nation together.

In contrast to S. Buarque de Holanda’s and A. de Mello Franco’s analyses of Brazil, which both end by diagnosing enormous social disequilibrium between the agrarian and industrial Brazils, Antonio Carneiro Leão’s *Tendências e Diretrizes da Escola Secundaria* focuses on education and the role it can play in creating a more unified and democratic Brazil. Unlike, S. Buarque de Holanda and A. de Mello Franco, who were young academics in 1936, A. Carneiro Leão was an accomplished academic and administrator who had served in a number of important educational posts. Through critiquing A. Carneiro Leão’s work, *Huit Mois au Brésil*, provides greater insight into the rationale behind the French University Mission as well as the pedagogical approach the French professors brought to the Mission.

Perhaps due to Carneiro Leão’s advanced standing, or Tronchon’s intimate involvement with educational initiatives in Brazil, Tronchon criticizes Carneiro Leão
with greater zeal than either Buarque or Mello Franco. He faults him for shoddy scholarship, pointing out that Carneiro Leão neglects to get his facts right—particularly when commenting on the French educational system. In characterizing the French system of secondary education as lacking flexibility, Tronchon takes Carneiro Leão to task for neglecting to take into account changes in the French system since the 1925-26 educational reforms under Prime Minister Edouard Herriot. Tronchon comments that Carneiro Leão does not get basic facts right, like what age secondary education in France ends. On the level of ideas, Tronchon faults Carneiro Leão for what he sees as loose standards and a lack of rigor. Despite these criticisms, however, Tronchon recognizes that Carneiro Leão is confronting one of the cardinal problems figuring in Brazilian development and as such seriously engages his ideas.

How did Carneiro Leão conceptualize educational reform in Brazil? To begin with, he was one of the animating spirits behind developing the Universidade do Distrito Federal and one of the Brazilians with whom the French professors consulted during their professional stay in Rio. Tronchon explains that before the initiative to found a Faculty of Philosophy, Science and Letters at the University of São Paulo in 1934 and the School of Philosophy and Letters to anchor the Universidade do Distrito Federal in Rio in 1935, there was nothing like a specialized training in literature and science. While there was a glut of lawyers in the educated population and professional medical schools developed a corps of doctors, Brazil

---

73 In fairness to Carneiro Leão, these reforms and the process by which they became enacted were extraordinary complex. For a thorough discussion of these reforms see D.R. Watson, “The Politics of Educational Reform in France during the Third Republic, 1900-1940,” Past and Present 34 (July 1966): 81-99.
lacked the institutions to produce a professional corps of teachers. Carneiro Leão recognized this need in his *Tendências*, and sought to respond to it in policy through developing a university system that would take up the Universidade do Distrito Federal as a model.

Animating Carneiro Leão's desire to transform the secondary and higher education was the sense that a revamped educational system was necessary to bridge the abyss between the industrial and agricultural Brazil. It was also imperative for Brazil to achieve its full potential. Carneiro Leão believed modernization was tied to democracy and to education. Characterizing Carneiro Leão's position, Tronchon writes:

> Il faut organiser l'enseignement par rapport à la "richesse des aptitudes individuelles du Brésilien", aux nécessités, obligations auxquelles le Brésil doit faire face: "en pleine démocratie, par et pour la démocratie, dentro da democracia e pela democracia", sans pourtant s’inféoder aux "idéologies asservissantes", à leurs "étendards sauveurs, plantés de droite ou gauche dans le sol stérile des dictatures."
> Au Brésil actuel, ceci est gros de sens.74

The importance of education was that it would permit Brazil the political stability to avoid the extremes of communism and fascism. Carneiro Leão envisaged education not only as creating the literate citizen, but also as providing a sense of how an individual fits into the social community. For this later end, Carneiro Leão envisaged primary schooling to be of cardinal importance in providing individuals with a sense of their physical and social milieu. For this type of schooling to truly

---

74 Henri Tronchon, *Huit Mois au Brésil*, 14-5. This translates as: "It is necessary to organize teaching in relation to the "rich aptitudes of individual Brazilians, to the necessities and obligations which Brazil faces: "in full democracy, by and for democracy, within and throughout the democracy," without becoming the servant of all-powerful ideologies that stake their claims on the right or left in the barren soil of dictatorship."
function in Brazil, there would have to be a teaching core fully conversant in Brazilian realities.

Up through the 1930s, the problem was that there was not a qualified set of teachers at either the primary or secondary school level as there was in the U.S. or Western European nations. Tronchon and Leão agree that the system that was in place at the time—one wherein candidates engaged in a competition for a teaching post rather than having to complete a process of certification—needed to be supplanted. There was very little oversight by the state. Tronchon agrees with Leão that more rigorous standards need to be adopted, but feels that Leão’s solution is not rigorous enough. He argues that in order for young people to truly see teaching as a legitimate profession, it needs to have a rigorous course of training. Leão balks at instituting the requirements for the French baccalaureate where 13 subjects must be passed in 5 years. Nonetheless, while Tronchon is critical of some details of Leão’s proposal for education reform, he thinks there maybe hope and concludes his review of Tendências by suggesting that Brazil’s promise may inspire success—writing that "En que autre grand pays neuf, de par le monde, aurait-on mieux l’impression que la jeunesse peut tout?"75

At this point, it is appropriate to take a few steps back from Tronchon’s analysis of Mello Franco, Buarque and Carneiro Leão in order to make a few generalizations about Huit Mois au Brésil. The work clearly shows us that Tronchon engaged Brazilian intellectuals, traveled widely throughout Brazil, and was humble in recognizing the limits to which he, as a foreigner, could claim to know Brazil.

75 Henri Tronchon, Huit Mois au Brésil, 38. This translates as: "In this other vast new country, on the other side of the globe, how can one help but have the impression that youth can do it all?"
Nonetheless, it is clear that he put in the effort to understand the multiple facets of the Brazilian nation and that he valued the work of Brazilian intellectuals. In terms of Tronchon’s own intellectual qualities, we see that like Braudel, he made a distinction between a national’s viewpoint and that of an international scholar. As a generalization, it is fairly safe to say that Tronchon extends the portraits that Mello Franco, Buarque and Carneiro Leão draw of Brazil by drawing on international scholarship and seeking to understand Brazil within a broader global context. It is also clear that Tronchon, while older and more established, is interested in some of the more recent developments in the social sciences. While he does not wholeheartedly embrace Mello Franco’s social psychology, he does find Mello Franco’s treatment of sexuality as a historical force worthwhile. Likewise, he embraced Buarque’s adoption of something like the Annalists regressive method as one of the strong points of his work. By way of conclusion, Huit Mois au Brésil shows us that the French University Mission engendered a type of intellectual exchange whereby ideas and new methodologies merged across national borders. Further we see, besides fulfilling a diplomatic mission, the faculty engaged in the University mission sought to learn as much as they taught and that the dynamics of power that obtained on the state level became fuzzier when applied to the realm of ideas.

**On edge in Brazil: Jean Magüé’s existential adventure**

Jean Magüé’s *Les Dents Agacées* provides an intimate glimpse of the French University Mission to Brazil. Magüé, an agrégé in philosophy at the time of his departure in 1935 to serve as Professor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Philosophy, Science and Letters at the University of São Paulo through 1944, provides a rich sense of the social networks that existed between the French professors and
Paulista society. Although Magüé did not go on to write a thesis and become a celebrated academic like his colleagues and friends Claude Lévi-Strauss and Fernand Braudel, he remained engaged with the world of ideas and developments in the humanities and social sciences throughout his career as a diplomat and later as a professor in some of the Grands Écoles Commerciales. Les Dents Agacées, a title with Biblical overtones, was published in 1982 and written as a confessional autobiography in the mode of Jean-Jacques Rousseau upon Magüé’s retirement from public life. Brazil features prominently in Magüé’s account in three different modes: existentially, in terms of its personal impact on Magüé, sociologically, as Magüé describes the features of the country and its people, and thirdly, as something like an anthropological study where Magüé richly describes the personalities and structures involved in the French University Mission to Brazil.

Magüe’s experiences in Brazil register in the existential mode because of the way he chooses to frame his experience. When he begins speaking about his appointment to the University of São Paulo, Magüe remembers an incident from an excursion into the Brazilian hinterlands with Claude Lévi-Strauss. He writes that:

J’ai vu dans mes voyages au Brésil, ces dépouilles dans les forêts dont on dit qu’elles ont été abandonnées par les serpents pendant leur mue. Ainsi va la vie. Elle

---

76 Jean Magüé, Les Dents Agacée (Paris: Éditions Buchet/Chastel, 1982). The title, Les Dents Agacées, translates roughly as 'Teeth set on edge.' It implies anxiety. For Magüé, this anxiety is tied into the philosophical life where the fundamental values that one lives by are questioned at the risk of undermining one’s own basic self-conception. Like all memoirs, Les Dents Agacées is problematic when considered as a primary source. It is almost impossible to say how the passage of time impacted Magüé’s attitudes towards Brazil and his former colleagues. Yet, in terms of extent sources, it is the closest we come to a thick description of the University Mission’s participants, rivalries, manners, and attitudes. While a skeptical attitude should be maintained with regard to Les Dents Agacées as far as it serves as an accurate portrayal of Magué’s mind-set in the 1930s, the benefit of it being written considerably after the fact is that it provides a window onto how the Mission impacted the interior life of Magué. For both of the above reasons, it is included in this chapter.
This reflection on serpents shedding their skins comes in the context of Magüé speaking about how the opportunity of teaching at the university level in Brazil saved him from the dreaded tedium of teaching in a provincial lycée with the same lessons and courses being recycled year after year. On a broader level, Magüé’s discussion of the transformative effects of his Brazilian sojourn coincides with the trope of transfiguration that he emphasizes throughout Les Dents Agacées. Magüé’s decision to choose a line from Matthew—"Celui qui voudra sauver sa vie la perdra, mais celui qui la perdra la trouvera"—makes this a dominant theme of the work as a whole. Likewise, Magüé’s Proustian conception of writing as an action through which the mundane is transformed into the sacred guides his specific treatment of Brazil. It is in this way that Magüé’s discussion of Brazil differs from Braudel’s and Tronchon’s discussed above. Both Braudel and Tronchon viewed Brazil from the detached standpoint of foreign observers, with Magüé, Brazil is much more engrained in his being and sense of himself.

---

77 Jean Magüé, Les Dents Agacée, 75. This translates as: "I saw during my stay in Brazil, these skins in the forest which I was told were shed by serpents when they molted. Such is life...it consists stage by stage in leaving other possibilities behind, which one can regret or revisit to reimagine another possible life."

78 Escaping from the dullness of the provincial lycée was a motivating factor in the decision making process of many of the young agrégés who took part in the University Mission. Claude Lévi-Strauss echoes what Magüé has to say here in both Triste Tropiques and in his interview with Didier Eribon. See Claude Lévi-Strauss, Tristes Tropiques, ed. John and Doreen Weightman (London: Penguin, 1992) and Didier Eribon, Conversations with Claude Lévi-Strauss (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).

79 Magüé, Les Dents Agacée, 8. Roughly: "Whoever wishes to save their life loses it, but s/he who loses it finds it."
This may perhaps be attributed to the length of time Magüé spent in Brazil. Braudel only spent two academic years in Brazil and Tronchon a mere eight months. Magüé spent close to a decade there. He was recruited for the chair in philosophy in the Faculty of Philosophy, Sciences, and Letters by Georges Dumas in November of 1934. In a personal meeting, Dumas intimated that one of his examiners for the agregation, André Lelande, had recommended him. Magüé, like Lévi-Strauss, was previously acquainted with Dumas through the seminars Dumas gave at the Hospital Sainte-Anne. Leaving for Brazil in February of 1935, Magüé was also familiar with a number of his cohort. Lévi-Strauss was part of his khâgne at the Lycée Condorcet and he knew Pierre Hourcade and Michel Berveiller from the École Normale Supérieure.\footnote{In France, the khâgne refers to the period of study between passing the Baccalauréat examination and acceptance to one of the Grand Écoles. In terms of specialties, Hourcade served as Chair in French Literature and Bourcades as Chair in Classical Philology at USP.}

During his years as part of the University Mission (1935-1939), Magüé became friends with Fernand Braudel who he describes as a refuge for him and someone who sharpened his intellect. He also took part in one of Lévi-Strauss initial expeditions into the Brazilian interior and traveled with him to the state of Goiás. As a professor he had a number of talented students who became prominent Brazilian intellectuals. Among them were Candido Mello e Souza and Caio Prado Junior. His assistant was João Cruz Costa who went to write a renowned history of Brazilian ideas. In addition to his scholarly contacts, Magüé mixed with prominent members of Paulista society as part of the diplomatic duties that came with his participation in the French Mission.
Magüé drew on this mix of experiences in composing a memoir that reads like an anthropological study of the French University Mission where the manners, attitudes, and contests of the participants are minutely observed and set against the social and political backdrop that structured these relations. He pokes some fun at his colleagues—particularly Braudel and Lévi-Strauss—as he details the French University Mission. We see that all of the professors were paid well, but that Braudel, who did not drive, took it to a level of ostentation with a gleaming Chevy and personal chauffeur.\textsuperscript{81} Magüé also conveys Braudel’s teasing of Lévi-Strauss over the pretensions of ethnography to find mathematical algorithms expressing indigenous mathematical rites. According to Magüé, Braudel would say that these same ethnographers "seraient souvent incapables de résoudre une modeste équation algébrique."\textsuperscript{82} He also conveys with humor Lévi-Strauss’s preparations for his initial fieldwork, with Lévi-Strauss getting his guns and clothes together as if he were going on a hunt in France.\textsuperscript{83}

Beyond these details, amusing in themselves, Magüé effectively communicates the various dimensions of the University Mission through his recollection of events. He describes his contacts with Julio de Mesquita, the owner of the leading São Paulo newspaper, \textit{O Estado de São Paulo}, who was a Francophile

\textsuperscript{81} Jean Magüé, \textit{Les Dents Agacée}, 93. Braudel’s biographer, Pierre Daix, debunks the notion that Braudel was specially treated with his chauffeur and car by clarifying that the car and chauffeur were provided to Braudel with the house he rented from a Swiss gentlemen in return for Braudel allowing the Swiss owner to occupy the house when Braudel was in Europe during intersession. See Daix, \textit{Braudel}, 111.

\textsuperscript{82} Jean Magüé, \textit{Les Dents Agacée}, 118.

\textsuperscript{83} Jean Magüé, \textit{Les Dents Agacée}, 118.
and most influential patron of the French professors in Paulista circles. Mesquita was from an old Paulista family that had made its fortune in agriculture, but whose father had the foresight to move into newer forms of commercial venture--one of them the founding of a newspaper. Magüé suggests that only someone from Mesquita's background would be interested in establishing higher education in Brazil because all the new wealth had no interest in culture or education—they were simply out to make money. While he gives Mesquita credit for his foresight and willingness to break with older Brazilian cultural traditions such as Catholicism and positivism, Magüé nonetheless thinks Mesquita fundamentally misunderstands the nature of culture and its relation to the political economy. He writes that:

La fondation de notre faculté répondait à des besoins réels. Mais prenant les effets pour les causes, Mesquita pensait que la supériorité de l'Europe venait de sa culture, et non pas que sa culture venait de son avance économique et politique.84

Here Magüé appears to be repeating a familiar Marxist trope that culture is the superstructure based on a foundation of economic and political reality. But despite this critique of Mesquita's reasoning, he credits Mesquita as being behind the government's call for innovating the social sciences through "former les étudiants du pays aux méthodes historique qu'avait mises au point l'équipe des Annales."85

In addition to providing some insight on the basis of Brazilian support for the University Mission, Magüé illuminates the competitive rivalries that swirled around the Mission. He describes Paul Arbousse-Bastide's ambitions to become an administrative head of the Mission and the distrust this engendered. Some of the conflicts this resulted in are detailed—for example, an argument with Lévi-Strauss

84 Jean Magüé, Les Dents Agacée, 92.

85 Jean Magüé, Les Dents Agacée, 94. This translates as: "training Brazilian students in the historical methods that were developed by the Annales school."
about Lévi-Strauss's insistence on teaching ethnography in his sociology seminars.

But the rivalry between the faculty extended well beyond Arbousse-Bastide and was the default state of affairs as Magué notes that "nous épiions d'un œil jaloux le succès des uns et des autres, le volume des auditeurs, leur qualité sociale, l'assiduité de la petite cour qui nous accompagnait a la sortie."86

The significance of these various rivalries was that the Mission was vulnerable to the Brazilian political scene and these competing interests only facilitated it being ripped apart. Besides the rivalries within the group, the French professors faced factions in the University that were hostile or unsupportive at best. Magué remarks on the doctors in the Faculty of Medicine considering the French to be pretentious amateurs and having a bias towards the United States. Likewise, the law faculty had a preference for Portuguese law. Outside the University, by 1936, the Mission faced new political circumstances as Vargas had abolished the constitutional regime, declared the Estado Novo and established himself as dictator. As a result of allying himself against Vargas, Julio de Mesquita's power was reduced and his ability to support the French Mission was reduced. Vargas, in Magué's depiction was a philistine with little interest in the arts and humanities. He writes that:

Getulio Vargas dansait alors la samba, un pas vers les Etats-Unis, un autre vers l'Allemagne et l'Italie, car il devait tenir compte de ses minorites et de son armee. De toutes façons, ce petit homme rustique et ruse n'avait aucune inclination pour les ecrivains, les peintres, les musiciens. Le medecins, les ingenieurs lui suffisaient.87

86 Jean Magué, Les Dents Agacée, 97. This translates as: "We kept a jealous eye on one another's success. This included how many students we had, their social status, and the zeal of the little court of followers that we acquired."

87 Jean Magué, Les Dents Agacée, 111.
By 1938, France’s standing within Varga’s diplomatic game had deteriorated to the point where the Quai d’Orsay was told that the Brazilian government would not renew the contracts of the French professors. While Magüé and a few other like Pierre Monbeig stayed on through the war, they were employed directly by the University and not as part of any binding agreement between the two governments.

Despite being vulnerable to the vicissitudes of Brazilian politics and facing hostility within the University structure, the French faculty nonetheless forged significant ties with the Brazilian intellectual community. *Les Dents Agacées* describes the alliances that were forged not only between the professors and their students, but with more established academics. Magüé mentions the alliance forged between Claude Lévi-Strauss and Sergio Millet, the Brazilian artist, poet, essayist and cultural diplomat who served as an advisor to Mesquita in his dealings with the French professors. Likewise, he provides evidence of Roger Bastide’s links to Mario de Andrade and Jorge Armado. Additionally, of course, there were ties to students who would become prominent intellectuals: Candido Mello e Souza, Caio Prado Junior, Carlos Prado, Cruz Costa, and Elias Chaves Neto.

In relating his teaching experience in Brazil, Magüé speaks of the way in which he tried to frame philosophical problems so that they had contemporary political relevance. While the majority of his students were not able to speak French and displayed an intellectual rigidity in favor of Durkheimian and Comtean social science, the best of his students, like Elias Chaves Neto and Caio Prado Junior were

---

88 Magüé discusses how Mesquita would meet the French faculty in his offices with his right hand men, Paulo Duarte and Sergio Millet. See Jean Magüé, *Les Dents Agacée*, 92.
formidable critics of the positions he advanced. While he admired and respected their intellects, he makes an observation similar to one articulated by Lévi-Strauss in *Tristes Tropiques*—they each tended to develop themselves as the archetype of some individual trait. Thus, Caio Prado Junior was the arch-communist, Elias Chaves Neto the economist, and Cruz Costa the French linguist. For Magüé, the comedy or tragedy in this was that they tended to lose their personality in reifying themselves.89

The type of philosophical engagement that Magüé entered into with his students is captured in one of the more absorbing passages of *Les Dents Agacée*. At one of the salons hosted by a Mme. Kliass—these salons featured prominent artists and writers like Emiliano di Cavalcanti and Oswaldo de Andrade—Magüé argued with Carlos Prado about socialist realism in painting. They were discussing the work of Candido Portinari whose depictions of favela life and the black working class in Brazil were challenging traditional conventions of art in Brazil. Magüé took aim at socialist realism by arguing that art is essentially consumed by the rich. If a painter produces art for an elite audience and if that painter also has some distance between herself and the subject, it follows that you no longer have realism or a direct connection between the subject and its audience. Instead, Magüé views

---

89 Magüé attributes the differences between the most talented and ambitious of students and the majority of students to class differences. He writes that: “C'est dans la bourgeoisie aisée que je rencontrais la meilleure adhésion. Soit que les plus riches se croupissent à l'abri de toute conséquence, soit que leur qualité de cœur et d'esprit, l'amour sincère qu'ils portaient au Brésil qu'ils voyaient déchirer entre une opulence cosmopolite et la misère la plus sordide, les fissent basculer dans l'opposition.” See Jean Magüé, *Les Dents Agacée*, 98. This translates as: “The upper middle-class tended to be the most responsive. Either the richest thought themselves immune to any consequences, or they were bold by nature. Regardless, they devoutly loved Brazil and being torn between the country's cosmopolitan opulence and its sordid misery, they switched their allegiance from their own class to the oppressed.” As the most affluent tended towards intellectual boldness, Magüé ascribes to the petite-bourgeoisie intellectual timidity.
artists like Portinari as a kind of mediator between the elite and subaltern classes:

"Ce qui signifie que l'ecrivain ou l'artiste est une sorte de sentinel, ou d'espion, ou de voyeur, charge d'aller regarder ce qui se passe chez les uns pour le rapporter chez les autres."90 Does this kind of mediation lead to substantive social change?

Magüé disagrees with Carlos Prado on this account as well, arguing that these images ultimately do not have any real social impact. Speaking of a painting depicting four black men, Magüé writes:

Que gagnent en fin de comte les uns et les autres dans une pareille transposition, ceux qui sont représentées ou ceux qui les représentent ou les regardent représenté? Je ne vois guère ce que quatre Nègres purent y gagner. Je vois par contre ce que leur maître put y trouver. Un avertissement, mais un avertissement à ce point neutralisé qu'il fut autant hommage qu'il fut reproché. Comme je le lis plus tard chez Artaud, les intellectuels et les artistes que nous étions chez Mme Kliss ne représentent jamais les situations qu'un fois vidées de leur cruauté, c'est-à-dire de leurs risques immédiats.91

The argument here is that by aestheticizing race, poverty, and the inequities of Brazilian society, a safe distance has been created between the subject and observer such that the need for action is easily dispelled.

Magüé's portrayal of his argument with Carlos Prado reveals his acuity in discerning how representational modes connect with social norms and behaviors as well as his attention to elite constructions of race. The attention Magüé pays to aesthetic form suggests he disagrees with Tronchon that the foreign observer's perceptions have little validity in comparison to the Brazilian. Like Braudel writing

90 Magüé, Les Dents Agacée, 115. This translates as: "The artist or writer is a kind of spy, or even voyeur, who's charged with surveying the life and affairs of one class and reporting on it to the other."

91 Jean Magüé, Les Dents Agacée, 117. This translates as: "What wins at the end of the day--those who are represented or those that represent them or see them represented? I do not see what these four Blacks could gain. By contrast, I see what the social elite can find there. A warning, but a warning so neutralized so as to be as much a tribute as a rebuke. As I read later in Artaud, intellectuals and artists such as the group at Mme. Kliss's never represent situations without emptying them of their cruelty, that is to say their immediate risks."
about Freyre, he holds that a participant, existentially concerned with the social order they write about, may potentially frame the social order so as to reinforce the social structure while appearing to engage its more taboo subjects. The discussion with Carlos Prado about socialist realism is not the only instance of Magüé’s concern with the way Brazilians frame their social experience. Throughout Les Dents Agacées, he remarks of the way that the Brazilian gran fino construct discourses to make social structures more palatable. He writes that "Je ne tardai pas en effet à comprendre que l'idée que la société brésilienne voulait donner d'elle-même était assez loin de la réalité."92 To this end, woman were hardly educated and men were taken with cheap amusements and visits to the brothels.

Magüé locates most of the distortion of social discourse around the subject of race. One of his first observations about Brazil is that "Par-delà le Portugal, toujours plaisante par les Brésiliens avec une tendresse indulgente par-delà les Indiens chers a Lévi-Strauss, c'était l'Afrique dont il était encore de bon ton de ne pas parler."93 Magüé points out that the Wonderly family that Freyre depicts in Casa Grande provides a superb example of this tendency. While Magüé does not explicitly comment on Freyre's treatment of racial relations, given his position in the argument with Carlos Prado about socialist realism, it seems fair to assume that Magüé would subject Freyre's work to the same criticism—it presents a potentially

92 Jean Magüé, Les Dents Agacée, 101-2. This translates as: "I was not slow to realize that Brazilian society wished to remove itself far enough away from reality."

93 Jean Magüé, Les Dents Agacée, 91. This translates as: "Besides Portugal which was always joked about by the Brazilians with an indulgent tenderness and besides the Indians dear to Lévi-Strauss, Africa was a taboo subject for the upper crust."
threatening subject in a manner that ultimately makes it palatable to the social order.

While Magüé acknowledges some of the positive ends realized by Brazilian writers treatments of race—such as a firm rejection of Nazism in Brazil—he nonetheless recognizes the artifice of their discourse. Speaking of Oswaldo de Andrade and Jorge Amado, two writers who he admires, Magüé comments:

Tandis qu'un poète de la vieille génération comme Guilherme de Almeida, s'épuisait a traduire Baudelaire, et maudissait auprès de moi sa propre langue, incapable a ses yeux d'égaler la limpidité française, des romanciers comme Oswaldo de Andrade, Jorge Amado me plongeaient au contraire pour mon ravissement dans l'incomparable épaisseur sensuelle de la Bahia de tous les Saints, ou de Terre Violette, dans cette écriture, a la fois tendre et cocasse et toujours passionnée de négritude. Ainsi les couches le plus profondes du Brésil et ses élites les plus sensibles, retrouvèrent-elles d'instinct le geste de défense de l'esclave, quand elles entendaient claquer le fouet que leur brandissait le nazisme.94

Here we see once again that while Magüé admires the form of expression and recognizes the talent of the expression, he is deeply suspicious about the ability of aestheticized treatments of race and class to fundamentally challenge and reshape Brazilian society. Even while he is sympathetic to these literary responses to Nazism, he doubts their capacity to effect meaningful social change or truly transform racial discourse.

Looking at Magüé’s discussion of the role of race in Brazil, we can observe a number of factors that differentiate it from Tronchon and Braudel’s discussions. To begin with, Magüé places far more emphasis on how discussions of race are framed

---

94 Jean Magüé, Les Dents Agacée, 130. This translates as: "While a poet of an older generation like Guilherme de Almeida, exhausted himself translating Baudelaire, and cursed his native language, which he felt was incapable of equaling the suppleness of French, some novelists like Oswaldo de Andrade and Jorge Amado allowed me to experience great pleasure with the sensuality of their prose in works like Bahia of All the Saints or Violent Earth. In these works, at once tender and funny, there is an expressed pleasure for negritude. Through writings like these, we see that the lowest layers of Brazilian society and its most sensible elites instinctively rediscovered their instinct to defend the slave as soon as they heard the crack of the whip yielded by the Nazis."
as well as the rhetorical aspects of those discussions. That is to say, Magüé provides a much fuller portrait of the elite class in Brazil and the rules of engagement on the subject of race. Unlike Braudel and Tronchon, he does not directly engage with Brazilian social thought and tends to affect a superior air in relation to Brazilians in general as remarks such as "Les Brésiliens ne comprennent pas cet art de dire le faux pour signifier le vrai..."\(^\text{95}\)

In Magüé's memoir, Brazilians are far too literal minded and generally lack conceptual sophistication. This, along with Magüé's more extensive experience in the country explain his greater willingness to make substantial judgment about the country despite being an outsider. Magüé’s account also deviates from Tronchon’s and Braudel’s in providing a sense of the aims and ambitions of the French university professors. Writing of Lévi-Strauss's work with indigenous groups, Roger Bastide’s concentration on Afro-Brazilian society, and Pierre Monbeig's work on Pioneer Zones, Magüé writes "Ainsi devenant spécialistes d’un savoir inédit dont l’«objectivité» scientifique les mettait a l’abri de toute contestation, mes collègues en partant pour le Brésil se préparaient le meilleur retour en France. Ils avaient le «fabuleux métal»."\(^\text{96}\)

Thus, Magüé gives us a sense of both the ambition of his colleagues as well as the importance of their Brazilian sojourn for transforming the social sciences when back in France.

**Brazil's place in the French Myth of a Pan-Mediterranean Civilization**

Henri Hauser, like Henri Tronchon participated in the French University Mission in Rio serving as the Chair of History at the University of the Federal

---

\(^{95}\) Jean Magüé, *Les Dents Agacée*, p. 90. This translates as: "Brazilians don’t understand the art of telling the truth through a lie."

\(^{96}\) Jean Magüé, *Les Dents Agacée*, 94. This translates as: "Thus, they became specialists with a unique knowledge whose scientific "objectivity" kept challenges at bay, my colleagues in Brazil were preparing for the best return in France. They had a "fabulous treasure."
District. Also like Tronchon, Hauser was a more established academic in comparison to the young agrégés who became academic leaders upon their return from Brazil. When he went to Brazil in the Spring of 1935, Hauser was Chair of Economic History at the Sorbonne. Upon his retirement in 1936, Marc Bloch was awarded the chair. While he was older than the core group of the annalists, his work on economic history was one of the inspirations for the Annalists.\textsuperscript{97} In fact, he was one of Fernand Braudel’s favorite professors while he was at the Sorbonne of whom Braudel later wrote: "he spoke a different language from the rest of our professors, that of economic and social history."\textsuperscript{98} Among the articles Hauser contributed to the \textit{Annales} is a piece entitled "Un problème d’influences: le saint-simonisme au brésil" published in 1937 shortly after Hauser’s return from Brazil.\textsuperscript{99}

Hauser’s article extends the line of thought articulated in Braudel’s review of Freyre whereby the French professors sought to integrate Brazil within a broader global history. In this specific case, Hauser examines the case of the Baron Mauà, Brazil’s most important industrialist of the later part of the 19th century, in order to assess the extent to which Mauà was influenced by Henri de Saint-Simon’s ideas. Reflecting on the possible connection between Mauà and Saint-Simon, Hauser traces its implication for the role of France in global economic development:

\begin{quote}
Quand on rencontre un de ces héros de la période capitaliste, un de ces lanceurs d'entreprises et d'idées, un de ces manieurs d'argent qui semblent avoir fait fortune
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{97} On Hauser’s influence and participation with the Annalists, see André Burguière, \textit{The Annales School: An intellectual History}, 91-2 and 94-5.


If Michel Chavalier, who is often credited with having first expressed the concept of Latin America, thereby linking the continent spiritually and culturally with France, and the Baron Mauà were indeed connected through Saint-Simonian ideas, then the French influence in Brazil’s developmental philosophy would predate the influence Comtean positivism on the Brazilian Old Republic (1889-1930). In fact, it would have paved the way for the pervasive influence of positivism on Brazil—thus, serving as 'brillante hypothèse' explaining the genealogy of positivism in Brazil.

---

100 Henri Hauser, "Un problème d’influences: le saint-simonisme au brésil," 1. This translates as: "When one recalls one of the heroic figures of the capitalist period, we immediately think of Henri de Saint Simon and the Saint-Simoniens. These were great innovators of free-enterprise and ideas, players in the money markets who would make a fortune and then ruin themselves--and sometimes repeat the cycle. They made famous their mantra: <<Honor Industry!>>. We mentioned earlier the Pereire bank. Would it not be exciting to find a link between this movement and the Baron Mauà? With this the influence of Saint-Simonianism would extend from the Suez Canal to the Amazon. The system of the Mediterranean established by Michel Chavalier would have its symmetrical link in South America. The heavily ironic commentary of Musset on the <<metal ribbon>> that extends the French Republic from Paris to Beijing would need extension. It would have to pass from the Andes to Kamchatka.

101 Whether or not Michel Chavalier was the first to articulate the concept of Latin America is the source of some dispute. Walter Mignolo traces the concept to Chavalier who traveled to the U.S. and Mexico in the 1830s shortly after de Toqueville made his famed visit to the U.S. Borrowing from Michelet the notion of Europe having twin origins as 'Latin' and 'Teutonic', Chavalier mapped this distinction onto America in his work, Lettres sur l'Amérique du Nord. As quoted by Walter Mignolo, he writes: "The two branches, Latin and German, reproduced themselves in the New World. South America is, like Meridian Europe, Catholic and Latin. North America belongs to a population that is Protestant and Anglo-Saxon." See Walter Mignolo, The Idea of Latin America (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005), 77-8. In framing this concept, Chavalier intended France to have a privileged role in Latin America as "the trustee of the destinies of all of the Latin nations on the two continents. It alone can prevent the swallowing of this entire family of peoples by the twin encroachment of the Germans or the Saxons or by the Slavs." See Mignolo, The Idea of Latin America, 79. While not disagreeing with Mignolo on the imperialistic impulses of France in the region, Leslie Bethell argues that the expression 'América Latina' predates Chavalier's writings in the works of José María Torres Caicedo, Francisco Bilbao, and Justo Arosemena. See Leslie Bethell, "Brazil and 'Latin America'," Journal of Latin American Studies 42: 457-485.
But did this connection between Mauá and the Saint-Simonians truly exist? And, did the historical documentation exist to support this hypothesis. ¹⁰²

Hauser thinks not. His article challenges the argument recently made by Mrs. George Dumas that he traces to the Brazilian intellectual Alberto de Faria’s biography of Mauá. While he admits that there is some resemblance between the ideas and actions of Mauá and members of Saint-Simon’s sect, some documentation showing direct connections between Mauá and figures like Chavalier and Père Enfantin would need to be established for the thesis to carry any weight.

Ultimately, despite finding Mauá to be a figure typically of the Second Industrial Revolution who bore many of the traits of a Saint-Simonian, Hauser argues that the documentation simply does not support the claim. Further, given Mauá’s biography—he was born an orphan into misery and eventually began work as a teller at the financial firm of Carruthers, Dixan and Company where he became an associate of Carruthers who eventually made him an associate and left oversight of the firm in Brazil to him—Hauser argues that British influence was dominant in informing his commercial practices and industrial endeavors. ¹⁰³ Hauser writes that:

Le jeune caissier de 1830 a reçu, au reste, une éducation tout anglaise. Quand il venait en Europe, c'était pour aller à Londres ou à Manchester. Nous ne le voyons jamais en contact avec des personnages français, on ne nous le montre jamais lisant ou discutant des livres

¹⁰² This is precisely the question Hauser asks, writing: ”On pourrait ainsi établir, ce qui serait conforme aux règles d’une bonne généalogie, que le Brésil fut saint-simonien avant d’être comtiste. Mais ces textes existent-ils? La filiation saint-simonienne est-elle autre chose qu’un brillante hypothèse?” See Henri Hauser, ”Un problème d’influences: le saint-simonisme au brésil,” 2. This translates as: ”Thus one could establish according to rules of a true genealogy, that Brazil was Saint-Simonian before it was Comtean. But do the documents exist to support this notion? Or, is the influence of Saint-Simon simply nothing more than a brilliant hypothesis.”

¹⁰³ For a more extensive biographical treatment of Mauá, see Anyda Marchant, Viscount Mauá and the Empire of Brazil: A Biography of Irineu Evangelista de Souza (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1965).
Hauser rightly points out that given the influence of Carruthers in Mauá’s life and the lack of any supporting documentation linking him to French industrial and commercial interests, one must conclude that Mauá represents the British influence in Brazil. While he holds out the possibility that Brazilian historians might unearth new evidence linking Mauá to currents of French thought, he thinks this is extremely unlikely given that Mauá burned his papers following bankruptcy in 1878.

In comparing Hauser’s work to other members of the French University Mission, a number of conclusions may be drawn. To begin with, once again we see an engagement with Brazilian scholars. While Hauser finds Alberto de Faria’s biography of *Mauá* defective in terms of its historical methodology, he finds Edgardo de Castro Rebello’s work illuminating. Hauser is in firm agreement with Castro Rebello’s assertion that given the lack of documentation no legitimate claim could be made connecting Mauá to Henri de Saint-Simon. Secondly, like Tronchon,

104 Henri Hauser, “Un problème d’influences: le saint-simonisme au brésil,” 7. This translates as: “The young teller of 1830 received when all is said and done, a very English education. When he travelled to Europe, it was to London or Manchester. We never see him in contact with French personalities or reading or discussing French books. It seems that the only school that he ever knew and followed was British. Until Brazilian historians bring us some new facts, it seems we must conclude that he was a manifestation of British influence in Brazil. We shouldn’t forget that, since the opening of its ports in 1808, Brazil was, like Portugal after the Treaty of Methuen, a commercial colony of England.”

105 Incidentally, Castro Rebello got himself in trouble for his scathing review of Faria’s work. Copies of his work were confiscated and in 1937 he was in prison—although Hauser is unsure whether he was in prison for his publication or other political activities. Castro Rebello was an avowed Marxist during a period when Vargas was trying to purge the left.

Braudel, and to some extent Magüé, Hauser’s main line of inquiry seeks to connect Brazilian history to broader international developments. Unlike the other works examined thus far, a new strain appears in this work that was either neglected or less explicit in the others—Brazil and Spanish America as part of a Pan-Mediterranean Latin Culture under French tutelage.

The notion of a Pan-Mediterranean Civilization, in so far as it functioned to legitimize France's colonial and imperial ambitions, has its roots in France's colonial efforts in Algeria. Philip Dine explains that the myth emerged in large part after the Franco-Prussian war when a significant number of Alsatians immigrated to Algeria after the loss of the territory to Germany. Relocated to a new land, these settlers sought to formulate a justification for their presence in this strange place. Dine identifies two major strands of the myth: the earliest articulation by Louis Bertrand (1866-1941) and a more liberal expression by the École d'Alger whose most famous representative was Albert Camus. In Bertrand's articulation, the French settlers—or pied-noirs—were justified in residing and ruling French Algeria because they were the natural heirs to the Romans who preceded the Arab conquest of the territory. The École d'Alger, deviated from this view in so far as they chose to emphasize the Hellenic past as opposed to the Roman in order to highlight a system of mutually beneficial trading relations and to deemphasize war and conquest. Nonetheless, Dine argues that the École d'Alger's was contiguous with the older

---

interpretation because it continued to hold onto the notion of Mediterranean archetype and essentially upheld the colonialisit logic implied in this view.  

What is interesting about the Pan-Mediterranean myth as featured in Hauser’s work, is that it connects this myth with Michel Chavalier’s conception of Spanish and Portuguese America as part of a Latin World led by France. Even though Hauser discounts the influence of Saint-Simonianism in Brazil, he nonetheless articulates an idea that was current in French academic circles—the idea of a Pan-Mediterranean culture that included Spanish and Portuguese America. His most famous student, Fernand Braudel, articulated this view—generally along the lines of the more liberal École d'Alger—by integrating Brazil into the Mediterranean World. Braudel's masterpiece, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, stands as the most famous expression of this idea. One of the broad themes of Braudel's *Mediterranean* is the shift of economic and political power from the Mediterranean world to the Atlantic world.

---

108 Dine writes: "Fundamentally they remained trapped in the same historic/colonial impasse as the Algerianists and what is perhaps more striking is not the supposed break between the École d'Alger and the older, conservative group, but the underlying similarities or continuities. The École remained grounded in a myth of a Mediterranean people but one which shifted away from the Roman/Latin symbolism of the Algerianists, rejected for its identification with colonial militarism as well as the founding myths of Italian fascism, toward an aesthetic denoted by Greece, Odysseus and "open" seafaring communities." See Philip Dine, "The French Colonial Myth of a Pan-Mediterranean Civilization," 15. He faults Camus, the most famous representative, for being "unable to escape" this colonial ideology. David Carroll's study of Camus provides some understanding of why Camus was beholden to this myth and in the process gives reason to think that the difference between Camus's ideas about Algeria and someone like Bertrand. He explains that Camus--somewhat mistakenly--believed his father's side of the family almost exclusively came from Alsace who refused to live in a German-occupied Alsace: "This gave a patriotic and Republican rather than colonialisit justification for his father's family's presence in North Africa and corresponded to the fiction of Algeria that Camus fervently believed until his untimely death." See David Carroll, *Albert Camus the Algerian: Colonialism, Terror, Justice* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), 1-2.

With the unification of Spain and Portugal under Philip II and by extension the Spanish and Portuguese holdings in the New World, "[w]hether consciously or unconsciously, Philip's composite empire by force of circumstance became centered on the Atlantic, that vital sea connecting his many dominions, the base of the claims to what was known even in Philip II’s lifetime as his 'Universal Monarch.'" 110 Prior to Philip II, Braudel thinks it is reasonable to say that the Mediterranean dominated the Atlantic for a long time.

The place occupied by Brazil in Braudel's Mediterranean seems somewhat disproportionate to its place within the Atlantic world. For example, Brazil appears in the index to the book twenty-two times in comparison to five citations of Mexico—which was a far wealthier and more developed colonial possession through the end of the Sixteenth Century. In Part One of his masterwork, where Braudel focuses on the role of the environment in shaping human destinies, Braudel identifies Brazil and the Portuguese Atlantic as one of the plurality of Atlantics with the others being the English, French and Spanish. Braudel criticizes traditional, or nationalist, historiography for failing to distinguish between these Atlantics and "regarding them on the whole as the Mediterranean's chief enemy." 111 He counters that "the Mediterranean for a long time dominated its immediate neighbor and that its decadence can be explained, among other reasons by its loss of this control." 112 This helps situate Brazil as part of a Portuguese Atlantic that was contiguous with

---

the Mediterranean. In the same vein, Braudel writes of how cities of the Mediterranean:

owed their existence to the control over physical space they exercised through the networks of communications emanating from them, the meeting of different transport routes, their continual adaptation to new conditions and the ways in which they developed slowly or rapidly. They were human hives, whose inhabitants might travel far from home.  

He continues on to explain how the Genoese established a colony in Brazil and cites Gilberto Freyre as the source for this connection between Mediterranean cities and the Atlantic world.

In bridging the Atlantic and Mediterranean Worlds, Braudel also points out social phenomenon that connect the two. Again, Freyre’s work serves as his source for documenting these connections. Braudel cites Freyre to demonstrate that the phenomenon of immigration cannot be explained solely through economic need because the wealthy also immigrated. In Brazil, as in Florence, there was a pattern of immigration by landowners from the country into the town. Likewise, he relies on Freyre’s Sobrados e Mucambos to illustrate that banditry in Brazil as in

---


115 Braudel writes that: ”The brilliant work of the Brazilian sociological historian, Gilberto Freyre, affords a valuable comparison. The first Brazilian towns eventually attracted the fazendeiros, house and all. There was a total removal to the town. In the Mediterranean, too, it is as if the town absorbed both lord and manor at once. A lord of Siena would have his country seat in the Maremma and his palazzo in Siena, as Bandello [Matteo] has described it for us, with its hardly-used ground floor and its state rooms where silk was making its triumphant first appearance.” See Fernand Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, 337.
Italy were "the henchmen, the cabras, of wealthy landowners, all threatened to some extent by modern development and obliged to defend themselves."\textsuperscript{116}

The connection Braudel makes between the Mediterranean World and Brazil seems quite natural given the trajectory of Braudel's personal life. After his university studies ended in 1923, Braudel taught for a decade at a lycée in Constantine, Algeria, where he began to see the Mediterranean "from opposite shore, upside down," which "had a considerable impact on [his] vision of history."\textsuperscript{117}

After a few years back in Paris, he was offered the opportunity to take part in the French University Mission in Brazil. Brazil and Algeria became intimately connected in Braudel's experience when he traveled from Brazil to Algeria and back during the Fall/Winter holiday in the Brazilian academic year. In Algeria, he and his wife, Paule, would leave their son with Paule's mother, before traveling on to the archives in Florence, Venice, and Genoa.\textsuperscript{118} His travels made it natural for Braudel to link the two through constant comparisons. His colleagues took note of the associations Braudel made. Charles Morazé, the editor of the \textit{Annales} in the immediate post-war period who also spent two years in Brazil from 1949-1951, remarked on the occassion of Bruadel's induction into the Académie française:

\begin{quote}
Au Brésil de l’époque, celui des années 30, on retrouve ces mêmes boutiques ouvertes sur l’extérieur comme celles des souks; les mêmes rues où, dans une à peine différence entre le jour et la nuit, chantent l’Italie et l’Afrique aussi bien que la vieille Europe nordique, autant que portugaise ou ibérique; Brésil où sont même présents les orients arabe ou turc non moins que l’Extrême-Orient d’où notamment sont venus les diligents Japonais. La Méditerranée-monde? L'idée ayant connu
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{116} Fernand Braudel, \textit{The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II}, 751.

\textsuperscript{117} Braudel, "Personal Testimony," 451.

\textsuperscript{118} On Braudel's travels during the autumn/winter break of 1935-6, see Daix, \textit{Braudel}, 115.
Morazé indicates here that the trope developed by Braudel that integrated Brazil into a pan-Latin Mediterranean had wide acceptance in France. He appears to agree that Braudel’s connection between Algeria, the Mediterranean and Brazil, was more than an idiosyncratic academic notion; there was an organic viability to it.\footnote{Daix, \textit{Braudel}, p. 115. The quoted material is from the Charles Morazé, \textit{Allocution prononcée par Charles Morazé lors de l'hommage rendu à Fernand Braudel le 18 décembre 1985 à la Maison des sciences de l'homme.} (Paris: Maison des sciences de l'homme, 1986), 114. This translates as: "In 1930s Brazil, one came across the same type of shop, opened to the outside like those of the souks; the same type of street where there was barely a difference between day and night which was common to Italy, Africa and Scandinavia as well as Portugal or Spain. In Brazil, there was a Middle Eastern as well as Asian population as the Arab and Japanese population was sizable. The Mediterranean world? This idea that has enjoyed recent success was already known there 50 years ago. Algeria, the Mediterranean, Brazil: countries near or below a tropic." On Morazé's time in Brazil, see Fernanda Peixoto Massi, \textit{Franceses e Norte-Americanos nas ciências sociais brasileiras (1930-1960)} (São Paulo: Instituto de Estudos Econômicos, Sociais e Políticos de São Paulo, 1988), 14.}\footnote{Of course, as with any comparison, there were points at which Algeria and Brazil diverged. For example, Braudel in a later interview contrasted the pattern of colonization in Brazil with that of Algeria: "Le monde français en Algérie était un monde assez fermé. La France s’était reproduite de l’autre côte de la Méditerranée. [...] C’était une société coloniale plaquée sur une société indigène que tu ne connaissais pas. Tandis qu’au Brésil alors, on radiographiait tout au premier coup d’œil. On voyait une étrange haute société, peu consciente de sa situation et pleine d’illusions." This translates as: "French Algeria was a world closed in upon itself. France reproduced itself on the other side of the Mediterranean. It was superimposed on an indigeneous society with which you had little knowledge. Brazil, on the other hand, was transparent on first glance. One saw a strange elite class, hardly conscious of the situation and full of illusions." See Daix, \textit{Braudel}, 111.}

Finally, this quotation shows that experience and theory were mutually reinforcing in the case of Fernand Braudel and Brazil.

Besides Braudel’s conceptualization of Brazil as being part of a continuum with the Mediterranean, the unique trajectory of Braudel’s academic formation that led him from Algeria to Brazil and back, contributed to his eventual articulation of the \textit{longuë durée}. Braudel’s biographer, Pierre Daix argues that the geographic and historical displacement that Braudel underwent through living and working in...
Algeria and Brazil helped him formulate a relativistic picture of historical space-time:

Même si Braudel est encore loin de concevoir ce qu'il appellera la longue durée, il perçoit ici intuitivement un relativisme des durées, une différenciation géographique des durées. Le temps de l'histoire n'est pas uniforme. Il est inséparable de l'espace. Mais aussi du lieu où a vécu, où travaille l'historien. Qui n'est pas seulement un lieu géographique, mais un lieu culturel.\footnote{Daix, Braudel, 127. This translates as: "Even though Braudel was still far from designating what he called the longue durée, he intuited the relativity of time and how time could be geographically differentiated. Historical time is not uniform; it is inseparable from space. But it is also the place where the historian lives and works. And, this is not only geographical, but cultural."}

Braudel's Brazilian years were particularly influential in this conceptualization of the relativity of historical space-time because Braudel interpreted going to Brazil as a journey back in time. Speaking in 1984 of a visit he made to the Brazilian State of Bahia in 1937, Braudel makes the following comparison:

Devant une mosquée d'Alger, je comprends les éléments parce que c'est du travail, beaucoup de travail italien, des marbres, des appliques de marbre, mais je ne comprends pas ce qu'est une mosquée, tandis que comprendre les églises de Bahia, c'est extrêmement facile: je suis à la hauteur...Le Brésil, c'est la même civilisation, mais pas au même âge. C'est vraiment le Brésil qui m'a permis d'arriver à une certaine conception de l'histoire que je n'aurais pas eue si j'étais resté autour de la Méditerranée.\footnote{Daix, Braudel, 138. Roughly translated: "Outside a mosque in Algiers, I understand the architecture because it is the product of a labor I understand--Italian labor, marble, and the detailing of marble, but I do not understand this as a Mosque. In contrast, understanding the churches Bahia is very easily: I am up to it because Brazil is the same civilization, but not at the same developmental age. Thus, Brazil allowed me to reach a certain conception of history that I would not have had if I had stayed in the Mediterranean."}

Here Braudel explicitly acknowledges the role his experience of Brazil had in allowing him to conceptualize the plurality of space-times within the framework of a single civilization. If this were not enough to establish the importance of the Braudel's comparative nexus of France/Algeria/Brazil, when Braudel did come around to articulate his notion of the longue durée, in his famous article, "History
and the Social Sciences," he credited strangeness, geographic displacement, and surprise as essential constituents in generating historical meaning:

Philippe Ariès has insisted on the importance of distance and surprise in historical explanation: in the sixteenth century one comes up against a certain form of strangeness; strangeness especially for the observer four centuries away. How can we account for this discrepancy? That is the whole problem. What I want to say is that surprise and distance—these important aids to comprehension—are both equally necessary for an understanding of that which surrounds you—surrounds you so evidently that you can no longer see it clearly. Live in London for a year and you will not get to know much about England. But through comparison in the light of your surprise, you will suddenly come to understand some of the most profound and individual characteristics of France, which you did not previously understand because you know them too well. The past likewise provides distance from the present.123

Substitute Algeria and Brazil in place of England and France and it becomes clear how important Braudel’s experience in these two locales was for his mature historical vision.

Returning to Braudel’s vision of Brazil as part of a Mediterranean civilization, a number of broad conclusions can be drawn. We can conclude along with Thomas Skidmore, that Braudel like the other French professors involved in the University Mission, was "Brazilianized and [his] books and articles radically changed the French perspective on Brazil."124 What can be added to this generalization is that social scientists like Braudel integrated Brazil within a broader global perspective—and, in the case of Braudel, and to a lesser extent Hauser, conceptualized Brazil within the framework of a Pan-Mediterranean civilization. While Braudel acknowledged that historical time in Brazil, like the Mediterranean itself, was not


homogenous, but a vast civilization demonstrating several different stages of
development contemporaneously, he nonetheless had the impression that to travel
to Brazil was to travel "en arrière dans l'histoire."125 Thus, implicit in this view is the
idea that France as the most developed national culture within a Pan-Mediterranean
civilization was obliged, or had the right, to extend its radiance into Brazil.

Émile Coornaert and the Brazilian Production of History
Emile Coornaert, Braudel’s predecessor as the Chair of History at the
University of São Paulo, differed with Braudel over the extent to which Brazil was
part of a Europe Américane.126 Coornaert, was like Braudel, a student of Henri
Hauser, but was considerably older and more established than the young agrégés
like Braudel, Lévi-Strauss, and Monbeig who served in faculty positions. By the time
he went to Brazil in 1934, Coornaert had been named to a faculty position at the
École pratique des Hautes Études and had published a monograph on the textile
industry in the frontier region between France and the Spanish Netherlands in the
Early Modern Period.127 Upon his return in 1935, he was elected to the Collège de
France.128 Although Coornaert acknowledges—along with Braudel and Hauser—
Brazil’s place in the history of Europe, he nonetheless sees it as having a destiny
distinct from Europe.

125 See Daix, Braudel, p. 241.
126 See previously cited passage from Braudel: "Pour nous, Européens, le Brésil est d’abord une
Europe américaine, une Europe appuyée sur cette Méditerranée moderne qu’aura été l’Atlantique,
vivant de sa vie plus ou moins animée, participant à son histoire générale et à la vie mêlée des
127 See Émile Coornaert, Un centre industriel d’autrefois: la draparie-sayetterie d’Hondshoote (XVIe-
128 For a brief overview of Coornaert’s life and academic work, see Henri Dubief’s obituary of
Coornaert: Henri Dubief, "Nécrologie d’Émile Coornaert (1886-1980),” Revue d’histoire moderne et
In a 1936 article, "Aperçu de la production historique récente au Brésil," published shortly after he returned to France in 1935, Coornaert provided a French academic audience with a review of not only Brazilian historiography, but also the institutions and archival sites supporting historical research. He surveyed what he found to be the major works of Brazilian history, compared Brazilian and French methods, and pointed out the unique features of Brazilian history while acknowledging its European ties and points of comparison with Europe.\(^{129}\) Coornaert's engagement of Brazilian scholarship is on the whole positive and reminiscent of Henri Tronchon's *Huit Mois au Brésil* with positive reviews of Brazil's most accomplished historians Francisco Adolpho de Varnhagen and Capitstrano Abreu. These works are compared favorably with French and European historical works.

In assessing the conditions undergirding historical research in Brazil, Coornaert observes that a wide variety of public and private initiatives have been undertaken to create the institutions and publications necessary for serious scholarship.\(^{130}\) He notes that in the years after Brazilian independence, Brazil created a number of institutes with literary and scientific missions that helped to renovate historical methods. The two most important are Rio de Janeiro's *Instituto historico e geographico brasileiro* and the *Instituto historico e geographico de São Paulo*. These institutes published journals, acquired archival treasures and


\(^{130}\) On the federal and state level you have the creation of various institutes, the Académie brésilienne, and archival sites like the State Archives of São Paulo State in 1894. On the private sphere, a number of societies like the Friends of Capistrano de Abreu were formed.
published works on a diverse range of topics. While these publications did not always achieve or aspire to brilliance—they nonetheless demonstrated a 'patient sagacity' in accumulating statistical measures that could serve as the basis for a broad range of scholarly projects. In characterizing these endeavors, Coornaert's attitude is nothing if not generous, writing, for example: "Et, joint à l'ardeur conquérante de ce peuple neuf, ce souci des traditions lointaines atteste un goût de la culture, témoignage d'une dignité intellectuelle ancienne, gage de rapides progrès pour l'avenir."131

Complementing the patient scholarship performed by the institutions and archives, the Brazilian Academy launched a publishing endeavor making the oldest sources on national history were made available to the public. A healthy number of these works were accounts by foreign travelers like Jean de Léry and Hans Staden as well as by the Jesuit missionaries to Brazil. Such works helped to link Brazil to European and Atlantic history. While Coornaert, like Braudel was interested in these connections, he is more taken by the specific features of Brazil's history and emphasizes that "Mais le Brésil est à la fois un «pays neuf» et un pays rattaché à un continent ancien."132 Coornaert finds the features specific to Brazil invite an innovative historical approach that melds history together with ethnography and geography. He acknowledges the multiplicity of forms besides published writings

131 Emile Coornaert, "Aperçu la production historique recente au Brésil," 46. This translates as: "And, combined with the intrepid spirit of this new nation is a concern for distant traditions. This attests to a taste for culture, shows a kind of intellectual dignity, and serves as a gage for the rapid progress of the future."

132 Emile Coornaert, "Aperçu la production historique recente au Brésil," 50. This translates as: "But Brazil is at the same time a 'new country' as well as a country attached to the old continent."
that historical documentation can take. This is especially true of Brazil and helps
distinguish the country from the rest of Europe. As he puts it:

> C'est plus que partout ailleurs, le cas au Brésil: le milieu physique et humain y fait
aux forces diverses dont le jeu constitue la trame de l'histoire des conditions
dessemblables de celles de notre continent, <<humanisé>> depuis plus longtemps et,
malgré les oppositions le plus frappantes, mieux unifié, plus homogène que cet État,
vaste à lui seul comme les quatre cinquièmes de l'Europe.133

Here, the geographic space of Brazil and its racial composition set it apart and make
it necessary that geography and ethnography be more extensively integrated into
historical study. Thus, in comparing Brazilian and French historical methodologies,
Coornaert observes that "le travail historique est-il plus que chez nous intimentement
inséré dans le réseau des sciences qui s'occupent de l’activité extérieure des
hommes."134 In pointing out the innovations of Brazilian scholars in integrating
history with the social sciences, Coornaert cites Affonso d’Escragnolle-Taunay’s *A
propagação da cultura cafeeira* and Gastão Cruls’s *A Amazônia que eu vi.*

While acknowledging the success of Brazilian scholars in integrating the
social sciences within the fold of history, Coornaert also warns of a potential
danger—the risk of reducing history to sociology. He writes that:

> C'est surtout la sociologie, et ici nous touchons à la tentation la plus forte -- assurément
naturelle -- au plus grand danger pour ceux qui font de l'histoire au Brésil: le désir de faire
oeuvre pratique, l'entrainement aux larges généralisations porte à mèler de très près la
sociologie à l'histoire, au point de compromettre celle-ci dans de vues systématiques.135

---

133 Emile Coornaert, "Aperçu la production historique recente au Brésil," 51. This translates as: "More
than anywhere else it is the case in Brazil that the physical and human environment have responded
to various forces that have made the narrative of history very dissimilar to those of our continent.
Europe, which has been cultivated and a literate tradition for a long time, and despite some very
striking oppositions is better unified and more homogenous than Brazil, which is vast space in itself
like four fifths of Europe."

134 Emile Coornaert, "Aperçu la production historique recente au Brésil," 52. This translates as:
"Historical work in Brazil is more integrated into the network of the sciences that are occupied with
the behavior of humanity than back in France."

135 Emile Coornaert, "Aperçu la production historique recente au Brésil," 52. This translates as: "It is
sociology--and with it we approach the greatest, albeit natural, temptation for the Brazilian historian:
Coornaert expresses here the worry that historical specificity and history's engagement with individuals will be lost within a sociological framework that reduces these particularities to broad generalities. In saying this, Coornaert, a frequent contributor to the *Annales*, articulates some of the tensions that were playing themselves out in France at the time. His worry that an emphasis on broad-based collective phenomenon and a penchant for generalization will lead to a neglect of individual lives, the historically exceptional, and highly reflective intellectual activity recapitulates some of the friction between the founders of the *Annales*, Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre. Where Bloch was more comfortable following a sociological approach in understanding culture, Febvre was critical of this method in so far as it ignored individuals and discounted intellectual experience.\(^{136}\)

On the basis of Coornaert's article, a number of general conclusions can be drawn. To begin with, his knowledge of Brazilian historiography is impressive. Coornaert is not simply familiar with an impressive array of Brazilian authors in history and the social sciences. He is also aware of the major historiographic trends, the desire to create a practical work, working towards large generalizations and thereby intimately mixing sociology in history, with the ultimate effect being that historical specificity is lost in a broad systematic view."

\(^{136}\) This argument over 'mentalities' manifested itself most explicitly in Febvre's review of Bloch's *Feudal Society* in 1939. André Burguière argues that Bloch and Febvre agreed on the concept of 'mentalities' because "it retained the socialized character of mental life without reducing it--as did the concept of representations--to intellectualized forms and without neglecting the place occupied in it by individual experience. Conversely, they were divided on the respective place to attribute to the conscious and unconscious aspects of mental life." See André Burguière, *The Annales School: An Intellectual History*, 59). Where Bloch focused on habits, their institutionalization, and transformation over time, Febvre was more interested in seeing how unconscious habits matched up with consciously held beliefs. For more on how Bloch's and Febvre's conception of mentalities differed according to their historical methodology, see Burguière's chapter, "The Notion of Mentalities, Invented or Inherited?"
the reception of particular works by the public, and understands the limited size and scope of the audience for such works in Brazil. What this suggests is that Coornaert, like the other French faculty, was committed to learning about Brazil and did not envision his role to be that of simply disseminating French culture in Brazil. Besides providing evidence of the interest of French academics in Brazil, Coornaert’s article suggests that French social scientists had something to learn from their Brazilian colleagues. This is made clear through the way he concludes his article:

Dès maintenant, l’excellence de maints travaux que ne le cèdent en rien aux publications les mieux qualifiées d’Europe, la multiplication des œuvres de recherche montrent que le Brésil acquiert peu à peu une place, insuffisamment connue, mais de plus en plus importante dans celui de plusieurs autres sciences. Il prendra, sans nul doute, un rôle de plus en plus actif parmi les pays qui créent, au jour le jour, une civilisation dont des connaissances positives et méthodiques, appuyées sur la plus large expérience humaine, sont un des éléments essentiels.\(^{137}\)

It is clear from this statement that Coornaert sees the Brazilian social sciences as on a par with the best publications in Europe. Further, in conjunction with his statements about the importance of geography and ethnography as being essential in the study of Brazilian history, he suggests that Brazil has a unique contribution to make to a more global sense of history.

The terms on which Brazilian history links up with World history in Coornaert’s treatment are more generous in Coornaert’s article than they are in Braudel’s work. Coornaert emphasizes Brazil’s unique civilization and contribution to global culture to a much greater degree than Braudel. Braudel, by contrast, tends

---

\(^{137}\) Emile Coornaert, “Aperçu la production historique récente au Brésil,” 60. This translates as: “From here it may be concluded that the excellence of the work being produced in Brazil is not lacking in any way when compared with the most accomplished publications of Europe. The proliferation of research works shows that little by little, Brazil is acquiring a place, not sufficiently known, but increasingly important in the realm of several sciences. It will take, undoubtedly, a more active role among the countries that are creative and dynamic. Day by day, Brazil’s scientific knowledge and methods grow in importance as elements that support a greater knowledge of human experience, broadly conceived.”
to treat Brazil as an outpost of Mediterranean culture that is defined by economic and social patterns that originate in the Mediterranean. Brazil for Braudel represents a stage of being within a broader civilization. It may be understood as providing a point of reference for the relativity of historical space-time when it is compared with advanced industrial democracies. In Braudel’s treatment, comparisons with Algeria suggest more commonalities than those with France.138 Likewise, Coornaert shows greater reverence for the aptitude of Brazilian scholars for innovative and original thinking than Jean Magüé who criticized the frames through which Brazilians filtered experience. He shares with Braudel, Tronchon, Hauser, and Magüé an engagement with Brazilian intellectual production, but of all of the above mentioned, he has the most respect for the pioneering aspects of Brazilian research. Further, considered against his colleagues, the implicit and explicit comparisons that Coornaert makes are most free of the tendency to regard Brazil as behind the intellectual pace set by Europe.

**Concluding Remarks**

A number of generalizations can be made regarding the contemporary literature produced by the participants of the French University Mission. To begin with, race immigration, and the social structure of Brazil figured highly in the articles and memoirs. Secondly, we see attention being granted to the new methods in the social sciences being employed by Brazilian intellectuals. In engaging their Brazilian contemporaries, these French authors do not simply display intellectual

---

138 Pierre Daix suggests that the conjunction of Algeria and Brazil in Braudel's professional formation, led to a presentiment of the term 'Third World,' decades before this concept became fully articulated. See Daix, *Braudel*, p. 127.
narcissism or cultural condesension. Two main divisions exist in their writings: one tending to treat Brazil as a society onto itself; the other, globalizing Brazil and viewing it within the current of World or transatlantic history. Finally, in this writing on Brazil, we see a number of figures associated with the development of the *Annales* school of history sharpening their own methodological skills through exploring comparisons and subjects ideally suited for a historical approach more thoroughly integrated with the social sciences. This is consistent with Guy Martinère’s research on Latin American studies in the early *Annales*. He points out that particularly between 1929-1949:

```
L’Amérique latine, dans l’émergence même de la nouvelle conception de l’histoire proposée comme un défi par l’école des Annales, a occupé un terrain de premier choix, labouré intensément par de nombreux collaborateurs de la revue, et non de moindres.139
```

The publication record of the first twenty years of the *Annales*, analyzed by Maurice Arnould, provides him with the evidence to make this claim.140 Martinière, likewise, discerns two main currents: Eurocentric works that focused on Latin America in order to write or revise the history of Europe from Columbus onwards and articles that took a more intrinsic interest in Latin America.

In light of these generalizations, the notion that the French University Mission to Brazil simply represented cultural colonialism appears untenable. While the French intellectuals involved were involved within cultural diplomacy and it is difficult to extract them completely from the power dynamics then extant between

---

139 Guy Martinère, *Aspects de la coopération franco-brésilienne* (Grenoble: Presses Universitaires de Grenoble, 1982), 151. This may be translated as: “In the emergence of the new conception of history that was proposed as a challenge to the academic establishment by the founders and contributors to the *Annales*, Latin America occupied pride of place. It was studied intensively by a number of the review’s collaborators and not the least prominent.”

France and Brazil, on the level of ideas, their writings suggest a more complex legacy.

A recent article by Robert Stam and Ella Shohat on transnational comparison provides some useful observations for thinking through the meaning of the French University Mission. Transnational comparison functions on the basis of ideas moving back and forth between geographic and cultural milieus. Stam and Shohat identify this type of comparison as one of the basic components in forming national identity as this type of cross cultural comparison helps to shape how nations perceive themselves and their role in the world. In their reading, comparison often
1) functions to rank a nation above or below one’s own, 2) perpetuates an exceptionalist myth, 3) reifies national communities into essential types for the purpose of comparison, or, more positively 4) can intervene in ‘narcissistic’ or ‘exceptionalist’ narratives.

The writings of the French University Mission tend to fall into this last grouping. They do not include comparisons that unfavorably characterize Brazil in relationship to France. Coornaert’s writing is perhaps the clearest example of this. In his piece, he describes the Brazilian historical profession in highly favorable terms. Likewise, Braudel, Tronchon, Hauser and Coornaert treat Brazilian social scientists as worthy peers even when criticizing them. While Braudel, Hauser, and Tronchon exhibit a tendency to enfold Brazil within a global framework rather than treat it as a society unique onto itself, they nonetheless do not set Brazil up as a society that can be used in any direct way to confirm France’s exceptionalism. Still,

---

it can be objected that Braudel’s project of incorporating Brazil within the French myth of a pan-Mediterranean culture reduces it to peripheral status. Further, his characterizing it as a society that replicates the form of early Mediterranean societies like that of Dark Age and Homeric Greece hints at not only the exceptionalism but the superiority of Western European societies.142

A final consideration in the French University Mission is that the experience in Brazil influenced them to rethink their methodologies as well as their narratives of European history. The subsequent attention paid to Brazil by the Annales school in the postwar era and the way in which this shaped social science discourse and practice in France is the subject of Chapters 3 and 4. The French University Mission occurred at a critical juncture in the maturation of the social sciences in France. As Peter Schöttler has pointed out in his research on transnational French and German historical communities, the post World War One era in which the Annales was founded and French University Mission took place, was a period which allowed for a great deal of innovation in the social sciences.143 Particularly in the case of Fernand Braudel’s work, we can see the extent to which his formative experience in Brazil led him to reconceptualize his masterwork and formulate new concepts that would influence French academic history for generations.


CHAPTER 2
CULTURAL POLITICS IN BRAZIL: THE UNIVERSITY OF SÃO PAULO AS A SYMBOL OF MODERNITY

Introduction

The opening chapter provided an overview of the French University Mission and argued that the French faculty's high regard for the work of Brazilian intellectuals made the overall legacy of the Mission much more complex than a straightforward case of cultural imperialism. In making this argument, Chapter One examined French political objectives in Brazil along with the mechanisms of cultural diplomacy. The writings of Fernand Braudel, Henri Tronchon, Jean Magüé, Henri Hauser, and Émile Coornaert played the central role in advancing the argument that the University Mission demonstrated a great deal of reciprocity between the French faculty and their Brazilian peers. In addition, the first chapter provided an overview of how these French scholars perceived the social and cultural features operative in Brazil in the 1930s. While this first chapter provided background on the political scene in Brazil in the 1930s, it focused on French objectives and perceptions of Brazil. In other words, it concentrated on what the University Mission meant from a French perspective.

This chapter shifts perspective from a French to a Brazilian perspective and looks at the conditions that made the establishment of the University of São Paulo possible—in both intellectual and political terms. In terms of exploring the French University Mission as a case study of what Bourdieu called, "The Social Conditions of
the International Circulation of Ideas," it is necessary to understand the institutions, structures, politics, individuals, and ideas exchanged within both the French and Brazilian cultural fields as well as the changes produced within both fields through this exchange. Having considered French institutions, personnel, and ideas in Chapter 1, moving on to a fuller consideration of the Brazilian intellectual and political fields is the next logical step in understanding the exchange of ideas in transnational perspective.

Drawing on the work of SergiÓ Miceli, Heloísa Pontes, and Fernanda Massi, in the first section of this chapter, "Features of Intellectual Production in Vargas Era Brazil," I argue that the type of intellectual engagements discussed in the previous chapter, were premised upon the conjunction of economic, political, and demographic forces of the late 1920s and early 1930s. More specifically, in response to the global depression of 1929, Brazil developed for the first time a robust publishing industry as part of its overall strategy to replace imported industrial products with domestic manufacturing. This greatly enhanced publishing industry combined with rapid urbanization and Géntulo Vargas' ambition to culturally unify Brazil, helped produce an explosion of attempts to capture Brazil as an integrated unit and to define Brasilidade—or what it meant to be Brazilian.

Although the 1930s was a period where the number of publications attempting to capture Brazil in broad brushstrokes increased dramatically, the development of the intellectual field during the 1930s eventually led to a movement away from these wide-ranging treatments towards increasingly specialized studies. Drawing upon the excellent studies of Miceli, Pontes, and Massi, I argue that
understanding the role of the French University Mission in the professionalization of the Brazilian social sciences requires linking the enhanced role of the Brazilian state in cultural production to its efforts in developing a system of higher education. In short, this was a period in which the Brazilian state was very active in restructuring intellectual life. Complicating the picture, however, are the marked regional variations that factor into any accounting of the development of the social sciences in Brazil. The French influence was most pronounced in USP with the creation of the University of São Paulo.

In the second section of this chapter, "Júlio Mesquitá and Brazilian Cultural Politics", I situate the founding of the University of São Paulo within the internal politics of Brazil. Understanding why the French were chosen in 1934 as the faculty of choice for the Faculty of Philosophy, Science, and Literature requires acknowledging Júlio Mesquita's political activism and ambitions for the University of São Paulo. In this section, I argue that the combination of Júlio Mesquitá's idealist view of history, his identification with the liberal Entente during World War I, the disillusionment he felt as a result of 1924 Tenente Revolt, and disaffection for Vargas's authoritarianism, led him to look at the creation of the Faculty of Philosophy, Science, and Literature as the solution to a cultural crisis.

**Features of Intellectual Production in Vargas Era Brazil**

**The Establishment of the Brazilian Press and Brasilidade**

By looking at the establishment of the Brazilian Press and a sense of what it meant to be Brazilian, or Brasilidade, this section demonstrates the preconditions
for the French University Mission. It shows that this Mission occurred at a time when Gétulio Vargas was attempting to nationalize the cultural field in Brazil.¹⁴⁴ Vargas’s attempt to unify Brazilian intellectual culture was made possible by the political, economic, and demographic forces that I examine below. These changes led to an dramatic increase in the number of historical works that attempted to explain Brazil both past and present in panoramic view. As a result, the type of intellectual engagement that was examined in Chapter 1, was conditioned on a historical specific set of circumstances which had only recently come into existence.

Chapter 1 examined Fernand Braudel’s reading of Gilberto Freyre and Henri Tronchon’s reading of Sergio Buarque de Holanda. By engaging Gilberto Freyre’s Casa Grande e Senzala and Sergio Buarque de Holanda’s Raízes do Brasil, Fernand Braudel and Henri Tronchon introduced the French public to what have become two of the most internationally well-known portraits of Brazilian historical development. Both of these works sought to capture Brazil as a nation in its geographic enormity and historical depth. In doing so, both offer meditations on the relationship between racial mixture and Brazilian national identity while differing markedly in their disposition towards contemporary Brazil. Freyre was profoundly anti-modernist in disposition and put forward an idyllic view of colonial and imperial Brazil based on plantation (fazenda) life in Pernambuco. Buarque de Holanda, on the other hand, was critical of the fazenda for retarding Brazil’s growth as a democratic state.

¹⁴⁴ For a panoramic view of the shifting cultural field in Vargas era Brazil, see Daryle Williams, Culture Wars in Brazil: The First Vargas Regime, 1930-1945 (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001).
While Braudel and Tronchon provide excellent summations of the main points of these works, as well as critical remarks, they do not assess these works against a broader backdrop of shifting patterns of intellectual production in Brazil. This is understandable given that these patterns were still unclear to contemporaries and both Braudel and Tronchon spent relatively little time in Brazil. Heloísa Pontes’s work "Retratos do Brasil: Editores, Editoras e "Coleções Brasileira" nas Décadas de 30, 40, 50" in the collaborative endeavor headed by Sergio Miceli to write the history of the social sciences in Brazil, provides the necessary context to understand the project of constructing Brazilian identity, or Brasilidade, during the 1930s.\(^\text{145}\)

Ponte's research connects the changing dynamics of the intellectual field to broader economic and political developments. With greater urban and industrial development in Brazil, particularly in São Paulo, the 1920s saw greater cultural development as witnessed in Semana de Arte Moderna (The Week of Modern Art), exhibit that launched the Brazilian modernist movement in 1922. While the Semana de Arte Moderna had a transgressive character because it was a protest directed at the state by independent intellectuals, Pontes argues that this type of project had become normative by the 1930s:

No entanto, foi somente nos anos 30, após a eclosão e consolidação da Revolução, que essas experiências culturais, geradas no decênio anterior, deixaram de ser uma marca de transgressão, sofrendo, a partir de então, um "processo de rotinização e de normalização."\(^\text{146}\)


The reason for this was that the political revolution that brought Vargas to power initiated a process of cultural unification such that projects formerly conceived on a regional basis were now envisioned on a national level.\textsuperscript{147} The shift from regional to national level conceptualizations was seen in movements for educational reform as well as in literary and cultural production.

Import substitution industrialization provided the material basis for the consolidation of the intellectual field on a national scale. Following Pontes, the worldwide depression of 1929 provided the impetus for the development of a national publishing industry. As Pontes indicates, during the 1920s most Brazilian authors continued to be published by French or Portuguese presses. By the mid-1930s, there was a 600\% increase in the production of domestic books.\textsuperscript{148} This surge helped create a broader domestic audience for the consumption of Brazilian literary works and opened up writing as a full-time professional career. Heretofore, even the greatest of Brazilian writers—Machado de Assis—required a career outside letters for material sustenance.\textsuperscript{149} But even more significantly, a domestic publishing industry permitted—in the same way that the rise of 'Print Culture'

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}


\textsuperscript{148} See Heloísa Pontes, \textit{Retratos do Brasil: Editores, Editoras e "Coleções Brasiliiana" nas Décadas de 30, 40, e 50}, 366

facilitated the transfer of sacrality from the Church to the Nation in Benedict Anderson’s telling—a Paulista, Bahian, Carioca or Minera to rethink their regional identity and enlist in the broader national project. As the famous literary scholar Antonio Cândido puts it:

*foi notável a interpenetração literária em todo o Brasil, depois de 30, quando um jovem, digamos do interior de Minas, ia vivendo, numa experiência feérica e real, a Bahia de Jorge Amado, a Paraíba de José Lins do Rego, a Aracaju de Amando Fontes, a Amazônia de Abguar Bastos, a Belo Horizonte de Ciro dos Anjos, a Porto Alegre de Érico Veríssimo ou de Dionélio Machado, a cidade cujo rio imitava o Reno, de Viana Moog.*

Here, for the first time in the 1930s, a Brazilian reader could integrate the regional inflections of Brazilian literature into a national mosaic.

This synthesis was facilitated by the initiative of major Brazilian publishing houses issuing series of publications that attempted to draw portraits of Brazil as a geographical and collective entity. Octalle Marcondes Ferreira’s Companhia Editoria Nacional began publishing the *Brasiliana* series in 1931; José Olympio began the *Documentos Brasileiros* series in 1936 and José de Barros Martins began publishing the *Biblioteca Histórica Brasileira* in 1940. Given that Brazil’s educational

---

150 In *Imagined Communities*, Anderson explains the importance of print culture by tying its development to the Reformation and the standardization of vernacular tongues for administrative purposes. The publication of Luther’s 95 theses in German and his subsequent publication of a German translation of the bible were important stages in the formation of a national consciousness. Anderson argues “before the age of print, Rome easily won every war against heresy in Western Europe because it always had better internal lines of communication than its challengers.” See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1991). He continues this line of argument by stating that the printing revolution changed this dynamic by deposing Latin as the language of sacred affairs and offering up the vernacular as a suitable alternative. The Reformation challenge to Rome was abetted by the preexistence of administrative vernaculars that had begun to form between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries as the early modern kingdoms of France and England consolidated their power. These languages were at first “used by and for officialdom” but became diffused through the spread of print culture. See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, 42.

infrastructure was still extraordinarily limited in the 1930s, Heloísa Pontes argues that these publishers and collections carried a great deal of weight in terms of providing the resources necessary for intellectuals and literary types to think through the problems of Brazilian history and Brasilidade.152

There were nonetheless important differences between the collections. Pontes’s research shows that Brasiliana, at least initially, published historical accounts that included foreign voyagers accounts. The books in the series took up questions of culture and national identity. The Documentos Brasileiros series had a slightly different inflection with a greater number of memoirs and biographies published over history or sociology. Nonetheless, Sergio Buarque de Holanda’s Raízes do Brasil was the first book published in this series. Martins’ series, Biblioteca Histórica Brasileira, was influenced by his political disposition—he was fervently opposed to Gétulio Vargas—attracting writers who were against the regime. In addition to these general differences, Pontes points out that both the Brasiliana and Biblioteca Histórica Brasileira series were published in São Paulo while José Olympio’s press was based in Rio de Janeiro. Thus, Documentos Brasileiros tended to have carioca and nordestino accents.

Returning to the French University Mission and the engagement of these foreign professors with the intellectual milieu in Brazil, it seems fair to say that Braudel, Tronchon, Lévi-Strauss, Magüe, Bastide, Monbeig et al, arrived at a time of particular intellectual ferment. Fernand Braudel’s and Henri Tronchon’s

---

152 The publishers themselves seemed to fashion this role for themselves. Pontes cites José de Barros Martins in particular as seeing his role as similar to that of the artist or social science in helping the country become aware of itself. Need to provide reference (pontes 38? and cite Martins work).
engagement of notable Brazilian intellectuals and works such as Gilberto Freyre’s *Casa Grande e Senzala*, Afonso Arinos de Mello Franco’s *Conceito da Civilização brasileira*, and Sergio Buarque de Holanda’s *Raízes do Brasil* was made possible by the conjunction of broad political, economic and demographic forces with specific changes in the publishing industry. Again, urbanization and industrialization (particularly in South Central Brazil) fostered a more dynamic society that produced a number of cultural movements in the 1920s. With the political revolution of 1930s, Vargas’s vision of modernizing Brazil included an attempt at cultural unification. This coupled with the promotion of a domestic publishing under an I.S.I. model provided the resources for intellectuals to interpret Brazil in broad strokes. Following Pontes, the *Retratos*, or portraits, of Brazil were a particular feature of this period.\(^{153}\) Prior to the 1930s, with the exception of the intellectuals of the Generation of 1870, less attention was focused on the nation as an historical and cultural entity. By the 1950s, the social sciences had become highly specialized and the kind of general intellectual meditation on Brazil that mixed literature, history and sociology in the manner of Freyre or Buarque de Holanda was replaced by more specialized studies.

\(^{153}\) Of the collection *Brasiliana*, Pontes writes: "O fato, porém, desses estudos só ganharem destaque, na Brasiliana, na década de 50, deve-s fundamentalmente a esta coleção (assim como a *Documentos Brasileiros*, que trataremos depois) expressar e refletir o universo intelectual dos anos 30 e 40, que encontra no ensaio a sua forma privilegiada de expressão. Esta tradição ensaística, rompida em parte na década de 50, dará lugar à emergência de um novo sistema intelectual — constituído no interior da produção científico-universitária — que sinalizará a partir de então o pensamento social brasileiro." Heloísa Pontes, *Retratos do Brasil: Editores, Editoras e "Coleções Brasiliana" nas Décadas de 30, 40, e 50*, 394.
The Development of the Social Sciences in Brazil

Understanding how the social sciences developed in Brazil and, more broadly, the shift from broad impressionistic essays of Brazilian history and culture to more specialized social scientific studies, requires considering some of the major shifts in the intellectual field during the Vargas era. Sergio Miceli’s work, *Intelectuais e Classe Dirigente no Brasil*, charts transformations in the intellectual field during the Vargas era and analyzes these shifts in relation to the economic and political changes that occurred in the transition between the Old Republic and the Estado Novo. In the early years of Vargas’s rule, new fronts of collaboration between intellectuals and the state developed. In this collaborative effort, Miceli indicates that the state assumed the role of tutor to intellectual production and became the principal investor in the cultural field. This is consistent with the more general increase in state intervention during the period with Vargas being responsible for ‘inaugurating the political rule of the bureaucratic elite.’

This meant that social ties were no longer as dominant a factor as they once were in dictating entry into the cultural sphere. Now that the state was in effect, the major patron and new social groups made demands for inclusion within the system of cultural production, a bureaucratic system replaced a system defined by more familiar patron-client ties. As Miceli puts it:

Do momento em que outros grupos sociais começam a fazer valer suas demandas por bens culturais e à medida que a elite burocrática passa a dispor de recursos financeiros e institucionais que lhe permitem subsidiar uma cultura e uma arte oficiais, as possibilidades de acesso ao mercado de trabalho intelectual não se restringem mais às exigências ditadas

---

Here we see that accompanying the diversification of the economy was a diversification of the cultural field. This diversification, as well as the distance that developed between intellectual production and the oligarchical class, was an overall structural change that, combined with changes in the publishing market (discussed below) facilitated the development of more specialized research in the social sciences.

These changes were accomplished by the opening of new state ministries like the Ministry of Education and Public Health (1930), the Ministry of Labor, Industry and Commerce (1930) and the Ministry of Aeronautics (1941). Additionally, Vargas created institutions that were linked to economic functions like the National Department of Coffee and The Institute of Sugar and Coffee. Staffing these ministries and departments required a new social category of professional civil servants. As Miceli relates it, the state issued decree 22,414 in January 1933 as part of an effort regulate the dispensation of civil service posts. Additionally, the Federal Counsel of Public Service and the Administrative Department of Public Service were created. In regulating civil service employment, the state distinguished between positions open through competitive civil service exams and others that were granted on an ad hoc basis by the executive. Certain positions required a secondary education, others a law, medical or engineering degree. In this way, Miceli argues that "O Estado transforma-se por esta via, na instancia suprema de legitimação das competências ligadas ao trabalho cultural, técnico e científico, passando a atuar

---

como agência de recrutamento, seleção, treinamento e promoção, do público portador de diplomas superiores.”

In terms of intellectuals integrating within this structure, the jobs that they filled generally had high entrance requirements. They could fill the highest administrative posts like Francisco Campos and Gustavo Capanema who both served as Minister of Education and Health; or as advisors to Vargas or various ministers, as administrators of cultural institutions such as the Biblioteca Nacional, or in more traditional teaching careers as the infrastructure of higher education developed during this period. Miceli shows that with the exception of those involved in teaching or heading cultural institutions, most of these bureaucratic posts had nothing to do with their intellectual or artistic endeavors. Nonetheless, the state did play a role when it came to determining who would be published and who would gain entry to academic posts. In Miceli’s words, ”o poder público impôs-se não obstante como concessionário mor dos padrões da legitimidade intelectual.”

Stepping back to give a sense of how these structural changes affected intellectual production and the creation of more specialized or segmented intellectual work, Miceli offers a comparison between the relations between the

---


157 As Miceli puts it: ”Ao garantir o acesso dos autores que unia ao plantel das grandes editoras particulares, como por exemplo à José Olympio, e às principais sinécuras do campo intelectual, as autoridades do poder público se converteram na instância suprema de validação e reconhecimento da produção intelectual. Assim, não é por acaso que, do total de 30 acadêmicos eleitos entre 1930 e 1945, 70% se constituía de elementos pertencentes aos altos escalões do estamento burocrático, sendo que muitos deles garantiram sua vitória em função da rede de influências que tiveram a oportunidade de acionar, em detrimento daqueles que concorriam apenas pelo mérito de suas obras.” See Sergio Miceli, *Intelectuais e classe dirigente no Brasil, 1920-1945*, 160.

Generation of 1870 and the generation that came of age during the Vargas years.

Intellectuals, such as Joaquim Nabuco, who formed the Generation of 1870 engaged the problem of slavery in Brazil—which was not abolished until 1888—and helped usher the fall of the Monarchy and the establishment of the Old Republic.159

Intellectual life during the Old Republic was characterized by polymaths. These polymaths were principally interested in literature and journalism. During the Old Republic, the press greatly expanded and intellectuals responded to the demands of this new force as well as to those of regional elites.

In contrast to the intellectuals of 1870, Vargas era intellectuals had to respond to campaigns of nationalist leagues or young academic youth mobilizing.

The defining characteristic of the Vargas era as Miceli relates it is that:

> Mas no que diz respeito às relações entre os intelectuais e o Estado, o regime Vargas se diferencia sobretudo porque define e constitui o domínio da cultura como um "negócio oficial", implicando um orçamento próprio, a criação de uma "intelligentzia" e a intervenção em todos os setores de produção, difusão e conservação do trabalho intelectual e artístico.160

Thus, the number of intellectuals in public employ increased, as did the specificity of their tasks. While the recruitment of intellectuals by the state did rely in some sense, on social connections, what is new is that an autonomous bureaucratic class was formed with intellectuals loyal to the central state as opposed to regional elites. It became a social and political force in its own right.161 While Miceli allows that

---


some intellectuals in the Vargas regime remained polymaths, generally speaking they committed to a particular genre. Prior to the Vargas era, the demands of the press and the regional politicians produced conditions such that they had to be polymaths.

The French Role in the Development of the Social Sciences

The engagement of members of the French Mission with Brazilian publications and the interest they took in the intellectual infrastructure of Brazil—made evident, for example, in Coornaert's survey of the research institutes and archival resources of Brazil—provides evidence that the Brazilian social sciences were burgeoning upon their arrival in 1934. Nonetheless, the participation of these social scientists in the creation of USP and the Universities of Rio de Janeiro and Porto Allegre played a fundamental role in giving shape to the more highly specialized social scientific community that took shape by the 1950s.

---

162 A connection can be made here between the fluorescence of the social sciences in Brazil during the 1930s and the origins of the term during the later stages of the 18th century and the French Revolution in particular. Keith Michael Baker makes the case that the origin of the term 'social science' can be traced to Condorcet. Condorcet worried about the chaos unleashed by the French Revolution, advanced a largely utilitarian conception of social science was advanced. That is, the moral and political arts were to be formulated and advanced with the goal of increasing the happiness of the nation. The groundwork for this concept was put in place in the 18th century when the French state built roughly 26,000 km of roads. This vast expansion of the infrastructure facilitated the growth of commerce between Paris and the provinces. As Daniel Roche points out, these projects were only made possible through the development of a social arithmetic that could regulate and standardize labor. Additionally, the advancement of communication between Paris and the provinces that was achieved through the construction of roads and canals also heightened the awareness of regional differences. In the seventeenth century, the system of intendants developed under absolutism began the process of codifying local mœurs. With the increasing contact between Paris and the provinces in the eighteenth century, social sciences that look like contemporary anthropology and sociology with their emphases on thick description and statistical analysis proliferated. See Keith Michael Baker, "The Early History of the Term 'Social Science,','' Annals of Science, 1964 [1965]: 211-226 and Daniel Roche, France in the Enlightenment, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998).
Essentially, following Heloísa Pontes, foreign social scientists—French as well as German and Americans—had to confront the power of the literature and the tradition of the essayist that ran from Euclides da Cunha through Gilberto Freyre and Sergio Buarque de Holanda. While Braudel and Tronchon engaged the works of these essayists and found them rich in ideas, they also offered sharp criticisms and clarifications. Further, participants of the French Mission such as Lévi-Strauss, Roger Bastide and Pierre Monbeig engaged in specific studies of ethnic groups, race relations and various religious traditions in Brazil. Combined with the more empirical tradition of American sociology that placed its emphasis on community studies, these French social scientists helped, paraphrasing Pontes, 'break up the grand reflections that Brazilians were found of making and provided new more precise objects of study.'

French as well as American (Donald Pierson and Charles Wagley) and German (Emílio Willems and Herbert Baldus) social scientists set a research agenda that opened up new lines of research with more specific themes. The international social scientific community engaged in research about race relations, the historical roots of race relations in Brazil, Afro-Brazilian religious practices, immigration, community studies and ethnology. In terms of the French, Roger


\[164\] Heloísa Pontes, Brazil com Z. A produção estrangeira sobre o país, editada aqui, sob a forma de livro, entre 1930 e 1938, 448.
Bastide’s studies of Afro-Brazilian religious practices and racial relations in Brazil were particular influential. His influence was also particularly strong because he spent seventeen years in the country and spent a significant amount of his time training students at USP.

In terms of foreign influences on the social sciences in Brazil, French and American influences were most pervasive. The French influence was most dominant during the First Vargas Regime (1930-1945) during the establishment of the University of São Paulo and the long residence of Roger Bastide and Pierre Monbieg in Brazil. A good generalization, formulated by Pontes, is that the French tended to research as individuals, had less research support, and tended to be more theoretical in their endeavors. The U.S. model was much more empirical. Fernanda Massi identifies Donald Pierson, a University of Chicago PhD in sociology as a pivotal figure in the development of a highly empirical social scientific model based on community studies in Brazil.165 Pierson came to Brazil for the first time in 1935 to conduct research for his dissertation on racial relations in Brazil entitled *Negroes in Brazil: a study of race contact at Bahia*. Pierson returned to Brazil in 1939 to become a lecturer at the Escola Livre de Sociologia e Política (ELSP). Massi contends that at ELSP, Pierson attempted to replicate a model of sociology developed at the University of Chicago: primacy was granted to graduate study,

---

working groups were formed with each student provided a sub-theme to study, and lectures and seminars were given.\textsuperscript{166}

Outside of the ELSP, ties between U.S. based sociologists and Brazilian institutions began to form in the 1930s with a cooperative effort between Columbia University and the Museu Nacional in Rio de Janeiro. On Brazilian side Heloísa Alberto Torres was responsible for an exchange with Franz Boas and Ruth Benedict. Charles Wagley benefitted from this and came to Brazil in 1939. As his career developed, Wagley became extraordinarily influential in forging ties between Columbia University and Brazil. In the 1940s, with his Brazilian counterpart, Anísio Teixeira, who studied at Columbia who was the Secretary of Education and Health in Bahia, Wagley signed an accord linking Columbia and the Programa de Pesquisas Sociais do Estado da Bahia. Under this agreement, they developed a project to study all the municipalities of Bahia with the aim of eventually feeding into a national project on education, health and public administration. In addition to this, Wagley, who was involved with UNESCO, helped develop the Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Educacionais in Rio de Janeiro in 1955.\textsuperscript{167} As Massi pointed out, the significance of these links is a basic shift that occurred in the 1940s. Before that, there are isolated U.S. researchers, whereas afterwards you have research developing through institutional projects.

\textsuperscript{166} Fernanda Massi, \textit{Franceses e Norte-Americanos nas Ciências Sociais Brasileiras}, 447.
\textsuperscript{167} Ties between U.S. and Brazilian institutions are documented extensively in Fernanda Massi, "Franceses e norte-americanos nas ciências sociais brasileiras 1930-1960." In addition to the ties that were forged between Columbia University and various Brazilian institutions, Massi cites a Harvard-Brasil Central project initiated in the 1960s through an accord between Harvard University and the Museu Nacional. David Maybury-Lewis (although British) was a central figure who gave courses for the training of anthropologists and organized publications—\textit{i.e.}, \textit{Dialectical societies: the Gê and Bororo of Central Brazil}. 
The U.S. influence was most pervasive after the Second World War, but both Heloísa Pontes and Fernanda Massi argue that the French influence continued to be influential despite the fact that the French government devoted had less personnel and resources to devote to the study of Brazil. Massi provides an answer in the form of identifying that "os franceses, que têm a "missão" de trazer os ensinamentos científicos e humanistas cá para os trópicos, e os norte-americanos, para quem o Brasil é o campo de investigação, objeto de doutoramento."\(^{168}\)

**Regional Differences in the Development of the Social Sciences**

While the creation of a Brazilian publishing industry along with national ministries like the Ministry of Education and Health fostered debates about national development and *Brasilidade*, it is easy to overstate the degree of national integration during the Vargas era. While there is widespread agreement in the scholarship that the First Vargas regime modernized Brazil through the various reforms carried out, more recent historical work has tended to highlight the degree to which Vargas’s plan of state-led modernization was more ideal than actual. It also stresses that the process by which the structures of the Old Republic were replaced stretched out until the end of the dictatorship in 1985.\(^{169}\) One of the cardinal reasons scholars have advanced this view is that despite Vargas’s initiatives, throughout the 1930s and 1940s Brazil remained a nation of regions


with pronounced differences and a high degree of political autonomy. These differences marked intellectual life and the development of the social sciences during this period. Thus, any account of the Brazilian social sciences must make allowance for these regional inflections in a way that is perhaps unnecessary for a country like France whose institutions and practices followed a more centralized, or Napoleonic model, with Paris as a dominant center.

Following Sergio Miceli, one of the commonalities all regions of Brazil shared within the development of the social sciences is that the social sciences relied on emerging social groups that had political power. Thus, the institutional bases of social sciences were tied to political and business groups who acted as dealers in cultural production. But the types of interest groups sponsoring the social sciences, the degree of autonomy they enjoyed and the types of institutional bases varied widely and were the key factors influencing regional divergence.

The social sciences developed most extensively and with the greatest degree of autonomy in São Paulo. This is because, as Miceli indicates, São Paulo experienced a greater degree of industrialization and urbanization than the other regions. Combined with this growth was a greater degree of occupational and social differentiation with new careers being created as a result of new technologies, corporate and administrative structures. As part of this general pattern of development, institutions fostering the social sciences were founded such as the Museu Paulista, the Escola Livre de Sociologia e Política, and the Faculty of

---

Philosophy, Sciences and Letters at USP. Also, as part of the development of the publishing industry, journals such as *Sociologia, Revista de Antropologia, Anhembi, and Revista Brasiliense* were founded and supported social science research.

One of the central reasons that the social sciences enjoyed a greater degree of autonomy in São Paulo is that the creation of the University of São Paulo and the Faculty of Philosophy, Science and Letters along European lines helped ensure some distance from the political groups that helped create it. Following Miceli, even if USP was created as a state project, the funding and administrative structure of the state did not impinge on the academic and intellectual autonomy of the institution.\(^{171}\) Thus, although the elite class saw USP and ELSP as ways of retaking political hegemony lost in 1930 with the coup bringing Vargas into power and further defeat in the Civil War of 1932, both of these institutions were devoted to the formation of personnel with high technical qualifications. In this process of professionalization, these institutions distanced themselves from the centers of political decision making in the state. As a result, Miceli argues that the university broke with its intentions: "Em outras palavras, os grupos sociais emergentes privilegiados por essa expansão do ensino superior arrombaram o projeto universitário acalentado pelas elites."\(^{172}\)

In contrast with São Paulo, the social sciences in Rio de Janeiro were not able to gain autonomy from the political establishment during this period. Miceli writes that given Rio was the capital during this era, that the impact of the juridical and

\(^{171}\) See Sergio Miceli, *Condicionantes do Desenvolvimento das Ciências Sociais*, p. 85.

\(^{172}\) Sergio Miceli, *Condicionantes do Desenvolvimento das Ciências Sociais*, 86-7.
military paradigms made social science exclusively concerned with
developmentalist issues as opposed to allowing social sciences autonomy. In Rio,
high political relevance rather than proper social scientific method dictated the form
the social sciences took. In Rio, the foreigners who were helping establish the
Universidade do Distrito Federal ran into problems. The academic hierarchy and
the holders of political power submitted to the pressures of interest groups in an
open fight for the machinery of government. There were contestations between
liberals, leftists, Catholics, and integralists. Eventually, the Catholics and integralists
shut down the Universidade do Distrito Federal in 1939. As a result of this political
turmoil, after the 1930s Catholic Universities thrived at the expense of public ones.
Thus, this was not an atmosphere conducive to the institutionalization of the social
sciences.

Even in the case of the Instituto Superior de Estudos Brasileiros (ISEB), the
most successful social science institution in Rio, there was a greater degree of
contamination between politics and social science than at either USP or ELSP.
Young intellectuals who associated with ISEB had as their primary ambition to go
into politics and saw having a hand in cultural institutions as a boost. Where the
institutions fostering the social sciences in São Paulo were full time engagements for
those involved, with ISEP it was a prestigious part-time engagement. Contributing
to this was the fact that in Rio, social scientists emerged predominantly from the
Faculty of Law with some trained in economics as a social science. The founders of
ISEP (originally IBESP) were Hélio Jaguaribe, Cândido Mendes de Almeida, João
Paulo de Almeida Magalhães e Israel Klabin were all trained in law with some of them taking additional courses in economics and philosophy outside the law faculty.

Also factoring in to the difference between social scientific development in Rio and São Paulo was the social status of the participants varied greatly. In São Paulo, social scientists tended to come from humbler origins and did not have access to the highest circles of economic and political power. Thus, they saw intellectual work as an end in itself and one that would confer a certain amount of privilege. In Rio, by contrast, those engaging in social scientific research tended to have a higher social pedigree and tended to be dilettantes as far as the social sciences were concerned. These differences in social status, intellectual training, and the degree of autonomy between the social sciences and politics are the major factors Miceli points to in explaining the radical difference between Rio's developmentalist social science and São Paulo's sociology based on a functionalist paradigm.¹⁷³

Outside of Rio and São Paulo, centers of intellectual life like Pernambuco, Bahia and Minas Gerais the social sciences developed through Faculties of Law or Brazil's autodidactic tradition. In Minas Gerais, given that the social sciences developed within the Faculty of Law, there was a good deal of proximity between the social sciences and politics, as was the case with Rio. What Minas had in common with Pernambuco was that in both these cases, you had a central

¹⁷³ To quote Miceli: "Tais diferenças estão na raiz de definições bastante contrastantes do que seja a ciência social, prevalecendo no Rio de Janeiro uma concepção "intervencionista", "militante" e "aplicada", cuja expressão intelectualmente acabada são as teorias desenvolvimentistas, enquanto em São Paulo parece se impor uma preocupação marcante com o treinamento metodológico, as leituras dos clássicos, o trabalho de campo individual e/ou em equipe e toda uma socialização acadêmico-disciplinar então sob hegemonia do paradigma sociológico funcionalista." See Sergio Miceli, Condicionantes do Desenvolvimento das Ciências Sociais, 92.
intellectual figure with Gilberto Freyre in Pernambuco and Júlio Barbosa in Minas. In both of these cases, social science took on a conservative tinge given the connections between local elites and social scientists. Miceli suggests that social science in these two cases were maintenance facilities for the status quo.174

**Julio Mesquitá, Brazilian Cultural Politics, and the Creation of the University of São Paulo**

The above section situated the founding of the University of São Paulo within the contours of the intellectual field in Vargas era Brazil. This section moves from the intellectual field to consider how the internal politics of Brazil impacted the founding of the University of São Paulo. Below, I argue that Júlio Mesquita thought of history in idealist terms and looked to create the Faculty of Philosophy, Science, and Literature as the solution to a cultural crisis.

**Júlio Mesquita and the Politics of the Late Republic and Early Vargas Period**

As a thinker, Julio Mesquitá tended towards the idealist pole in thinking about politics and history. In Chapter One, we saw Jean Magüé critique Mesquitá for his idealism when explaining Mesquitá’s reasoning for choosing a faculty from Europe. In Magüé’s view, Mesquitá had confused cause and effect when thinking that it was Europe’s cultural superiority that accounted for its material progress when it was the other way around. While Magüé’s Marxist view of the relation of political economy and history to culture is open to contestation, he was nonetheless

---
spot on in characterizing Mesquita as an unabashed idealist. In addressing the first graduating class from USP, Mesquita clearly attributes São Paulo's defeat in the Constitutionalist Revolt to a crisis of culture and dramatically compares the situation of the State and City of São Paulo to Germany's defeat to Napoleon at Jena and the French defeat in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870. In a particularly dramatic and often quoted passage he writes:

Ao sairmos da revolução de 32 tínhamos a impressão perfeitamente nítida de que o destino acabava de colocar São Paulo em posição idêntica àquela em que se achava, após lena, a Alemão, o Japão no dia seguinte ao do bombardeio dos seus portos pela esquadra norte-americana, e a França depois de Sedan. E se atribuíamos a série infinita de gravíssimos erros praticados dentro das fronteiras do nosso Estado pela ditadura à mentalidade primária dos seus prepostos, não nos parecia menos evidente que só uma reforma radical do aperelhamento escolar do País e a instauração de uma vigorosa política educacional poderiam evitar a catástrofe final que os movimentos de 1922, de 24, de 30 e 32 nada mais faziam do que prenunciar. Para os males que nos acabrunhavam, a história daqueles países nos apontava o remédio. Sabíamos por experiência própria a que terríveis aventuras nos tinham arrastado, de um lado, a ignorância e a incapacidade dos homens que até 30 haviam discricionariamente disposto dos destinos tanto do nosso Estado como da Nação, e de outro, a fatuidade vazia dos escamoteadores da revolução de outubro. Quatro anos de estreito contacto com os meios em que se moviam as figuras proeminentes de ambas as facções em luta levaram-nos à convicção de que o problema brasileiro era, antes de mais nada, um problema de cultura. Dá a fundação da nossa Universidade e consequentemente a criação da Faculdade de Filosofia, Ciências e Letras.  

Mesquitá’s words clearly indicate that he was critical of the Vargas regime and sought to establish the University as a remedy to the political situation. Mesquitá also implies that foreign models were necessary at this point in Brazilian history for the advancement of Brazilian culture. As he saw it, Brazil itself did not yet have the cultural resources to escape from the current predicament. Yet, to truly unpack this quotation, we need to look more closely at Mesquitá’s position within the public

175 Júlio de Mesquita Filho, “"Focos de Renovação do Pensamento Paulista,"” in Politica e Cultura, 155-211 (São Paulo: Livraria Martins Editôra, 1969), 164. This passage is also noted in Simon Schwartzman, A Space for Science: The Development of the Scientific Community in Brazil (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991). Schwartzman uses the quote to characterize the impetus behind the creation of the University of São Paulo.
sphere of 1930's Brazilian and Paulista politics. Additionally, an understanding of the basic political history Mesquitá refers to in citing the events of 1922, 1924, 1930, and 1932 is necessary to comprehend the role he saw the University of São Paulo fulfilling.

Júlio de Mesquita Filho came from one of the most prominent Paulista families.176 His father was Júlio César de Mesquita, owner of São Paulo's most read daily journal, O Estado de São Paulo, who was active in state politics and had served in the São Paulo State Legislature.177 Mesquita Filho was born in 1892 and was sent abroad to Europe at an early age for his studies where he attended school both in Lisbon and Geneva before returning to Brazil to attend the São Paulo Law School. While in law school, he was active in politics and participated in the founding of the Liga Nacionalista, which constituted a reformist branch of the Partido Republicano Paulista (the PRP was the only existing party in São Paulo and remained so until the founding of the Partido Democrático in 1926). After taking his law degree in 1917, Mesquita worked in a law firm while also working in a journalistic and editorial capacity for O Estado de São Paulo. In the early part of his career, he inserted himself as an intermediary between striking workers and industrialists as his liberal constitutionalist principles made him wary of both working class militancy and the

176 This basic biographical sketch is drawn from the entry on Júlio Mesquita in the Dicionário Histórico-Biográfico Brasileiro available online. See O Centro de Pesquisa e Documentação de História Contemporânea do Brasil, Júlio Mesquita, http://www.fgv.br/CPDOC/BUSCA/BuscaConsultar.aspx (accessed 2011 20-July).

conditions that would produce it.

In addition to actively contributing articles to *O Estado de São Paulo*, Mesquita Filho published a number of full-length works during his lifetime. The first was *A Crise Nacional* in 1925. In this book, Mesquita Filho raised themes that would remain constant throughout his life work. In addition to campaigning for São Paulo to drive the rest of Brazil into the modern age, Mesquita advocated for democratic reforms such as the introduction of the secret ballot in Brazil (designed to curtail the machine politics overwhelmingly practiced in the period), parliamentary and educational reform. In 1926, Mesquita Filho took a lead role in helping to form the Partido Democrático, the first opposition party the PRP faced since the formation of the Old Republic. When the succession crisis that opened the door for Vargas’s seizure of power in 1930 occurred, Mesquita and the PD initially lent their support to the Liberal Alliance backing Vargas. By 1932, with the onset of Constitutionalist Revolt (and as the above passage from 1937 makes clear) that support was withdrawn.

Understanding Mesquita’s political activism and ambitions for the University of São Paulo requires a broader discussion of the political scene on both the regional and national levels. Beginning with the regional level, São Paulo at the opening of the twentieth century experienced an expansion of the public sphere. As James Woodard explains in his study on politics in São Paulo during the Old Republic, São Paulo experienced a growing public sphere due to increases in population growth, literacy, and the number of periodicals, publications, and

178 See Júlio de Mesquita Filho, *A crise nacional; reflexões em torno de uma data* (São Paulo: Secção de obras d’ "O Estado de S. Paulo, 1925).
presses.\textsuperscript{179} Even though the Partido Republicano Paulista enjoyed an exclusive stranglehold on power from the end of monarchical rule in 1889 through 1926 when the Partido Democrático formed as an opposition party, there were significant divisions and debates within the party that grew as the public sphere expanded. James Woodard argues that "conflict within this one-party system was every bit as heated as it had been under the previous regime, in contests between and among in- and out-of-power factions ranging territorially from the Paulista littoral to the furthest reaches of frontier settlement."\textsuperscript{180} Mesquita's father exemplifies the enhanced public sphere, not only through his publishing activities (in addition to \textit{OESP, he founded the Revista do Brasil} in 1915 to argue the need for Brazil to enter WWI on the side of the liberal powers) but also because he was the "leader of a statewide schism" within the PRP at the turn of the century and claimed his faction of the part to be the true heir of the Republican tradition in São Paulo.\textsuperscript{181}

Nonetheless, despite challenges from within the party, the PRP enjoyed, as Joesph Love puts it, "a monopoly of power [that] was never seriously challenged until the last four years of the Old Republic, when the Partido Democrático was

---

\textsuperscript{179} See James Woodward, \textit{A Place in Politics: São Paulo, Brazil from Signeurial Republicanism to Regionalist Revolt} (Durham: Duke University Press, 2009).

\textsuperscript{180} James Woodward, \textit{A Place in Politics: São Paulo, Brazil from Signeurial Republicanism to Regionalist Revolt}, 8. Woodard's book complements and challenges Joseph Love's earlier work on the PRP. Where Love focuses on the PRP executive committee and argues that the general stability of the committee in terms of persons and politics kept a damper on factions within the party, Woodard looks at the lower rank and file members operating outside the executive committee to emphasize the diversity of the party, its constituents, their social bases and views.

\textsuperscript{181} James Woodward, \textit{A Place in Politics: São Paulo, Brazil from Signeurial Republicanism to Regionalist Revolt}, 56.
formed." The reasons for the PRP’s success can be classified as historical, economic, and social. Historically speaking, the PRP became the dominant party once a Brazilian Republic was established with the Constitution of 1891 (the Republic was declared in 1889). According to Joseph Love, the end of slavery (1888) and the success of immigration in São Paulo state led to a successful amalgamation of the then extent Liberal and Conservative parties by the Republican Party. The Liberal Party fractured due to a debate over abolition and was without a political program in 1889. It thus adopted a federalist program that was being advocated by the Republicans. In doing so, the Liberal Party leaders sought to collaborate with the Republicans. On the other side of the political divide, the Conservative Party had abandoned the monarchy and the idea of highly centralized national government. The party chief of the Conservative Party, Antônio Prado had cast his lot for provincial autonomy. Further, the PRP had the distinction of playing a significant role in toppling the Emperor Dom Pedro II—the leaders of the PRP were the only key players outside of the capital of Rio de Janeiro to be involved in the coup that brought Dom Pedro II down. While Love acknowledges some distinctions remained in play between Liberals, Conservatives and Republicans in the early years of the Republic, these distinctions faded away rather quickly.183

In addition to an ideological malleability that permitted it to absorb both Liberals and Conservatives (Love describes the PRP as essentially opportunistic and

---


183 For a fuller discussion of this process of political melding, see Chapter Four, "State Politics: Men, Events and Structures," in Joseph Love’s *São Paulo in the Brazilian Federation*. Love’s political analysis serves as the basis for this summary of the why the PRP enjoyed a political monopoly until the later years of the Old Republic.
pragmatic), the PRP's success can be attributed to the regionalist platform that it advanced. Joseph Love argues that the most important development pushing Brazilian Republicanism was the 1870 publication of Aureliano Tavares Bastos's *A Província*, which advocated for "administrative decentralization, provincial autonomy in politics and administration, provincial control of banking and immigration policies, and the decentralization of revenues."\(^{184}\) Even though Tavares Bastos was not necessarily arguing for an end to monarchical rule, Brazil under Dom Pedro II had a centralized administrative structure that ran counter to the interests of Paulista coffee planters and thus his argument for a far-reaching federalist structure advocated a radical shift in the relationship between the Brazilian states and the central government. As Love notes, once this idea was embraced, the notion of replacing the monarchy with a republic was not so radical. Paulistas were interested above all that "the new regime would serve São Paulo."\(^{185}\) The political class in São Paulo was so interested in a decentralized structure because it would allow the province to take control of its revenues to reinvest in developing its infrastructure, public health and education. Under the Empire, São Paulo contributed more than eight times what it received back from the Imperial Treasury and never received any direct financial aid from the Empire.\(^{186}\) Further, in terms of population and economic importance, São Paulo was less than adequately

\(^{184}\) See Joseph Love, *São Paulo in the Brazilian Federation*, 103. Joseph Love notes that Tavares Bastos was a widely respected essayist who had been a member of Congress and argues that his publication was more influential in forming the PRP than both the declaration of the Third Republic in France in the same year and the publication of the Republican Manifesto.

\(^{185}\) Love, *São Paulo in the Brazilian Federation*, 103.

\(^{186}\) For a more detailed explanation, see Joseph Love, *São Paulo in the Brazilian Federation*, 103.
represented in the Imperial Legislature in the final years of the Empire. Thus, a more decentralized, or federal structure, would permit Paulistas to distribute revenues to "allow the province to meet the requirements of the expanding export economy, and for political autonomy to maximize São Paulo's economic potential."\textsuperscript{187}

A final reason for the PRP's continued success from the last decade of the nineteenth century into the twentieth has to do with the structure of social relations in São Paulo during the period. As noted above, Joseph Love attributed the stability of PRP to the continuity within the executive committee and upper reaches of the party. Besides this stability within the upper reaches of the political apparatus, the elite class remained remarkably unchanged during the period. Love writes that:

\begin{quote}
Despite the massive changes in São Paulo's economy and population mix in the first half-century of the Republic, its political elite remained strikingly homogenous. Its leaders, like those of Minas Gerais and Pernambuco, tended to come from a small circle of families, closely linked by blood and marriage; went to the same schools or the same sorts of schools; and were wont to adopt European cultural values. Shared values and experiences, similar career patterns, and common recruitment pools for the Brazilian elite at large were legacies of the Empire. In all three states, the traditional agrarian upper class during the Republic became more urban and market-oriented without losing its rural foundations, and the same was true of the smaller political elite. I define this group as Wirth and Levine define theirs in the companion studies, namely, the holders of important positions in the government and in the leading political parties at both the state and national level from 1889 through 1937; the São Paulo elite consisted of 263 persons.\textsuperscript{188}
\end{quote}

Here we see that despite the massive immigration that the state of São Paulo experienced between 1889 and 1937 (Love puts the figure at roughly 3.5 million immigrants to São Paulo in these years), control of the political system remained in the hands of a well-established elite class. Coupled with the consistency of this


\textsuperscript{188} Joseph Love, \textit{São Paulo in the Brazilian Federation}, 152.
regional elite was the persistence of a hierarchical system of patron-client relations that linked the hoi polloi to their political patrons vertically. This system of relations can be traced back to the Imperial Period. However, a basic shift occurred between the Empire and the Old Republic. As James Woodard points out, under the Empire there was a center to the web of relations (in the figure of the Dom Pedro II) whereas during the Old Republic there were a number of patron-client networks that could overlap at times but were essentially separate. In terms of São Paulo, this system of patron-client relations governed both the PRP and the state government so that the two became one in practice.\footnote{Following James Woodard’s analysis, See James Woodard, \textit{A Place in Politics}, 4.} Essentially, as Woodard puts it, the President of the State of São Paulo was the ‘\textit{supreme chefe político}’ while at the level of the various counties that constituted the state you had local \textit{perrepista} bosses serving as the local ‘\textit{prefeito}.’ In terms of the practice of politics, this hierarchical system of patron-client relations was directed by \textit{coronéis}, or bosses, where local bosses reported to the regional bosses who in turn reported to the PRP executive committee. Following James Woodard, under this system of \textit{coronelismo}, elections were seldom in doubt with local bosses able to control election through controlling voter registration and delivering their clients votes.\footnote{For a more detailed account of the practice of politics on the local and state level, see James Woodard, \textit{A Place in Politics}, Chapter Two, “A Republic of Layers.” The beginning of the chapter details how \textit{coronelismo} functioned in practice.}

Yet, despite the success that the PRP enjoyed during the Old Republic, fissures began to appear within the PRP beginning with World War One. These fissures were due to a fundamental ideological conflict between Brazilian elites who
identified with the liberal values of Entente and those who identified with a more militaristic and hierarchical conception of society. Ultimately, these fissures would signal the end of the party and the beginning of the Vargas era. They also help explain the politics behind the creation of the University of São Paulo because Júlio Mesquita strongly identified with the liberal values of the Entente and wanted Brazil to intervene to support France and Britain. He equated modernity with liberal democratic values. This explains why Júlio Mesquita Filho was convinced that a University modeled on European was the key to Brazil's attainment of modernity.

In the years predating the First World War, critics of the PRP proliferated with military types, students, workers, and planters launching barbs at the status quo from competing directions. The basic conflict, as identified by James Woodard, was one of disunion between the concepts of order and progress that were paired together on the Brazilian flag. During the Republic, Woodard writes, "Brazilians faced a fundamental conflict between patrimonial values and constitutional precepts, local privileges and cosmopolitan aspirations, personal fealty and individual independence—in short, some might argue—between order and progress."\textsuperscript{191} One of the earliest instances of this conflict within high politics was the 1910 election between Marshal Hermes da Fonseca (representing the military and the forces of order) and Ruy Barbosa (representing liberal progressive values) that Fonseca won although Barbosa took the majority of votes in São Paulo State.\textsuperscript{192} In

\textsuperscript{191}Woodard, A Place in Politics, 47.

\textsuperscript{192}For more on this election, see Woodard's section "A Campaign to Remember," 63-70 in Chapter Two of James Woodard, A Place in Politics.
this conflict between fundamental values, Júlio Mesquita Filho aligned himself with progress based on the adaption of liberal European values. His father's example strongly influenced him. During World War One, the elder Júlio Mesquita strongly identified with the Entente and aligned himself with the leading statesmen of Paulista liberalism—Ruy Barbosa. As Woodard indicates, "the First World War, far from being a sidelight in Brazilian intellectual life, was seen as nothing short of central, absorbing the attention of Ruy and his counterparts in the paulista intelligentsia, who identified with the Entente and the civilization they believed it represented."\textsuperscript{193} In part, Júlio César de Mesquita's decision to found the Revista do Brasil was predicated on Mesquita's determination that Brazil should declare war on Germany.\textsuperscript{194}

More directly concerning the son, Júlio Mesquita Filho, was the founding of the Liga Nacionalista. The Liga Nacionalista was founded in December of 1916 when the poet Olavo Bilac spoke at the São Paulo law school condemning Brazil's lack of participation of the war and describing it as a moral failure.\textsuperscript{195} At that time, Mesquita Filho was a student at the São Paulo law school (the Faculdade de Direito do Largo de São Francisco) and was inspired by Bilac's speech to help found the Liga Nacionalista. The Liga attempted to mobilize Brazilian patriotism by calling for obligatory military service that would lead to a rapprochement between civil society

\textsuperscript{193} James Woodard, A Place in Politics, 71.

\textsuperscript{194} Following James Woodard, A Place in Politics, Chapter 3, "War and the Health of the State."

\textsuperscript{195} Following James Woodard, A Place in Politics (need page just before Patriotism, Pickets and Pestilence section of Chapter 3). Unlike the later Partido Democrático, the Liga was not a competing party to the PRP but was more like a reform movement within the PRP.
and the military, and also sought political reforms that would make it easier for males to register to vote and an end to the machine-like politics through the adoption of the secret ballot. Mesquita Filho continued to support the notion of reforming the political system through the use of the secret ballot throughout the Republican era. This was a key component in the platform he supported later when he was involved in the founding of the Partido Democrático. The idea was that the secret ballot would keep the masses rounded up by the political bosses from voting and would attract the elite to the polls which would then allow informed public opinion to drive the Brazilian political system forward into modernity.196

While the First World War exposed the fault lines within Paulista politics between those identifying with the liberal values of the Entente and those identifying with the more militaristic German model, the first major breach of the Republican order occurred in 1922 with the election of Arthur Bernardes as President of the Brazilian Republic. On July 5, 1922, young military officers and a host of supporters of the defeated candidate, Nilo Peçanha, staged an uprising in the city of São Paulo.197 Although this uprising was put down without much disruption, it foreshadowed events of the much larger 1924 Tenente Revolts.

In 1924, young military officers staged a revolt on July 5 to commemorate the earlier rebellion. Unlike the earlier event, in the 1924 Revolt the young military officers took control of the city of São Paulo with members of the political and

---

196 For more on this, see Woodard’s explanation of the logic behind the secret ballot in his discussion of Monteiro Lobato’s politics. See James Woodard, A Place in Politics, 126-7.

197 This account of the Tenente revolts of 1922 and 1924 is adapted from James Woodard, A Place in Politics, Chapter Four "Knaves, Pedants, and Rebels."
cultural establishment—the governor of the state of São Paulo, Carlos Campos, and Júlio Mesquita Filho among them—fleeing the city. The legalists, as members of the establishment were called, left the city on July 9, 1924 and soon after members of the military who supported them began shelling the city. With the shelling of the city by legalist forces, public opinion began to shift against the legalists with the *Liga Nacional* moving from condemning the rebel soldiers to protesting the legalist bombing of the city. Eventually, the rebels withdrew from São Paulo city by the end of July and evaded capture by retreating into the Brazilian interior.\(^198\)

The violence of the 1924 *Tenente* Revolt had a profound effect upon Júlio Mesquita and the Paulista intelligentsia prompting him to write *A crise nacional*. In this book, Mesquita decried the violence and chaos of the 1924 revolt and attributed the backwards state of affairs in Brazil to the abandonment of the country by the intellectual elite and a civic pride. Along the way, he exhibits his racism, xenophobia, and not a touch of snobbery while casting aspersions on emancipated slaves, immigrants, and workers and suggesting that the solution to Brazil’s problem was a reconstituted elite class that was committed to political rule. For Mesquita, the secret ballot and reform of the educational system, particularly at the university level were the keys to reinvigorating Brazil.\(^{199}\)

After the dust settled on the *Tenente* Revolt, Mesquita became involved in the

---

\(^{198}\) In their retreat into the interior, the Paulista rebels were joined by Luiz Carlos Prestes rebels from the far south. After retreating through the Brazilian interior they reached Bolivia and remained in exile until Washington Luís became president following Arthur Bernardes. James Woodard points out that the rebels became popular heroes in São Paulo because they had challenged the established political oligarchy that was becoming increasingly disliked. For more on the Prestes Column and the place of the Tenente Revolt in the popular imagination, see James Woodard, 136-142.

\(^{199}\) Based on Woodard’s reading of Mesquita. See James Woodard, *A Place in Politics*, 132-6.
formation of the *Partido Democrático* in 1926. This was a result of Mesquita’s increasing frustration with the dysfunction of the existing political regime controlled by the PRP. Following the 1924 revolt, the PRP attempted to repress all opposition that led to both the form of underground movements and increasing disenchantment with the party. As James Woodard points out, in the municipal elections following the revolt, the PRP had increasing difficult manipulating the vote as voters selected some of the more famous rebels of 1924 as write-in candidates. The PRP also started to experience some key defections like José Adriano Marrey Júnior, a state senator, and Reynaldo Porchat, a professor at the São Paulo law school. While these figures appealed to different constituencies (Marrey appealed more to middle and popular classes while Porchat was a high brow), they both resigned from the party because they felt it no longer represented public opinion and that the political class had isolated itself. This in turn led to their joining forces, together with Antônio Prado, an elder statesman and former counselor to Dom Pedro II, to form the Partido Democrático. Júlio Mesquita Filho aided in this effort as a program was drawn up by Luiz Augusto de Queiroz Aranha, Francisco Morato, and Gama Cerquiera.\(^{200}\) This program was released to the public as the 'Manifesto to the Nation' in March of 1926 and called for a number of liberal democratic reforms—

\(^{200}\) Luiz Queiroz was responsible for reorganizing the local agricultural school in Piracicaba and establishing an agricultural college there in 1901. This was later named the Luís de Queiroz Institute which became one of the established professional schools (together with Law, Medical and Engineering) that became incorporated into USP when it was founded in 1934. For more on Queiroz and the establishment of the agricultural school, see Joseph Love, *São Paulo in the Brazilian Federation*, Chapter Three, "Society and Culture," 80.
multiple parties, more open and transparent elections, freedom of the press, etc...\textsuperscript{201}

Generally speaking, the leadership of the PD consisted of intellectuals like Mesquita. Some were exceptionally distinguished, like Reynaldo Porchat, but many simply held professional degrees. In terms of the rank and file, Woodard has identified the party as including many in the professional class like lawyers, physicians and engineers as well as more middling types such as tailors, cobblers, pharmacists and small business. Additionally, he identifies railway and industrial workers as belonging to the party. This wide coalition accounted for the initial success of the party, even if, as Woodard writes, "it guaranteed that the PD would be a fractious host."\textsuperscript{202} Another reason for the early success of the PD was the fact that the PRP had sanctioned "the federal government’s abandonment of valorization in 1924, and the PRP’s failure to incorporate a younger generation into its upper echelons."\textsuperscript{203}

Despite earlier success, the PD seemed to be fading in 1929. Then Brazilian

\textsuperscript{201} This snapshot of the PD is based on Woodard’s telling, for more specifics see James Woodard, \textit{A Place in Politics}, 150-187.

\textsuperscript{202} James Woodard, \textit{A Place in Politics}, 184.

\textsuperscript{203} Joseph Love, \textit{São Paulo in the Brazilian Federation}, 118. Valorization was a program whereby the government would take out a foreign loan to purchase coffee from planters to keep prices inflated—and thus was integral to the Paulista coffee complex. Love writes that "Valorization was essentially simple: a foreign loan would be obtained to purchase coffee from planters and stockpile it; in years of bad harvests this supply would be released on the international market; and meanwhile all exported coffee would be taxed at a high enough rate to repay the foreign loan" p. 45. The problem with valorization is that it was not always in the interest of the federal government to subsidize the coffee industry in this way. As Love puts it, "One of the vital elements in the coffee trade, and perhaps the most complex, was the foreign-exchange system. Coffee producers calculated costs in Brazilian milréis but received "hard" dollars, marks, francs, and pounds for their goods. They consequently favored an ever-depreciating milréis. Although there were other interests who wanted an appreciating rate—including consumers and importers in São Paulo—the core of the opposition to rapid depreciation came from the federal treasury itself, which had to repay its extensive loan obligations in ever-more-expensive currencies." See Joseph Love, \textit{São Paulo in the Brazilian Federation}, 43.
politics erupted in what has become known as the Revolution of 1930 and the PD experienced a revival through its support of Getúlio Vargas. In 1930, Brazil’s *política dos governadores* broke down. The *política dos governadores* refers to the decentralized political system where by the President of the Brazilian Republic and the Governors of São Paulo and Minas Gerais controlled the upper echelon of political appointments and negotiated succession of the presidency. In 1929, the status quo faltered when Washington Luiz, President of the Brazilian Republic and a former Governor of São Paulo, selected as his successor another Paulista, Júlio Prestes. The Republican political machines of Minas Gerais and Rio Grande do Sul were opposed to Prestes’s candidacy and supported Gétulio Vargas as an opposition candidate. According to the election returns, Prestes was the winner of the contest, but the Aliança Liberal, or Liberal Alliance which consisted of the political leaders of Minas Gerais, Rio Grande do Sul and the majority of the Partido Democrático in São Paulo contested the results. Adding fuel to the fire was the assassination of Liberal Alliance’s vice-presidential candidate, João Pessoa, by a group that had ties to Washington Luiz (although he had not supported or aided the killing). With the military abandoning support of Washington Luiz and his candidate, a coup led by generals Tasso Fragoso and Mena Berreto seized power from the Washington Luiz on October 24 and installed Vargas as President on November 4, 1930.

---

204 This is Joseph Love’s formulation. See Joseph Love, São Paulo in the Brazilian Federation, xv.

205 For a more complete account of the political events leading up to the coup establishing Gétulio Vargas as President, see Thomas Skidmore, *Politics in Brazil: An Experiment in Democracy 1930-1964* (London: Oxford University Press, 1969). This account follows Skidmore’s rendition of events unless otherwise noted.
Initially, the PD supported Vargas because they were interested in breaking the power of the PRP and the state-run political machines. Further, Vargas had campaigned in the state of São Paulo in 1929 and had cultivated the reform vote. Yet, at the same time that Vargas had support from the liberal constitutionalist comprising the PD, another significant segment of his support came from the tenentes who wanted the state to modernize without the inconvenience of democratic politics. Thomas Skidmore characterizes their technocratic vision as elitist and anti-political. After Vargas assumed power, these two bases of his political support remained in tension so that the opposition between order and progress that fueled politics during the Old Republic remained very much at play in the new order. In the opening years of his rule, Vargas attempted to balance these political forces against one another. On the one hand, he shut down state and national congresses and consolidated extraordinary power in the opening days of his rule which he was to retain until a constitutional assembly was elected. Breaking the power of the old state-run political machines appealed to both the militaristic and liberal constitutionalist supporters of his regime, as did his efforts to purge the government of corruption. However, supporters like Mesquita in the PD wanted to see immediate elections so that a new constitution could be put into place while the tenentes supported Vargas retaining his newly consolidated power for the foreseeable future.

This tension would ultimately explode into the 1932 Constitutionalist Revolt that pitted São Paulo State against the Vargas government. As Skidmore tells it, the Partido Democrático broke with Vargas government of January 13, 1932 and
organized a Frente Única Paulista. The PD was unhappy with the pace and scale of Vargas's plans for electoral reform. The Frente Única Paulista consisted of the PD together with the disaffected PRP. On July 9, 1932, a violent revolt began in São Paulo. Joseph Love provides some explanation for the miscalculation of the Paulistas that led to the defeat Mesquita poignantly refers to in the opening of this section. He notes that Paulistas thought they would have the military support of the São Paulo state military force, the Força Publica, as well as the support of allies in Minas Gerais and Rio Grande do Sul. Paulistas organizaing the uprising also believed that they would have the military support of General Bertoldo Klinger who was leading federal troops in the interior. Vargas, however, frustrated the Paulista effort by replacing his pro-Constitutionalist minister of war and dismissed Klinger from command. Additionally, Minas Gerais and Rio Grande do Sul ended up backing Vargas and although Klinger came to São Paulo in support of the Constitutionalist cause, he came without his troops. The lack of concrete military support for the Paulistas ultimately doomed the revolt and thus in September of 1932, it ended in the defeat that Mesquita likened to Jena and Sedan.206

Conclusion

The features of intellectual production in Vargas era Brazil together with the political tensions that motivated Júlio Mesquita to found the University of São Paulo demonstrate a profound tension between the burgeoning sense of Brasilidade and an entrenched regionalism in Brazil. The French University Mission to Brazil and

---

206 For greater detail, see Joseph Love's section "Mainstream Politics," in São Paulo in the Brazilian Federation, Chapter Four, 110-125.
the founding of the University of São Paulo occurred within the context of these contradictory impulses. To understand the intellectual exchange between French and Brazilian thinkers that resulted from the University Mission, it is essential to take into account Vargas's attempt to nationalize Brazilian culture as well as regional resistance to Vargas's program in São Paulo.
CHAPTER 3
WRITING BRAZIL IN FRANCE: FRANCO-BRAZILIAN INTELLECTUAL EXCHANGE IN THE ANNALES: 1945-1964

Introduction

The first two chapters focused on the French University Mission to Brazil in the 1930s. Chapter 1 focused on French political objectives in Brazil as well as the diplomatic institutions that made achieving these objectives possible. It also focused on the writings the French faculty produced in the 1930s up through World War II in order to demonstrate what the University Mission meant from a French point of view. Chapter 2 shifted perspective to look at Brazil's intellectual and political culture in the 1930s. By surveying the University Mission from both the French and Brazilian standpoint, the first two chapters provided a transnational perspective on the exchange of ideas between French and Brazilian social scientists.

This chapter switches the focus from prewar France and Vargas-era Brazil (1930-1945) to look at the impact of the French University Mission on the development of the social sciences in France in the postwar period (1945-1964). It does this by focusing on the distinguished social science journal, the Annales. Members of the University Mission such as Fernand Braudel, Roger Bastide, and Pierre Monbeig were frequent contributors to the Annales. Lucien Febvre, co-founder and editor of the Annales, also had a keen interest in Latin America and Brazil. In fact, Febvre was so enthusiastic about Brazilian and Latin American
studies that he articulated a research program for the journal. As a result, articles and reviews focused on Brazil were published frequently in this period.

This chapter will begin by analyzing the comprehensive vision for Latin American studies that Lucien Febvre articulated as editor of the *Annales*. It will also demonstrate the prominent role played in fulfilling that mission by members of the French University Mission through focusing on the articles and reviews they contributed to the *Annales* between 1945 and 1964. Contributions to the *Annales* by Roger Bastide, Fernand Braudel, and Pierre Monbeig clearly demonstrate the influence of Brazilian thinkers on the ideas they began to form about race, modernization, the legacy of colonialism, and the possibility of a postcolonial vision. Further, it demonstrates that they tended to look at Brazil and Latin America as a way to understand the limits of European thought and material culture. Finally, it argues that Brazilian intellectuals stimulated thinkers like Bastide, Braudel, and Monbeig to abandon romanticized conceptions of Brazil and think substantively about race as a category of social and historical analysis.

**Lucien Febvre and the *Annales* Program for Latin American Studies**

To understand Lucien Febvre's affinity for Brazil, one has to first understand Febvre's historical interest in Latin America. He visited Latin America in 1937 as part of the *Groupement des Universites et Grandes Ecoles de France pour les relations avec l'amerique Latine* and stopped in Brazil on his way back to France. On the voyage back, he cemented his relationship with Braudel. He also spent substantial

---

time in Brazil on a 1949 visit where he spent three months visiting universities in Rio, São Paulo, Belo Horizonte, Bahia, Recife, and Fortaleza.208

In 1948, Febvre devoted the fourth installment of the *Annales* to the study of Latin America. In introducing it, Lucien Febvre communicated the anticipation felt by the social scientific community over the publication of this volume. This was a publication that he himself had "dreamed about and contemplated for so long." Why did Latin America hold so much weight for Febvre? What was at stake in the study of Latin American for French social scientists in the aftermath of the Second World War? And why had some of France’s leading social scientists put so much care and thought into creating this volume?

Febvre himself answered these questions in two ways. One was to point out the methodological challenges the study of Latin America posed to the social sciences. The enormity of the problems posed by Latin America’s demography, geography, and history would challenge historians to rethink and renew their disciplines. The second major reason he would give for promoting the study of Latin America was that it would lead to an understanding of the limits of Western culture and society. This was because of the links between Latin America and Europe both past and present. He thought of Latin America as a space at the limits Western material culture as well as the furthest boundary where Western ideas, beliefs, and feelings were still recognizable. The logic behind these two reasons will be examined in the next two sections.

Latin America and the Rejuvenation of the Social Sciences

Lucien Febvre viewed Latin America as a source of extraordinary methodological problems because of its geographic diversity and the speed of demographic, economic, environmental and cultural transformation in the region. For Febvre, the pace and scale of change in the region made for a series of brutal contrasts. He articulated the challenges posed by Latin America as a field of study as early as 1929 when he published an article in the Annales, "Un champ privilégié d'études; L'Amérique du Sud." He made explicit and striking the degree of transformation Latin America experienced in a mere four centuries. It went from a continent that had never seen cows, sheep, wheat or coffee to one whose economy was based on these animals and commodities. Within a few centuries an entire landscape and economy was transformed.

Roughly twenty years later, Febvre referenced his 1929 article in order to acknowledge that the fundamental challenge posed by Latin America had not changed. In his introduction to the special 1948 Annales issue on Latin America, "l'Amérique du Sud devant l'Histoire," Febvre describes the excitement this

---

region—"toujours de foisonnant, de multiple, de contradictoire"—holds for a
historian by asking the rhetorical question:

Comment, si l’on est historien vraiment et profondément—comment, si l’on a l’Histoire
dans le sang et dans le peau, comment ne pas frémir d’appétit et d’envie devant cette
Amérique si variée, si offerte en apparence, si repliée en réalité: au total si irritante pour le
spectateur intelligent? Ces pays qui se cherchent toujours. Qui n’ont pas fini, depuis quatre
siècles et demi, de se faire un lit vraiment à leur taille dans l’immensité d’un domaine
terrestre qu’ils ne parviennent toujours pas à remplir.210

This selection shows Febvre was fascinated with Latin America’s youth and future
potential as well as the fact that it was a region still in search of its identity.

Febvre thought of Brazil in similar terms. Brazil was fascinating because of
its economic, geographic, and demographic diversity. Studying Brazil promised to
wake European historians from their dogmatic slumbers and get their blood flowing
freely once again. In reviewing Gilberto Freyre’s Maîtres et esclaves in the Annales,
Febvre confesses a jealousy for Brazilian social scientists when he pronounces on
the good fortune they enjoy:

Ah, puissent-ils les Brésiliens, comprendre leur bonheur! Puissent-ils ne pas troquer cette
liberté d’allures, cet accord, cette intimité simplement renouée avec leurs pères, leurs
auteurs, ceux qui les ont engendrés, ceux qui ont déposé en eux tant de sentiments instinctifs
et profonds, tant de façons d’être et d’agir toujours vivantes—puissent-ils ne pas troquer
ces bienfaits contre les pédantes règles d’une histoire de vieux fiers paradoxalement de leurs
artères cassants et de leur sclérose. Puissent-ils repousser l’invasion dans leur continent de
cette histoire, vide et morte, contre laquelle nous sommes obligés, ici, de lutter péniblement
et dont ils croient bien faire parfois, peut-être, en demandant le secret ingrat et inutile à des
<<événementalistes>> pédants de notre monde occidental.211

Febvre’s envy of the Brazilians corresponds in part to the strictures that he felt
weighing upon him as he and his journal fought against entrenched institutions and
traditions. As François Furet observes in his essay, “Beyond the Annales,” Febvre’s

210 Lucien Febvre, "L’amérique du sud devant l’histoire," 388.

211 Lucien Febvre, “Gilberto Freyre, maîtres et esclaves,” Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations 8,
no. 3 (1953), 410.
journal and the Sixth Section of the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes (which he founded in 1948) was engaged in an institutional rivalry with the Sorbonne. Febvre was at pains to advance a new conception of history in the face of resistance from the more traditional historians of the Sorbonne who emphasized political and narrative history.²¹² Brazilians, on the other hand, were free to reject this dead form.

Febvre felt the study of Brazil was an opportunity and could invigorate French social science. In his review of Freyre’s book, he argues that failure to regard Freyre’s work and Brazil with passionate curiosity amounts to blindness:

C’est une sottise d’Occidentaux se figurant toujours, dans leur fatuité, dans leur mépris foncier de cette <<Science de l’homme>> que leurs savants créent cependant au jour le jour — mais qu’ils ignorent — que les veilles postions sont éternelles, que les rapports des peuples et des continents demeurent inchangés, que l’Europe peut se désintéresser de leçons aussi saisissantes que les leçons brésiliennes.²¹³

Just as with Latin America, Febvre here advances the position that Brazil provides European scholars with the opportunity to develop new methods and gain new insight into historical and contemporary problems. More specifically, we see Febvre defend the concept of a ‘Science of Man’ that would contrast with a more narrative and politically based conception of history. Febvre applauds the fact that Freyre’s work bridges sociology and history. To move the practice of history away from the a


narrative history emphasizing political events, Febvre advocated history borrowing from geography, sociology, ethnography and other related disciplines.\textsuperscript{214}

\textbf{Brazil, Latin America, and the Limits of Europe}

Febvre’s comments on Freyre also suggest another trope with regard to Brazil. When he rebuts the notion that "l’Europe peut se désintéresser de leçons aussi saisissantes que les leçons brésilienne," Febvre suggests both a deeper historical and contemporary connection between Brazil and France. In terms of the historical connection, Febvre clearly sees not just Brazil, but all of Latin America as deeply intertwined with the European past.\textsuperscript{215} He makes explicit in his introduction to the 1948 special issue on Latin America. In this issue, he argues that Latin American history can not simply be left to Latin Americans because the very fact that many of the colonial archives for this region are located in Spain, Portugal and France suggest they are also very much a part of the European past. He expresses this connection forcefully as he writes:

\begin{quote}
Mais, bien européene, aussi largement européene que puissamment Sud-Américaine. Une histoire qui fait partie intégrante de nos histoires nationales, mais plus encore de notre histoire culturelle. Une histoire de va-et-vient, de prêtre et de rendus, d’emprunts et de refus d’emprunts, d’allers aventureux et de retours avec intérêts composés. Un des premiers, un des plus important chapitres de nous commence, dans ses rêves, à élaborer pour le proche avenir.\textsuperscript{216}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{214} Succinctly described by Furet, this broadened idea was “that history should add to its subjects and methods by borrowing from neighboring disciplines and even by the temporary abolition of divisions between disciplines; and second, that it should nevertheless remain an all-embracing and ecumenical discipline, meeting the conditions required for the fullest understanding of social phenomena.” See François Furet, “Beyond the Annales,” 392.

\textsuperscript{215} Guy Martinière notes that this connection between Europe and Latin America was one of the stresses of \textit{Annales} writing during its early period, 1929-1949. See Guy Martinière, "L’École des Annales et les Amériques Latines (1929-1949)."

\textsuperscript{216} Lucien Febvre, "L’amérique du sud devant l’histoire," 390.
What we see here is Febvre challenging a nationalist conception of history in favor of one that acknowledges world historical exchange.

One specific example of this type of world historical exchange occurs in a brief note Febvre wrote on Robert Ricard’s *Brefs conseils pratiques pour la transcription et l'impression des mots espagnols et portugais*. Febvre calls attention to Ricard’s point that a contemporary practice in Portugal and Brazil of classifying people by their first names was in fact a European custom in the 15th and 16th centuries. Febvre goes on to give the examples of 'Gilbert Cousin' begin indexed under 'Gilbertus' and not 'Cognatus.' Likewise Phillip Mélanchthon appears under Philippus. This notion of a contemporary Brazilian practice echoing the European past appears frequently in Febvre’s reflections on Brazil and on a more general level, South America. In his introduction to the 1948 special edition on Latin America, Febvre questions what South America reminds him of and offers the response:

Rien qu'un autre petit fait: ne sont-ils pas, ces pays, la France du XIIe siècle, partant avec confiance pour éprouver sa force dans de belles aventures, et reflétant ses jeunes certitudes dans un art monumental à sa mesure: mais, à quatre ou cinq siècles de distance, en remontant le cours des temps — elle touchait encore du doigt, cette France de Vezelai, la France <<barbarisée>> d'après les invasions. Telles les nations Sud-Américaines.

---


218 This is reminiscent of James Scott’s discussion of the evolution of proper names. See James C. Scott, *Seeing like a state: how certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).

Here we see South America as a simulacrum of twelfth-century France in terms of its adventurous spirit and monumental art. This image of the European past in the present holds for Febvre the promise of reinvigorating history. As he puts it a little later on in both admitting the limits and expressing his hopes for what the 1948 special edition could accomplish:


Above, Febvre, in quite poetic terms, suggests that the special allure of Latin America resides in its ability to serve as a living example of a past epoch. In the full bloom of youth, Latin America, in all its vitality supplies the historian with the necessary tonic to accomplish what Michelet saw as the proper role for the historian—restoring the dead to life.

But while Febvre conceives of both Brazil and Latin America representing Europe’s past, he also thinks that Brazil forecasts Europe’s future. This was implicit in his remarks on Gilberto Freyre where he argues that only through intentional stupidity could "l’Europe peut se désintéresser de leçons aussi saisissantes que les leçons brésiliennes." Febvre makes clearer what he means by these "leçons

---

220 This is a trope that is not unique to Febvre amongst the Annalistes. Braudel, in particular, would amplify this theme in his thinking on Brazil.


brésiliennes," in the introduction he wrote to Roger Bastide’s published translation of Freyre's *Maîtres et esclaves*. In the course of speaking about Freyre's analysis of racial and ethnic fusion in Brazil, Febvre comments that it is a useful tool for reflecting on the challenges to European colonial rule in the postwar era.

So given the importance of Brazil and Latin American as an object of both historical and contemporary interest, how does Febvre propose that historians proceed? As noted above, Febvre articulated the primary purpose of this special edition of the *Annales* as delivering a shock to the system.²²³ His introductory essay displays a sense of humility as a result of appraising the limits and omissions of the volume: art, religion, political and social ideologies, and key figures in the independence of Latin America hardly figure in the volume. But despite his modesty and recognition that "le temps n'est plus, des pédagogies omniscientes," Febvre does provide some general guidelines that provide clues to how he envisions a research program for Brazilian and Latin American studies proceeding.²²⁴

These guidelines are more clearly articulated in his 1929 article, "Un champ privilège d'études: l'Amérique du Sud." He continued to think of these outlines as valid in 1948. Cardinal among these guidelines is that historians and social scientists cannot simply rely on local studies to answer the problems posed by history and geography. Reflecting on the geographic diversity of Latin American, the transplantation and transculturation involved in the colonial enterprise, and the

---

²²³ As he intended it, the volume was not to bring certitude; it was intended to provoke thinking anew: "Il voudrait au contraire réfleter des inquiétudes. Et surtout, surtout, éveiller des désirs et des curiosités. Donner un choc." See Lucien Febvre, "L’amérique du sud devant l’histoire," 389.

²²⁴ Lucien Febvre, "L’amérique du sud devant l’histoire," 387.
kind of hyper-modernity Latin America experienced, Febvre concludes that these problems cannot be captured by local studies. As he puts it, "Et ce ne sont pas de petits problèmes limités, de ceux dont la solution n'importe qu’aux études locales."225

Febvre’s distrust of local studies differentiates his program for the *Annales* from the study of Latin America in the United States in the post-war period through the recent past. Scholars comparing French and American historiography on Brazil have noted this distinction. With Brazil, for example, Edward Riedinger points out:

> French scholars rarely focus exclusively on Brazil. Generally, Brazil is studied only as a "case" within the context of a particular disciplinary focus or hypothesis such as the psychology of religion, literature in Portuguese, Third World economies, tropical native peoples, agriculture, ecology, and so on. The approach is integrated more horizontally than vertically.226

Race is an exception to this generalization. As Fernanda Massi points out, for French scholars dealing "with racial relations, Brazil was treated as a specific geographical object. Brazil was a counterpoint to North American reality."227

The counterpoint of Febvre’s disapproval of local studies is his endorsement of works that deal with South America as a whole. So, for example, in reviewing Pierre Denis’ *Amérique du Sud*, Febvre writes approvingly that it fills a void precisely because of a dearth of books treating South American geography in its totality.

---


While Febvre thinks Denis’ treatment is not comprehensive enough, its attempt to engage the continent in its entirety provides Febvre the occasion to articulate that such a work should ideally:

donner une idée claire et distincte de cet immense domaine sud-américain, où la civilisation côtoie la sauvagerie, où la nature se manifeste à côté de la nature cultivée, où deux mondes se juxtaposent plutôt qu’ils ne se pénètrent.228

Forming such a clear and distinct idea would also cultivate an appreciation for the "prodigieuse diversité, de richesse et de variété dans l’outillage."229 But the comparisons and diversity yielded through a broad study of the South American continent are merely a prelude to what Febvre sees as the ultimate ends of a study of South America.

From this, we can conclude that Febvre’s real aim is to understand the limits of Western culture and society. In a passage worth quoting at length, he articulates this reflexive function of social scientific study:

Je sais bien: cette Amérique-là, cette Amérique indigène et sauvage, objet de curiosité pour les conservateurs de musées, les ethnographes, et les lecteurs de romans d’aventure. Ce qui est vivant, ce qui importe aujourd’hui, ce qui pèse dans le monde, c’est l’Amérique européanisée des élévateurs et des buildings, des usines électriques et du rail — non pas celle de la flèche empoisonnée, du hamac et de la hutte quadrangulaire. Voire, dirait Panurge. Le problème est de taille. C’est celui de notre civilisation et de ses limites. Et n’y aurait-il pas lieu de lui consacrer une enquête approfondie: je veux dire une enquête qui s’efforce d’atteindre les vraies réalités, par-delà les apparences sensibles? Car une civilisation, ce n’est pas seulement un ensemble d’inventions matérielles, de machines et d’outils plus ou moins compliqués. C’est un système d’idées, de sentiments et de croyances. Et qu’il y ait pour le concevoir dans l’Amérique du Sud une élite de plus en plus nombreuse, qui participe largement à une culture supérieure — c’est un fait qui n’est plus à révéler. Mais dans quelle mesure la civilisation que cette élite représente se répand-elle, rayonne-t-elle en dehors des grandes villes et des centres de culture les plus anciens? Comment s’inscrivent sur le sol ses limites? Comment s’en opère la diffusion? Quel rôle jouent, à cet égard, dans les divers pays de l’Amérique du Sud, les Universités et les institutions diverses d’enseignement élémentaire, moyen ou supérieur? Ces problèmes importent au plus haut point à notre connaissance des pays et des États. Et je me demande si un enquête menée auprès de quelques-uns des grands journaux de l’Amérique du Sud et portant sur le nombre et la

---


répartition de leurs abonnées, sur le rayon d’action de leurs vendeurs ne permettrait pas — renforcée et précisée par une enquête analogue menée chez libraires et les éditeurs — de tracer une carte bien parlante et vraiment expressive des limites de la civilisation intellectuelle dans l’Amérique du Sud.230

Once again, this passage bears witness to the connection between Europe and Latin America, both in a historical sense, but more importantly, in terms of the present and future. Febvre places special emphasis on the present Latin America with its skyscrapers and elevators. But what is especially interesting about Febvre’s thinking is his desire to map the continent as a system of ideas, sentiments, and beliefs. This mapping would in turn reveal the limits of European civilization.231

Febvre continually returns to his objective of trying to draw an intellectual map in his reviews of works on Latin America. In doing so, he clarifies what he hopes research going forward will achieve. So, for example, in critiquing Pierre Denis study of South America, he faults Denis for paying too much attention to national differences and rivalries while not doing enough to explain what unifies the continent. He asks: "En dépit de leurs rivalités, de leurs contestations de frontières encore fréquentes, tous ces États sud-américains ne possèdent-ils pas en commun certaines tendances et certains intérêts?"232 In a somewhat different context, but consistent with the idea of grasping the broader intellectual contours of a historical phenomenon, he critiques Guillaume de Vaumas’ L’Éveil missionaire de la France on

———


231 Febvre’s articulation of a program of trying to understand "notre civilisation et ses limites," in his article "Un champ privilégie d’études" is significant for understanding Febvre’s thought as a whole. Hans-Dieter Mann argues that this expression is a key to understanding Febvre’s work as a whole. Taking some liberty with Febvre’s wording, Mann entitles a chapter devoted to explicating this phrase as "Les limites de notre civilisation," and indicates that "Un champ privilégie d’études" is a unique source where Febvre works out the implications of this idea.

the grounds that Vaumas does little to contextualize missionary activity in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. As he puts it, Vaumas fails to relate his subject to other lines of inquiry that can inform it: "Et en particulier aux transformations intellectuelles et morales qui se sont produites en France à la fin du XVI siècle et qui expliquent l'intérêt pris de plus en plus par les milieux religieux pour les entreprises de colonisation spirituelle."233

This criticism of Vaumas for neglecting to provide a broader sense of the intellectual and moral transformations falls in line with what André Burguière has identified as its concern with identifying the general characteristics of humankind.234 This shows up in Febvre’s writings on Brazil in his review of Lévi Strauss, *La vie familiale et sociale des Indiens Namikwara*.235 In this review, which appeared in 1950 before the 1955 publication of *Tristes Tropiques* that cemented Lévi-Strauss’s status as a first-rate intellectual, Febvre begins by taking note of Lévi-Strauss’s talent and goes on to relay a moving scene where Lévi-Strauss describes the daily challenges of life for a Nambikwara couple that end in the nighttime with the couple huddling together in front of a fire. Febvre interrogates himself by asking

---


234 Here I am paraphrasing André Burguière, who identifies two threads of discourse in the *Annales*: 1) aiming to achieve a psychological identification with the past and 2) looking to the past as a field of observation for learning the general characteristics of humankind and of societies along with the geographical diversity of cultures and society with the dimension of our genealogical relation to the past. See Burguière, *The Annales School: An Intellectual History*, 3.

235 *La vie familiale et sociale des Indiens Namikwara* was the research monograph Lévi-Strauss produced from his fieldwork conducted in 1938 and was a prelude of sorts to his later more poetic, philosophical, and personal *Tristes Tropiques*. 
whether reading this sort of ethnographic work is the proper province of the
historian and answers his own questions with one of his own:

Mais qu'il ne m'est pas interdit au contraire, d'y trouver mon profit. D'historien, c'est à dire
d'ami de l'homme. —Et que de leçons à chaque pas! Cette réalité du couple parmi ces
bandes errantes qui se font et se défont sans cesse, n'en est-elle point une, et
d'importance?236

Moving on, Febvre explains that what can be extracted from this vignette is
something more fundamental which can be more broadly applied to human activity.
As he puts it, one "trouve dans une sorte de communauté humaine fondamentale
des sources d'explication et d'intelligence pour tant d'usages, de manières d'être et
de comportements collectifs qui ne se limitent pas aux sociétés indiennes du
Brésil..."237 For Febvre, Lévi-Strauss's vignette of this couple both provides a
fundamental coherence to their way of life while also extending beyond itself to
provide a broader understanding of human social behavior.238

---


238 André Burguière makes an important distinction about the broader understanding of human social behavior. He explains that unlike the 19th century hermeneutic philosopher Wilhelm Dilthey, who theorized a sense of common humanity across historical time as the basis for his theory of understanding, Febvre's attempt to connect human experiences across time "is a methodical labor of decipherment." In short, this common humanity is not taken as a given, but rather is something that needs to be constructed. This, in part, explains why the history of *mentalités* was such an important project for Bloch and Febvre. As Burguière puts it, "But to benefit from the past, historians must approach it with the sense that the past is separate, remote from the present. It is in this respect that the study of mentalities can be useful. In placing their observation post "in the consciousness of men living in society," as Febvre wrote, historians seek to recover the movement of life (the vitalist metaphor is common among the founders of the Annales) but also to restore to the era they are studying its overall cohesion, its singularity." See Burguière, *The Annales School: An Intellectual History*, 4-5.
Febvre and the Special Role of France

Before concluding this discussion of Febre, one final aspect of his program for Latin American studies deserves consideration—the relationship between France and Latin America. As scholars of Latin America are oft to repeat, “Latin America” is a term invented in the second half of the nineteenth century by the government of Napoleon III. In that nineteenth-century context, the French government was attempting to forge a political identity that tied the countries of Central and South America, along with the Caribbean, to France. Following Walter Mignolo, using the term, “Latin America,” was a way of speaking about a unified elite in the southern regions of the Americas that distinguished itself from British and North American political, cultural, and economic influence. Brazil resisted falling under this umbrella in the nineteenth century largely because its intellectuals and politicians during Pedro II rule were wary of being too closely associated with their Spanish American neighbors. Nonetheless, in the early twentieth century Europe and the United States firmly included Brazil within Latin America, even if Brazilians only began to accept the applicability of the term to itself in the later part of the twentieth century.

Regarding France’s relationship to Latin America, Febvre concludes his introductory essay to the 1948 special edition on what to contemporary eyes may


240 See Leslie Bethell, "Brazil and 'Latin America'", Journal of Latin American Studies 42 (2010): 457-485. In this piece, Bethell argues that "When, especially during the Cold War, the United States, and by extension the rest of the world, began to treat Brazil as part of 'Latin America,' Brazilian governments and Brazilian intellectuals, apart from some on the Left, still did not think of Brazil as an integral part of the region. Since the end of the Cold War, however, Brazil has for the first time pursued a policy of engagement with its neighbours—in South America." See Bethell, 457.
appear to be a strange note. He suggests making this collection, "un monument à la gloire exclusive de la France et de ses apports aux peuples d'Amérique." He continues:

Nous savons et nous nous rappelons avec joie combien, hier, ces pays latins ont pu se tourner passionnément vers notre pays. Nous n'ignorons pas ce qu’aujourd’hui encore nous représentons pour eux de vie intellectuelle désintéressée et, si l'on peut dire, de capacité novatrice à la mesure de l’homme.

Besides suggesting a nationalist sentiment, which Febvre generally avoided in terms of his program for Latin America and historical studies more generally, this quotation recalls the bond between Brazilian and French intellectual elites that led the founders of the University of São Paulo to choose the French to form the core faculty for the humanities and social sciences. The geopolitical context at the time of Febvre’s writing also helps make this passage understandable. Guy Martinière writes that by the time World War Two concluded, despite the longstanding ties between France and Latin America, the seeds of this friendship "ne purent s’opposer à la capture de l’Amérique latine par l’Amérique du Nord selon les impératifs du panaméricanisme et la règle de la rose des vents si remarquable évoquée par André Siegfried."

Thus, the context of Febvre’s remark was one in which the United States was supplanting France in Brazil as well as Latin America as a whole. In his article comparing Brazilian studies in France to the United States, Edward Riedinger

---


243 Refer back to Chapter 1, "A Transnational Cultural Politics."

244 Guy Martinière, "L’École des Annales et les Amériques Latines (1929-1949)," in Aspects de la coopération franco-brésilienne: Transplantation culturelle et stratégie de la modernité, 166.
observes that in addition to the United States defeating the Soviet Union during the Cold War, it also defeated France—in cultural terms. This may explain why Febvre concludes his introduction with a quote from one of Braudel's friends from Chile who wrote:

Aucun pays actuel ne possède, au même titre que la France, le degré de civilisation et la vigueur humaine qui permettent de fournir au monde une solution possible, rationnelle et vivante des grands problèmes qui agitent nos consciences. Le principe de la solution peut bien naître en Russie ou en Allemagne, en Italie ou en Angleterre ou aux États-Unis: cette solution manquera de valeur universelle tant qu'elle n'aura pas été retravaillée dans le grand laboratoire de la conscience française, aujourd'hui comme au XVIII siècle. Ce n'est pas, continuait cet ami, que je croie le Français plus savants ou plus intelligents ou plus puissants que les autres peuples, ou pas davantage que le Destin avec un D majuscule les ait désignés pour cette mission, mais simplement parce qu'ils n'ont pas perdu, à mon avis, le don de parler pour tous les hommes...

This suggests a quasi-mythic view of France as the enlightened nation par excellence whose historical mission consists in popularizing and transmitting the scientific and philosophic achievements of other nations for global consumption. Febvre's endorsement of, in his own words, the "rayonnement de la France dans des pays à qui elle a beaucoup donné," lacks the critical distance one would expect of a critical academic journal. This passage is particularly jarring when one considers that the Annales "sought to form a truly international network around their ideas." It is important to recognize that this tension between a fervent patriotism and a cosmopolitan vision was not specific to Febvre's writings on Latin America,

---

245 Edward A. Riedinger, "Comparative Development of the Study of Brazil in the United States and France," 375.


but was an inherent characteristic of his intellectual make-up. In his intellectual biography of Febvre, Hans-Dieter Mann comments:

> Le grand patriotisme de Lucien Febvre ne l'avait pas empêché de voir dans la Seconde Guerre mondiale se jouer plus que le destin de la France: celui de la Civilisation en général, de la collaboration entre les nations dans tous les domaines, y compris l'économie, que le national-socialisme en particulier s'était donné à tâche de faire régresser.²⁴⁹

While Febvre's patriotism did not obstruct him from thinking on a global level, and even from distinguishing French history from universal history, he did, nonetheless, endow France with a special mission of explaining the world to itself. Or as Febvre himself put it "Expliquons le monde au monde."²⁵⁰

This also becomes more understandable when recognizing that this 1948 Annales issue was an entry point into a more specialized study of Latin America. Foreign contemporaries like the American historian John Leddy Phelan, who reviewed French postwar scholarship in Latin America in 1953, observed that a project to create a Latin American institute at the Sorbonne was "approaching fruition."²⁵¹ As Guy Martinière's work shows, by 1948 there was a shift underway in French academic relations with Latin America. It was moving from a cultural

---


²⁵⁰ This is excerpted from a piece Febvre wrote in 1946 entitled "Face au Vent" for *Combats sur l'Histoire*. Mann provides a fuller quotation which parallels the end to Febvre's "L'Amérique du Sud devant l'Histoire": "Fini le monde d'hier. A tout jamais fini. Si nous avons une chance en tirer, nous Français--c'est en comprenant, plus vite et mieux que d'autres, cette vérité d'évidence. En lâchant l'épave. A l'eau, vouds dis-je, et nagez ferme. Cette solidarité de fait qui, dès maintenant, unit les naufragés--qui demain unira tous les hommes--travaillons à en faire une solidarité de labeur, d'échange, de libre coopération. Nous avons tout perdu, ou presque, de nos biens matériels. Nous n'avons rien perdu, s'il nous reste l'esprit. Expliquons le monde au monde." See Hans-Dieter Mann, *Lucien Febvre: La pensée vivante d'un historien*, 44.

politics that was based on individual elite relationships to one that was more institutionally based.\textsuperscript{252}

**Summation of Febvre’s Research Program**

Thus far, an outline has been provided of the research program Lucien Febvre articulated for the *Annales* with regard to Latin America. The extraordinary methodological problems Latin America posed for social science exercised Febvre’s interest in the region. Likewise, the historical and contemporary connections between Europe and Latin America that had yet to be treated with any systematic rigor fueled Febvre’s passion for the region.

In terms of articulating guidelines for the study of Latin America, Febvre conveyed a distrust of local studies in favor of an intellectual mapping of continent. This mapping would in turn indicate the limits of Western civilization. Along the way, Febvre also advocated an integrative social science program that would break from traditional historiography in favor of a ‘*science de l’homme*’ that aimed to arrive at a universal conception of humanity through a process of decoding rather than through assuming it as a given.

Finally, in terms of carrying out this program of research, Febvre stated a special role for France—a role seemingly imbued with a mythological conception of France as the enlightened nation *par excellence*. As noted, this nationalistic note seems out of tune with Febvre’s desire to form a truly international network around

the *Annales* and break down the artificial national boundaries that prevented important questions from being asked and comparisons made.

In any case, what the rest of this chapter will do is provide a map to the research that was carried out on Brazil in the *Annales* in this post-war period. In the first section, I will analyze the articles in the journal with an eye towards identifying the intellectual ties between France and Brazil. The sources will be interrogated with the following questions in mind: Which Brazilian authors do French contributors cite and which French authors do Brazilian contributors mention? Are these citations positive, negative, or something in between? What positions do the author and the cited hold in the academic field? Did these cross-references result from interactions during the French University Mission to Brazil? What ideas receive the most attention? How do these authors engage questions of race, development, and colonialism? And how does the meaning of these ideas shift as the ideas cross from Brazil into France? Answering these questions will permit us to understand the development of the *Annales* school in a broader international context as well as illuminate how the experiences of the French University Mission to Brazil fed discourses about race and decolonization during the breakdown of the French colonial empire.

**The Annales and the Study of Brazil: 1945-1964**

In the period 1945 through 1967, roughly forty-seven articles appear that focus either directly on Brazil or provide substantial coverage through a regional or
Atlantic world perspective. Of these 47 articles, twenty-eight were written either by members of the French University Mission to Brazil in the 1930s, or by their students. Roger Bastide, Fernand Braudel, Émile Coornaert, and Pierre Monbeig authored twenty-six of these forty-seven articles. The two students whose work appears are João Cruz Costa, who became a preeminent historian of ideas in Brazil, and Sergio Buarque de Holanda, one, if not the most renowned, historian of Brazil. Another Brazilian, Aroldo de Azevedo, one of the first geography professors at the University of São Paulo, also published work in the Annales. The sheer number of articles contributed by these participants in the USP mission demonstrates the influence of this mission on the development of historical studies of Brazil. When considering that two of Braudel’s students, Frédéric Mauro and Pierre Chaunu contributed eleven additional articles, that influence is further amplified.

This section will focus on the writings of these members with an eye towards identifying connections made to Brazilian intellectuals as well as key themes and interests. This emphasis on transnational connections contributes to the existing literature on the French University Mission to Brazil by emphasizing the production and interchange of ideas by both French and Brazilian intellectuals rather than institutions and political dynamics. As Patrick Petitjean has noted:

Il reste que l'influence des missions étrangères, en particulier françaises, sur l'histoire des idées au Brésil, comme, inversement, l'influence de leur séjour brésilien pour ceux d'entre

---

253 The number 47 was arrived at through conducting a search of the Annales for the years in question using the Persée database (http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/revue/ahess) and reading through the articles cited to verify whether Brazil received sustained discussion.

254 Mauro himself spent time at USP from 1953-1955. See table in Fernanda Massi, Franceses e Norte-Americanos nas Ciências Sociais Brasileiras, 419.
Additionally, as a result of evaluating these writings it will be argued that they demonstrate a remarkable consistency with Lucien Febvre’s broad conceptualization of how Latin American studies should be carried out. It will also be argued that Brazilian thinkers helped disabuse their French counterparts of a romanticized vision of Brazil and inspired them to think about how to engage race within a social scientific framework.

Franco-Brazilian Scholarly Exchange

The publication record of the *Annales* between 1945 and 1967 displays the avid interest that contributors had in the scholarly and literary works of Brazilian intellectuals. In addition to including articles by the Brazilian academics Aroldo de Azevedo, Sergio Buarque de Holanda and João Cruz Costa, the French contributors—particularly those participating in the French University Mission—show an avid, if critical, appreciation for works of Brazilian scholarship. Leaving aside Gilberto Freyre, whose works are continually referenced by Febvre, Bastide, and Braudel, the Brazilians whose work receives attention in the journal are: Fernando de Azevedo, Antônio Carneiro Leão, Caio Prado Júnior, Paulo Prado, Euclides da Cunha, Sérgio Millet, J.F. de Almeida Prado, João Dias da Silvera, Carlos Borges Schmidt, Manuel Querino, and Réne Ribeiro.

---

255 Patrick Petitjean, “Autour de la Mission Française pour la Création de l’Université de São Paulo,” in *Science and Empires: Historical Studies about Scientific Development and European Expansion*, ed. Patrick Petitjean, Catherine Jasi and Anne Marie Moulin, 339-364 (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1992), 355. This translates as: "The influence of foreign missions, especially French, on the history of ideas in Brazil, and, conversely, how the time spent in Brazil influenced those who continued their careers in Europe, has yet to be studied systematically."
Roger Bastide, Pierre Monbeig, Fernando de Azevedo, and Antônio Carneiro Leão

It should scarcely be surprising that Roger Bastide, Pierre Monbeig, and other members of the French University Mission had a strong interest in Fernando de Azevedo's work. He was the Secretary of Education for the State of São Paulo at the time USP was founded, wrote up the plan for USP, and became the Director of the Faculty of Philosophy, Sciences and Letters. He was also, as Jerry Dávilia points out, secretary of the São Paulo Eugenics society. In addition to his role in the educational reform movement, Azevedo was a polymath who enjoyed prominence as a literary critic, publisher, and sociologist. As Nelson Piletti writes in the

Dicionário de Educadores do Brasil:

Não obstante os numeros cargos administrativos que desempenhou, Fernando de Azevedo legou-nos uma vasta obra escrita—são 25 livros, entre os quais Princípios de Sociologia (1935), Sociologia educacional (1940), traduzido para o espanhol, e o clássico A cultura brasileira (1943), uma obra de 810 páginas, escrita como introdução ao Censo de 1940, cuja presidência não aceitou, traduzida para o inglês em 1950.

In addition to being awarded the Prêmio Machado de Assis from the Academia Brasileira de letras for his literary contributions, Fernando de Azevedo also served as President of the Sociedade Brasileira de Sociologica. secretary of the São Paulo Eugenics society. He reformed both the Rio (1926-1930) and São Paulo (1933-4) school systems. Davila writes: "Eugenics, Fernando de Azevedo observed, "called for the elimination of poisons, not people."

256 See Jerry Dávila, Diploma of Whiteness: Race and Social Policy in Brazil, 1917-1945 (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003). Noting Azevedo’s role in reforming both the Rio (1926-1930) and São Paulo (1933-4) school systems, Davila writes: "Eugenics, Fernando de Azevedo observed, "called for the elimination of poisons, not people" p. 25. Annales reviews of Azevedo’s work fail to engage the eugenicist dimension of Azevedo’s thought.

Discussion of Fernando de Azevedo’s work appears in the *Annales* in Roger Bastide’s 1953 review of Antônio Carneiro Leão’s *Panorama sociologique du Brésil* and Pierre Monbeig’s 1955 review of Azevedo’s *Um trem corre para Oeste: Estudo sobre a noroeste e seu papel no sistema de viação nacional*. At the time of Bastide’s article, Leão, another accomplished polymath, was Director of the Faculty Federale in Rio de Janeiro. His life and career paralleled Azevedo’s in many ways. Antônio Carneiro Leão, like Fernando Azevedo was involved in politics, publishing, education, and sociology. He began his career as a philosophy Professor in Recife in 1911 and then became involved in the education movement. He was diretor geral da Instrução Pública in Rio de Janeiro from 1922 to 1926 and then moved on to Pernambuco where he was involved in reforming education and became Secretary of the Interior, Justice, and Education in Pernambuco from 1929-1930. He then returned to Rio during the Vargas years to work under Ansío Texeira as director of the Instituto de Pesquisas Educacionais da Prefeitura do Distrito Federal and was involved in the development of the Universidade do Distrito Federal. As noted in Chapter 1, he was a contact for French participants of the University Mission in Rio. Like Azevedo, he was also involved in publishing as director of *O Economista*. His scholarly production included works on sociology as well as geography, Brazilian culture, and education.258

But despite Antônio Carneiro Leão’s many accomplishments, Bastide

critiques him fiercely. His critique of *Panorama sociologique du Brésil* recalls Henri Tronchon’s critique of Leão’s *Tendências e Diretrizes da Escola Secundaria* discussed in Chapter 1. There we saw Tronchon, a member of the University Mission, take Leão to task for his shoddy scholarship in discussing the French educational system and a lack of rigor on the conceptual level. While Bastide criticizes Leão severely on both methodological and conceptual grounds, he approvingly cites the work of Fernando de Azevedo and the sociological school of São Paulo. In contrast to Leão, Bastide sees Azevedo and the São Paulo school in terms of "d’avoir renversé le courant, en s’appuyant justement sur le Durkheimisme."259 Bastide takes issue with Leão’s argument that Brazilian culture was a disinterested culture lacking in pragmatism. He argues that Leão’s desire for the application of sociology to practical problems is rushed. In this vein, Bastide invokes Durkheim for whom "la sociologie ne vaudrait pas une heure de peine si on ne pouvait pas en tirer des applications pratiques—mais il faut des heures et des heures de travail désintéressé avant de songer à ces applications pratiques."260 Besides Leão’s hurried attempt to apply sociological findings to making public policy, he finds Leão’s lack of comparative method flawed and attributes this to a bias for North American sociology. Despite Leão’s invocation of Durkheim’s name, Bastide notes that Leão portrays his work along the lines of a "case-study," popular among North American and German sociologists of the time.


Like Bastide, Monbeig reads Azevedo favorably and begins his review by saying that although five years have passed, it's never too late to review a good book. He identifies Azevedo as "l'un des meilleurs sociologues du Brésil," and praises Azevedo's research on the state railway company's efforts to design a railroad from São Paulo state to Porto Esperança close to the Bolivian border. Monbeig approves of how Azevedo documents the history of the *Noroeste* company and tying that to Paulista development. By building this line to the Bolivian border, the *Noroeste* had made Bolivian oil available and revitalized the western edge of São Paulo. For Monbeig, the monograph was special because of Azevedo's ability to reflect on the sociology of communications while establishing fruitful comparisons between the European railway enterprises and those of Brazil.

**Fernand Braudel and Caio Prado Junior**

Caio Prado Junior, like Fernando de Azevedo, received favorable reviews in the *Annales*. Prado Junior, who along with Gilberto Freyre and Sergio Buarque de Holanda, constitutes the intellectual triumvirate of the 'Generation of 1930,' had substantial contact with the French University Mission. He sat in on Jean Magüe's classes, accompanied Lévi-Strauss on one of his initial expeditions, and helped form with Pierre Deffontaines, the *Associação dos Geógrafos Brasileiros*. Magüe, in concurrence with Lévi-Strauss, observed that the Brazilian *gran fino* were "connu
pour une particularité qu’il entretenait jalousement,” identified Caio Prado Junior within that milieu as the paradigmatic Marxist intellectual.261

On a more sympathetic note, Fernando Novais attributes Caio Prado Junior’s strident Marxism to a particularly intense conversion experience. Coming from one of the most distinguished Paulista families made Caio Prado Junior’s transition to Marxism much more extreme and radical. As Novais puts it:

É que se trata de uma ruptura muito particular: não estamos diante da radicalização, normal em determinadas circunstâncias (estudadas por M. Loewy), da intelectualidade pequeno-burguesa que atravessa o Rubicão. Aqui, o fosso é muito maior: o declínio do estilo aristocratizante de uma elite burguesa parece ter, em certos casos—a serem estudados—a efeito igualmente radicalizador; mas a travessia é evidentemente mais difícil—a outra margem está muito distante.262

Thus, for Novais, the depth of Caio Prado’s Jr.’s transformation makes understandable the ‘repetitive, insistent style’ and ‘reoccurrence of themes and arguments’ in his oeuvre.263

---

261 Jean Magüé, Les Dents Agacée, 97. Magüé’s observation about the Brazilian elite echoes Lévi-Strauss’s remark in Tristes Tropiques that “All the occupations, tastes and interests appropriate to contemporary civilization could be found in it, but each was represented by only a single individual. Our friends were not really persons in their own right, but rather functions which had been selected less for their intrinsic importance than for their availability. There was the Catholic, the Liveral, the Legitimist and the Communist; or, on another level, the gourmet, the book-collector, the pedigree-dog (or –horse) lover, the specialist in old or modern painting; and also the expert in local history, the surrealist poet, the musicologist and the painter. These vocations did not spring from any genuine desire to go more deeply into a given branch of knowledge; if two individuals, through some wrong move or effect of jealousy, happened to occupy the same field or different but too closely adjacent fields, their one though was to destroy each other, which they did with remarkable persistence and ferocity.” See Claude Lévi-Strauss, Tristes Tropiques, ed. John and Doreen Weightman (London: Penguin, 1992), 100.


263 In Novais’s words, “Daí a profundidade e onipresença da opção a marcar o conjunto da obra; a fidelidade e constância às idéias, que expressam escolhas existenciais; daí até o estilo repetitivo e insistente, a recorrência dos temas e argumentos, que caracterizam a escritura.” See Fernando Novais, “Caio Prado Jr. na historiografia brasileira,” 13.
In 1948, Braudel reviewed Caio Prado’s *Formação do Brasil contemporâneo* and *Historia económica do Brasil*. While he recognizes Caio Prado’s genius and the value of both works, Braudel nonetheless finds numerous points on which to criticize Prado. First and foremost, Braudel admires the tremendous passion that Caio Prado brings to the study of Brazil. In terms similar to his initial review of Gilberto Freyre in the *Melanges d’histoire sociale* (Discussed in Chapter 2), Braudel writes that Caio Prado’s books:

> trahissent une violente passion pour le pays immense dont nous sont étudiées l’enfance et l’adolescence, avec un souci aigu de vérité, d’intelligence, d’honnêteté -- ce qui est encore la meilleure façon d’aimer les hommes, d’où qu’ils soient. Comprendre le Brésil, déchiffrer ses origines, diagnostiquer ses maladies, mais cette fois scientifiquement, valablement, hors des voies faciles et incertaines de l’essai, hors de chemins de la seule poésie, hors des intuitions...On s’apercevra demain, si ce n’est des aujourd’hui (mais nul n’est prophète dans son pays), que ces livres tendus, au grain serré, prennent place très exactement dans la série des grands et beaux livres où le Brésil a essayé de découvrir son vrai visage, depuis Euclides da Cunha jusqu’à Paolo Prado et à Gilberto Freyre. Signe des temps nouveaux: dans cette explication nationale, sans cesse recommencée, les historiens ont relayé poètes, philosophes et essayistes. Nous ne nous en plaindrons pas.264

This admiration for Caio Prado’s literary abilities and combination of history with poetry, philosophy, and literary style contrasts with Braudel’s complaint of his heavy handed Marxism that marks both *Historia económica do Brasil* and *Formação do Brasil contemporâneo*. While Braudel admits that every history presupposes a philosophical starting point, he thinks Caio Prado devotes too much time to explicating his philosophical commitments, particularly in the preface to the *Historia económica do Brasil*. This is not because Braudel has any particular

---

complaint about Marxism—in fact, he admits the influence of Marxism in the *Annales*—rather, it distracts from the historical analysis put forth.\textsuperscript{265}

These generalities aside, Braudel commends *Historia económica* for Caio Prado’s attention to the last hundred years of Brazilian history and comments that it is an important contribution because Brazilian historiography has neglected more recent Brazilian history.\textsuperscript{266} Besides this, he finds Caio Prado’s discussion of the Revolution of 1889 absolutely brilliant. Braudel remarks that this revolution, which ended the Brazilian Empire and ushered in a republican government, had been seen as simply a top-down revolution where nothing really changed and the vast majority of Brazilians remained "bestializado" according to one of the founders of what would become the 'Old Republic.' But Braudel argues that Caio Prado helps us see that 1889 marked a completed undoing of the imperial order where "toutes les digues (il en est d’innombrables) du conservatisme impérial craquent ensemble sous la pousée des eaux nouvelles."\textsuperscript{267} This is because Prado treats the imperial system as what Marcel Mauss would call a total social phenomenon because in

\textsuperscript{265} Braudel notes that a debate for and against Marxism has already taken place in the *Annales* and that the applicability of historical materialism to history is at the time of this review something of a banal truth.

\textsuperscript{266} At the time Braudel was writing, this was very much the case. Heloísa Pontes indicates that Thomas Skidmore’s Politics in Brazil 1930-1964: An Experiment in Democracy, published in 1967, ushered in a big shift in Brazilian historiography. Prior to the publication of Skidmore’s book Brazilian historians (i.e., those who were Brazilian nationals and not U.S. based) were focused on the colonial period. Heloísa Pontes, *Brazil com Z. A produção estrangeira sobre o país, editada aqui, sob a forma de livro, entre 1930 e 1938*, Vol. 2, in *Hisória das ciências sociais no Brasil*, 441-477 (São Paulo: Instituto de Estudos Econômicos, Sociais e Políticos de São Paulo, 1995).

\textsuperscript{267} Fernand Braudel, "Au Brésil: Deux livres de Caio Prado," 101
looking at the Brazilian Empire, Caio Prado "entendez non seulement le régime politique, mais la société impériale, l'atmosphère même de la vie brésilienne."268

Yet despite such high praise, Braudel does not think Caio Prado always rises to this level. Braudel criticizes him for following a chronological model that overemphasizes event history and privileges change over continuity. Speaking of *Formação do Brasil contemporaneo*, which he finds to be of even higher quality then Caio Prado’s *Historia económica*, Braudel thinks the relationship between Brazilians and the landscape is underplayed—particularly given that Caio Prado was a geographer as well. But Braudel delivers his most significant critique when concluding the review when he writes that '"Et, toujours à mon goût, il manque peut-être encore à cette analyse brillante une étude systématique de la civilisation, conduite, hors des habituelles et stériles routines, selon les idées novatrices de Lucien Febvre et Marcel Mauss."269 This brings us back to Febvre’s idea of an intellectual mapping of the limits of a civilization and suggests continuity between Braudel’s and Febvre’s thinking with regard to Latin American and Brazilian history.

This continuity can be extended further when one considers a general critique of Brazilian historians that Braudel advances in the course of his review of Caio Prado, Jr. Braudel finds that Caio Prado’s *Historia económica* confines itself by not exploring the international dimensions of the Brazilian economy. As he puts it:

> Comme on le pense, j’ai quelques réserves à formuler. Elles viennent - des divergences de point de vue au départ, et aussi de ce qu’un Brésilien, plus que nous — je pense aussi à


Gilberto Freyre — a tendency to view the history of his country (and even his duty); par suite to make him more responsible for his destiny as he had always been. Each part of the world reflects the history of the world entire, the subit, s’en accommodates. Si attentif que soit Caio Prado to this vast world, to the intervention of the grands trusts bancaires qui est une forme of this general history, I think in a definitive way he enferme trop souvent dans the seul horizon brésilien, et, si vasté que soit cet horizon, il n’en est pas moins, parfois, une prison pour l’historien. Comment se fait-il ainsi que Caio Prado n’ait pas été plus attentif to the history of the Atlantic-South ? l’Océan, en ce qui concerne le Brésil, n’est-il pas l’outil de sa liaison with the world ? Je crois with lui que s’opposent assez dramatiquement une économie brésilienne humaine, qui serait faite for l’homme brésilien, à une économie imposée au Brésil du dehors, inhuma, lié to the “impérialisme” mondial. Cette distinction met en lumière une série of notations and of faits remarquables. Mais, en fin of compte, le Brésil n’est-il pas condamné to être ouvert sur the monde, for son bien et for son malheur, comme toutes les contrées of the planète ?

This admonition to think outside the box of Brazilian national history, recalls Febvre’s distrust of local studies and his endorsements of studies like Pierre Denis’s that attempted to capture South America in its totality. In this critique of Brazilian social scientists, Braudel appears to be following what Febvre laid out as early as 1928 when he said, as quoted earlier:

> Je sais bien: cette Amérique-là, cette Amérique indigène et sauvage, objet de curiosité pour les conservateurs de musées, les ethnographes, et les lecteurs of romans d’aventure. Ce qui est vivant, ce qui importe aujourd’hui, ce qui pèse dans the monde, c’est l’Amérique européanisée des élévateurs and des buildings, des usines électriques and du rail — non pas celle de la flèche empoisonnée, du hamac and of the hutte quadrangulaire. Voire, dirait Panurge. Le problème est of taille. C’est celui de notre civilisation and de ses limites.

The desire to challenge the predominance of the nation and state as the central concern of historians unifies Braudel’s and Febvre’s approach to the study of Brazil and Latin America. This commonality between the two Annalists helps confirm Edward Riedinger’s generalization that in France, "Brazil is studied only as a "case" within the context of a particular disciplinary focus or hypothesis." It further suggests the development of a world history paradigm.

---


While Braudel’s critique of Caio Prado Junior makes sense within the general outlines of the program laid out by Lucien Febvre, there is nonetheless something unreasonable about it. In suggesting Caio Prado imprisonment within the confines of the nation, Braudel both states the obvious and entirely misses the point. In *Formação do Brasil*, Caio Prado writes that:

> When we analyze the elements of contemporary Brazilian life—“elements” in their widest sense, geographical, economic, social, and political—we find that the past, the colonial past to which I have referred above, is still present and still very noticeable, partly modified, to be sure, but nevertheless present in traces that cannot be denied. When we look at present-day Brazil, what immediately strikes us is that it is not an organism in the process of open and active change, not yet settled along any clearly defined lines, an organism that has not yet "taken shape." it is true that in certain sectors the transformation is already profound and that we are faced with specifically new elements. But these are exceptions. In most cases, behind these transformations that can at times deceive us, we feel the presence of a very old reality which often takes us by surprise and which is in fact the colonial past.274

The passage clearly locates Caio Prado’s exclusive focus as Brazil—and thus Braudel quite correctly points out the limits of the study. But Braudel apparently fails to grasp that the passion behind Caio Prado’s study of Brazil stems from his desire to understand how colonial structures have continued to live on in contemporary society. Although Caio Prado’s writing avoids stating the problematic relationship between colonial past and present in existential terms, Brazilian commentators have acknowledged this dimension—even though its character is not explicit.

---

273 Recently, the *Annales* has republished a selection of articles published between 1946 and 2007 that are "designed to contribute to a greater understanding of the field and the historiographical developments in the wider area of World History over the last 60 years (including Global history, Connected Histories, Comparative History, Transnational History and Regional Histories--Empire, Atlantic, etc.)." The articles were selected by É. Anheim, R. Bertrand, A. Lilti et S. Sawyer. Yet, with the exception of Braudel’s article, "Monnaies et civilisations: De l’or du soudan à l’argen d’amérique," none of the articles published on Latin America made their way into the review. See *Annales: Histoire, Sciences Sociales*, *Annales: Histoire, Sciences Sociales*, http://annales.ehess.fr/index.php?247. (accessed March 8, 2013).

Thus, Fernando Novais argues that to truly understand *Formação do Brasil*,

readers have to acknowledge the central role the *sentido da colonização* plays in the work:

A leitura de *Formação do Brasil Contemporâneo*, acima proposta, abrira a possibilidade de acompanhar aquele primeiro movimento; o "sentido da colonização", categoria analítica básica, é apreendido através da inserção do objeto (colonização européia na América) num todo maior, ou seja, os mecanismos comerciais da expansão marítima europeia. Assim, a localização do fenômeno na totalidade de que faz parte, situando em seus nexos, permitiria a apreensão das categorias a partir das quais a reconstrução inteligível se torna uma possibilidade.  

The reading and import that Novais gives to Caio Prado’s *sentido da colonização* parallels Braudel’s praise for Caio Prado’s treatment of the imperial system as a total social phenomenon. In discussing the relationship between the *sentido da colonização* and the material aspects of Brazilian social life, Novais identifies a basic dialectic. A primary category of analysis, or *sentido da colonização*, gets enriched through an analysis of various sectors of social life while it simultaneously helps to define and explain these aspects of Brazilian culture. Given that this *sentido da colonização* permeates all of Brazilian social life, it must also be understood in subjective and existential terms.

At the heart of Braudel’s reading of Caio Prado Junior lies a fundamental misunderstanding or failure to appreciate that *Formação do Brasil* may also be read as a *histoire des mentalités*. In Novais’s reading of *Formação*, Caio Prado attempts to provide a historical account of the processes responsible for the formation of a colonial sensibility. In other terms, Braudel’s oversight can be expressed as a

---


276 As he puts it, "É, em suma, essa categoria que explica os vários segmentos vai enriquecendo e comprovando a categoria fundamental." See Fernando Novais, "Caio Prado Jr. na historiografia brasileira," 16.
function of his own national biases and the self-confidence attendant to being the bearer of French civilization. Norbert Elias's comments on the distinction between civilisation and kultur can help to further explain the disjuncture between Braudel's and Caio Prado Junior's perspectives. Elias writes that:

To a certain extent, the concept of civilization plays down the national differences between peoples; it emphasizes what is common to all human beings or—in the view of its bearers—should be. It expresses the self-assurance of peoples whose national boundaries and national identity have for centuries been so fully established that they have ceased to be the subject of any particular discussion, peoples which have long expanded outside their borders and colonized beyond them.  

Contrasted to this notion of civilization, exemplified by France in the early modern period, is the notion of culture which Elias explains as "the self-consciousness of a nation which had constantly to seek out and constitute its boundaries anew, in a political as well as a spiritual sense, and again and again had to ask itself: "What really is our identity?""

Although Elias was contrasting the French and German bourgeoisie in the eighteenth century, this contrast works well for contrasting French and Brazilian intellectuals in the 1930s as well. As shown in Chapter 2 of this dissertation, the 1930s brought a shift from regional to national level conceptualizations. Again, this was because the political revolution that brought Vargas to power initiated a process of cultural unification. This shift was exemplified by movements for educational reform as well as in publishing ventures, literature and other aspects of cultural production. What you see in Brazil, starting in the 1920s and flourishing in


the 1930s, is the fluorescence of an intellectual class that engages questions of national development that can be compared with the developing sense of national identity in Old Regime France and the French Revolution.\(^{279}\) Indeed, the classic historiographical treatments of the Revolution of 1930 in Brazil, such as Boris Fausto's, identify this as Brazil's modernizing revolution in similar terms to France's Revolution of 1789—although Charles Morazé thinks the more appropriate analogy is to 1848 in France.\(^{280}\)

Returning to Braudel and his critique of Caio Prado Junior, Braudel's failure to truly understand the subjective and existential dimensions of the *sentido da colonização* may be attributed to what Edward Said has referred to as a *positional* differential. Said was, of course, speaking of the study of the Orient when he argues that "no production of knowledge in the human sciences can ever ignore or disclaim its author's involvement as a human subject in his own circumstances" and as a consequence brings a "geopolitical awareness into aesthetic, scholarly, economic, sociological, historical, and philological texts."\(^{281}\) Nonetheless, this argument about

\(^{279}\) The classic work on the development of a national mentalité in France, is David A. Bell, *The Cult of the Nation in France: Inventing Nationalism, 1680-1800* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001). Bell charts history of the concept "nationalism" from 1680 to 1800 in terms of a clear progression from the idea of the nation as a closed community based on longstanding legal and political traditions to the notion that the nation was to be constructed with the ideals of linguistic and regional uniformity as guidelines.

\(^{280}\) For a classic historiographic treatment of the Revolution of 1930 as a modernizing revolution, see Boris Fausto, Boris Fausto, *A Revolução de 1930: historiografia e história* (São Paulo: Editória Brasiliense, 1970). In terms of the connection between 1848 in France and 1930 in Brazil, Roger Bastide, in reviewing Charles Morazé's *Les Trois âges du Brésil*, points out that Morazé identifies France and Brazil having parallel political phenomenon between 1815 and 1848: Pedro I gives Brazil a constitution and Louis XVIII gives a charter to France; In 1830 France retained the monarchy but switched kings and in Brazil Pedro I abdicated for Pedro II. However, in 1848 the two destinies separated and Morazé argues that you had to wait until 1930 for Brazil to have its revolution of 1848. See Roger Bastide, "Trois Livres sur le Brésil," *Revue de science politique* 5, no. 1 (1955): 110-118.

how geopolitical awareness plays a role in transnational or regional interpretation is general enough to apply to Braudel's engagement of Brazilian culture. It is also consistent with Elias's differentiation between the self-assurance of those living in a nation whose borders and identity have been established for centuries and those of a nation in the process of development. This positional differential that helps explain Braudel's problematic reading of Formação do Brasil, also helps explain Febvre's strange conclusion to the Annales 1948 special edition where he endorsed the "rayonnement de la France dans des pays à qui elle a beaucoup donné."282

To conclude, Braudel's reading of Caio Prado Junior, is consistent with his general project of incorporating Brazil within a world-historical outline. In Chapter 1, we saw Braudel's effort to integrate Brazil within a pan-Latin Mediterranean. His criticism of Caio Prado for being trapped within the nationalist prison connects with this desire to establish connections between the Mediterranean and Atlantic world. Yet in this critique of Caio Prado, Braudel does not exhibit the kind of self-awareness he displayed in a review of Gilberto Freyre's work published in the Melanges d'histoire sociale published in 1943 and discussed at length in Chapter 1 of this dissertation. There Braudel noted that:

Pour nous, Européens, le Brésil est d'abord une Europe américaine, une Europe appuyée sur cette Méditerranée moderne qu'aura été l'Atlantique, vivant de sa vie plus ou moins animée, participant à son histoire générale et à la vie mêlée des Europes qui l'entourent, les vieilles et les nouvelles.283


283 Fernand Braudel, "A Travers une continent d'histoire: Le Brésil et l'oeuvre de Gilberto Freyre," 19. This translates as: "For us Europeans, Brazil is above all an American Europe. A Europe reclining on that modern Mediterranean, the Atlantic, that lives an animated life through participating in the general history of the Atlantic. This life combines the Europes that surround it, both the old and the new."
The absence of self-reflection diminishes Braudel's review of *Formação* because it suggests that he fails to understand the source of the passion that he credits Caio Prado for bringing to the work. It also suggests that he fails to understand the process of colonization as a total social phenomenon encompassing economy, politics, culture, and *mentalités*.

In his review of Caio Prado Junior’s two works, Braudel refers to the work of Euclides da Cunha and Paolo Prado, as well as Gilberto Freyre. Roger Bastide also pays particular attention to both de Cunha and Paulo Prado in his article, "La psychologie ethnique en Amérique du Sud." Although Bastides article appeared in the *Revue de psychologie des peuples*, Braudel thought the piece important enough to review in the special 1948 *Annales* edition devoted to Latin America. In his review, "La règle du jeu: Le jeu des portraits," Braudel articulates the aim of Bastide’s article: to survey a handful of the most influential works by Latin American authors from 1900 to the present that attempted to provide national portraits of their respective countries. Braudel notes that all of these portraits, but especially those from the early part of the nineteenth century, are inflected with romanticism, a sense of inferiority, a desire to imitate Spencer or Taine, and a desire to "diagnostiquer les maladies dont souffrirent tous ces pays malmenés par l’histoire, pour leur indiquer, ensuite, le chemin du salut—nul ne le contestera et ne pensera

---

284 As quoted above, he writes On s'apercevra demain, si ce n’est des aujourd’hui (mais nul n’est prophète dans son pays), que ces livres tendus, au grain serré, prennent place très exactement dans la série des grands et beaux livres où le Brésil a essayé de découvrir son vrai visage, depuis Euclides da Cunha jusqu’à Paolo Prado et à Gilberto Freyre.
que ces images, dessinées avec amour ou colère, soient des images de vérité."  

In other words, these authors have cast themselves in the role of cultural physician and their works seek to diagnose and offer a pathway by which these countries, 'battered by history,' can heal.

As the subtitle indicates, Braudel's "Le Jeu des Portraits," picks up on the publishing trend that took off in Brazil in the 1930s, and discussed at length in Chapter Two. Briefly, as Heloísa Pontes indicated in her work, "Retratos do Brasil: Editores, Editoras e "Coleções Brasiliiana" nas Décadas de 30, 40, 50," the Brazilian publishing industry reached maturity in the 1930s and began issuing numerous series of publications that drew portraits of Brazil as a geographical and collective entity. Braudel remarks positively on this type of effort, writing:

> Et que, pour de longue années encore, tout intellectuel de ces pays jeunes ne peut se comprendre lui-même qu’en comprenant son pays, en se l'expliquant à lui-même et aux autres. L'Argentine d'Ezéquel Martinez Estrada, c'est Ezéquiel Martinez Estrada lui-même, le Brésil de Gilberto Freyre, Gilberto Freyre en personne -- l'un et l'autre citoyens du vaste monde et nos frères en esprit, mais qui sentent le monde et nous sont fraternels au travers de leur expérience d'homme, je veux dire au travers de leur pays même, dans la mesure où ils aiment et comprennent ces pays qu’ils trouveront, selon les circonstances, la couleur de leurs passions ou de leurs idées, adorables ou détestables -- bien que toujours irremplaçables.

These remarks about the existential linkage between self and national history are somewhat ironic considering Braudel's later critique of Caio Prado Junior, Gilberto Freyre, et al. for not being able to escape the nationalist prison. Here, Braudel appears more understanding of why that nationalist framework was so vital and necessary for these writers.

---


Roger Bastide, Euclides da Cunha, and Paulo Prado

Given the attention Braudel grants to Bastide’s piece, it is worth looking at what Bastide had to say about the portraits drawn of Brazil by Euclides da Cunha and Paulo Prado. Bastide argues that with Euclides da Cunha, ethnic psychology was born in Brazil. For Bastide, ethnic psychology was a precursor to sociology in Latin America. A product of the nineteenth century, ethnic psychology was born of the contrast between North and South America with the North being seen as dynamic while the south was viewed as languishing in an underdeveloped state. Characterized by a philosophical pessimism à la Schopenhauer, ethnic psychology attempted to explain the causes of this underdevelopment through reference to racial formation.

The place of Euclides da Cunha’s Os Sertoes in Brazilian culture makes it natural that Braudel and Bastide would have read him with interest. Ilan Stavans introduces a recent translation of Os Sertôes by noting that it has been described as "the bible of the Brazilian nation."287 As Stavans records, Da Cunha, who was educated at the Colégio Aquino in Rio, where he studied under the positivist thinker and one of Brazil’s leading intellectual figures of the 'Generation of 1870,' Benjamin Constant Botelho de Magalhães, had a somewhat itinerant career path. He worked as military engineer, journalist, surveyer, and teacher.288 While Comtean positivism was a determinate influence on da Cunha in his formative years, particularly

---


288 For a brief biographical sketch of da Cunha, see Ilan Stavans, "Introduction," in Backlands: The Canudos Campaign, xvii-xxiii.
through the influence of Benjamin Constant Botelho de Magalhães, his
disappointment with Republicansim as a result of the 1897 Canudos massacre led,
according to Frederic Armory, to "a changeover to another more compelling and
distinctly different scientific paradigm—namely, English evolutionism or social
Darwinism—which in the person of Herbert Spencer imposed itself on Republican
élites from the beginning of the decade onward."\textsuperscript{289}

In speaking of Euclides da Cunha’s Os Sertões, Bastide acknowledges the
literary value but questions its scientific validity. He writes that it is "Magistrale
d’ailleurs plus au point de vue littéraire qu'au point de vue scientifique. C’est le
moment géographique de notre science."\textsuperscript{290} He summarizes Euclides da Cunha’s
work by showing how da Cunha attempts to define regional types in terms of
environmental influences: the Amazonian is exhausted by heat and humidity, the
forest-dwelling Indian is in a state of disequilibrium, the Northeasterner is inclined
to superstition and fanaticism as a result of the hostile climate. Vast generalizations
are made about the superiority of Southern Brazil to Northern Brazil and race is
considered along with climate as one of the predominant influences of character.
And so, Bastide summarizes da Cunha’s view that the mulatto is caught between
laziness and immorality while the mameluco (mix of Portuguese and Indigenous) is
brave and energetic.


\textsuperscript{290} Roger Bastide, "La Psychologie ethnique en Amérique du Sud," \textit{Revue de psychologie des peuples}
(Institut havrais de sociologie économique) 3, no. 1 (1948), 33.
For Bastide, the 'moment géographique' that da Cunha represents was a preliminary step along the road to sociology. As he puts it in opening his survey of ethnic psychology in Latin America, "nous retrouverons dans tous les pays, de l'Argentine à la Colombie, ces trois moments: le moment géographique, le moment racial et le moment social."\textsuperscript{291} Bastide faults the geographic and racial approaches to understanding development for eschewing proper historical and social analysis and argues that sociology "allait éliminer cette psychologie ethnique et montrer que tout ce que l'on attribuait au climat ou à la race dépendait en fait des conditions sociales et historiques."\textsuperscript{292} Thus, for Bastide, da Cunha represents one road on the path to social science.

With Eulides da Cunha representing the geographic phase of Brazilian social science, Bastide indentifies Oliveira Vianna’s biological racism as the racial moment, and Fernando Azevedo’s *Cultura Brasileira* as the sociological moment. Of Azevedo, Bastide writes that his discussion of Brazilian traits such as emotionality, irrationality, mysticism, tolerance, and hospitality are appropriately ascribed not to climate or race "mais de facteurs historiques, d’une éducation par exemple restée longtemps littéraire et juridique," or from "la séparation des familles dans un pays grand comme la moitié de l'Europe, chacune vivant isolée et devant subsister par elle-même," or "l'esclavage qui a crée la superstition du travail comme servilisme et de la main blanche comme synonyme de l'aristocratie, etc.."\textsuperscript{293} So even though, at

\textsuperscript{291} Roger Bastide, "La Psychologie ethnique en Amérique du Sud," 28

\textsuperscript{292} Roger Bastide, "La Psychologie ethnique en Amérique du Sud," 35.

\textsuperscript{293} Roger Bastide, "La Psychologie ethnique en Amérique du Sud," 36
the end of the day, Azevedo does, like da Cunha, identify broad national and regional
traits, he indexes them to these historical factors. He also finds a way out of the
generalized pessimism by positing that the development of industry and a proper
educational system would address whatever problems existed with the Brazilian
character.

Where da Cunha represents for Bastide the geographic stage along the
pathway to a truer social science, Paulo Prado and his *Retrato do Brasil: Ensaio sobre
a tristeza brasileira* represents the intermediary, or racial moment, in between da
Cunha and someone like Azevedo. Paulo Prado, who was the uncle of Caio Prado
Junior, was from of the most distinguished families in Brazil. Paulo was active in the
*modernista movement* in São Paulo where he was fundamental in turning the *Revista
do Brasil* into a conduit for the modernist movement.\(^{294}\) Wilson Martins notes that
Paulo Prado hired Mário de Andrade to be the art critic for the *Revista* and
comments that "no other occurrence could have been so expressive of a
transformation in spirit."\(^{295}\)

Of Paulo Prado himself, Wilson Martins classifies him as more of an artist
than a social scientist; nonetheless, he credits his *Retrato do Brasil* as having
"opened the royal road of "Brazilian studies," of which [Freyre's] *Casa Grande &

\(^{294}\) On this point, Wilson Martins writes that "One journal, which to that point had been conservative
and indifferent to Modernism (that is the least one can say), marked an important transition in 1923

Senzala was the decisive landmark." As Martins puts it, Prado's Retrato is an artist's book, not just because Prado, in his own words, "adopted the Goethean process of the creation of works of art," in exiling himself from the city of São Paulo to the provinces, but also because "Prado saw Brazil and her history above all else as an intellectual creation, if not as an artistic creation." Speaking of Prado's conception of Brazil, Martins writes:

The Brazil of Paulo Prado is less a country, a geographical and historical reality, than a human figure. Brazil, for him, is the Brazilian people, that sad people inhabiting a radiant land. What attracts him in Brazil is the population and its emotional growth, the action of man in moments of crisis, his typical behavior. For that very reason, in this regard he distinguished himself from those somber historians of archives and documents. He did not pretend to exhume lost document nor meddle around in the dust of past centuries; he wrote a history as he saw it from a quiet, clean study, "book-lined inside, and outside covered with roses and climbing vines." His mission was to breathe new life into the body of that imaginary man, Brazil.

Looking at Martins comments, it is easy to understand why Paulo Prado's work was admired for its literary quality. Braudel and Bastide both appreciated this aspect in Prado's work. They took issue with the historical and sociological aspects of the Retrato.

On this note, Bastide observes that Prado's Retrato do Brasil attempted to examine the source of alienation within the collective soul of the Brazilian people, but fails to provide an adequate historical or sociological explanation. Bastide remarks that for Prado, "le métissage semble avoir une action multiplicatrice, agir comme une addition, alors que pour les prédécesseurs de Paulo Prado, le mal consistait surtout dans la lutte à l'intérieur de l'homme de trois mentalités différentes.

---


297 Martins quotes Prado on p. 185; his own words quoted here appear on p. 186.

In Bastide's telling, Prado looks at Brazilian lust as resulting from interracial relations between the Portuguese masters who came to Brazil without their wives and African slave women who Prado defines in terms of their sensuality. Prado likewise defines Brazilian sadness in terms of the *saudade* or nostalgic longing for Portugal being mixed with *banzo*, the sadness of the slave, along with the sorrow of the Indian. For Bastide, Prado, along with Affornso Arinos de Mello Franco can be understood as trying to define the Brazilian mentality of the present through incorporating the Portuguese, African, and Indigenous heritage.

While Bastide does not directly refute Paulo Prado's generalization, or critique his particular method of approaching social problems, he moves from summarizing Prado's work to arguing that the brand of ethnic psychology practiced by Prado is being replaced with a proper sociology where "tout ce que l'on attribuait au climat ou à la race dépendait en fait des conditions sociales et historiques." It is from here that Bastide takes up his discussion of Azevedo's *Cultura Brasileira* which has been discussed above.

At this point, it is worth picking up on the relationship Bastide saw between literature and sociology both in terms of the Brazilian and French intellectual fields. As noted in Chapter 2, literature and the essayistic tradition remained extraordinarily powerful in Brazil at the time of the French University Mission. Heloísa Pontes argues that foreign social scientists whether American, French or

---

299 Roger Bastide, "La Psychologie ethnique en Amérique du Sud," 34.

German had to confront this tradition and that this tradition continued to have force into the 1950s when more specialized social scientific disciplinary boundaries formed.

In a review essay of a series of Latin American novels that Roger Callois published in France with Gallimard, Roger Bastide meditates on the relationship between literature and the social science. In this essay, "Sous <<La Croix du Sud>>: L'Amérique latine dans le miroir de sa littérature," published in the *Annales* in 1958, Bastide argues that there need not be an absolute distinction between literature and sociology. He notes that in France this rupture was never complete while in the United States, sociology in the first half of the twentieth century tended to follow a more quantitative model inspired by the hard sciences. In short, there are two things that he thinks that literature can bring to sociology and the social sciences: 1) material for sociology to rework into generalizations and 2) certain means of conceptualizing.

Bastide believes North American, Brazilian, and French social science all engage with literary works in providing material for sociology to rework. He cites as an example Adalberto Ortiz’s *Juyungo*. Ortiz, an Ecuadorian, wrote about black life in Ecuador, a subject which at that point in time had yet to receive serious attention among sociologists. Thus, this novelistic portrait raised questions and
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301 Although he does note that the cultural anthropology of Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict has breached the rigid opposition social scientists have set up between "<<les règles de construction de la théorie>> aux <<règles de l’art>>. See Roger Bastide, "«Sous la croix du sud»: L’amérique latine dans le miroir de sa littérature," *Annales. Économies Sociétés, Civilisations* 13, no. 1 (1958), 30.
brought sociological attention to an issue not yet studied. So in this regard, Bastide argues that:

Le premier mérite de cette littérature est de fournir justement ces hypothèses; nous ne disons pas toutes se montreront également fécondes, — car le romancier, même naturaliste, choisit les données d’près critères esthétiques et non après leur valeur généralisante,—mais peut-on commencer sans elles?

Here Bastide accurately sums up the first manner in which literature contributes to sociology—through furnishing hypothesis and suggesting particular research subjects for sociologists.

As for the second contribution of literature to the social sciences—a unique means of conceptualization—Bastide argues that this is an area that American style quantitative sociology neglects. He writes that "L’abus des mathématiques a fait oublier que le social est <<vécu>> et peut être atteint par le dedans aussi bien que par le dehors." For Bastide, literature enriches the conceptual resources of sociology by providing glimpses of the interior life and thus drawing psychological profiles. He uses the work of the Brazilian novelist Graciliano Ramos's novel *Enfance* which provides a portrait of a child developing the capacity to think from mere sense experience while also relating these individual stages of growth to a changing landscape. *Enfance* explores the way geography conditions the development of an individual psyche and thus provides "dans son autobiographie le verso psychologique de cette <<échelle>> écologique: par quoi le passage de la nuit à la lumière est moins l’éveil de l’intelligence, selon les stades chronologique de
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302 Roger Bastide, "«Sous la croix du sud»: L’amérique latine dans le miroir de sa littérature," 33.

303 Roger Bastide, "«Sous la croix du sud»: L’amérique latine dans le miroir de sa littérature," 33.
l’évolution enfantine, quela répercussion de changements massifs de milieux." In moving from an isolated fazenda in the Brazilian sertão to an urban milieu, Ramos links place and thought. Bastide finds this linkage arresting and writes that "ainsi, à travers un document saisissant, le développement des facultés intellectuelles apparaît parallèl à l’extension des rapports sociaux et à l’urbanisation, avec tous les phénomènes d’acculturation qu’il comporte dans une société pluri-raciale." In short, Ramos’s literary treatment places individual cognitive development beside social development which suggests a number of parallels to be explored in more systematic sociological studies.

Besides expanding the conceptual resources of sociology, particularly with regard to the interior life of individuals, Bastide explores some of its possible methodological influences. For this he turns to Gilberto Freyre and speaks of two of his works appearing in Callois’s collection, Maîtres et Esclaves and Terre du Sucre. Bastide sees both of these works departing from literature—the first inspired by historical method and the second by ecology—but nonetheless interrogates how these works are inspired by literature and how literature extends them. He writes:

Mais si un tel rapprochement entre science et littérature a été possible, c’est que la sociologie de G. Freyre ne craignait pas d’utiliser déjà, — avant même les manifestations nord-américaines dont nous avons parlé, — les techniques du littérateur. Sa sociologie a été qualifiée d’<<impressionniste>>: en effet il accumule les petites taches de couleur, juxtapose de menus faits, tirés des <<mémoires>>, des journaux, des récits de voyageurs, du folklore paysan, qui composent peu à peu par leur juxtaposition une histoire <<humaine>>; il se refuse à emprisonner la réalité dans les chaînes des <<concepts>> ou des catégories sociologiques. Lui-même a défini sa méthode par l’introduction dans la sociologie des procédés de Proust, par opposition à ce qu’il appelle la sociologie cartésienne: ne lui faut-il pas, lui aussi, redécouvrir <le temps perdu> à travers la saveur d’une madeleine (ce qui correspond dans son œuvre aux belles pages sur la cuisine africaine, les gâteaux des
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Here we see Bastide reflecting on the Proustian dimensions of Freyre’s work and how the poetic rediscovery of the past engages all of the physical senses and provides clues to how collective memory works. His comments on the way Freyre connects cuisine to collective memory evokes Lucien Febvre’s work on the relationship between regional dietary habits in France and the availability of cooking fats. Febvre’s findings were that dietary habits did not reflect contemporary resources, but rather echoed that of the ancient agriculture of the region. Thus, like Freyre, Febvre had drawn the lesson, in André Burgière’s words that "Tastes in food are a memory." Further, it is hardly surprising that Bastide would be interested in collective memory given the involvement of Maurice Halbwachs in the founding of the Annales and that both Bastide and Halbwachs were heavily influenced by Durkheim.

Perhaps even more generally it is fair to say that Bastide’s evaluation of Freyre’s evocative treatment of memory dovetails with the broad interest in the histoire de mentalités. Bastide’s case for literature informing sociological and

---


308 André Burguière notes that Halbwachs was at the University of Strasbourg when the Annales was founded there after the war when Strasbourg was converted from a German to a French university. See André Burguière, The Annales School: An intellectual History, 28.
historical studies dovetails with the general interests of the *Annales* in defining and developing the study of *mentalités*. While there are certainly variations and discrepancies among the *Annales* in terms of the broad conceptualization of what is meant by *mentalités*, André Burguière speaking of Marc Bloch provides a helpful definition and explanation of the role they play in an understanding of historical and social phenomenon. He writes:

> These "obscure things," as he sometimes called them, these deep strata of the mental universe, play an important role in the subjects assent to power and in the symbolics that foster it, but they are not coextensive with the social system. They come from a remote place. They feed the imaginary. They make mentalities not the servants of economic fluctuations or of the social system but rather the masters of the game, which can elicit adherence as well as panic and the breaking of the social bond.  

In this view, mentalities are not reducible to the economic or social dynamics but have an autonomy of their own. Understanding and conceiving of these "obscure things" requires more than quantitative methods and a sociology focused on external social relations; it requires an understanding of the collective interior life—precisely the argument Bastide is making with regard to the role literature can play in helping develop social science.

All this is not to say that sociology has nothing to contribute to literature. For while Bastide recognizes the contributions literature makes to the study of social phenomenon, he also thinks "la sociologie à son tour éclaire la littérature," and goes on to consider the case of Argentine literature where it might appear that the gap between the two is greatest.  

Taking the example of Jorge Luis Borges, Bastide explains how an understanding Latin America’s social development serves as a key
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310 Roger Bastide, "«Sous la croix du sud»: L’amérique latine dans le miroir de sa littérature," 44.
for understanding Borges’s work. He does this in a manner reminiscent of Angel Rama’s more contemporary treatment in *The Lettered City*.\footnote{See Angel Rama, *The Lettered City* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1996). In this work, Rama investigates the relationship between language and the social order in Latin America drawing upon Michel’s Foucault’s *The Order of Things*. Differentiating himself from historians studying Latin America through a materialist lens, Rama looks at the way the symbolic system in Latin America was responsible for prescribing “an order for the physical world,” and “constructing the norms for community life.”\footnote{Rama explores the relationship between Europe and Latin America in terms of a system of ideas. He sees Latin America as having experienced a type of hypermodernity where stages of development were bypassed. As a result, Rama emphasizes the distortion and the conflict produced by the impact of this imposition of European thought on the material life of Latin America.}\footnote{Roger Bastide, “«Sous la croix du sud»: L’amérique latine dans le miroir de sa littérature,” 46.} Bastide makes the same observation as Rama about the Latin American city’s divergence from the European city in terms of origin. He writes:

>Cependant la grande cité sud-américaine n’a pas été fondée par le laboureur—par le Lapithe opposé au Centaure—mais par le commerçant. La capitale argentine n’est pas comme l’euroÂ©enne l’extension d’un village de paysans; c’est le port, braqué sur le rest du monde.\footnote{Roger Bastide, “«Sous la croix du sud»: L’amérique latine dans le miroir de sa littérature,” 46.}  

This divergence where the city grows—not as an outgrowth of the peasant village—but as a commercial port founded by merchants and integrated into a world capitalist system provides the key to the strange sorts of inversions that one finds in Borges. Unmoored from an organic process of historical development, signs and symbols have free reign and autonomy over material processes and even over individuals and communities. Regarding the connection between the development of the city and Borges’s literary output, Bastide explains:

>Là nous retrouvons sans doute la genèse d’autres mythes de Borges: celui du livre, dont les hommes ne sont que les versets, les paroles et les lettres, comme les livres des marchands, où les individus se réduisent en calculs; celui de la combinatoire universelle, qui rappelle la langue analytique de John Wilkins ou le calcul combinatoire de Leibniz, et qui, par son degré d’homogénéisation du concret, nour rapproche peut-être encore davantage des mathématiques des marchands.\footnote{Roger Bastide, “«Sous la croix du sud»: L’amérique latine dans le miroir de sa littérature,” 46.}
In this passage, Bastide explains Borges as taking the logic of the both the scientific and commercial revolutions to a logical extreme where human beings are reduced to verses, words, and letters in a universe utterly indifferent to human purpose.\(^\text{314}\) Bastide concludes his discussion of Borges at the same time that he concludes his essay by stating that Argentine literature of whatever variety is always marked by America and the processes of development and forms of sociability that are distinctly American. For Bastide, a culturally specific sociology that researches the different forms of sensibility within a social milieu outside of Europe, permits for a deeper understanding of literature.

**Fernand Braudel, Pierre Monbeig, Josúe de Castro, João Dias da Silveira, and Aroldo de Azevedo**

Thus far, we have sampled intellectual engagements between the *annalists* and Brazilian sociologists, historians, essayists, and literary figures. Another important field in which these engagements took place was in the realm of geography. Pierre Monbeig and Fernand Braudel published several reviews
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\(^{314}\) Rama draws on Foucault and suggests that this worldview originates with the Port Royale logic. Another way of thinking about the overall phenomenon is in terms of the scientific worldview originating in the 17th century and discussed by E.A. Burtt in his book *The Metaphysical Origins of Modern Science*. Burtt describes this view in terms of three basic principles: The first involves the notion that objects in the world are fully commensurable; they may be compared on a quantitative basis and their behavior expressed through laws that may be expressed mathematically. Expelled from the view is the notion that the world contains multiple substances with distinct qualities that defy comparison with one another. The second feature of this view articulates a view of causality that sees the world as governed by a series of discrete events that are related physically and temporally. This view of causality is distinguished from the Aristotelian conception employed in medieval times that allowed for explanations in terms of purposes. Under the Aristotelian scheme it was legitimate to explain a physical phenomenon in terms of its importance to humanity and ultimately to God. In the absence of a teleological framework to the world of experience and as a result of trying to explain the relationship between the quantitative features (primary qualities) and qualitative aspects (secondary qualities), Cartesian dualism emerges with mind and matter being separate entities. With this Cartesian conception, the central question philosophers wrangle with is how to relate such fundamentally different substances. See E.A. Burtt, *The Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Science* (Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 2003).
assessing the works of prominent Brazilian geographers. Josué de Castro was the
most renowned of these, but Monbeig and Braudel also addressed the work of João
Dias da Silveira and Aroldo de Azevedo.

Pierre Monbeig's review, "La <<Géographie de la Faim>> de Josué de Castro,"
appeared in the *Annales* 1948 special edition, *À travers l'Amérique latine*. The
overall tone of Monbeig's review was positive—he endorsed de Castro's work as
groundbreaking. *Géographie de la Faim,* or *Geografia da fome* in the original
Portuguese, did indeed receive international recognition. This work published in
1946, together with De Castro's later *Geopolítica da fome* cemented Josué de Castro's
international reputation. As a result of the this work, he was considered for the
Nobel Prize. Employing Josué de Castro's own words, Vera Callichio notes these
works were pioneering scientific works that denounced hunger as a “uma praga
fabricada pelo homem” and analyzed it as “a expressão biológica de um fenômeno
econômico: o subdesenvolvimento”.

With the international recognition achieved through these pioneering works, Josué de Castro went on to become President of the
Executive Council for the United Nation’s Food and Agriculture Division. This
recognition also translated into a professorship at the University of Paris when he
was forced into exile during the Brazilian military dictatorship in 1964.

One of the most interesting aspects of Monbeig's review of *Geografia da Fome*
is the way he situates this work in relation to the perception the French have had
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315 See *O Centro de Pesquisa e Documentação de História Contemporânea do Brasil, Dicionário Histórico-Biográfico Brasileiro,* April 22, 2013,
with Brazil both past and present. After introducing the scale of the problem of hunger in Brazil and noting the special relationship that France and Brazil have historically enjoyed, Monbeig writes:

```plaintext
Ce fut là, pendant longtemps, un article de foi pour bien des Français que se vantaient d'être de parfaits connaisseurs des problèmes brésiliens et de grands amis du peuple brésilien. Véritable paradis, ce Brésil, où, l'homme ne souffrant ni froid, ni de la faim, la question sociale n’existait pas.316
```

Essentially, he points out that the French conceptualization of Brazil has involved the notion of a tropical paradise. For Monbeig, the idea of dying of hunger challenges this romanticization of Brazil and this is one reason he found Josué de Castro's work valuable. While the book was not an entirely unprecedented study, Monbeig notes that it is one of the first works to be accessible to both a domestic and international audience.317 As he puts it, "jusqu'à présent celle-ci était principalement formée d'articles publiés dans des revues dont l'accès, déjà difficile au Brésil, l'est encore plus en Europe."318 This again highlights that Brazil's

---


317 Still, it should be noted that Josué de Castro was something of a pioneer. He was trained as a medical doctor and after graduating from the Faculdade de Medicina da Universidade do Rio de Janeiro in 1929, he began to turn his attention to public health and nutrition. Vera Calicchio writes that "Em 1932, por intermédio do Departamento de Saúde Pública do Estado de Pernambuco, orientou a realização de pesquisa pioneira sobre a qualidade e o padrão de vida do operariado nordestino. O inquérito, realizado entre as famílias operárias de Recife, foi inicialmente publicado pela Diretoria de Estatística e Publicidade do Ministério do Trabalho sob o título *As condições de vida das classes operárias*, voltando a aparecer em 1936 como um capítulo do livro *Alimentação e raça*, que trataria do problema da subsistência alimentar em seus aspectos econômicos e sociais. Com esse inquérito, Josué de Castro procurou demonstrar, através de dados estatísticos, que “o fator primário da alta mortalidade da população brasileira é o estado de pobreza que condiciona a fome coletiva”, documentando assim, segundo ele, “uma fase da evolução econômica e social do Nordeste”. Abrindo caminho para esse gênero de pesquisa, o estudo influiu no surgimento de investigações semelhantes em outras áreas do país." See O Centro de Pesquisa e Documentação de História Contemporânea do Brasil, "Josué de Castro," *Dicionário Histórico-Biográfico Brasileiro*, April 22, 2013, http://www.fgv.br/cpdoc/buscabuscabuscaConsultar.aspx.

intellectual infrastructure was still relatively new and was developing on a fully national scale in these years.

The idea of recognizing the reality of widespread hunger in Brazil that Monbeig credits Josué de Castro with was not only novel to French intellectuals who romanticized Brazil, but, as Stanley Blake points out, was also taboo for Brazilian elites up until the 1920s—even though famine was endemic to the northeast of the country. In the 1920s, Blake writes that "reformers, physicians, and public health officials began to take an interest in the subject," and as a result "eugenic and biotypological research of the late 1920s and early 1930s also led researchers to believe that poor diet contributed to physical underdevelopment."319 The Peranambucan government responded to the widespread problem of hunger, public health officials took the position that hunger resulted from "the general population's ignorance of what constituted a healthy diet," and not due to basic issues of economic distribution.320 Blake argues that to do so would have forced them to address broader political issues of social inequality.

Within this context, Josué de Castro’s writing was transformative. That being said, he carried out this work within a eugenicist framework; he argued in one of his early works that "as a eugenic problem, it cannot be forgotten that diet is one of the most important external factors in the constitution of vital biotypes and that it is by
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320 Stanley Blake, *The Vigorous Core of Our Nationality*, 141.
biotypological selection that the vital index of the race is raised." Following Blake, De Castro's work was transformative because he began "to place a greater emphasis on the social, economic, and racial dimensions of diet" and "also believed that hunger, rather than inherent biological and racial qualities, "translated into the inferiority of the anthropo-sociological characteristics" of the working and lower classes." Taken together, De Castro's continued belief in biotypes and eugenics along with his emphasis on the economic dimensions of the hunger problem and imputation that diet was an important factor in explaining physical differences "reflected the intellectual debates of his era." De Castro's idea that the physical differences of race could be explained through diet also put in squarely in the positivist tradition that held "that individuals and Brazilian society as a whole could be improved through government intervention."

Returning to Monbeig's review of De Castro's *Geografia da Fome*, it is clear that Monbeig was aware of the taboo surrounding hunger in Brazil. Likewise, he was aware of the intellectual milieu—in terms of hygiene and eugenics—in which De Castro operated. Along these lines, he writes that while certain *Cariocas* and *Paulistas* were unaware of the problem, "Pourtant l'alarme a été donnée et, là-bas,
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des hygiénistes et des géographes ont commencé d’étudier les questions alimentaires.”

What differentiates Monbeig’s comments on De Castro, from a contemporary reading of his work, however, is that Monbeig does not offer any criticisms of the underlying program of eugenicists like De Castro. This may be because eugenics had a softer tone in Brazil—being "practiced primarily as a means of social reform rather than a means of social and racial exclusion.”

When he does criticize De Castro, it is due to the discomfort De Castro shows in his discussing Central and Southern Brazil. In contrast to the expertise De Castro demonstrated in treating Amazonia and the sertão of Northeastern Brazil, Monbeig finds the discussion of Minas Gerais and São Paulo a collection of piecemeal facts and overgeneralizations. This is hardly surprising given De Castro’s background. He was native to Pernambuco—born in Recife in 1908—and returned there after graduating from the Faculdade de Medicina do Rio de Janeiro in 1929. As early as 1932, when he was teaching at the Faculdade de Medicina de Recife, he began to research issues concerning public health for the Departamento de Saúde Pública do Estado de Pernambuco. His expertise in the interior region of Amazonia derived from his work with the Comissão de Alimentação (CNA) in 1945. Up through the publication of Geografia da Fome, De Castro had held a number of university and


327 Stanley Blake, The Vigorous Core of Our Nationality, 148. Here Blake cites Dávila’s Diploma of Whiteness and Daniel J. Kevles, In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity (New York: Knopf, 1985). He expands on this saying that “It is clear, however, that eugenics had limited political appeal in Pernambuco and in Brazil as a whole. North American and European eugenics championed a racialized, white ideal that conformed to neither Latin American social and racial realities nor new understandings of national identity that idealized mixed-race, native Brazilians."
political posts in Rio de Janeiro, but spent no substantial time in São Paulo or Minas Gerais.\textsuperscript{328}

This would explain why, for example, in the case of Minas, Monbeig finds his discussion of iodine deficiency worthwhile and, in the case of Brésil 'Centro-Occidental', he critiques De Castro for the uniformity of the 'régimes alimentaires' that he attributes to vast regions. Looking at De Castro's equation of the Center West with corn, he asks if you can equate someone living in the highlands of Minas with someone who raises pigs in Parana. But, on the other hand, Monbeig does allow that De Castro's treatments of Central and Southern Brazil may also be due to the fact that these are areas of undernourishment or malnutrition rather than famine. Still, given his own research interests in these areas of Brazil, Monbeig's disappointment with De Castro is clear from his comment that:

\begin{quote}
Tout de même, les contacts culturels sont si variés, la gamme des climats commence tant à changer que l'on regrette que le sujet n'ait pas davantage retenu son attention et l'on souhaite qu'il fasse l'objet d'une étude sérieuse: moins spectaculaire, elle ne sera pas moins utile puisque c'est, précisément, le Brésil Méridional qui paraît surtout appelé à être un grand foyer de colonisation.\textsuperscript{329}
\end{quote}

Here we see Monbeig arguing that although less dramatic than the cases of endemic famine in the Northeast and Amazonia, the issue of hunger in São Paulo is important because this is an area of widespread immigration and development. Monbeig's critical remarks also make it clear that he critiques De Castro for not fully taking into account the diversity of Brazil.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{footnote} \textsuperscript{328} These biographical details derive from See O Centro de Pesquisa e Documentação de História Contemporânea do Brasil, "Josué de Castro," \textit{Dicionário Histórico-Biográfico Brasileiro}, April 22, 2013, http://www.fgv.br/cpdoc/busca/Busca/BuscaConsultar.aspx. \end{footnote}

\begin{footnote} \textsuperscript{329} Pierre Monbeig, "Au Brésil: La «géographie de la faim» de Josué de Castro," 499. \end{footnote}
\end{footnotesize}
Nonetheless, Monbeig's interests in De Castro's work and the themes evoked by *Geografia da fome* extend beyond Brazil. In a move reminiscent of Braudel, whose general impulse was to critique the nationalist framework of the Brazilian authors he read in order to move towards world history, Monbeig wants to extend De Castro's themes because "[d]es enseignements d'une portée plus vaste s'en dégagent." Limiting the ideas in this work would, in his words, "diminuer le mérite de cet ouvrage que d'en resteindre l'intérêt aux questions brésiliennes." What he finds particularly relevant in De Castro's work is the idea that care needs to be taken in applying international standards to tropical climates. In this regard, he observes that doctors like De Castro have conducted studies on how the metabolism functions differently in relation to climate and not just in terms of the temperature, but also humidity. He then speaks of how "La Géographie de la Faim au Brésil n'est donc qu'un des multiples aspects d'un problème singulièrement plus complexe, celui du comportement des Blancs dans les régions tropicales." While this comment evokes a colonial *topos*, it is somewhat mitigated by Monbeig's elaboration that this Brazilian contribution to knowledge is welcome relief from "l'égocentrisme que les auteurs européens et nord-américains manifestent trop facilement." Still, by ending his review by saying that France and Europe are beginning to know through painful effort the tropical countries of the world "parce que jusqu'à présent

---


nous avons été plus pressés d’en tirer des profits que désireux d’y vivre,” Monbeig appears to endorse a colonial logic. This is because he seems to treat the tropics as a land where France and Europe should have a physical presence. His last sentence speaks of how everything that contributes to posing questions and clarifying the issues involved "est d’un prix intellectuel et humain inestimable."

In addition to assessing Josué de Castro’s work, Monbeig also reviewed João Dias da Silveira’s 1946 monograph, *Estudo geográfico dos contrafortes ocidentais da Mantiqueira*. This brief review appears as part of larger piece coauthored in 1949 with Fernand Braudel and Paul le Cointe entitled, "Au Brésil: L’homme et La nature en Amérique Méridionale." In it Monbeig provides a sense of the state of geographical studies in Brazil as well as his own geographical interests.

He notes that this study of the Mantiqueira (a mountainous region that traverses the states of São Paulo and Minas Gerais) is valuable because it is one of the few intelligent examples of a regional geographic study done in Brazil. The study provides an analysis of which cantons come under *paulista* influence and which are *mineran* and effectively captures how these cantons fare within a boom-bust economic cycle. Dias da Silveira shows how coffee farming began, developed into large plantations, employed immigrant labor, led to the development of railroads and then went into retreat due to a number of economic crises. The study also effectively demonstrates tensions between this highly capitalized form of agriculture with *caipira* culture—a more traditional peasant form of agriculture

---


involving the raising of some maize, manioc, a few cows and pigs. Monbeig's hope is that Dias da Silveira will continue to find the time to continue to develop and extend his study of this region of contacts between paulistas and mineiros.

Monbeig's review of Dias da Silveira was combined in a larger piece, "Au Brésil: L'Homme et La nature en Amérique Méridionale." This larger piece contained Fernand Braudel's reviews of Aroldo de Azevedo's work as well as Paul le Cointe reporting on his own work. Braudel's review along with Monbeig's are further examples of the role of the French University Mission in facilitating the intellectual exchange of ideas between France and Brazil. In the brief introduction to the larger piece, the authors write of how the young Brazilian school of geography—exemplified by Aroldo de Azevedo and José Dias de Silveira—exemplify the spirit of the French geographer Paul Vidal de la Blache who exerted a powerful influence on the Annales group. As they put it, the connection between Vidal de la Blache lies in interest in connecting the analysis of human concerns and problems with an understanding of physical phenomena.

This interaction between human communities and the natural landscape features prominently in Aroldo de Azevedo's work *Suburbios orientais de São Paulo*. The overall tone of Braudel's review is positive. Braudel calls Azevedo a young master and complements his choice of studying a marginal neighborhood in the course of expanding. Braudel complains that normally researchers take the whole of an urban zone instead of the progressively expanding limits. He complements Azevedo for his overview of the topography of the eastern suburbs and success in combining the historic backdrop with economic aspects. In his view, Azevedo does
a good job describing the mosaic of neighborhoods of Penha, Itaquear, São Miguel, Itaquaquecetuba, and Poá as well as evoking how these names relate "un passé métisse."

While Braudel sees much promise in Azevedo and his work, he finds it lacking in a couple of regards. Despite its promise it does not pull enough out of the study. For Braudel, there is too much generalization and the conceptualization needs to be sharpened. He explains that the study is more static than dynamic. In his words, "Les remous de cette frange urbaine ne nous éclairent pas suffisamment sur les phases et la nature de la poussée de la grande ville."336 In short, it is unclear how these suburbs relate to the overall dynamic of urban growth. Braudel continues on in this vein saying that we don't see how land valuation and speculation come into play. Additionally, the boundary between the city and country doesn't appear to be looked at closely enough and Azevedo does not pay much attention to the forward frontier and the way the city eats away at the plain. To paraphrase Braudel—millions of element that are worth studying are ignored.

Despite this criticism, it is clear that Braudel thought highly of Azevedo. He went on to review two more of his works—"A região de Joaizeiro e Petrolinan" and "O Reconcavo de Bahia." Both of these articles deal with Bahia and are small-scale studies with "A região de Joaizeiro e Petrolinan" looking at two twin cities located on the São Francisco river and "O Reconcavo de Bahia" looking at Salvador da Bahia. Again, Braudel finds much that is valuable and even original in these works. He, nonetheless critiques Azevedo for not paying attention to the small sailboats in the

picturesque bay which he refers to as the "Méditerrannée bahianese." This reference to the "Méditerrannée bahianese" again suggests how Braudel connected Brazil to the larger Mediterranean world (see Chapter 1). But on a more substantial note, he criticizes Azevedo for not providing more emphasis on social and cultural facts. Braudel would like to see more emphasis on the relationship between Bahian society and its geography.

**Conclusion**

The above section demonstrates that Roger Bastide, Fernand Braudel, and Pierre Monbeig published a substantial number of articles and reviews that engage the works of Brazilian intellectuals. In their assessments of these intellectuals, Bastide, Braudel, and Monbeig, show themselves to be very much in line with the Febvre's conceptualization of a program for Latin American research. This can be discerned through the positive remarks they make about works by Brazilian thinkers that provide an outline of the overall contours of Brazilian society by synthesizing material elements together with psychological and linguistic elements.

For example, in Monbeig's treatment of Fernando Azevedo's *Um trem corre para Oeste*, Monbeig applauds Azevedo for being able to think of the railway in terms of a broader system of communications that considers more than the material dimensions of the railway system. Likewise, Braudel credited Caio Prado Jr. for providing a historical explanation of the fall of the Imperial system that took into account not just the most obvious political facts, but also the psychological, cultural, and economic and social dimensions of this shift. Along these same lines, Roger
Bastide looked positively on literary contributions to social science because of their ability to provoke questions about the collective social mentality of Brazil. Although literature by itself failed to provide scientific answers to these questions, Bastide thought they provided problem content around which historical and sociological studies could be developed. Pierre Monbeig’s discussion of Josué de Castro’s study of hunger complimented de Castro for synthesizing social, economic, and racial factors in his investigation of a seemingly physical problem. Finally, Braudel wrote approvingly of the Brazilian school of geography’s ability to integrate human concerns, history, and economics into the study of geography.

All of these examples cohere with Febvre’s distrust of the localized case-study that fails to bridge multiple disciplines and dimensions of human experience. Thinkers who failed to do this, such as Antônio Carneiro Leão, were criticized severely. In addition to sharing Febvre's interest in a holistic mapping of Brazilian society, Bastide, Braudel, and Monbeig are of the same mind with Febvre regarding the comparative method. Carneiro Leão was castigated for failing to include a comparative element in his Panorama sociologique du Brésil whereas Azevedo was cheered for his comparison between European and Brazilian railways. Pierre Monbeig looked to extend Josué de Castro’s work on diet by thinking through what his work meant in terms of applying international standards to the tropics. Further, Braudel’s criticism of Caio Prado Junior heavily emphasized Prado Jr.'s failure to transcend a nationalistic framework. These criticisms strongly echo Febvre's desire to understand Brazilian and Latin American history as an exploration of the limits of European thought and material culture. Likewise, the suggestions offered regarding
how the works reviewed might be improved generally involve broadening the context from Brazil to the Atlantic world and beyond.

The work of Bastide, Braudel, and Monbeig also shows that Brazilian thinkers influenced French social scientists to reflect on race as a sociological and historical factor. This is most clearly the case with regard to Roger Bastide’s work (which will be treated more fully in the following chapter). From the above example of Bastide discussing Paulo Prado, it is clear that Bastide valued even literary and outmoded treatments of race in Brazil as valuable for the social scientific questions they provoked. Likewise, in his discussion of how social scientific studies of race were advancing beyond the simplistic assumptions nineteenth century ‘ethnic psychology,’ Bastide found Fernando de Azevedo’s work informative for its ability to apply social and historical analysis to race. Monbeig’s discussion of Josué de Castro provides evidence that Monbeig saw in de Castro’s example the need to account for race as a social factor within the field of human geography.

Besides provoking these French social scientists to conceptualize how race should be studied, Brazilian thinkers helped shatter a romanticized idea of Brazil that was a feature of French thought since at least Montaigne. Pierre Monbeig makes this point explicitly in his review of Josué de Castro. In exposing the degree that hunger was a problem in Brazil, de Castro shattered a taboo and provided a more realistic image of the country. Similarly, literary treatments of Brazil provided Bastide with a sense of how profoundly race produced a sense of alienation in Brazil. The next chapter will investigate more fully Bastide’s and the Annale’s engagement of race in Brazil and demonstrate how this engagement was brought
home to bear on issues of race and decolonization facing France.
CHAPTER 4
REFLEXIVE DIMENSIONS OF THE STUDY OF BRAZIL IN THE ANNALES: RACE AND THE LIMITS OF EMPIRE

Introduction

The previous chapter focused on the research program articulated by Lucien Febvre in the postwar period (1945-1960) as well as the research network that developed between French and Brazilian thinkers as a result of the French University Mission. It argued that the writings of Roger Bastide, Fernand Braudel, and Pierre Monbeig published in the Annales during in the postwar era aligned with the objectives Febvre articulated for a program of Latin American studies. It also argued that Brazilian social scientists influenced their French counterparts to abandon romanticized conceptions of Brazil and think substantively about race as a category of social and historical analysis.

This chapter follows up the work done in the previous chapter by focusing on why the study of race was of contemporary relevance to French social scientists and how it was treated in the pages of the Annales. This chapter argues, on the basis of Febvre's research program and the extensive space the Annales devoted to Brazilian themes, that French social scientists saw Brazil as a historical example of racial and ethnic fusion that suggested a way to understand what a postcolonial world would look like. Further, Brazil served as a model to interrogate France's colonial past and to integrate the study of race into the social sciences. This was a particular resonant
issue during the period examined (1945-1964), because this was the era in which France lost most of its colonial possessions.

To make this argument, the chapter begins by returning to Lucien Febvre and the program he articulated for Latin American studies. It shows Febvre was also interested in Latin America and Brazil, in particular, because Brazil provided a model for thinking through the process of decolonization. After articulating this reflexive dimension of Febvre’s program, the chapter looks at Roger Bastide’s work on race and shows Bastide’s attempt to formulate an appropriate social and historical language to speak about race. In the process of doing so, Bastide challenged Brazil’s myth of racial democracy and provided French social scientists with a model for challenging racial exclusion in France. Pierre Monbeig’s work on Japanese immigration to Brazil becomes the focus of the next part of the chapter and shows that Monbeig thought of São Paulo as a living laboratory that could illuminate contemporary and historical issues.

The final section of the chapter concludes with a discussion of how Braudel thought of Brazil within a global framework. The writings discussed here show that Braudel saw Brazilian history as key to understanding how dominance shifted from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic world. Braudel’s project was motivated by a desire to understand France’s colonial fortunes and its failure to become an Atlantic world power. This along with Febvre’s reflection on France’s failure to establish a presence in Brazil during the 16th century provide evidence that Brazil was conceptualized as the outer limit of the French Empire. At the time these reviews were written, France failure as a colonial power was of great contemporary
relevance. The role of Brazil in France’s past thus served as a way to imagine a post-colonial France.

**Lucien Febvre, Gilberto Freyre, and Europe’s Future**

In the previous chapter, Lucien Febvre’s research program was examined in detail. Febvre gave two major reasons why the study of Brazil was important: the special problems it posed would force historians to revitalize the historical profession and its study would lead to an understanding of limits of Western culture and society. This chapter begins by discussing a third reason Febvre provided regarding the importance of studying Brazil—it served as a signpost for the European future.

In the preceding chapter, Febvre’s envy for Brazilian social scientists like Gilberto Freyre was discussed. Febvre was envious of Freyre because of the freedom he enjoyed in studying Brazilian society without the burden of entrenched institutions and traditions. Unlike Freyre, Febvre felt himself weighed down by an institutional rivalry with the Sorbonne and a tradition that emphasized political and narrative history.337 Despite the weight of this rivalry, Febvre still felt that Brazil offered a potential object of study that would broaden French historical methods. With regard to Freyre’s work, Febvre also suggested a deeper historical and contemporary connection between Brazil and France.

Besides these two reasons for studying Brazil, Febvre saw in Gilberto Freyre’s work a third reason to engage Brazilian history—he thinks that Brazil

---

forecasts Europe’s future. In his review of Freyre’s *The Masters and Slaves*, Febvre argued that only through intentional stupidity could "l’Europe peut se désintéresser de leçons aussi saisissantes que les leçons brésiliennes."³³⁸ Febvre makes clearer what he means by these 'leçons brésiliennes,' in the introduction he wrote to Roger Bastide’s published translation of this work. In the course of speaking about Freyre’s analysis of racial and ethnic fusion in Brazil, Febvre comes to comment on its contemporary import:

Partout, ils voient se révolter contre eux ces peuples de couleur (et, de quelques-uns, à dire d’anthropologues, la couleur est blanche) -- qu’ils n’ont voulu détruire ni physiquement ni moralement, mais qu’avec une enfantine légèreté, ils ont cru pouvoir à leur heure, à leur gré, et dans la mesure qui leur convenait, assimiler et, pour parler leur langage, éléver au niveau du Blanc civilisé. Et voici que ces peuples secouent leur joug. Non qu’ils aient la force. Provisoirement, elle reste aux mains de ces Occidentaux qui sont pour tant d’autres contrées des Orientaux. Mais l’employer, cette force -- la chose, moralement, s’avère malaisée. Et cette gêne égalise dans une certaine mesure les chances et les pouvoirs. De la force, les non-Européens en ont assez pour revendiquer contre les Blancs d’Europe leur droit humain d’être libres. De se faire responsables de leurs propres destins. De renouer le fil rompu avec leurs vieilles civilisations -- ces civilisations que, bien souvent, les Blancs eux-mêmes, par le noble effort de leurs savants, ont sauvées de l’oubli et restituées à leurs légitimes héritiers.³³⁹

What we see here, given the year (1952) in which Febvre is writing, is an extended reflection on the challenges to European colonial rule in the postwar era. At this time, France was fully engaged in a war to retain Indochina while experiencing growing unrest in Algeria. While Febvre thinks that for the moment, the West continues to keep a grip on its colonies, the old colonial logic with its racial hierarchy has been broken. In so far as Freyre’s Brazil offers Westerners a window onto a historical experiment of racial and ethnic fusion, it provides an example to


think through the present. Or, as Febvre puts it, "il nous invite, de la façon la plus pressante, à la réfléchir à ce qu’ils signifient."\(^{340}\)

This line of thinking about Brazil as a model to think through the problems confronting European civilization dovetails with Febvre’s more general reflections on the importance of studying Latin America. In his introduction to the 1948 special edition on Latin America, Febvre writes:

> Ce grand trouble que nous ressentons tous, quand nous nous interrogeons sur le lendemain de nos civilisations — quand, pressés que nous sommes, vieux peuples répandus, à des époques diverses de notre histoire, hors de leur foyer d’origine, dans des pays neufs qu’il s’agissait à la fois d’exploiter, d’asservir et tout de même, de façonner un peu à notre image — nous nous demandons, non sans angoisse, ce que sera demain la civilisation commune de la planète quand, tous barrages rompus, toutes écluses ouvertes, les eaux s’établiront à un niveau moyen: infiniment plus bas, peut-être, que le niveau des parties privilégiées de notre monde, infiniment plus haut certainement que le niveau des parties les plus déshéritées de notre monde, infiniment plus haut certainement que le niveau des parties les plus déshéritées de notre monde, infiniment plus haut certainement que le niveau des parties les plus déshéritées de notre monde.

This passage communicates Febvre’s diagnosis of the challenge faced by Europe in the Postwar era. Acknowledging the history of Europe’s emigration overseas to new lands, he asks what will happen to the planet’s common civilization when all the barriers that have previously been erected (and here it seems save to assume he is making reference to colonial and racial hierarchies) are washed away and through a process of entropy a certain equilibrium establishes itself. The anxiety brought on by this leveling tsunami is something Febvre acknowledges to be more keenly felt in Latin America where he sees social and racial hierarchies increasingly threatened. He continues on to say that:

> Plus de soucis pressants: car pour nous, le péril n’est pas dans nos foyers. Les masses indigènes vivent hors de nos limites. Hors de notre continent. Dans les terres lointaines que


\(^{341}\) Lucien Febvre, "L’amérique du sud devant l’histoire," 390.
Here Febvre argues that Latin American nations, like Brazil, have and are continuing to experience the type of racial and social unrest that appear on the European horizon. How this will unfold, both for Latin America and for Europe, is in his phrase a mystery of tomorrow. Nonetheless, this basic problematic ties French and South American historians together. In so far as Latin America is in advance of Europe in confronting what will become a global problem, Febvre sees it as a kind of object lesson for French historians.

**The Annales and the Issue of Race in Brazil**

The works of Gilberto Freyre served as the centerpiece for the *annalists* discussions of race in the period spanning 1945-1967. Gilberto Freyre's centrality in these discussions should not be surprising given his place in the Brazilian public sphere and the promotion of his ideas by Brazilian political and intellectual elites. In arguing that "Much of the perception of another country's system of social stratification is molded by the way in which intellectuals (including social scientists) and politicians have presented that system to foreign observers," Thomas Skidmore explicitly notes how "Legions of foreign observers of Brazilian race relations have looked little farther than the works of Gilberto Freyre as their prime source in

---

342 Lucien Febvre, "L'amérique du sud devant l'histoire," 390.
interpreting his country's system of social stratification."343 Skidmore advances these points in order to explain why Brazil’s Myth of Racial Democracy held such sway through the 1990s and explains, in a later interview, that Brazil’s promotion of its image of softer racial relations was part of "a geopolitical intellectual contest" where "the whole question of race turns out to be an extremely important weapon in the defense of national honor." 344 This geopolitical contest was, of course, with the United States, and 'softer' race relations permitted Brazil with one metric whereby it could claim superiority with the United States.345

Yet, despite recognizing the importance of Freyre’s work, in terms of both its methodology and its recognition of the role of African culture in Brazil’s historical and cultural identity, the annalists as a whole were critical of his interpretation of race relations in Brazil. This was partly because those those, like Braudel, Bastide, and Monbeig, who spent substantial time in Brazil as a result of the French University Mission, had been able to experience the reality of Brazilian race relations for themselves. They also drew upon a broader palette of Brazilian sociologists, historians, and geographers as the proceeding section shows.

Mention of Freyre’s work in the Annales began as early as 1943 when Fernand Braudel reviewed Casa Grande e Senzala in the Mélanges d’histoire sociale


344 Jerry Dávila, Zachary R. Morgan and Thomas Skidmore, "Interview: Since 'Black into White': Thomas Skidmore on Brazilian Race Relations," Americas 64, no. 3 (Jan. 2008), 415.

345 As Skidmore puts it, "The pervasive problem for Brazilians was how one measured oneself against the U.S. It was constant. Brazilians had to concede that Americans had better automobiles, more movies and so on, but felt strongly that this was outweighed by the fact that they had better race relations." See Jerry Dávila, Zachary R. Morgan and Thomas Skidmore, "Interview: Since 'Black into White': Thomas Skidmore on Brazilian Race Relations," 410.
(a wartime substitute for the *Annales* after the French defeat that was published sporadically). Braudel's review of Freyre entitled, "A Travers une Continent d'Histoire: Le Brésil et l'oeuvre de Gilberto Freyre," introduced Freyre's work to a French academic audience as we have seen in Chapter 1. Briefly restated, Braudel praised Freyre for his experimental methods, literary skill as well as for the passion and poetry he brought to his study. He criticized him for trying to cast all of Brazil in the light of the Northeast and for the conclusions that Freyre drew with regard to miscegenation softening racial relations in Brazil. Nonetheless, Braudel did commend Freyre's treatment of race in terms of his willingness to integrate race, sexuality, gender, and patriarchy in the intimate portrait of domestic life he draws of life on the seigneurial estate in *Casa Grande*.

Along with Braudel, Lucien Febvre saw Freyre's work as tremendously important. Brazil, in Febvre's view, offered a window onto a historical experiment of racial and ethnic fusion that could serve as guide in a period when European colonialism was breaking down and along with the racist logic supporting it. Febvre was less critical of Freyre than Braudel—he applauded Freyre for his intimate knowledge of both Brazil and Portugal, his artistry and experimental method, and for his focus on race and sexuality in Brazilian history. Nonetheless, he was wary of the portrait of plantation life Freyre drew and warned against making this history seem idyllic stating:

Non, rien d'une idylle. Il est facile d'accumuler les témoignages les récits contrôles de tant d'actes épouvantables: noirs liés vivants à la bouche d'un canon et recevant le projectile par le travers du corps ou mulâtres trop aimées du maître, dont la femme blanche, pour une
fois jalouse, ordonnait qu'on arrache les beaux yeux—et qu'on les apporte au dessert, tout sanglants, à l'infidèle de coeur.346

Despite this criticism, what was most important was that Freyre raised interesting questions about a post-colonial future. It was not that Freyre’s conclusions or that his book provided any solutions as France and Europe more generally adjusted to a new reality, but rather that that "il [Freyre] nous invite, de la façon la plus pressante, à la réfléchir à ce qu'ils signifient."347

While Braudel and Febvre engage the works of Freyre at length, Roger Bastide cited and commented on Freyre’s work more frequently within the Annales from 1945 to 1964. Bastide drew on Freyre in three articles published in the Annales in this period, while Braudel mentioned him twice in passing, and Febvre’s engagement was limited to the review he published of Bastide’s translation.348 This is hardly surprising given Bastide’s interest in African religions in Brazil and race relations. This section will focus on the articles he published in the Annales during this period while drawing on a few related articles published in other journals and anthologies. The point is to illuminate both that members of the French University Mission did not buy the notion that Brazil’s race relations were 'soft' as well as to show that a highly sophisticated discussion of race was developed in this period that did not involve the notion of radical difference.


Before engaging Bastide’s writings on race in Brazil, however, it is necessary to provide the appropriate context for them by setting them against the historical backdrop of the study of race relations in Brazil.

**Brazil and the Study of Race in Historical Perspective**

Brazil imported the largest number of slaves in the Americas and was the last nation to abolish slavery. Yet, it has enjoyed the reputation of having 'soft' race relations since its independence in 1822. The idea that Brazil was and is a racial democracy has been discredited within both the North American and Brazilian social scientific communities for at least the past forty years. "Indeed, there has not been a single attempt by a Brazilian, in recent decades, to build a scholarly case, based on evidence as opposed to ideal or myth, that Brazil is in fact a society without racism," writes John French in an article from 2000.349 Thomas Skidmore observed that scholarly consensus that Brazil was a racial democracy began to shift in the 1950s with the UNESCO studies on Brazil. Although these studies generally attributed the social inequalities faced by Afro-Brazilians to a "consequence of Brazilian underdevelopment, of the poverty trap in which most of the population, both white and non-white languished," Skidmore notes that "Brazil did not escape, unscathed."350 But still, because scholars in the 1950s emphasized class and not race it was seen as less racist than the United States. Working with quantitative data from the 1950s onwards that was initially suppressed by the Instituto Brasileiro

---


Geografia e Estatística, demographers have cast doubt "on the traditional view of Brazil as a multi-racial society in which subtle racial gradations render almost inoperable any attempt at quantitative analysis of social stratification by race."\textsuperscript{351} As John French puts it, scholarship in the late 1970s by George Reid Andrews, Nelson do Valle Silva, Carlos Hasenbalg, and Charles Wood, "tended to rebut with statistical evidence, the supposition that mixed race Brazilians occupied a distinct 'middle' position between Black and white."\textsuperscript{352}

Yet despite this scholarship, the myth of racial democracy has persisted both domestically and internationally. In 1994, Michael Hanchard published a monograph, \textit{Orpheus and Power: The Movimento Negro of Rio De Janeiro and São Paulo, Brazil}, which moved away from quantitative analyses of racism "to push the study of Brazilian racial inequality into more qualitative areas," with the aim of demonstrating "the cultural and political forms of inequality that have impeded the development of racially specific, Afro-Brazilian modes of consciousness and mobilization."\textsuperscript{353} Hanchard uses Gramsci's notion of hegemony to situate race in Brazilian national politics and argues that:

\begin{quote}
What distinguishes Brazil from any other plural society in the New World is that no other nation has had such an elaborate "solution" to the "problem" of racial and cultural pluralism. Racial democracy and its attendant racist ideology of whitening was "the result of the elite's struggle to reconcile Brazil's actual social relations—the absence of a clear line between white and nonwhite—with the doctrines of scientific racism that had penetrated Brazil from
\end{quote}


abroad," and greatly influenced the course of Brazilian history, race relations and national identity. In making the case for this, Hanchard traces the evolution of Brazil's fictional racial exceptionalism from the time of slavery through the construction of the myth of racial democracy under Freyre.

Starting in response to international anti-abolitionist fervor in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, "Anti-abolitionist Brazilian elites, including the bishop of the Brazilian Catholic church, began concocting favorable representations of Brazilian slavery for foreign consumption, especially for British audiences (para ingles ver)." This began a tradition of Brazilian artists, intellectuals, and diplomats depicting slavery in Brazil as more benign than in other nations or colonial possessions. In this tradition, Hanchard indicates that it was not uncommon to depict slave life in Brazil as better than life for the toiling classes in Europe. The resultant "image of a racial paradise in Brazil, effectively internationalized the myth of racial democracy and provided Brazil with an "escape clause" from a race relations critique until the 1950s." Hanchard illustrates how effective this myth was citing its impact on African Americans like Booker T. Washington, W.E.B. Dubois, and Henry McNeal Turner as well as scholars of race.

---


356 As Hanchard puts it, "Some went so far as to suggest that the living conditions of Brazilian slaves were superior to those of the working classes in some European countries." See Michael George Hanchard, *Orpheus and Power: The Movimento Negro of Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo Brazil*, 48.

such as Frank Tannenbaum. He argues that Gilberto Freyre was likewise influenced by it, and updated it in a way that "Freyre's pastoral scene became the basis for Brazil's self-portrait for the latter half of the twentieth century."\textsuperscript{358}

Perhaps the best gauge of how influential Brazil’s myth of racial democracy remained up through the twenty-first century is the response that Hanchard’s deconstruction of the myth occasioned. In their article, "The Cunning of Imperialist Reason," Pierre Bourdieu, the eminent French anthropologist, philosopher, and sociologist, and L\'\oe i Wacquant assert that Hanchard’s book instantiates "the quasi-universalization of the US folk concept of "race" as a result of the worldwide export of US scholarly categories."\textsuperscript{359} Besides posing as a 'messenger of liberation' who, with other 'progressive intellectuals' actually promote the hegemonic interests of the U.S. and the 'rampant McDonaldization of thought,' Hanchard is guilty of projecting racism "on a society without racism."\textsuperscript{360}

As John D. French rightly points out in his counter-critique of Bourdieu and Wacquant, "there has not been a single attempt by a Brazilian, in recent decades to build a scholarly case, based on evidence as opposed to ideal or myth, that Brazil is in fact a society without racism."\textsuperscript{361} But, he adds that it continues to persist as the

\textsuperscript{358} Michael George Hanchard, \textit{Orpheus and Power: The Movimento Negro of Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo Brazil}, 54

\textsuperscript{359} This is John French paraphrasing Bourdieu and Wacquant. See John D. French, "The Missteps of Anti-Imperialist Reason: Bourdieu, Wacquant, and Hanchard's Orpheus and Power," 10.

\textsuperscript{360} See John D. French, "The Missteps of Anti-Imperialist Reason: Bourdieu, Wacquant, and Hanchard's Orpheus and Power."

"folk wisdom of Brazilians who do not conduct scientific research on the topic" and amongst "naive foreign observers and social scientists who have been taken in by the ambiguity and evasiveness of Latin American racial ideology, especially in its Brazilian form."362 French, for good reason includes Bourdieu and Wacquant amongst them.

While not exactly defending Bourdieu and Wacquant, a more recent study of race relations in Brazil published in 2004, Race in Another America: The Significance of Skin Color in Brazil attempts to make sense of the persistence of Brazil's myth of racial democracy in sociological terms.363 Edward Telles correctly notes that "Current scholars emphasize exclusion; past scholars emphasized race mixture. These two generations of scholars accepted either racial exclusion or inclusion as truth while ignoring or discrediting the other."364 He points out that one of the fundamental differences between the two generations of researchers was regional in nature and that "Regional differences are fundamental for understanding Brazilian society."365 Most of the 'classic' racial studies "focused almost entirely on


363/364 In fact, he quotes them as stating "Carried out by Americans and Latin Americans trained in the USA most of the recent research on racial inequality in Brazil strives to prove that, contrary to the image that Brazilians have of their own nation, the country of the "three sad races"...is no less racist than others" and comments that these remarks "do not derive from a careful or systematic understanding of the Brazilian racial system." For Telles, their work leaves the impression that there "seems to be little familiarity with Brazil." See Edward E. Telles, Race in Another America: The Significance of Skin Color in Brazil (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 10-11.

364 Edward E. Telles, Race in Another America: The Significance of Skin Color in Brazil, 6.

365 Edward E. Telles, Race in Another America: The Significance of Skin Color in Brazil, 19.
the northern half of Brazil, which were too often generalized to all of Brazil.\textsuperscript{366} Likewise, studies emphasizing discrimination and exclusion generally focused on southern regions like São Paulo.

While not disagreeing with the reality of racism in Brazil, Telles differentiates himself from the second generation by "considering the possibility that both racial inclusion and exclusion may coexist."\textsuperscript{367} To do this, he attempts to develop the appropriate sociological categories for understanding race and settles on 'vertical' and 'horizontal' relations. In his conception, vertical relations map onto economic class relations and are used to think through the mines of statistical data that indisputably capture racial exclusion in educational and professional dimensions. 'Horizontal' relations, in Telles's rendering, map onto "levels of sociability" that take into account aspects such as intermarriage and residential proximity. For Telles, in terms of sociability, it is understandable that "the high levels of intermarriage and low levels of residential segregation were key determinants," would have led the first generation of scholars of race in Brazil to conclude that race relations were indeed better than in the U.S. were more benign.\textsuperscript{368} And indeed, it is true that Brazilian nationalism "stressed integration through race mixture, rather than segregation" as was the case in the U.S.\textsuperscript{369} Still, despite this, Telles demonstrates that "hidden behind the façade of miscegenation, a racist culture is ubiquitous in all

\textsuperscript{366} Edward E. Telles, \textit{Race in Another America: The Significance of Skin Color in Brazil}, 21.

\textsuperscript{367} Edward E. Telles, \textit{Race in Another America: The Significance of Skin Color in Brazil}, 5.

\textsuperscript{368} Edward E. Telles, \textit{Race in Another America: The Significance of Skin Color in Brazil}, 217.

\textsuperscript{369} Edward E. Telles, \textit{Race in Another America: The Significance of Skin Color in Brazil}, 214.
social interactions among whites, browns, and blacks in virtually all social situations."370 Thus from a sociological point of view, Telles research is interesting because it shows that "fairly high rates of intermarriage and low levels of residential segregation do not necessarily imply greater acceptance of outgroups."371

This idea that racial intermarriage and miscegenation not incompatible with racism was articulated by Roger Bastide almost half a century before Edward Telles. In an article published in the journal, Race, in 1963, Roger Bastide wrote:

It seems then, in conclusion, that contrary to a widely-held opinion, closer relationships between the colours, whether in marriage or in simple sexual pleasure, are not a sign of absence of prejudice: the Dusky Venus hides the debasement of the black woman as a prostitute; and the Black Apollo is seeking revenge on the white man. It is not so much that love breaks down barriers and unites human beings as that racial ideologies extend their conflicts even into love's embrace.372

Thinking through what might seem a paradox of "racialism in its most savage, most withering forms," revealed when it might seem that courting by "partners of different color" would "seem to destroy race" leading the lovers to "rediscover the unity of the human species," Bastide argues that we must understand racial conflict "as a total social phenomenon."373 He goes on to explain:

by total social context we mean not only the present situation but also all the heritage of the past, of that more or less distant past which has sketched the pattern for the present, for human beings joined in the sexual act are not only bodies, but persons in a society, social beings, and endowed each of them with what Halbwachs called a 'collective memory.'374

370 Edward E. Telles, Race in Another America: The Significance of Skin Color in Brazil, 222.

371 Edward E. Telles, Race in Another America: The Significance of Skin Color in Brazil, 224.


Roger Bastide’s writings in the *Annales* from the late 1940s through early 1960s help explain how Bastide came to arrive at this conceptualization.

In this postwar period, we can see Bastide actively searching for a sociological language with which to study race. Despite being well ahead of his time in engaging issues of race and the diasporic transfer of culture between Africa and Brazil, Bastide remains a relatively neglected figure in both the American and French academies. To give an example, in citing the first and second generations of scholars of Brazilian race relations, Edward Telles neglects to cite Bastide despite citing the famous study he coauthored with his student, Florestan Fernandes, *Blacks and Whites in São Paulo*. This oversight is unfortunate, because in agreeing with Telles that "Race is an important organizing principle in both Brazil and the United States but in very different ways," and that studying Brazil is importing for "building a universal sociology of race," Bastide’s work appears to be a forgotten resource worth reflecting upon. His attempts to formulate a sociological language for the study of race will be the subject of the next section.

**Bastide’s Attempt to Formulate a Language for Studying Race in Brazil**

In addition to his introduction to the 1948 *Annales* edition, Lucien Febvre also introduced Roger Bastide’s comparative piece, "Dans les Amériques noires:

---

375 Telles cites Freyre along with Charles Wagley, Donald Pierson, Marvin Harris, and Carl Degler among the first group with Florestan Fernandes as a pioneer in challenging the idea that racial discrimination was benign in Brazil. Carlos Hasenbalg’s 1978 PhD dissertation at UC Berkeley is cited as the work that anchored generation scholarship that argued that racism was not a temporary feature in the development of a capitalist economy, as Fernandes had, but "would persist because racism had acquired new meanings since abolition and would continue to serve the material and symbolic interests of dominant whites through the qualification of nonwhites as competitors." See Edward E. Telles, *Race in Another America: The Significance of Skin Color in Brazil*, 9.
Afrique ou Europe?,” dealing with race in the United States and Brazil. While underlining the importance of studying race and outlining some of the challenges, Febvre introduced Bastide to the social scientific community by noting Roger Bastide’s longtime affiliation with the University of São Paulo and generously comments that Bastide exemplifies the best that the Annales has to offer.

As the title suggests, in "Dans les Amériques noires: Afrique ou Europe?,” Roger Bastide reflects on the extent that African culture survived in black communities across the Western Hemisphere as well as the degree European cultural forms destroyed African traditions. He begins his study with preliminary remarks on the problems and available methods for researching African culture in the Americas. For Bastide, accounting for the diversity of African cultures should be a primary imperative for any researcher and he sketches out the relationship between broad cultural groups in Africa (i.e., the Yoruba, Dahomey, Fanti-Ashanti, and Bantus) and diasporic concentrations of these groups in the Americas.

A second imperative he lays out in determining the degree to which African culture resisted the destructive influence of slavery and imposition of European cultural practices, involves understanding that both resistance to European cultural forms as well as assimilation exist along a continuum. In this spirit, the bulk of this 1948 article, devotes itself to meditating on the work of Melville Herskovitz’s 1941 Myth of the Negro Past—and thinking through whether and how Herskovitz’s concept of reinterpretation applies to his own studies of African studies in Brazil. Intervening in the debate between Franklin Frazier and Herskovitz over whether slavery destroyed African family structures and recreated new forms or recast these
forms in new guises, Bastide argues in favor of Herskovitz’s concept of reinterpretation which was used to describe how African traditions survived and were expressed in European forms despite the brutality of slavery. Citing Herskovitz’s work on Haiti and Trinidad, where Herskovitz finds that African traditions of polygamy survive amongst the priestly class but are expressed in European terms as marriage to one woman with a diverse set of mistresses, Bastide goes on to consider the Brazilian case by drawing upon his extensive fieldwork in Bahia, his own book, *Imagens do Nordeste*, Manuel Querino’s *Customes africanos no Brasil*, Gilberto Freyre’s *Casa Grande e Senzala*; Robert Walsh’s 19th century travel account, *Notices of Brazil*; the Jesuit, André João Antonil’s *Cultura e opulência do Brasil*; and Henry Koster’s 19th century *Voyages pittoresques*. Sifting through these multiple sources, Bastide concludes that Herskovitz’s conclusions for Haiti and Trinidad seem applicable to Brazil as far as familial forms are concerned.

But, he challenges Herskovitz’s idea when it comes to labor relations and religious life. Bastide argues that Herskovitz goes too far in extending the persistence of a cooperative form of labor that he observed in Haiti and Trinidad to Brazil. He summarizes his findings as follows:

Nous avons été ainsi amenés, en le suivant pas à pas dans quelques cas particuliers, à accepter la notion de réinterprétation pour la structure de la famille afro-américaine et pour le protestantisme de l’homme de couleur. Par contre, il nous a semblé que le concept de <<convergence>> devait lui être substitué pour le cas du travail coopératif au Brésil et celui de <<correspondance mystique>> dans le cas du syncrétisme entre la religion africaine et les saints catholiques. En un mot, la réinterprétation est un fait réel, mais son usage doit être limité. Ce n’est pas une clef qui puisse ouvrir toutes les serrures.376

So we see here that Bastide finds this concept of reinterpretation valid for speaking of Afro-American family structures in general, as well as for Afro-American religion in Protestant countries. In the case of labor practices, he finds convergence a more appropriate framing concept. And finally, in the case of Afro-American religion in Catholic countries, Bastide proposes the use of the term correspondance.

Bastide’s article is that it demonstrates his pursuit of a proper language with which to describe and explain Afro-Brazilian life. His engagement with Herskovits represents an attempt to build a lexicon with which to talk about race. The article also exhibits his immersion in Brazilian source materials—from travel accounts dating back to the eighteenth century, to more contemporary figures like Manuel Querino and Gilberto Freyre, to international social scientists working in Brazil like Emilio Willems and Herbert Baldus. We also see Bastide fully engaged with North American sociologists of race such as Melville Herskovits and Herbert Baldus. From Lucien Febvre’s introduction of Bastide, we see a leading intellectual figure lending intellectual capital to a junior scholar indicating the extent to which Febvre saw the importance of Bastide’s work.

Bastide’s engagement with race continues in the *Annales* with an review published in 1952 dealing with Arnold Rose’s *Negro’s Morale, Group Identification and Protest*. In this work published in 1949, Rose, a prominent American sociologist, examined the question of how racial consciousness developed amongst American blacks despite the numerous divisions in the community and obstacles to group solidarity. Besides summarizing the gist of Rose’s argument, Bastide reflects on the relevance of Rose’s work for thinking about Brazil.
While acknowledging that the racial situation in Brazil functions quite differently from that of the United States—with Brazil having no clear color line—he argues that economic competition in the large industrial centers restricted the access of blacks to a host of professions. He extends this argument and indicates that an anti-black racism is fully evident in São Paulo as well as a sense of black solidarity committed to fighting against racism.

What's particularly interesting about Bastide's article, however, is the reflexive dimension of his writing. He ends the article by reflecting on the relationship between minority groups in France. Suggesting a similar tension between African immigrants and existing minorities in France, he writes "Ce qui correspondrait davantage, dans le Sud du Brésil, à ce qui se passe ici vis-à-vis des immigrants: nous y trouverions la même ambivalence d'attitudes ou de sentiments. L'hésitation entre la solidarité et la xénophobie." This remark reflects the presentist concerns articulated by Febvre in laying out the program for the study of Brazil. In addition to this ending salvo, Bastide comments on Rose's remarks on the geopolitical use of race by the United States against the European powers. He writes that "Le premier point intéresse particulièrement les puissances coloniales, car les Blancs des États-Unis, tout en se séparant des Noirs, jouent avec le nationalisme noir contre les États d'Europe qui possèdent des territoires en Afrique." This again indicates reflexive dimension of his thinking on race and the broader context of decolonization.


Bastide’s attempts to formulate a language for a sociology of race can also be witnessed in a third article he wrote for the *Annales* during this period. In "Sous <<La Croix du Sud>>: L’Amérique latine dans le miroir de sa littérature," Bastide thinks through the relationship between literature and the social sciences. Ultimately, he argues that literature provides a rich source of personalized sociological experiences for social scientists to explore more systematically. In his words, "ils nous permettent de saisir, d’une façon bien plus satisfaisante qu’aucune autre méthode ne le permettrait, la signification des comportements collectifs, que le sociologue enregistre ou mesure."\(^{379}\) In addition to material that sociologists can rework into generalizations, literature also suggests new means of conceptualizing relationships between individuals and society that would otherwise be lost if sociology limited itself to a quantitative methodology.

While Bastide covers a vast array of Latin American literature, Brazil and the subject of race figure prominently in his article. Brazilian authors whose works he discusses include: Gracialino Ramos, Gilberto Freyre, and Jorge Amado. He also treats the novel, *Pourquoi*, partially set in Brazil by the Cuban novelist, Lydia Cabrera. On the topic of race, Bastide argues that novelistic treatments help expose a number of facts that would otherwise escape the attention of the sociologist. He argues that he would not have understood how "les sectes africaines ont pu être un instrument de passage de la résistance culturelle à la révolte économique par

dislocation de la mythologie ancestrale." Likewise, reading Cabrera’s novel focused his attention on the storyteller that has its roots in African tradition and helped explain how African religion persisted in Cuba as well as Brazil.

Stepping outside purely literary treatments, Roger Bastide speaks of the Gilberto Freyre as something of a hybrid—a cross between literature and social science—whose integration of literary methods with sociology he finds admirable. This is not to say that Bastide wholeheartedly accepts Freyre’s conclusions about race in Brazil. He notes that Freyre oversteps his bounds in drawing conclusions about the formation of Brazilian society on the basis of a regional study limited to the north-eastern state of Pernambuco. For this he draws on the criticism of the São Paulo School of Sociology. By the time Bastide published this article in the Annales, he had already collaborated with Florestan Fernandes, a former student and by the time of writing an eminent sociologist of this school, on the UNESCO publication Blacks and Whites in São Paulo Brazil. This was one of the pioneering works that debunked—on the level of social science—Brazil’s myth of racial democracy.

Bastide, along with Braudel, who had written a review of Gilberto Freyre’s Casa Grande e Senzala saw Freyre’s methods as innovative, but was not blind to his profoundly anti-modern sensibilities as well as the limitations of his regional studies.

Bastide and Discourses of Race in Brazil and France

Roger Bastide's studies of race and African culture at Brazil are relevant at this point in time because the questions and concerns that he shared with Lucien Febvre over racial and ethnic fusion in Brazil and the world at large seem particularly salient for contemporary France. In the recent scholarly anthology Black France/France Noire stemming from a 2008 [check] Reid Hall conference, the editors Trica Danielle Keton, T. Denean Sharpley-Whiting and Tyler Stovall, announce the book's attempt to "reconceptualize the socio-historical discourses, narratives, and formations underpinning discourses of race." Even if the Brazilian lessons Lucien Febvre hoped to extract through the annalists engagement with Brazil do not provide solutions to contemporary problems, it is nonetheless remarkable the degree to which he anticipated the questions to be raised by contemporary scholars of France. As an example, consider Elisabeth Mudimbe-Boyi’s article, "Black France: Myth or Reality? Problems of Identity and Identification," where she writes:

The influx of other populations and the demographic changes within the space of the Hexagon have given rise to an anxious questioning of what forms or defines French national identity today. Would a "Black France" constitute a threat to that identity? Is a "Black France" a given, a self-enclosed entity, a formed body, or a body in formation? Does "Black France" represent only a provisional moment in a transitional process? As against Febvre's forecasting of these issues as early as 1928:

Plus de soucis pressants: car pour nous, le péril n'est pas dans nos foyers. Les masses indigènes vivent hors de nos limites. Hors de notre continent. Dans les terres lointaines que nos aieux sont allés coloniser. Elles ne sont pas installées à demeure, et déjà depuis des

---


siècles--depuis plus longtemps que nous-mêmes--sur le sol que nous possédons. Et que nous appelons notre sol. Là-bas? La partie est engagée, qu'on le veuille ou non.\footnote{Lucien Febvre, "L'amérique du sud devant l'histoire," 390.}

From what Febvre says here—as well as his title "l'Amérique du Sud devant l'Histoire,"—it is clear (although still expressed in Eurocentric terms) that Latin America serves as a future past for both Europe and France.

In looking at the ways in which Brazilian race relations could provide an illuminating comparison for post-colonial France, Bastide is a compelling figure to consider because, in contrast to Febvre, he was very aware of imposing a Eurocentric conceptual scheme on the study of race and Afro-Brazilian culture. In his \textit{African Religions of Brazil}, a work that synthesizes much of the sixteen years of research he conducted while in Brazil, Bastide writes:

\begin{quote}
We for our part must be wary of our models of interpretation, our conceptual schemes, because we can always make them accommodate anything we want to put into them, the false along with the true. The role of ethnology consists in providing a solid base on which we can build. That is why, after outlining in an article the conceptual framework of my research, I embarked on a first-hand investigation of the Afro-Brazilian sects, with no preconceived ideas and without having any kind of theory in mind.\footnote{Roger Bastide, \textit{The African Religions of Brazil: Toward a Sociology of the Interpenetration of Civilizations} (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1960), 27.}
\end{quote}

This effort to question models of interpretation and conceptual schemes was on full display in the \textit{Annales} articles discussed above. In terms of his engagement of Brazilian culture, Bastide is also noteworthy in the extent to which he engaged Brazilian intellectuals. This is also evidenced above with his citations and discussions of Brazilian novelists and sociologists.

But this did not preclude Bastide from forming his own interpretations and exposing oversimplifications. While he was aware of the "criticism of "consular"
sociology," and saw it "as a useful warning against attempts to apply methods or concepts of European or North American sociologies to Brazilian realities," he did not see it as an impediment to a conceptualization "of the type that is subject to verification by facts, modeled on facts, and that changes as the facts change."385 It was on this basis, that Bastide was one of the first to challenge the Brazilian myth of racial democracy—or the idea that racial relations in Brazil were unproblematic in Brazil or at least softer than in the United States. Marcos Chor Maio has shown that Bastide through his close relationship with Alfred Metraux was instrumental in the decision by UNESCO to broaden the scope of its famous studies of racial relations conducted in the 1950s beyond Bahia to include the Brazilian southeast. As he puts it, the changes in the research design of the UNESCO project, which was original supposed to showcase the harmonious race relations of Bahia, were due to "the pressures exerted by social scientists who wished to include the Brazilian Southeast, a more urbanized and industrialized region that would reveal the racial tension existing in the larger Brazilian society."386 But Bastide wanted more to result from the UNESCO project than a series of academic projects, Marcos Chor Maio cites a letter he wrote to Metraux in which he argues that it was:

> important to give a practical direction to theoretical reflections in order to foster a cooperative attitude between white intellectuals and black associations. In this way, at least in the Southern part of Brazil, certain “taboos” could be broken and emerging tensions could be relieved. Bastide told Métraux about his plans to create a research center dedicated to


386 Marcos Chor Maio, "UNESCO and the Study of Race Relations in Brazil: Regional or National Issue?,” Latin American Research Review 36, no. 2 (2001), 120.
the black community of São Paulo that would pull blacks and whites together and seek to influence government actions.\textsuperscript{387}

This, as far as I know, was not realized by the UNESCO project, nonetheless Bastide's study, \textit{Brancos e Negros em São Paulo}, co-authored with former student turned pre-eminent Brazilian social scientist, Florestan Fernandes, is recognized as one of the first scholarly works to dismantle Brazil's myth of racial democracy.

Until recently, the consequences of Brazil's myth of racial democracy, as eloquently put by Michael Hanchard were "the absence of racial consciousness among Afro-Brazilians and, as a consequence, the non politicization of racial inequality by those who suffer most from it, and the continued discrimination against blacks in employment and education."\textsuperscript{388} In order to effectively combat racism in Brazil, Hanchard argued it would be necessary for activists to confront the public through "a consistent presentation of data and political language about Brazilian racial politics that contradicts official and unofficial, public as well as private transcripts about racial democracy."\textsuperscript{389} Since the 1994 publication of his book, Brazil has made significant strides in this direction both in terms of academic recognition of the problem and in terms of addressing racial disparities through anti-discrimination policies.

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{387} Marcos Chor Maio, "UNESCO and the Study of Race Relations in Brazil: Regional or National Issue?," 127.

\textsuperscript{388} Michael George Hanchard, \textit{Orpheus and Power: The Movimento Negro of Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo Brazil}, 73.
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While France does not have a myth of racial democracy, the role of Republican Universalism in suppressing discussion of minority identity and racial discrimination bears functional resemblance to Brazil’s tradition. With the creation of CRAN—or the Conseil Représentatif des Associations Noires—after the riots in 2005, work has begun to document statistically anti-black racism. And, as the editors of Black France argue, institutions like CRAN (and here the Comité pour la mémoire et l’histoire de l’esclavage and Alliance Noire Citoyenne can also be included), "are positioned, then, against and within the prevailing discourse of colorblind indivisibility, designating nonetheless an unmarked normative whiteness intrinsic to a powerful republican ideology expressed in the narrative, symbols, and representations of French national identity." The parallels between this 'discourse of a colorblind invisibility' carried out in a multi-ethnic, multi-racial France composed of--as Elisabeth Mudimbe-Boyi puts it--"an assemblage of micro-societies," and Brazil with its myth of racial democracy imposed on a similarly heterogeneous society should be clear. It also seems worth remarking that the aim of the anthology Black France in "reconceptualizing the socio-historical discourses, narratives and formations underpinning discourses of race." As such, its aim mirrors that of Michael Hanchard’s attempt to provide a counter-narrative to the myth of racial democracy in Brazil. The gap of a decade and a half between

---

Hanchard’s 1994 *Orpheus and Power* and *Black France* suggests again this trope of Brazil as future past for France.

In concluding, I want to be clear that I am not suggesting there are not enormous differences between the histories and practices of racial exclusion in Brazil and France. There are. Loic Wacquant in his *Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality* warns against easily collapsing what might be seemingly similar social phenomenon: the American ghetto, the Brazilian *favela*, and the French *banlieue* into a single analytic. This is important to keep in mind. Nonetheless, in thinking about historical comparisons of race in Brazil and France, Roger Bastide’s work is worth a look. Given his nationality he is immune to the criticisms Wacquant and Bourdieu have directed at U.S. social scientists like Hanchard for the "quasi-universalization of the U.S. folk concept of "race" as a result of the worldwide export of US scholarly categories." Further, because Bastide was extraordinarily scrupulous in subjecting his conceptual schemes to rigorous analysis and was consistently in the process of revising them his work could serve as a model for scholars trying to develop new paradigms for thinking through the complexity of race in France.

---

Pierre Monbeig: The Human Geography of Brazil and the European Past and Present

Like Roger Bastide, Pierre Monbeig’s studies of Brazilian society yielded insights for the study of European society both past and present. Monbeig thought of his studies of the population and development of Brazil’s vast terrain as yielding insight into historical problems such as population development in the ancient world. In this way, his work is linked to Lucien Febvre’s idea that the study of Brazil would lead to an understanding of the limits of European society and culture. The emphasis Monbeig placed on how issues of race and culture manifested themselves in Brazil’s 'pioneer zones,' also relates to Febvre’s idea that the study of Brazil would provide insight into the European future. This chapter section explores Monbeig's work on Brazil’s pioneer zones as it touches upon issues relevant to European past and present.

Where Global and Local Meet: Monbeig’s Pioneer Zones

Even though it falls slightly outside the chronology structuring this chapter, Monbeig's 1937 Annales article, "Les zones pionnières de l'État de São Paulo," is the logical place to begin this investigation of how Brazilian space was conceptualized. This article provides in condensed form many of the ideas that would be developed in his later monographs. It also exhibits Monbeig's profound curiosity about the internal geography of Brazil as well as his interest in understanding that geography within a global framework. It begins by conveying the strangeness of the pioneer zones of the Alta Paulista, Alta Sorocabana, and northern part of state of Parana for the new arrival to Brazil. These landscapes juxtapose intact ancient forest with
newly established plantations and towns buzzing with feverish activity. These places distort new arrivals', like Monbeig, sense of time—towns of less than twenty years are considered old and the oldest are a mere thirty years.

While this strange juxtaposition fascinates, Monbeig eschews being content with the exotic veneer of these spaces. Placing these zones within a larger global framework, he cites the work of the American geographer, Isaiah Bowman, and those associated with him in providing descriptions of pioneer zones in Canada, Australia, Manchuria, and Patagonia. Although all these landscapes share certain characteristics, Monbeig notes that they also "se révèle passionnément variée pour qui cherche plus loin qu'une impression de voyageur."392 His goal is to understand these variations and the particular characteristics of these Brazilian spaces while simultaneously keeping in mind how they cohere with broader global phenomenon.

In terms of similarities, the Alta Paulista, Alta Sorocobana, and northern part of Parana have all developed along river networks, but the populations are clustered in the plateaus rather than the valleys because malaria posed a threat in the low river valleys. Northern Parana is also at a higher elevation than the Alta Paulista and Alta Sorocobana and has the terra roxa (red soil) perfect for planting coffee. These variations would escape the casual traveler, but nonetheless make for different specializations in each of these regions even if these differences did not yet create vast economic contrasts. In looking more closely at these regions, Monbeig wants to understand how these pioneer zones developed and how they connect

with the broader region anchored by the city of São Paulo. As he puts it, he wants to know "comment se fondent et se développent des centre urbains reliés par la voie ferrée et les routes," and "quelle est la place de la zone pionnière dans la collectivité pauliste."393

Monbeig’s writing yields some fascinating ideas in the course of answering these questions. The role of land speculation in the creation of these pioneer zones is the first major aspect he studies. He notes that the way this functions in São Paulo state varies considerable from what happens in the north of Parana. In São Paulo, individuals or families generally buy large plantation style blocks of land in the interior with the intent of selling or subdividing when the area becomes developed. The general pattern was that small proprietors, or colonos, would buy the land. This constituted something of an agricultural revolution. As Monbeig puts it, "la caractéristique de la zone pionnière actuelle est indiscutablement la petite propriété, tandis que, dans la zone pionnière de 1880 ou de 1912, la grande fazenda paraissait la seule form d’exploitation possible."394 He qualifies this by saying that although the classic grand fazendas are not rare, they used to be the exclusive feature of the region.

In the areas of the Alta Paulista and Alta Sorocobana, he explains the phenomenon of the small proprietor through the drop in coffee prices rather than

393 Pierre Monbeig, "Les zones pionnières de l’État de São Paulo," 345
through the fact that these interior regions lacked the prized *terra roxa*. When coffee prices fell, big property owners needed to find money by parcelling property. They did not have the option of opening new lots to monoculture. This coffee crisis led to a new mentality that reinforced what the geography of the region would have determined.

The area in the north of Parana state was a different story in terms of development. The one constant was that you had a regime of small proprietors, but in this area, particularly around Londrina, development was directed by a large English company—the Terras do Norte Paraná. This company attempted to systematize colonization by constructing railways that would extend to Paraguay and setting up lots of clients practicing polyculture. As he puts it ”elle veille à favoriser le trafic abondant et régulier de la voie ferée.” There was, nonetheless, a desire to set up cotton plantations as this company had experience developing areas of the Sudan. Monbeig seems critical of this highly syncretized linking of railroad development and colonization and notes that it was unprecedented in Brazil. He also notes that growth in the northern Parana region was disrupted by the 1932 Constitutionalist revolt.

After providing a highly technical description of the problems surrounding land surveying in these pioneer zones, Monbeig considers lodging and cultural differences. The first sorts of lodgings erected after the land was cleared were

---

395 As Monbeig explains it, the lack of *terra roxa* generally translates into a bountiful first planting of coffee plants and then a diminution from there.

primitive cabanas, but once larger dwellings began to be created some variants crept in:

Les variantes sont rares et les originalités sont presque toujours le fait d'une tradition culturelle: un autel au-dessus d'une porte dans les maisons japonaises, des fleurs autour des habitations des Autrichiens, un soin particulier apporté à la construction avec utilisation de belles planches bien sciées, un plancher rendu possible par la construction sur pilotis chez un colon allemand, ou encore, suprême sujet d'orgueil, une bonne cave de pierre pour garder fraîche la bière!397

Besides these differences on the level of the individual lodging, Monbeig observes a number of modifications in terms of the ways ethnic communities grouped their houses. Most lodgings were either isolated or were clustered in groups of three or four with the exception of the Latvian community and the Japanese who tended to build in communities.

Later on in the article, Monbeig expands upon how issues of race and culture manifest themselves in the pioneer zone and what this about the state of São Paulo and Brazil more broadly. This shows that his interest lies in the human as well as physical landscape. Here he notes that the entire state of São Paulo could be considered a pioneer zone in terms of its growth and expansion, but these frontier zones of the Alta Paulista, Alta Sorocobana, and the northern part of Paraná, or 'moving frontiers,' are where it is possible to "s'observe le mieux l'un des phénomènes habituels aux régions de défrichements: la variété ethnique et l'amalgame progressif des races."398 For Monbeig, "La population de la zone pionnière est une image réduite de la population du Brésil par sa variété et, par les

397 Pierre Monbeig, "Les zones pionnières de l'État de São Paulo," 354
problèmes qu’elle pose immédiatement, elle fait mieux comprendre l’acuité des questions nationales.”

These questions involve the relationship between immigrant communities and the formation of a national Brazilian identity. In looking at the pioneer zones, Monbeig finds that there are more foreigners than native Brazilians. For example, in the north of Parana there are seven hundred Brazilian nationals followed by five hundred Germans, four hundred Italians, four hundred Japanese, one hundred Portuguese, eighty Poles, Czechs, and Spaniards (combined), and forty Russians. He notes some differences between the various communities but spends the most time looking at the Japanese community because this is the community in greatest tension with the Paulista authorities and the population at large.

Of the Japanese, Monbeig writes that they are "comme pionniers isolés" within the pioneer zone. This is not surprising since Japanese immigration to Brazil was organized through companies licensed for bringing families, rather than individuals, from Japan to Brazil. As Monbeig notes, the Japanese set up their own


400 Monbeig was not unique in his interest in the Japanese community in Brazil. Pierre Chaunu published a short article in 1948 that reviewed works by Emilio Willems and Hiroshi Saito on the Shindo Renmei in Brazil. The Shindo Renmei was a secret society of Japanese intelligentsia in Brazil that spoke of "la Grande Asie Orientale," and occasionally engaged in terrorist acts. Like Monbeig, Chaunu was attracted to the study of Japanese immigrant communities in Brazil because Japanese culture appeared as a barrier to assimilation in Brazil. As Chaunu put it, "Leur culture est aux antipodes de celle du pays qui les a reçus, d’où une barrière. L’émigrant n’a en rien le <<complexed’inférioritée>> à l’égard de ses hôtes. Il estime sa culture égale, sinon supérieure à la leur." See Pierre Chanu, "Un aspect du grand problème unitaire: La minorité japonaise au Brésil," Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations 3, no. 4 (1948), 473.

401 See Pierre Chanu, "Un aspect du grand problème unitaire: La minorité japonaise au Brésil."
schools and hospitals and social support networks that led to a certain resentment by fazendieros. As he puts its,

Leur présence, leur cohésion, qui se manifestent par des fêtes, des caisses de secours, par une politique agricole commune, par des écoles, sont l’objet de discussions passionnées; l’existence de noyaux comme la fazenda Bastos est parfois considérée comme un dange pour le pays. 402

Yet despite this social cohesion and distance from population at large and Paulista authorities, Monbeig does not that the Japanese are not necessarily on bad terms with their neighbors and comments that "il n’est pas impossible de voir déjà maintenant quelques signes sinon de fusion, au moins de coexistence pacifique et laborieuse de tous les éléments ethniques de la zone pionnière." 403

This concern with the fusion of populations within the pioneer zone was not isolated to Monbeig. He notes that Paulistas and Brazilians more generally were fascinated by this phenomenon. Still despite the interest in immigrant populations, Monbeig observes that the biggest population movement to the interior comes from more established regions—the Paraiba valley, Campinhas, as well as from the states of Minas Gerais or Bahia. According to Monbeig, the presses of Minas and Bahia were just as full of complaints about internal migration as Japanese immigration. And, while the Japanese received a great deal of attention, Monbeig remarks that "Mais, bien que le problème japonais soit sérieux, il ne peut exister de doutes sur l’assimilation soit des autres Brésiliens, soit des Européens, soit aussi des Syriens."


Despite the problematic surrounding immigration in Brazil, Monbeig shows a fundamental faith in Brazil's ability to incorporate new immigrant populations within the nation. As he puts it, "La zone pionnière pauliste est un creuset où se fondent les races." He also refers to the 1932 Constitutionalist revolt as an example that the differences between races and ethnicities can be erased within a half century of life together. Perhaps most significantly, he cites the work of the Paulista historian João Carlos Fairbanks, on the failure of Brazilian pioneers and the success of foreigners and draws from this the lesson that the son of the foreign pioneer has "la mentalité essentiellement nomade du pauliste, je dirais même brésilien, car je l’ai rencontré dans d’autres États, celui du défricheur." Monbeig’s confidence regarding Brazil’s ability to absorb a foreign population parallels Pierre Chaunu’s remarks on the Japanese population. Chaunu ended his article, "Un aspect du grand problème unitaire: la minorité japonaise au Brésil," by expressing an extraordinary faith in Brazil’s assimilative capacities: "Et Dieu sait que ce milieu ambiant—le jeune Brésil—est capable de tout assimiler, de tout plier au rythme de sa vie généreuse et puissante."

Monbeig’s reflections on the distinct character of the Japanese immigrant community and its potential for the absorption within a broader current of Brazilian nationality are astute and foreshadow more recent scholarship. Jeffrey Lesser has argued, for example, that "[m]embers of the Brazilian elite were as bewildered as

immigrants about the relationship between ethnicity and national identity. As a result of analyzing these elite discourses, Lesser arrives at the position that "mestiçagem, which many scholars have taken to mean the emergence of a new and uniform Brazilian “race” out of the mixing of peoples, was often understood as a joining (rather than mixing) of different identities, as the creation of a multiplicity of hyphenated Brazilians rather than a single, uniform one." Lesser also looks at the issue of ethnicity and national identity from the point of view of immigrant communities and has found that multiple strategies developed for self-definition. One strategy of immigrant elites was to argue "that their own group was ethnically “white,” proposing to render their premigratory identities harmless in return for inclusion in the pantheon of traditionally desireable groups." Another was to propose "that “whiteness” was not a necessary component ofBrazilianness” and to promote "the idea that Brazil would improve by becoming more “Japanese” or “Arab,” terms constructed to mean “economically productive” and/or “supernationalist.” As a third option, "many immigrants and their descendants seemed to reject all forms of inclusion by creating ultranationalist groups that, at


408 Jeffrey Lesser, Negotiating National Identity: Immigrants, minorities, and the Struggle for Ethnicity in Brazil, 5.


least on the surface, sought to maintain political and cultural loyalty to the countries of origin."  

In comparison to Monbeig's observations in "Les zones pionnières de São Paulo," Lesser's findings are more scrupulously sketched. But they benefit from the result of hindsight whereas Monbeig was trying to make sense of a phenomenon still very much in the infancy of its development. In his conclusion, Monbeig speaks of how the pioneer zone in São Paulo is best seen as a living laboratory. He sees the significance of this contemporary laboratory in terms of its ability to shed light on the European past as well as the European future. In doing so, he picks up on Lucien Febvre's remarks on André Siegfried in "L'Amérique du Sud devant l'Histoire," where Febvre used Siegfried to show how a city like Rio de Janeiro could help us become clearer about the cities of Antiquity like Massilia. Monbeig extends these remarks to the pioneer zone stating that "La description d'une zone pionnière moderne peut avoir le même intérêt historique." 

**Monbeig on the Necessity of a South American Education**

In two review articles to the *Annales* published during the second half of the 1940s, Pierre Monbeig argued that a productive relationship between Europe and South America was highly desirable. But, in order to take advantage of this opportunity, scholars would need to radically reeducate themselves about South

---


America. A prerequisite for this education would be a change in comportment. Towards this end, Monbeig urged French social scientists to adapt a more humble attitude. Monbeig’s criticism of Jean Romeuf’s book *L’économie brésilienne au mois de mars 1947* in his 1947 review essay, "Économie ou économies brésiliennes?," should be understood in terms of his stated desire for developing a new mindset toward South America. The same is true of his remarks on Pierre Chaunu, Jacqueline Beaujeu-Garnier, and M.J. Touchard in "Sur L’Amérique Latine"—a review Monbeig published in 1949. In addition to demonstrating Monbeig’s intention to aid in the process of reorienting French scholarship, these reviews also demonstrate how far his own education had progressed. These reviews exhibit an awareness of the interplay between Brazil’s foreign and domestic economy, regional tensions, and geographic variances as they relate to land tenure and the economy.

In commencing his review article, "Économie ou économies brésiliennes," Monbeig articulates his wish to break down the simple exoticism that he finds in the contemporary vogue for South America. In a passage that calls to mind Lévi-Strauss’s famous opening to *Tristes Tropiques* ("I hate travelers and travelling), Monbeig speaks the fashionable allure of South America for young Europeans:

L’Amérique du Sud est décidément à la mode: à Rio de Janeiro, à São Paulo ou à Buenos Ayres, les conférenciers venus de France se succèdent à un rythme accéléré; nos journaux et nos revues ne se lassent pas de publier des reportages ou des articles souvent pittoresques, parfois dangereusement dithyrambiques; nos jeunes gens reprennent pour leur compte le vieux mythe de l’Eldorado -- et n’oublions pas les Européens aussi sûre que fructueuse pour leurs capitaux en détresse.\(^{413}\)

---

\(^{413}\) Pierre Monbeig, "Économie ou économies brésiliennes," *Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations.* 2, no. 2 (1947), 171.
Yet, despite these dangerous sometimes dionysian reveries of the general population, Monbeig does take some comfort in the fact that some serious initiatives have gone forward to help establish a better understanding of the other side of the Atlantic. Most notable in this regard was the establishment of the *Insitut Français des Hautes Études brésiliennes*. Another institute, designed specifically to study the Brazilian economy, the *Institut d'étude de l'économie brésilienne* was also just coming into being and beginning to publish studies on the Brazilian economy. One of the inaugural studies sponsored by this institute was Jean Romeuf's *L'économie brésilienne au mois de mars 1947*, and serves as the focus of Monbeig's review essay.

Monbeig strongly critiques Romeuf's work for its failure to fully recognize the regional diversity of Brazil. In questioning the source documents Romeuf uses to paint an economic portrait of Brazil, Monbeig indicates that the official statistics published by the government headquartered in Rio, have been faulty and criticized and past years. But even if they were accurate, Monbeig finds that they "ne permet pas de mesurer autant que cela serait désirable l'importance d'un des traits permanents du Brésil: l'évolution économique inégale des différentes régions géographiques."\(^{414}\) He warns that reliance on these official statistics "risque de fausser le point de vue en dépersonnalisant les faits propres à chaque région."\(^{415}\) In the case of a book written for a French audience, Monbeig finds it irresponsible not to provide extensive discussion of Brazilian regionalism because by not doing so, the

\(^{414}\) Pierre Monbeig, "Économie ou économies brésiliennes," 171

\(^{415}\) Pierre Monbeig, "Économie ou économies brésiliennes," 171
reader will get "l'impression erronée d'une unité économique brésilienne comparable à l'unité économique française."\textsuperscript{416}

Besides ignoring the issue of regionalism, Romeuf's \textit{L'économie brésilienne} committed the bigger sin of "dèshumanisent les faits."\textsuperscript{417} That Monbeig would raise this issue highlights his own emphasis on the human elements in geography. In his view, Romeuf's neglect of how economic reality impact individuals and households effectively ignores that the vast majority of Brazil's forty seven million people were living "éloignée du minimum de santé qui lui permettrait d'être vraiment et totalement productive."\textsuperscript{418} While he does not think an economic survey needs to elaborate on all the problems associated with hunger and poverty in Brazil, Monbeig makes a fair point in questioning whether simply adducing statistics on the production and consumption of various commodities clarifies the challenges of economic development in Brazil.

These twin concerns—economic development and social inequality—receive sustained refection in Monbeig's review of Romeuf and are characteristic of his thinking on Brazil. He takes Romeuf to task for failing to provide sufficient attention to the difficulties increased rents have posed for the majority of the population that has failed to see its wages rise. While surveys of these problems are readily available—Monbeig cites the \textit{Revista do Arquivo Municipal de São Paulo} as an example—Romeuf seems unaware of them and Monbeig suggests "Des contacts plus

\textsuperscript{416} Pierre Monbeig, "Économie ou économies brésiliennes," 172

\textsuperscript{417} Pierre Monbeig, "Économie ou économies brésiliennes," 172.

\textsuperscript{418} Pierre Monbeig, "Économie ou économies brésiliennes," 172.
On a related note, Monbeig critiques Romeuf for not only getting some facts about industrial development in Brazil wrong, but for failing to recognize how industrialization reinforced social inequality in this era and has led to a swelling of the population in industrial zones and increased rural malaise that goes beyond a diminished labor force.

In addition to faulting Romeuf for failing to adequately treat the imbalances shaping the domestic economy, Monbeig takes him to task for ignoring the destructive role foreign investment was playing in the economy. He finds it positively mystifying that Romeuf "ne pas avoir cherché à savoir dans quelle mesure l'évolution économique actuelle est influencée par les interférences étrangères."

Although Monbeig recognizes that the relationship of the Brazilian government and foreign powers is not one of straight-foward dependency, with attempts being made to nationalize certain industries and investments, he does argue that on balance foreign investment tends to lead to greater indebtedness and creates political and...

---

419 Pierre Monbeig, "Économie ou économies brésiliennes," 173.

420 Romeuf claims the Volta Redonda steel plant predates WWII whereas it was constructed during the war. In regards to the social imbalances created by industrialization, Monbeig writes: "A moins de mettre en oeuvre des conceptions nouvelles (et serait-ce possible?), les centres industriels du Brésil tropical atlantique vont s'hypertrophier, et l'écart ne fera que croître par rapport à l'Amazonie, au Brésil Central, au Nord-Est." He adds "la capitale pauliste se gonfler dangereusement au détriment des campagnes où les fazendeiros se plaignent plus que jamais du manque de bras." See Pierre Monbeig, "Économie ou économies brésiliennes," 173.

421 See Pierre Monbeig, "Économie ou économies brésiliennes," 175.
economic alienation. In Monbeig’s view, foreign capital will only develop a sector of the economy and will leave the others dormant.422

The concerns that Monbeig expresses in "Économie ou économies brésiliennes," about the need to understand Brazilian regionalism and the more quotidian aspects of life in Brazil emerge in his 1949 review "Sur l’Amérique Latine," as well. Here he reviews three works: Pierre Chaunu’s *Histoire de l’Amérique latine*, Jacqueline Beaujeau-Garnier’s *L’Économie de l’Amérique latine*, and M.J. Touchard’s *La République Argentine*. In terms of the works that deal with Brazil, Monbeig’s discussion of Chaunu is brief but complementary—it is in his review of Beaujeau-Garnier that Monbeig articulates concerns that appear elsewhere in his work.423

In reviewing *L’Économie de l’Amérique latine*, Monbeig points out mistaken notions Beaujeau-Garnier has about northeastern geography. This he attributes to her lack of fieldwork in Brazil and reliance on published sources. In addition to

422 While much of the literature on foreign capital in Latin America supports Monbeig’s position, Elizabeth Cobb’s *The Rich Neighbor Policy* and Joel Wolfe’s *Autos and Progress* offer more nuanced interpretations. Cobb’s book on the investment strategies of Nelson Rockefeller and Henry Kaiser suggests that foreign capital and the development of a robust and inclusive Brazilian internal market were not mutually exclusive. See Elizabeth Anne Cobbs, *The Rich Neighbor Policy: Rockefeller and Kaiser in Brazil* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992). Likewise, Joel Wolfe finds the role of foreign capital ambivalent rather than exclusively negative. Speaking of the automobile industry, Wolfe writes: "But such broad public support for the foreign auto companies also demonstrates how the productive side of capitalism (i.e., modern factories with good jobs that manufacture popular products) was welcomed throughout Latin America, while the more obviously exploitative aspects of this economic system (e.g., extractive industries and financial speculation) often engendered harsh opposition in the region." See Joel Wolfe, *Autos and Progress: The Brazilian Search for Modernity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 133

423 He summarizes Chaunu’s book by indicating it looks at the links between colonial patterns and problems with development into the twentieth century. He does criticize Chaunu for neglecting to speak about the aftershocks of abolition as well as the development of the coffee industry in São Paulo.
these errors, Monbeig finds fault with her trying to read into Brazil a tradition of small landholders as in France. When Beaujeau-Garnier speaks of São Paulo where Monbeig did his work on pioneer zones, he finds that she attributes to small holders 'mixed farming.' He says:

> il est rare ques ces <<sitiantes>> associaent la technique de l'élevage au travail agricole et, le plus souvent, cette association n'existe que dans le paysage; d'autre part, l'économie des <<sitiantes>> demeure, dans une très large mesure, sous la dépendance d'un seul produit, café ou coton.  

He goes on to say that in all of Latin America, the small farmer is present, but neither numbers nor official affirmations allow you to comprehend which makes it difficult to make generalizations as Europeans tend to do.  

Monbeig's most serious critiques of Beaujeau-Garnier, however, have to do with her misuse of the term *caboclos*. Not only does she misspell the word in a way that suggests a slur (see quote below on the distinction between *caboclos/cabocles*), she contends that there is a significant population of *caboclos* (mixed indigenous and European) in Rio de Janeiro proper which Monbeig argues cannot be since this is a more rural than urban phenomenon. He contends that "Rio est une ville de Blancs, de Noirs, de Mulâtres infiniment plus que de Métis, sans compter que les <<caboclos>> (et non: cabocles, qui est une détestable adaptation)."  

---


425 As he puts it a bit earlier, "Les géographes d'Europe cèdent facilement à la tentation d'attribuer toutes les vertus aux petits propriétaires, d'identifier paysannat de type français avec division de la propriété et de considérer qu'il y a automatiquement progrès économique dès que la plantation se morcelle." See Pierre Monbeig, "Sur l'amérique latine," 219.

Reminiscent of his critique of Jean Romeuf discussed above, Monbeig also takes Beaujeu-Garnier to task for her mistakes about the nature of Brazilian labor relations and her failure to deliver on the promise of a informative account of the Brazilian economy. In Monbeig’s view, the book contains nothing on the circulation of money, problems of overproduction, variants of change, issues of indebtedness. Likewise there is nothing about salaries or standards of living.

Beyond these specific issues about Beaujeu-Garnier’s discussion of Brazil, Monbeig ends his review by speaking of the general dynamics of the relationship between the Latin American nations, Europe, and the United States. He argues that Latin American nations have little love lost for the United States and represent potential economic and political partners with Europe. As he puts it, "les pays de l'Amérique latine sont moins dociles à leur grand voisin du Nord qu'on ne le dit souvent." But in order for France and other European nations to take advantage of these opportunities, a new comportment needs to be adopted: "Une Europe moins figée dans une attitude de maître d'école, des Français moins persuadés d'une supériorité surannée, trouveraient là une occasion à saisir et, qui sait, une éventualité d'équilibre." This requires that Europe educate herself and explains the force of Monbeig’s critique of these works. While the books in the collection "éclairant nos lanternes sur des problèmes peu connus," Monbeig


sees their importance as more than academic exercises or, as he puts it, "exercises universitaires." 429

**The Space of Brazil and Global History**

Chapters 1 and 3 included discussions of Fernand Braudel's reviews of the Gilberto Freyre and Caio Prado Jr. These reviews illustrated a general tendency on Braudel's part to think about Latin America as a springboard for reflecting on Atlantic World and Global history. While Braudel's thinking in global terms may not be surprising to scholars familiar with his work, some of his conclusions about the centrality of Brazil within the space of both European and world history may be. This section will illustrate how Braudel conceptualized the importance of Brazil for understanding world history by looking at the argument he makes in a 1946 article, "Monnaies et civilisations de l’or du soudan à l’argent amérique." With Brazil's central role on the historical stage established, the section then shifts to show how Braudel reflects on Brazil as an object around which France's position as a world power turns.

His 1946 article, "Monnaies et civilisations de l’or du soudan à l’argent d’amérique," provides a tour de force survey of the relationship between money, the rise of the Atlantic world, and the eighteenth century Enlightenment. He begins by tracing the flow of gold from the Sudan to the Mediterranean world vis-à-vis North African middlemen, and follows the developments of the Portuguese incursions into Africa to take direct control of the gold trade as well as the flow of American silver

into Europe through Spain. One thing that stands out about Braudel’s article is that it appears to be inappropriately titled because Braudel ends not with the drying up of American silver in the mid-17th century, but with the flow of Brazilian gold in the 18th century. Speaking of the decline of the Mediterranean in the 17th century, Braudel writes ”Il n’y sera remédie, à la veille du XVIII siècle, que par un afflux nouveau de richesse monnayée. Par un afflux d’or: celui des mines brésiliennes. Des <<Mines Générales>>." 430

In Braudel’s view, since money provided the rhythm for world history, Brazil provided a new beat for the 18th century.431 As he explains, Brazil may not have been the sole factor for shaping the historical trajectory, but it was an essential part of the composition. Braudel emphasizes this idea in a particularly striking passage where he declares:

Dès la fin du règne de Louis XIV, n’avait-il pas signalé un retour à la prospérité ou, du moins les prémières de ce retour? Ne pouvons-nous pas y voir un nouveau don de l’Amérique à Europe: un don, non plus d’argent, cette fois, mais, à nouveau, d’or, l’or de Minas Geraes, tiré du cœur même, du cœur continental du Brésil? De l’or: et l’on sait que sa puissance est démultipliée par rapport à celle de l’argent. De l’or: et c’est justement dans les dernières années du XVIIe siècle qu’il apparaît. Nous n’allons pas dire, bien sûr, que c’est lui, lui seul, qui a lancé le XVIIe siècle. Mais nous dirons, une fois de plus, que les vissitudes de la monnaie n’intéressent pas que la seule histoire économique. C’est l’histoire totale des sociétés et des civilisations qu’elles contribuent à éclairer puissamment. Elles ont valeur de signe. Elles ont valeur de cause.432


432 Fernand Braudel, "Monnaies et civilisations: De l’or du Soudan à l’argent d’amérique," 22
What makes this passage forceful is the idea that Minas Gerais should be considered as much a seat of the Enlightenment as Konigsberg, Geneva, or Paris. In articulating a view that money is not simply of interest for economic history, but a broader cultural history of societies and civilizations, Braudel echoes Georg Simmels’ thought that money is significant because "it represents within the practical world the most certain image and the clearest embodiment of the formula of all being, according to which things receive their meaning through each other, and have their being determined by their mutual relations." For Simmel, the development of money makes it clear that value is not a specific quality of the object, but rather represents the desirability of that good in relation to other goods. It thus forms part of the total social fabric of a given civilization. By sharing this view and attaching particular significance to Brazilian gold in the development of the 18th century’s trajectory, Braudel reinforces Lucien Febvre’s trope that European and Latin American history are intimately connected.

Although Braudel occasionally focused his attention on Latin America as a region onto itself, as a whole his writings in the *Annales* tend not only to emphasize connections between Europe and Latin America, but to view Latin American history instrumentally—as a way of articulating a new perspective on the European past. One of his articles, a review of Charles-André Julien’s *Les voyages de découverte et les

---

Charles-André Julien’s *Les voyages de découverte et les premiers établissements, XVe et XVIe siècles* recounts the destiny of *France antartique* (France’s fledgling colony in Rio de Janeiro), French Florida, and the voyages of France up the Saint Lawrence river in the 15th and 16th centuries. Although Braudel faults Julien for "le péché de l’histoire historisante, biographique et événementielle," his book did two things to stimulate his interest. First, the book explored how the European discoveries unleashed a revolution of ideas in France. Secondly, it posed the question of why France failed to make great discoveries in the age of exploration and why it renounced fighting wars for the coasts and islands of Africa and America. Braudel goes on to ask whether these were "Deux échecs, double problème, ou un seul grand problème du destin français?"  

Ultimately, Braudel finds Julien’s explanation of these failures lacking—essentially, Julien argues that France had a bad king. Still, Braudel commends Julien for having a taste for "une histoire saisie dans le cadre d’un problème vivant, ou d’une série de problèmes vivants clairement posés et à quoi tout ensuite est

---

435 Charles-André Julien was a fascinating figure in his own right. He was a public intellectual of international renown who helped found *Le Monde* and wrote a number of articles on the Algerian war for Foreign Affairs. He was a professor at Sciences-Po who specialized in North Africa.

subordonné." While Braudel never explicitly states what makes this such a living issue, the fact that the article focuses on France's failure to expand its overseas empire and was written in a period when the fate of the empire was challenged both in Indochina and Algeria, the pertinence of Julien's writing seems clear enough. Coupled with Julien's role as a public intellectual who wrote extensively on North Africa the relationship between this historical work and contemporary postwar politics should be clear enough.

In terms of Brazil as a pivot point for France's place in world history, Braudel thinks Julien does a particularly good job. Brazil illuminates France's late entrance into the Atlantic World of sugar and slavery. On this particular point, He commends this treatment, writing:

Ainsi au Brésil, dont il parle avec tant d'intelligence, c'est le sucre plus peut-être que les admirables Jésuites, qui a fait la fortune portugaise. Peut-être les Français auraient-ils conservé une grande place au Brésil si ce dernier était resté, comme au début du siècle, le pays du bois de teinture, du bois rouge, du pau brasil. Mais, avec la seconde moitié du siècle, il est devenu le pays du sucre, des engenhos, des maisons de maîtres--les casas grandes--des senzalas, ces cases réservées aux noirs importés d'Afrique...Si l'on ne devient pas un pays colonial, ce peut être parfois, simplement, parce que, du jour au lendemain, non devient pas un pays sucrier. La vocation coloniale met en cause toute la vie, toute la structure d'un pays jusqu'à ses entrailles. La France du XVIe siècle que nous montre Charles André Julien n'est pas ouverte aussi profondément. Elle est soeur de la Venise de Charles Diehl. On ne saurait mieux--ni plus mal dire... 

Here we see Braudel agreeing with Julien that France may have been able to have more of a hold on Brazil if its primary product was still the Brazil wood from which a red dye was extracted. But, the world changed with the sugar trade becoming highly profitable and France at a comparative disadvantage vis-à-vis Spain and Portugal. What the colonial vocation required was a total transformation of social

\[437\] Fernand Braudel, "La double faillite «coloniale» de la France (XVe-XVIe siècles)," 453.

\[438\] Fernand Braudel, "La double faillite «coloniale» de la France (XVe-XVIe siècles)," 454.
and commercial life. As a result of France’s success in the Mediterranean, it was not prepared to do this. France’s failure to expand and develop its initial foothold in Brazil—France Antartique—exemplifies the broader currents of trade and economic development in the 15th and 16th centuries.

But more generally, in terms of understanding France’s place in these broader currents, Braudel moves away from Julien’s simplistic explanation that France failed to be in the vanguard of discoveries and colonial explanation due to the ineptitude of its rulers and provides instead an explanation of the shift in the world trade system from the 13th century through the 15th. He argues that rather than chance or individual choice playing the foundational role,

En vérité tout—ou pour le moins beaucoup de choses—a été commandé par l’économie internationale du XVe, principalement l’économie atlantique dont l’étude éclairerait les vraies raisons de notre carence et de notre échec, à nous Français, durant la compétition des grandes découvertes.439

He expands upon this by saying that to understand the circumstances under which the discoveries were made, one has to look to the expansions of sugar culture and the beginnings of African slavery. In understanding, why Spain and Portugal were in the vanguard of expansion into the Americas, Braudel further argues that one has to recognize that Genoese galley ships were the crucial link between the economy of Northern Europe and the Mediterranean. With the development of international commercial capital, and the fact that the Genoese passed through the Straits of Gibraltar, Lisbon and Seville took great interest in expanding its commercial fortune. While the Hundred Year’s War explains diminished France’s capacity to take

439 Fernand Braudel, "La double faillite «coloniale» de la France (XVe-XVIe siècles)," 454.
advantage of new commercial possibilities, Braudel disputes Julien’s claim that it was one of the lynchpins.

Once the Atlantic World became an exciting and vibrant locale of commercial exchange, Braudel argues that France lacked the motivation to venture into this new motor of the global economy because of its attachment to the Mediterranean. As he puts it, "Comme Venise, la France reste engagée dans l’économie méditerranéenne, y emploie ses forces vives, y marque des points, y conserve des positions anciennes, en développe de nouvelles."440 Ironically, it was success—in this case the extraordinary success of Marseille in the last quarter of the 16th century—that thwarted France's venturing further into the Atlantic.441

Worth mentioning in Braudel's treatment of France's failure to expand its colonial fortunes in Brazil is the lack of any criticism of the colonial enterprise. Braudel's tone appears wistful—with his discussion of France's failure to be at the vanguard of the trade in sugar and slaves punctuated with a sense of regret. In fact, he goes so far as suggest using the term 'expansion' instead of 'colonisation' because colonisation does not capture "d'échanges fructueux et de possiblités d'échanges, du crédit des marchands."442

440 Fernand Braudel, "La double faillite «coloniale» de la France (XVe-XVIe siècles)," 455.

441 As Braudel puts it, "Cette demi-victoire au Sud, sur la mer familière, qui a peut-être nui aux fortunes atlantiques, Ch.-A. Julien le suggère presque: encore faudrait-il le démontrer..." In this case, he thinks Julien was onto something but was unable to demonstrate it. See Fernand Braudel, "La double faillite «coloniale» de la France (XVe-XVIe siècles)," 455.

442 Fernand Braudel, "La double faillite «coloniale» de la France (XVe-XVIe siècles)," 455.
Conclusion

This chapter began by discussing how Lucien Febvre saw Brazil as a signpost for the European future. It has argued that the writings on Brazil published in the *Annales* had a reflexive dimension that corresponded to this idea of Febvre's. Roger Bastide's writing demonstrated an attempt to formulate a social scientific language to understand race as France underwent a colonial crisis. Likewise, Pierre Monbeig's geographical studies of Brazil were linked to Febvre's notion that the study of Brazil would lead to an understanding of the limits of European society and culture. It also shows that Monbeig had an awareness of the political dimensions of social scientific research. He desired for French social scientists to educate themselves about the region in order to facilitate a more productive relationship with Europe. Finally, the chapter demonstrated that part of Braudel's interest in Brazil was the role it played in France's colonial fortunes and how it could be used to explain the shift between the dominance of the Mediterranean and Atlantic.

The connections made in this chapter between social scientific research on Brazil and the colonial fortunes of France will be further developed in the final chapter. Chapter 6 looks at how France's most celebrated thinkers and politicians regarded Brazil in the late 1950s and early 1960s. This final chapter argues that in the broader public sphere Brazil's history and future potential was linked to not just the future of France, but the direction of world history. Before making this final argument, however, the next chapter investigates the impact of Brazilian studies on the development of French anthropology through the figure of Claude Lévi-Strauss.
CHAPTER 5
CONNECTING BRAZIL AND FRANCE THROUGH LÉVI-STRAUSS'S STRUCTURAL
ANTHROPOLOGY

Introduction

Chapters 3 and 4 of the dissertation argued that Brazilian intellectuals had considerable influence in stimulating French social scientists associated with the Annales group to reframe notions of race, modernization, and Europe’s colonial legacy. This chapter has a similar objective to the two previous ones in so far as it seeks to look at the impact of the French University Mission on the development of French social sciences in the postwar period (1945-1964). It shifts focus, however, from the Annales group to the most famous member of the French University Mission—Claude Lévi-Strauss. This chapter demonstrates the impact Lévi-Strauss’s experiences in Brazil had upon him and consequently upon the development of anthropology in France.

This chapter explains the emergence of Lévi-Strauss’s Structural Anthropology as the dominant research paradigm for anthropology in France through focusing on the personal, institutional and broader political and cultural contexts of his formative years in Brazil. The first section examines how Lévi-Strauss’s fieldwork in Brazil and publication of Tristes Tropiques, elevated him to the status of Grand patron in the French University system. Given that the social sciences had yet to be institutionalized within the University structure, this position was necessary for Lévi-Strauss to establish his l’anthropologie structurale as a dominant research paradigm. In the second part of the paper, I look more closely at
the institutional context and development of anthropology prior to Lévi-Strauss and then, in the third section, how Lévi-Strauss redefined and transformed the practice of anthropology. The final section of the paper examines political and intellectual currents contemporary with Lévi-Strauss's fieldwork in Brazil and suggests the influence of these currents on the development of his thought.

**From Amateur to Anthropologist**

*Travel is usually thought of as a displacement in space. This is an inadequate conception. A journey occurs simultaneously in space, in time, and in the social hierarchy. Each impression can be defined only by being jointly related to these three axes, and since space is itself three-dimensional, five axes are necessary if we are to have an adequate representation of any journey. I felt this immediately on landing in Brazil.*

Almost everyone capable of distinguishing the clothier Lévi-Strauss from the intellectual Lévi-Strauss can recite the famous line with which Claude Lévi-Strauss begins *Tristes Tropiques*: “I hate traveling and explorers.” But few are capable of unpacking the contradiction of why a confessed hater of traveling and travelogues would trouble himself with writing what might be the twentieth century’s most famous—at least from an academic point of view—travel narrative. Besides recounting Lévi-Strauss’s expeditions through the Brazilian interior into Amazonia, *Tristes Tropiques* also documents his academic journey from philosophy to anthropology. In doing so, it provides us a glimpse into the development of

---


444 Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Tristes Tropiques*, 18. The ‘Jeans’ and ‘Books’ distinction is taken from an anecdote Claude Lévi-Strauss related to Didier Eribon about a waiter in Berkeley asking him if he was the Jeans or Books guy upon learning his name. See Didier Eribon, *Conversations with Claude Lévi-Strauss* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 30.
anthropology as an academic discipline in France. The phenomenal success of 
*Tristes Tropiques* propelled Lévi-Strauss from the margins of the French academy into the Collège de France—an institution that so intimidated him during his student days that he prohibited himself from attending lectures because of a deeply felt fear of inadequacy. With the prestige of a chair—the first chair bearing the title of anthropology—at the Collège de France, Lévi-Strauss was able to assure the future of anthropology as an independent discipline in France.\(^{445}\) What follows is an account that integrates Lévi-Strauss’s academic journey as told in *Tristes Tropiques* with a broader history of the institutional development of anthropology in France.

The beginning of Lévi-Strauss’s anthropological venture can be traced rather precisely to a phone call received at 9:00 AM in the autumn of 1934.\(^{446}\) The caller was Célestin Bouglé, the director of the École Normale Supérieure, a disciple of Émile Durkheim, and a key figure in extending the Durkheimian legacy in the French Academy.\(^{447}\) Although, Lévi-Strauss never studied at the prestigious École Normale Supérieure, he had encountered Bouglé at the Sorbonne. Bouglé served as one of Lévi-Strauss’s examiners for the *agrégation*, a rigorous examination that distinguished the best undergraduate students and permitted them access to some

---

\(^{445}\) Terry Clark writes: “The prestige of the Collège was considerable enough that participation of one of its professors in a new activity helped provide academic legitimation. The importance of this sort of activity, which might be called academic pump-priming, was especially evident in the social sciences during the nineteenth century.” See Terry N. Clark, *Prophets and Patrons: The French University and the Emergence of the Social Sciences* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), 7.

\(^{446}\) Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Tristes Tropiques*, 47.

\(^{447}\) On Bougle, see Chapter 7 of Terry N. Clark, *Prophets and Patrons: The French University and the Emergence of the Social Sciences*. 
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of the more advanced teaching positions in French lycées, or high schools.\footnote{448 For a fuller explanation of the agrége see Terry N. Clark, \textit{Prophets and Patrons: The French University and the Emergence of the Social Sciences}. 22. In his interview with Eribon, Lévi-Strauss lists Bouglé along with Albert Rivaud, Jean Laporte, Louis Bréhier, Léon Robin, and Paul Fauconnet as his professors for the agrégation. Fauconnet and Bouglé were his examiners in sociology. See Didier Eribon, \textit{Conversations with Claude Lévi-Strauss}, 10.}

Remembering Lévi-Strauss's interest in the nascent field of anthropology, Bouglé told him that time was of the essence—he would have to call Georges Dumas, the psychologist in charge of the French mission to establish the University of São Paulo by noon of the same day to accept a position teaching sociology in Brazil.\footnote{449 At the time, it was unclear what the relationship between anthropology and sociology would be. It was one of Lévi-Strauss's achievements to establish the independence of anthropology as an independent discipline.}

At the time of this phone call, Lévi-Strauss was teaching at a lycée in Laon, France. His academic training was principally in philosophy and law. He had studied philosophy at the Sorbonne and law at the Faculté de droit in Paris. As he puts it in \textit{Tristes Tropiques}, studying philosophy was "the result less of a genuine vocation than of a dislike for the other subjects I had sampled up till then."\footnote{450 If his relationship to philosophy was reluctant, studying law—other than providing him with material for some rather scathing comparisons of law and humanities students—was a completely indifferent experience for Lévi-Strauss. In a later interview, he attributes his study of law to a recommendation of André Cresson, one of his philosophy professors who suggested to Lévi-Strauss that philosophy was not for him, but that something related might do.}

Claude Lévi-Strauss, \textit{Tristes Tropiques}, 51.

\footnote{451 In the interview with Eribon, Lévi-Strauss quotes Cresson as saying "Philosophy is not for you, but something close." See Didier Eribon, \textit{Conversations with Claude Lévi-Strauss}, 9.}
Still, despite his distaste for the superficial dialectical method in vogue in France at the time, Lévi-Strauss’s preparation for the *agrégation* thoroughly grounded him in the ancient and modern classics. This level of general academic culture is on display throughout *Triste Tropiques* as Lévi-Strauss steps back from his narrative to deliver historical reflections on Rousseau and Montaigne. Historically speaking, and even through the present day, the French academy has been famous for producing thinkers with a “broad, general culture [with] quickness and clarity of thought, a logical mind and literary ability.”\(^{452}\) Part of this, of course, is due to structural factors—up through the second World War, the university system with the École Normale Supérieur as its gem, was geared towards producing generalists who could teach in the lycées.\(^{453}\) Despite the fact that the social sciences were in a nascent state in terms of their institutionalization within the university, some inroads into the university system had been made by Émile Durkheim and his followers. Celestin Bouglé, Lévi-Strauss’s examiner in sociology was among them and as director of the École Normale Superieur was an influential figure in the French academy.\(^{454}\)

Notwithstanding the absence of a clear distinction between sociology and anthropology during the interwar period, there was an informal sense of

\(^{452}\) Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Tristes Tropiques*, 23.

\(^{453}\) A full discussion of this is present in Clark. The structure of the French University system will be discussed in greater detail below.

anthropology as a separate discipline.\textsuperscript{455} According to Lévi-Strauss himself, Jacques Soustelle was perhaps the first example of an \textit{agrégé} in philosophy becoming an anthropologist.\textsuperscript{456} By 1930, there were some institutional structures that signaled a nascent discipline: the Institut d’ethnologie had been created in 1925 and the Musée d’ethnographie du Trocadéro was transitioning into the Musée de l’homme. While the French University system continued to be focused on producing teachers for the lycées, and hence generalists rather than social scientists with highly focused fields of research, it began to recognize new directions in scholarship in the 1920s by offering certificates in \textit{sociologie générale} and \textit{ethnologie}. To receive a \textit{licence d’enseignement} or to pass the \textit{aggregation}, a candidate had to demonstrate proficiency in a field to be awarded a \textit{certificat} in that field—a determinate number of \textit{certificats} were required for the \textit{licence}.\textsuperscript{457} Although the creation of these \textit{certificats} in the social sciences was a step towards the institutionalization of these sciences in France, they were not part of the required sequence for the \textit{licence}. This meant that limited resources were available for the development of the social sciences within the university system and that researchers had to rely on independent sources of funding.

Given the nascent state of the social sciences in the 1920s and 1930s, Claude Lévi-Strauss was typical of his generation of young scholars interested in sociology.

\textsuperscript{455} Lévi-Strauss notes as much in his interview with Eribon see Didier Eribon, \textit{Conversations with Claude Lévi-Straus}, 16.

\textsuperscript{456} Didier Eribon, \textit{Conversations with Claude Lévi-Strauss}, 16.

\textsuperscript{457} The number of \textit{certificats} required for a \textit{licence} in 1920 was four. See Terry N. Clark, \textit{Prophets and Patrons: The French University and the Emergence of the Social Sciences}, 22.
and anthropology. In addition to the required university program, this generation took courses at the École pratique des hautes études that were more specialized in the areas of linguistics, history and area studies. Additionally, we learn from *Tristes Tropiques* that Lévi-Strauss used to attend Georges Dumas’s seminars on Sunday mornings at the St. Anne Psychiatric Hospital where he might be said to have had his first exotic encounter. Looking back on this, he remarks that:

No contact with savage Indian tribes has ever daunted me more than the morning I spent with an old lady swathed in wollies, who compared herself to a rotten herring encased in a block of ice: she appeared intact, she said, but was threatened with disintegration, if her protective envelope should happen to melt.458

While daunted, Lévi-Strauss was nonetheless fascinated by this contact with the irrational. In fact, it is this fascination with the irrational that helps explain his movement away from philosophy towards the social sciences. Later on in *Tristes Tropiques*, after commenting on the stifling effect philosophy and its method of opposing a common sense opinion with a more rigorous analysis and then reconciling them, Lévi-Strauss explains how Marx, Freud and the study of Geology drew his interest. In short, “[a]ll three demonstrate that understanding consists in reducing one type of reality to another; that the true reality is never the most obvious; and that the nature of truth is already indicated by the care it takes to remain elusive.”459 These three influences would be of great import in forming his particular conception of structural anthropology. For Lévi-Strauss, anthropology is a science of the labor of humanity, a study of the unconscious forces that give rise to


collective social forms, and a complement to geological history in so far as it studies
the human contribution to the “transformation of the terrestrial globe.”\footnote{460}

While Lévi-Strauss may have had some predilection for the social sciences
and anthropology in particular, it was his experience in Brazil that transformed him
into an anthropologist.\footnote{461} Having called George Dumas for a position teaching
sociology in the newly founded University of São Paulo, Lévi-Strauss set sail for
Brazil in February of 1935. With the University being established the year before,
he was part of the second set of French scholars that formed the University
mission.\footnote{462} Participants in the University Mission included Fernand Braudel, Pierre
Monbeig, Charles Morazé, Paul Arbousse-Bastide, Jacques Lambert, Pierre
Deffontaines, François Perroux, and Roger Bastide.\footnote{463} Upon arriving in Brazil, Lévi-
Strauss taught sociology at the University of São Paulo and got himself into some
trouble by focusing on ethnography rather than traditional Durkheimian
sociology.\footnote{464} In the first phase of his Brazilian years, 1935-1937, Lévi-Strauss taught

\footnote{460} Claude Lévi-Strauss, \emph{Tristes Tropiques}, 59

\footnote{461} One caveat is worth mentioning here. The experience in Brazil provided him with the experience
in the field necessary for becoming an anthropologist, but his experience in the United States where
he met Robert Lowrie, Franz Boas and Roman Jakobson was necessary for the full development of his
mature theoretical conception of anthropology. This is a point and argument that Christopher
Johnson makes effectively. See Christopher Johnson, \emph{Claude Lévi-Strauss: The Formative Years}

\footnote{462} See Didier Eribon, \emph{Conversations with Claude Lévi-Strauss} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press,
1991), 18.

\footnote{463} See Thomas Skidmore, "Lévi-Strauss, Braudel and Brazil: A Case of Mutual Influence," \emph{Bulletin of
Latin American Research} 22, no. 3 (2003), 343.

\footnote{464} In his interview with Eribon, Lévi-Strauss explains that the conflict arose from a young relative of
George Dumas's who was also an orthodox Comtean sociologist who was threatened by Lévi-
Strauss's rather loose reading of what could be taught in a sociology course. See Didier Eribon,
\emph{Conversations with Claude Lévi-Strauss}, 20.
at the University and made his first journeys into the Brazilian interior. His first extended trip was into the South Eastern Brazilian state of Parana where he encountered the indigenous Caduveo tribe. He followed this trip with one into the West Central state of Mato Grosso where he spent time amongst the Bororo. On the basis of these two trips, he was able to mount an exhibition in Paris—at the temporarily dislocated Musée de l’homme—during the winter of 1936-1937.465

In addition to mounting an exhibition in Paris, Lévi-Strauss was able to publish an article on the Bororo in the Journal de la Société des Américanistes.466 The combination of the exhibit and publication made Lévi-Strauss into an anthropologist. As he puts it in Tristes Tropiques:

Lévy-Bruhl, Mauss and Rivet had given me their retrospective blessing; my collections had been exhibited in a gallery in the Faubourg Saint Honoré; I had delivered lectures and written articles. Thanks to Henri-Laugier, who was in charge of the department of scientific research, then in its early stages, I obtained an adequate subsidy for a more ambitious undertaking.467

The legitimacy that Lévi-Strauss earned with his exhibit and publication earned him the support of the Centre national de la recherche scientifique and the Musée de l’homme. This funding made his trip from Mato Grosso into Amazonia to study the Nambikwara possible. For all intents and purposes, this trip began in June of 1938 and ended shortly before his return to France in 1939.468 Combined with the first phase of his sojourn in Brazil, this venture into the Brazilian wilds provided Lévi-

---

465 At this time, the Musée de l’homme was moving to the new site being built for it at the Palais de Chaillot.

466 See Didier Eribon, Conversations with Claude Lévi-Strauss, 24.

467 Claude Lévi-Strauss, Tristes Tropiques, 249.

468 See chapters 24 and 25 of Claude Lévi-Strauss, Tristes Tropiques.
Strauss the material to write *Tristes Tropiques*, the book that catapulted Lévi-Strauss into the ranks of academic royalty in France.

Lévi-Strauss’s path from youthful researcher in the most remote regions of Brazil to the Collège de France was, however, sinuous and uncertain. *Tristes Tropiques* was written between October 1954 and March 1955, roughly fifteen years after his trek across Brazil, during a time when Lévi-Strauss believed that he no longer had a future in the French university system.469 In fact, he had just experienced an unsuccessful bid for a chair at the Collège de France and thought that the publication of such a book—a hybrid of poetic reflection, travelogue, and ethnographic study—would ruin the credibility he had established in the academy.470 Lévi-Strauss’s descriptions of his experiences in Brazil are a combination of original impressions reconstructed from his field notes and reflections on these primary impressions that amalgamate the knowledge and experience Lévi-Strauss acquired in intervening years with the *mentalité* of the young field researcher.

A profound sense of anxiety relating to both his chosen vocation of anthropology and his professional status flows across the various temporal layers of Lévi-Strauss’s narrative. Recalling a particularly difficult moment during his time in the field, Lévi-Strauss reflects on his chosen profession:

> Is it a normal occupation like any other profession, the only difference being that the office or laboratory is separated from the practitioner’s home by a distance of several thousand

469 See Didier Eribon, *Conversations with Claude Lévi-Strauss*, 58.

470 See Didier Eribon, *Conversations with Claude Lévi-Strauss*, 59.
kilometers? Or does it result from a more radical choice, which implies that the anthropologist is calling into question the system in which he was born and brought up?"^{471}

In this instant of self-reflexivity, Lévi-Strauss raises the question of how the choice to study foreign cultures relates to the researcher’s relationship to their home culture. Does this choice imply some already extant estrangement? In addition to the anxiety expressed here about the existential motives behind the anthropological impulse, Lévi-Strauss expresses frustration over his career prospects. Finding himself at perhaps the furthest possible remove from Paris, he remarks that:

> the more prudent of my former colleagues were beginning to climb the academic ladder; those with political leanings, such as I had once had, were already members of parliament and would soon be ministers. And here was I, trekking across desert wastes in pursuit of a few pathetic human remnants.^{472}

What was his motive? Was all the time wasted in organizing the expedition, braving hazards, and moving at a tedious pace across a foreign continent worth the effort? Given that he was writing this in a period where his future in the French Academy looked bleak, these passages take on additional pathos. The young Lévi-Strauss mired in the wilds of Mato Grosso and the middle-aged author separated by the fifteen years of experiencing war, exile and the frustration of enduring an uncertain place in the French Academy, seem to merge here in this meditation on the existential plight of the anthropologist.

This is a theme that Lévi-Strauss continually revisits in *Tristes Tropiques*. In fact, it is a theme that is introduced in his very first line—“I hate traveling and

---


exploring.” The reason given for this hatred is that travel literature seeks to impress through an aesthetic of fantasy rather than engage the critical faculties. Further, the horde of professional travel writers lecturing and touring the globe in the post-War era, describe a reality that no longer exists. What was apparent for Lévi-Strauss by 1955 was that humanity was losing the wild species of cultures that populated the globe in a few remote areas in favor of a ‘monoculture.’ His unease and the sense of loss over these disappearing cultures explain the title of his work. Yet, the hatred Lévi-Strauss expresses for the vogue of mid-twentieth century travel betrays some apprehension of the family resemblance of the anthropologist to the traveler.

Early on, in the first part of the book, while discussing the emptiness of the traveler’s tales, the naïveté of the public in believing them, and anthropology’s use in disabusing the public of such myths, Lévi-Strauss brings up the phenomenon seen in North American Indian tribes where young men separate themselves from the tribe as a ceremonial rite of passage. In the journeys they take, these young men face a number of trials—some of them self-created like soaking in freezing water and removing their body hair piece by piece. These journeys may be seen as quests for power where the participants “hope to enter into communication with the

473 Claude Lévi-Strauss, Tristes Tropiques, 17.

474 This is borne out more fully when Lévi-Strauss writes: “So I can understand the mad passion for travel books and their deceptiveness. They create the illusion of something which no longer exists but still should exist, if we were to have any hope of avoiding the overwhelming conclusion that the history of the past twenty thousand years is irrevocable. There is nothing to be done about it now; civilization has ceased to be that delicate flower which was preserved and painstakingly cultivated in one or two sheltered areas of a soil rich in wild species which may have seemed menacing because of the vigour of their growth, but which nevertheless made it possible to vary and revitalize the cultivated stock. Mankind has opted for monoculture; it is in the process of creating a mass civilization, as beetroot is grown in the mass.” See Claude Lévi-Strauss, Tristes Tropiques, 38.
supernatural world.\textsuperscript{475} With this communication or vision, they hope to gain a power or privilege that will allow them to return to their home society with an elevated status. While Lévi-Strauss speaks of this phenomenon as he is castigating the modern traveler’s “quest for power” in France of the 1950s, this kind of quest for power does not seem far removed from the Lévi-Strauss’s ritual removal and return to France. After all, the dynamics of becoming an anthropologist (being anointed by Mauss et al.) and ascending the ranks of the French academy have a similar ritual pattern. The structure of \textit{Tristes Tropiques} where the opening parts of the work describes Lévi-Strauss’s departure for Brazil, the middle sections his ordeals, and the final section the anthropologist’s return to the home society.

Perhaps the contradiction between Lévi-Strauss’s hatred of the modern traveler and his own anthropological practice cannot be entirely resolved.\textsuperscript{476} Nonetheless, the problem posed by the quest for power and how it translates into anthropological practice is explored extensively if indirectly in the leading chapter of \textit{Tristes Tropiques} final section devoted to the anthropologists return to society. This chapter, the \textit{Apotheosis of Augustus} takes its name from a play Lévi-Strauss wrote during lull in his Brazilian expedition. Written on the back of field notes filled with data and genealogical tables that seek to capture basic elements of relation amongst members of the Nambikwara, this play reads like an allegory for both the

---

\textsuperscript{475} Claude Lévi-Strauss, \textit{Tristes Tropiques}, 40.

\textsuperscript{476} Nonetheless, we might say that in the case of the anthropologist, travel is demystified—it’s cache known and understood as well as the limitations it has in terms of the understanding.
condition of the ethnographer and Lévi-Strauss’s relationship to academe. The play centers on a fundamental dichotomy between the Roman Emperor Augustus and Cinna, a childhood friend. In the play, Cinna returns to Rome after ten years of adventures just as Augustus is about to be deified by the Roman Senate. Where Augustus represents a model of success achieved through conforming to societal norms, Cinna is a figure, like the traveler or ethnographer, that has willfully exiled himself from his community and returned in the hope that the trials he has endured will merit him a special distinction.

The dramatic tension between Cinna and Augustus propels the play forward. Cinna’s return from his travels make him a temporary celebrity in society. Nonetheless, he becomes disquieted by his own conviction that his travels have amounted to nothing: “traveling was a snare and a delusion; the whole thing could appear true only to those people acquainted with the reflection, not the reality.” Augustus, on the other hand, was about to be deified. Further, prior to his apotheosis, Augustus learns that deification will not involve a transcendent condition where he is removed to something like Plato’s realm of forms, but rather will involve the “ability to tolerate the proximity of a wild beast without a sensation of disgust, to put up with its stench and the excrement with which it would cover him.” Thus, given that Augustus is an exemplar of society, his apotheosis will amount to reconciling nature and society. This, of course, provokes great envy in

---

477 My reading is consistent with and influenced by the reading given by Christopher Johnson. See Christopher Johnson, *Claude Lévi-Strauss: The Formative Years*, Chapter Five.


Cinna who resolves to assassinate Augustus. Augustus himself is likewise dismayed that his lifelong ambition for social distinction might be undone through his apotheosis—given that this involves a union with the base natural world. Together, Cinna and Augustus conspire to arrange Augustus’s assassination. This will confer upon Cinna “the black immortality of the regicide,” and allow him to be “reintegrated into society while continuing to oppose it.”

Through a purported fault of memory—fifteen years having elapsed since the writing of the play and the last scenes remaining unwritten—Lévi-Strauss leaves the ending of the play in a state of doubt. Nonetheless, he suggests that rather than remain complicit with Cinna’s plot, Augustus doubles his guard and has Cinna arrested. Augustus would become a god and pardon Cinna—who would count this as just another failure.

This play penned by the young ethnographer and narrated by the mature author of Tristes Tropiques suggests a number of readings. One possible reading of the play is an analysis of what it has to say about the anthropologist’s relationship to their own society upon their return from the field. This is a reading that Lévi-Strauss pursues in the next chapter in Tristes Tropiques: “A Little Glass of Rum.” Here he engages in an extended reflection on perhaps the central problem of anthropology: the place of judgment in the evaluation of foreign societies. This is

---

480 Claude Lévi-Strauss, Tristes Tropiques, 381.

481 Christopher Johnson reads Lévi-Strauss as suggesting two possible endings to the play: one written by the younger ethnographer which ends with Cinna’s successful assassination of Cinna, and a second where Augustus doubles the guard. The problem with this reading is that Lévi-Strauss never proposes the successful assassination as an ending. He relates the play scene by scene. After the assassination plot is conceived and agreed to by both Cinna and Augustus, Lévi-Strauss interrupts his narration of the plot to say that he does not remember how it is supposed to end. Nonetheless, he does not propose two endings: he says he ‘thinks’ it was supposed to end with Augustus’s subterfuge and Cinna’s failure.
the problem he, as well as the character Cinna, faces upon return home. As he formulates it:

how could we proclaim the validity of foreign societies, except by basing our judgment on the values of the society which has prompted us to engage in research? Since we are permanently unable to escape from the norms by which we have been conditioned, our attempt to put different societies, including our own, into perspective, are said to be no more than a shamefaced way of admitting its superiority over all others.482

Lévi-Strauss’s response to this dilemma is to shift the modality of judgment from absolute approval or criticism towards a relative weighing of the merits and flaws of each society.483 The solution then becomes one of recognizing that “No society is perfect. It is in the nature of all societies to include a degree of impurity incompatible with the norms they proclaim and which finds concrete expression in a certain dosage of injustice, insensitiveness and cruelty.”484 Once we recognize that our judgments of societies near and far are neither absolute nor comprehensive, Lévi-Strauss argues that anthropological research can help us evaluate that “certain dosage of injustice, insensitiveness and cruelty.”485 This solution to the problem seems remarkably close to Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s conception of perfectibility as articulated in the Discourse on Inequality. Lévi-Strauss acknowledges Rousseau’s influence by arguing that it was Rousseau “who taught us that, after demolishing all

482 Claude Lévi-Strauss, Tristes Tropiques, 385.

483 My reading follows Christopher Johnson on this point. He notes that Lévi-Strauss’s solution is one of recognizing that the anthropologist is not unique in his alienation. Rather, the anthropologist articulates explicitly a general contradiction of humanity and is able—to the extent that it is possible—resolve this contradiction by being able to “discern what in other societies would be the principles of social organization applicable to the reform of our own society.” See Christopher Johnson, 156.

484 Claude Lévi-Strauss, Tristes Tropiques, 387.

485 Claude Lévi-Strauss, Tristes Tropiques, 387.
forms of social organization, we can still discover the principles which will allow us to construct a new form." A further element of Lévi-Strauss’s solution is to focus evaluation on the home society because the “society we belong to is the only society we are in a position to transform without any risk of destroying it, since the changes being introduced by us, are coming from within the society itself.”

A second reading of Lévi-Strauss’s “Apotheosis of Augustus” centers on the theme of power. The character Cinna can be read as a stand-in for Lévi-Strauss. Like Lévi-Strauss, Cinna had chosen to live outside the bounds of his own society. By going to Brazil and pursuing fieldwork in a discipline that was in an immature state, Lévi-Strauss had forsaken more traditional paths to academic success in France such as literature, philosophy and the classics. Further, by choosing academia itself, instead of something like law, Lévi-Strauss had made a decision to live on the margins of social power in his home society. Earlier in Tristes Tropiques,

---

486 Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Tristes Tropiques*, 390. Lévi-Strauss does not reference Rousseau’s notion of perfectibility explicitly. Instead he argues that the above realization comes from understanding *Emile* as providing the key by which Rousseau was able to move from “the ruins left by the Discours sur l’origine de l’inégalité to the ample structure of the Contrat Social.”

487 Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Tristes Tropiques*, 392. It is worth noting here that Lévi-Strauss discussion of anthropology as a tool in social reform of the home society is a remarkably elegant expression of the notion of anthropology as cultural critique that George Marcus and Michael Fischer advanced more recently. See George E. Marcus and Michael M.J. Fischer, *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences*, 2nd Edition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999). In fact, the juxtaposition of Lévi-Strauss’s fieldnotes on one side of the paper with the sketch of his allegorical play about the return of the anthropologist perfectly illustrates what Marcus and Fischer have to say about anthropology as an act of translation. They write: “In cross-cultural communication, and in writing about one culture for members of another, experience-near or local concepts of the cultural other are juxtaposed with the more comfortable, experience-far concepts that the writer share with his readership. The act of translation involved in any act of cross-cultural interpretation is thus a relative matter with an ethnographer as mediator between distinct sets of categories and cultural conceptions that interact in different ways at different points of the ethnographic process.” See George E. Marcus and Michael M.J. Fischer, *Anthropology as Cultural Critique*, 31.
Lévi-Strauss drew some distinctions between the personality types he met in law school and in the arts and sciences. Paraphrasing his remarks, law students tended to be extroverted, aggressive, vulgar and political identified with the Right; whereas the academic types were “prematurely aged adolescents, discreet, withdrawn, usually Left-Wing.”\(^{488}\) He ascribes the correlation between career trajectory and personality type to the fact that those who are entering professions like law “behave as they do to celebrate their release from school and the fact that they already accept a definite place in the system of social functions.”\(^{489}\) Those seeking positions as academics attempt to stay in school through adulthood and withdraw from the broader social world to devote themselves “to the preservation and transmission of a heritage independent of the passing moment.”\(^{490}\) Although granted a chair in the Religions of non-civilized people—that he renamed ‘non-literate’—at the École pratique des hautes études in 1950, by the writing of *Tristes Tropiques* Lévi-Strauss felt his position in the academy was tenuous. Had the choices he made and the boldness of his expedition failed to deliver the *mana* required to establish himself and anthropology within the French Academy? Was he now just like Cinna with his thunder stolen left contemplating another failure?\(^{491}\)

\(^{488}\) Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Tristes Tropiques*, 54.

\(^{489}\) Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Tristes Tropiques*, 54

\(^{490}\) Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Tristes Tropiques*, 54.

\(^{491}\) A relevant passage which contains these confessional overtones reads as follows: “Can it be that I, the elderly predecessor of those scourers of the jungle, am the only one to have brought back nothing but a handful of ashes? Is mine the only voice to bear witness to the impossibility of escapism. Like the Indian in the myth, I went as far as the earth allows one to go, and when I arrived at the world’s end, I questioned the people, the creatures and things I found there and met with the same disappointment: ‘He stood still, weeping bitterly, praying and moaning. And yet no mysterious sound reached his ears, nor was he put to sleep in order to be transported, as he slept, to the temple
Lévi-Strauss knew that *Tristes Tropiques* would be a controversial text. It was a text he had no intention of writing until he was approached by Jean Malaurie, a fellow ethnographer, who was compiling a series of ethnographic works called *Terre humaine* for the publisher Plon. Feeling that he had no future in the university system, he was tempted by the offer to write about his travels with the liberty granted him by the publisher.492 Literary critics praised the text—in fact the Académie Goncourt regretted not being able to award Lévi-Strauss its prestigious award because the book was a work of non-fiction. Anthropologists, however, were mixed in their reaction. Paul Rivet, one of the founders of the Musée de l’homme with whom Lévi-Strauss had enjoyed a good relationship, "shut the door in [his] face."493 They were not to repair their relationship until Rivet’s last days. Although the “Apotheosis of Augustus” might be read as a reflection on Lévi-Strauss’s failure to achieve the academic position he sought and the place he desired for anthropology within the academic field, the text of *Tristes Tropiques* might also be read as a kind of last ditch attempt to depart from the norms and conventions of society—and in this case those norms that had been established in ethnography—in order to return to that society with sufficient honor and power to establish himself. This is a reading suggested by Christopher Johnson who argues that “*Tristes Tropiques* could therefore be seen as a final attempt at exorbitant departure, this

---

492 This follows Lévi-Strauss’s account given in his interview with Eribon. See Didier Eribon, *Conversations with Claude Lévi-Strauss*, 58.

time not simply of ethnology from the parent disciplines of philosophy or sociology, but a departure from ethnology itself.” What Lévi-Strauss had done—in entirely breaking with protocol—was merge his own subjectivity in with his ethnographic descriptions so that the book mixed the genres of ethnographic writing, autobiography, and *bildungsroman*.

Whether written out of frustration or as a final attempt to gain personal recognition, *Tristes Tropiques*’s success won Lévi-Strauss the professional status necessary to elevate anthropology as a professional discipline in the French Academy. In 1959, with Maurice Merleau-Ponty as his sponsor, he was elected to the Collège de France. His was the first chair in anthropology at the Collège. The Collège de France was the perfect institutional setting for Lévi-Strauss. During his time (1960-1982) at the Collège, Lévi-Strauss set up an anthropology laboratory that helped centralize research efforts amongst French scholars. Additionally, the freedom Lévi-Strauss enjoyed at the Collège—being able to lecture solely on his research interests—permitted him to publish original works at a lively pace. Given its role in helping establish Lévi-Strauss at the apex of the French academy, *Tristes Tropiques* may be thought of as completing Lévi-Strauss’s academic journey from philosophy to anthropology. As much as it narrates the initial stages of this journey, it was the publication of this work that provided the platform for the institutionalization of anthropology as a discipline in the French University.

---

494 Christopher Johnson, *Claude Lévi-Strauss: The Formative Years*, 160.


496 Although as Lévi-Strauss points out in his interviews with Eribon, Mauss held a chair which—although nominally in sociology—was for all intents and purposes, in anthropology.
next section, I will turn my attention more exclusively to the institutional development of anthropology prior to Lévi-Strauss.

**Anthropology before Lévi-Strauss**

In the section above, I have provided a few intimations of the state of anthropology during Lévi-Strauss’s student days and before the recognition of the discipline by the Collège de France. With the establishment of the Institut d’ethnologie in the Sorbonne under the direction of Lucian Lévy-Bruhl, Marcel Mauss, and Paul Rivet an informal sense of anthropology had developed. With the French university focused on the production of lycée teachers with a general knowledge of history, literature and the classics, resources for specialized research in anthropology were limited. Nonetheless, although outside the required sequence for the licence d’enseignement, ethnologie was recognized as a field of study.

Further, besides the Institut d’ethnologie, the Musée d’ethnographie du Trocadéro had been founded during the nineteenth century. The Musée was a haphazard mix of objects acquired from France’s colonial ventures during the scramble for Africa; in the mid-1930s, it was being transformed into the Musée de l’homme and set up along more scientific lines. Because the history of anthropology has not been as well thoroughly studied as its American and British counterparts497, what I intend to do in this section is provide a fuller account of the development of anthropology prior

---

to Lévi-Strauss by probing the issues surrounding anthropology’s relationship to colonialism as well as some of the confusion historians have had over the use of the terms anthropology, ethnography and ethnology. Additionally, I will sketch some of the reasons for the relatively late development of anthropology and the other social sciences as professional disciplines by using the analysis of the French University system given by Terry Clark in *Patrons and Prophets, The French University System and the Emergence of the Social Sciences*.

In the past decade, interest in the relationship between the historical development of ethnography and the French colonial state has been augmented by the increased attention that French imperialism has received more generally. A number of scholars, Alice Conklin, Herman Lebovics and Paul Silverstein among them, have sought to bring French colonial history from the margins to the center of French history. One of the strategies for bringing colonial history into the fold of French metropolitan history is to show how the colonies served as laboratories for developing new administrative techniques that could be brought back home for more effective policing of the French populace. In her book, *Mission to Civilize: The Republican Idea of Empire in France and West Africa, 1895-1930*, Alice Conklin advances the argument that many features of the modern welfare state arose out of policies that were first enacted in a colonial setting. With French West Africa as her focus, Conklin argues that efforts to employ science and medicine for the betterment
of local society led to the notion that the state could be seen as an powerful agent of transforming and regulating social order.\footnote{498}

Likewise, in \textit{Bringing the Empire Back Home}, Herman Lebovics looks at the roles colonial administrators played back home in metropolitan France. Focusing on Émile Biasini, who worked as an administrator in Chad before working under André Malraux at the French Ministry of Culture and played a significant role in the design of the \textit{Grand Travaux} completed under François Mitterand, Lebovics argues that the projection of imperial power abroad through monuments and culture was brought back to France to subdue centrifugal forces, mainly regional, that were threatening to undermine the hegemony of the French government.\footnote{499} One of principal arguments of Lebovics’ work is that French social science in the 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} century developed in a colonial context in order to more effectively manage colonial populations. As a result of decolonization, the social sciences and ethnography began to study the home population in order to quell regionalist and other radical movements in the hexagon.

\footnote{498} She writes, “Some reformers became convinced that state intervention was required for a healthy, efficient, and productive social order; they also maintained that the best way to create this order was to alter the social milieu in which individuals functioned—rather than to act upon the individuals themselves.” See Alice L. Conklin, \textit{A Mission to Civilize: The Republican Idea of Empire in France and West Africa 1895-1930} (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997), 8.

\footnote{499} Of the \textit{Grand Travaux}—the Louvre’s renovation, the building of La Defense and the Bibliothèque nationale—Lebovics writes: “There are, I think, three especially striking things about this gluttony for big buildings. First, for all the new talk of decentralization under the Socialists, the capital got the most money and the grandest project. Second, and more tellingly, the buildings erected—the arch, the conservatory, the Grand Louvre, the opera house—were all monuments to the largely exhausted arts of the old culture. And third, these structures were all remakes of institutions that had been founded or had flourished at moments of French triumphal power, either in Europe or in the colonies. In the postcolonial era, they serve as display cases for accumulated cultural capital.” See Herman Lebovics, \textit{Bringing the Empire Back Home: France in the Global Age} (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004), 82.
Paul Silverstein’s *Algeria in France: Transpolitics, Race and Nation*, makes a similar argument about ethnography as a colonial science. In his work, Alexis de Tocqueville serves as an exemplar of the nineteenth-century connection between social science and imperialism. Tocqueville, besides being in the vanguard of famous French intellectuals to write a great work on American culture, served as a colonial administrator in Algeria. His colonial writings show Tocqueville arguing that knowing a society was necessary for that society’s control. Further, despite his criticism of state centralization in France, he argued that the French Republican model should be applied to Algeria—concerns about balancing centralization with individual liberties could be addressed later.500 After France conquered Algeria in 1830, “geographers, linguists and ethnologists, catalogued the racial traits, language forms, sociopolitical traditions and religious rites they observed among the conquered.”501 As with Conklin and Lebovics, the sciences and techniques developed in the colonial sphere were brought back to France for more effective policing of the metropolis. Silverstein connects the colonial practiced developed in Algeria to the modernization projects developed during the Second Empire to control the working class.

In addition to these general links that Conklin, Lebovics, and Silverstein identify between the French colonial administration and the development of anthropology, there are a few historical moments worth mentioning. The first


would be the founding of the Musée d’ethnographie du Trocadaro in 1878. The creation of this museum coincides with the expansion of colonial territory in Africa. As Emmanuelle Sibeud has put it, “[t]he Musée was created at the beginning of France’s colonial expansion with the stated goal of gathering material on the “poor inferior humanity” doomed to annihilation through conquest”\(^502\). According to Sibeud, there were no resources available for the Musée to train ethnologists, so as a result, it was colonial officials in French Africa that were writing reports on indigenous groups with no scientific training. One major reason that the Musée du Trocadaro was converted into the Musée de l’homme was that by the 1920s and 1930s, it had become recognized as “a jumble of exotica” with “an extrascientific ambience.”\(^503\) By this time it was more tied up with the interwar craze for jazz, l’art nègre, and primitivism.\(^504\)

A second historical moment in which colonial history and the history of ethnography were intimately tied together was the aftermath of the Great War. One consequence of the War was the parceling out of German and Ottoman territories to France and Britain by the League of Nations. They were, however, handed out as Mandate territories which entailed a number of provisions. Thus, although France’s colonial empire could be said to have grown with the additions of Syria, French Cameron, and French Togoland, the League of Nations directed the French government “to grant colonized populations a degree of self-rule; to promulgate

---


503 These are James Clifford’s words. See James Clifford, "On Ethnographic Surrealism," 554.

504 This is James Clifford’s observation on the Musée.
reforms that improved subject peoples’ economies and enhanced their welfare; to work toward making Mandate territories capable of independence (however long this might take).” In addition to the terms the League attached to the transfer of power, France and Britain alike faced internal criticism from their communist parties as a result of the condemnation of colonial rule issued by the third Communist International. Given the size and disruptive power of the communist parties of this era, both France and Britain sought to apply “scientific” rationality to the rule of subject territories” in order to tamp down on actual and potential criticism of colonial policy. This provided impetus for the French government to lend greater support to a scientific program of ethnography that figures like Mauss, Rivet and Lévy-Bruhl were eager to develop.

This brings us to the foundation of the Institut d’ethnologie in 1925. Lucien Lévy-Bruhl described the Institut as a practical institution that would allow for ethnology to develop as a science while simultaneously serving the colonial administration. As Emmanuelle Sibeud notes, the funding for the Institut was provided by grants from French colonial administrations in Indochina, Madagascar and French West Africa. Given the usefulness of the Institut for France’s colonies, it formed partnerships with colonial institutions such as the Ecole française d’Extrême-Orient and in the case of French West Africa, the Institut “sanctioned an


organization of research isomorphic with the colonial hierarchy."\textsuperscript{509} Given that the Institut d’ethnologie was part of the Sorbonne, what we see is that the first recognition of anthropology within the university system was intimately tied in with the colonial enterprise.

Another highly visible instance of the connection between French ethnography and its colonial possession was the Colonial Exposition of 1931 discussed above and which Herman Lebovics and Patricia Morton discuss at length in their respective works \textit{True France} and \textit{Hybrid Modernities}. Likewise, the 1931-33 Dakar-Djibouti expedition from Senegal to Ethiopia was sponsored by the French state for the purpose of gathering “artifacts and art objects for the museum which was soon to become the Musée de l'Homme.”\textsuperscript{510} The cumulative effect of the enumerated links between the colonial project and the development of ethnography lends weight to the notion that “anthropology was the daughter of colonialism.” Nonetheless, questions remain about the intellectual norms that were developed by figures like Mauss, Rivet and Lévy-Bruhl. Did they simply reproduce colonial power relations or did they try and achieve a more universal understanding of humanity? This leads us into a discussion of the terms anthropology, ethnography, and ethnology as they were used in the nineteenth century up through the twentieth.

In the contemporary French Academy, anthropology is the study of cultures, peoples and civilizations and is roughly consistent with American cultural anthropology and the British social anthropology. This was not the case prior to the


\textsuperscript{510} Michel Beaujour, “Anthropology and Ethnography,” 139.
Second World War. It was largely due to Lévi-Strauss’s efforts that the term anthropology came back into currency in the French academy. Prior to Lévi-Strauss, anthropology was used to refer to the natural history of humanity and ethnology was the preferred term used by figures like Mauss, Rivet and Lévy-Bruhl. As Michel Beaujour has observed, “it applied to humans those methods which zoologists applied to other species.”\(^{511}\) In essence, during the nineteenth century and through the Second World War, anthropology was the science of race in France. It acquired this definition in the mid-nineteenth century because of the research program taken up by the creation of Paul Broca’s Société d’anthropologie in 1859.\(^{512}\) In *True France*, Herman Lebovics argues that the expansion of anthropology as a racial science during the later part of the nineteenth century and again in the interwar period was due to consolidation of the French colonial empire. Given the expansion of French overseas territories, the question of what differentiated citizens of France from their colonial subjects became a pressing issue.\(^{513}\)

While the definitions of anthropology and ethnology were clear by the 1930s, these terms have a complicated history in France. Emmanuelle Siebud argues that the meaning of these terms fluctuated over the course of the 19\(^{\text{th}}\) and early 20\(^{\text{th}}\) centuries because the social sciences lacked a coherent paradigm. Rather than being organized within the University, these sciences were developed in learned societies and organized around what Terry Clark has referred to as patron/client

---

\(^{511}\) Michel Beaujour, "Anthropology and Ethnography," 138.


clusters.\textsuperscript{514} It was towards the end of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century that the term anthropology gained currency as a term referring to the natural history of humanity.\textsuperscript{515} Ethnology was a newer coinage that began to appear in French dictionaries around 1830. Emmanuelle Siebud writes that by 1839, with the creation of the société ethnologique, ethnology was the science of races. With Paul Broca’s creation of the Société d’anthropologie in 1859, and the waning influence of the société d’ethnologie, anthropology became the dominant term used for the scientific study of race. For the most part, ethnology dropped out of parlance until it was revived in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century by social scientists like Arnold van Gennep, Émile Durkheim, Marcel Mauss, Paul Rivet and Lucien Lévy-Bruhl to refer to the comparative study of cultures based on field research.\textsuperscript{516}

What happened in the interim was that about the time ethnology lost currency as a term referring to the science of races, ethnography began to distinguish itself as a practice from anthropology.\textsuperscript{517} Practioners of ethnography formed the Société d’ethnographie de Paris in 1859 to contest the physical reductionism of anthropology. These practioners formed ties with linguists and scholars who studied literate populations in the Americas, Asia and Africa; they were not yet interested in the non-literate populations that Lévi-Strauss would

\textsuperscript{514} See below for a fuller discussion of Clark’s concept.

\textsuperscript{515} Emmanuelle Siebud, "The Metamorphosis of Ethnology in France, 1839-1930," 98. Siebeud writes that before it took on this meaning, anthropology had a theological connotation but does not spell this out more fully.


\textsuperscript{517} Here I am paraphrasing Emmanuelle Siebud, "The Metamorphosis of Ethnology in France, 1839-1930," 99.
come to be fascinated by. Their vision contrasted sharply with Paul Broca’s laboratory-based practice of anthropology. Anthropology was to be concerned with “the physical description of races and the elucidation of racial hierarchy.” With the sanction of science, and given the fact that many of the members of the Société d’anthropologie were doctors, anthropology had the upper hand on ethnology because the medical profession was held in high regard and ethnography had yet to develop an adequate methodology or professional standards. The creation of the Musée du Trocadéro in 1878 represented an attempt at a rapprochement between the two. With the aim of collecting the art and artifacts of the colonial peoples of French West Africa, the Musée was to engage in ethnographic practice to document the cultures that were doomed to fail under the pressures of colonialism. The problem, as Siebud points out, is that “a pragmatic and descriptive ethnography [...] was not officially sanctioned in France.” The first director of the Musée was an anthropologist, Ernest-Théodore Hamy, who despite trying to carry out the museum’s ethnographic mission lacked a trained cadre of ethnologists. Thus, colonial administrators ended up being the ones who compiled information on colonial populations.

By the beginning of the twentieth century, ethnography’s challenge to anthropology had faded as a result of its lack of a methodology. Anthropology, as a


519 Sibeud notes that ethnography during the last third of the 19th century was “steeped in spiritualist philosophy and literary erudition.” See Emmanuelle Siebud, "The Metamorphosis of Ethnology in France, 1839-1930," 99.

science of the race, also declined in the early twentieth century as problems with the notion of race began to develop. Towards the end of the first decade of the twentieth century, new journals (such as the Revue des études ethnographiques et sociologiques), institutions (the Institut ethnographique international de Paris in 1910, the Institut français d’anthropologie in 1911, a new Société d’ethnographie in 1913, and the Société des amis du musée d’ethnographie du Trocadéro in 1914) and figures (Marcel Mauss and Arnold van Gannep) began to emerge to revive ethnology and put ethnography on sounder academic footing. The new journals and institutions began to debate what was proper ethnographic technique. Thus, intellectual norms began to be argued, debated and adopted for the practice of ethnography. Professional conferences were held, such as “the first international conference on ethnology and ethnography” hosted by Arnold van Gannep. The journals, institutions and conferences that emerged in this period provided points of contact with colonial administrators who were actually doing the field research on populations and academics who were interested in a more rigorous conceptualization of ethnology as an academic field.521

Nonetheless, there were tensions between colonial administrators and the more established academics who were in the process of trying to define and develop the social sciences. Emmanuelle Sibeud writes that roughly 30 or so colonial administrators became involved in the Institut ethnographique; they also participated in the Société des amis du musée du Trocadaro and the Institut français

---

While figures like Durkheim, Mauss, Rivet and Lévy-Bruhl also partook in Institut français d’anthropologie, they looked down upon the colonial administrators who lacked academic qualifications. Arnold van Gannep, who was independent of the Durkheimian academic circle, but nonetheless linked to it through Mauss, who was the supervisor of his thesis, formed stronger links with the colonial administrators. Ultimately, however, given that figures like Mauss never did fieldwork, academic social scientists in France began to utilize the ethnographic studies produced by the colonial administrators. With the onset of the First World War, the reliance of academic social scientists on these administrators increased. Siebud notes that Mauss lost many students to the war. With some of the antagonisms between the colonial administrators and metropolitan academics alleviated as a result of interaction within institutions like the Institut français d’anthropologie, Mauss, Rivet, and Lévy-Bruhl dropped their reservations about partnering with them. As a result of this partnership, Siebud argues that two important shifts occurred: 1) a formal methodology for field research was created and 2) a link was created between metropolitan France and the colonies as a result of the links between the academic societies of Paris and the learned institutions in

---


523 Siebud notes that one of the reasons why it was difficult for academics to produce these ethnographic studies themselves was that the French university did not have positions for ethnographers/ethnologists. Mauss had the only position—as Chair of the history of non-civilized peoples at the École pratique des hautes études. It was therefore also difficult to draw students toward the practice of ethnography as there were no jobs available for such practitioners.

the colonies. Ultimately, this alliance—given that it generated a formal methodology that was teachable—permitted ethnography to gain official recognition in the French University in the form of the Institut d’ethnographie.

While the above narrative clearly signals a relationship between French colonialism and the development of anthropology, the notion that anthropology simply reproduced the power relations of colonialism is simplistic and misguided. Siebud makes an excellent point in arguing that “the mere accumulation of information about subject peoples in colonial administrative files would [not] have sufficed to solidify ethnology.” Her view is that the relationship between knowledge and power is more complex than most historical commentators acknowledge. While the colonies were certainly an impetus for the development of ethnology as a social science, ethnology never became merely an instrument for domination. The administrators practicing ethnography “chose to channel their findings into forming a new discipline rather than forming pragmatic formulae for domination,” Sibeud writes. This argument helps portray the development of anthropology prior to Lévi-Strauss in a new light. Although born of colonialism, ethnology in the 1920s and 1930s was not a simple reproduction of colonialism. Indeed, we have here a rigorous formation of intellectual norms that are at some distance from the politics of colonialism.

From Ethnology to Structural Anthropology

So I accept the characterization of aesthete in so far as I believe the ultimate goal of the human sciences to be not to constitute, but to dissolve man. The pre-eminent value of anthropology is that it represents the first step in a procedure which involves others. Ethnographic analysis tries to arrive at invariants beyond the empirical diversity of human societies; and, as the present work shows, these are sometimes to be found at the most unforeseen points. Rousseau foresaw this with his usual acumen: ‘One needs to look near at hand if one wants to study men; but to study man one must learn to look from afar; one must first observe differences in order to discover attributes.’ However, it would not be enough to reabsorb particular humanities into a general one. This first enterprise opens the way for others which Rousseau would not have been so ready to accept and which are incumbent on the exact natural sciences: the reintegration of culture in nature and finally of life within the whole of its physico-chemical conditions.528

The brief history of anthropology’s development provided in the previous section should at the very least complicate the relationship that has often been invoked about the relationship between colonial power and anthropology. The work of Claude Lévi-Strauss and his involvement in furthering the establishment of anthropology in France further removed anthropology from reproducing colonial power relations. This makes sense given that he developed the paradigm for his Structural Anthropology in the 1950s and 1960s during a period in which France lost its possessions in Indochina and Algeria. This was a period of global decolonization; one in which the superiority of Western culture was rigorously questioned.529 In academic terms, Lévi-Strauss was a member of the first generation of French academics, the generation of the 1930s, to do fieldwork.530 Among his


529 Johnson makes a similar point in Chapter Four of his work where he considers the relationship between Lévi-Strauss’s project and humanism.

530 Both Terry Clark and Christopher Johnson identify Strauss as part of this generation and credit it with innovation in the social sciences. See Christopher Johnson, Claude Lévi-Strauss: The Formative Years, 3 and Terry N. Clark, Prophets and Patrons: The French University and the Emergence of the Social Sciences, 233.
most important contributions to the development of anthropology in France was his redefinition of the term anthropology. As Christopher Johnson has argued, Lévi-Strauss’s preference for the term anthropology over ethnography is related to his project for establishing anthropology as “the human science par excellence.”

This section will discuss more fully Lévi-Strauss’s attempts to establish anthropology as a specific discipline in France and the conflict this generated with his desire to have anthropology play a central role in general intellectual discourse.

To set up anthropology as an independent discipline in the French academy, Lévi-Strauss needed to declare anthropology’s independence from sociology. During Lévi-Strauss’s student days, Émile Durkheim’s imprint upon the social sciences in France was overwhelmingly pervasive. Although sociology itself was not fully established as an independent discipline in the French University, Durkheim’s influence was far-reaching. After Durkheim’s death in 1917, Célestine Bouglé, Marcel Mauss, Maurice Halbwachs, Paul Fauconnet, François Simiand and Henri Hubert were among the most influential successors to Durkheim’s legacy. Although figures like Mauss and Hubert were to venture into ethnography, part of Durkheim’s legacy was a conception of sociology as the queen of the social sciences. As Terry Clark puts it, in Durkheim’s conception, “sociology neither claimed a


532 Terry Clark argues that because the social sciences were marginal to the University system throughout the 19th century and into the twentieth, the practice and development of these sciences owed much to the formation of patron-client clusters. Durkheim was an example of a powerful patron who had an extensive network of clients.

533 See Chapter 7 of *Prophets and Patrons* for Terry Clark’s discussion on the development of the social sciences after 1914.
subject matter separate from the individual social sciences, nor did it approach the same subject matter with a distinctive methodology; sociology comprised the “system” or the “corpus” of the individual social sciences. Thus, if Lévi-Strauss was to establish anthropology as a discipline that was truly independent of sociology, it would be necessary to show the limitations of sociology in order to reconfigure the organization of the social sciences.

This is what he does in his article “History and Anthropology,” that was reprinted in his *Structural Anthropology*. Here he argues that:

> When one confines oneself to the study of a single society, one may do valuable work. Experience shows that the best monographs are generally produced by investigators who have lived and worked in one particular region. But they must forgo conclusions about other regions.

This passage is clearly directed toward sociology’s lack of a comparative dimension. Lévi-Strauss’s strategy in “History and Anthropology” seems to be one of forming an alliance between history and anthropology at the expense of sociology. Anthropology studies cultures and civilizations remote in space while history does the same for those at a temporal remove. After forging this alliance, Lévi-Strauss goes on to show that the true difference between history and anthropology lies in the former being occupied with “conscious expressions of social life” while the latter

---


“proceeds by examining its unconscious foundations.”\textsuperscript{537} He seals it by arguing that history and anthropology need each other to reach a full understanding of humanity. Given the distinction that Lévi-Strauss was at pains to make between anthropology and sociology, his adaptation and redefinition of the term anthropology makes sense. The term ethnology was used by figures like Mauss and Rivet, and carried with it a sense of being subsumed under the practice of sociology. The use of the term anthropology helped Lévi-Strauss free his practice from the shadow of sociology. Lévi-Strauss’s employment of the term anthropology also reflects the importance of his period of exile in New York for the maturation of his thought. In his interview with Didier Eribon, Lévi-Strauss asserted “What I know of anthropology I learned during those years.”\textsuperscript{538} Besides spending his mornings in the New York Public Library to peruse the ethnographic collection, Lévi-Strauss’s interactions with Franz Boas, Robert Lowrie, and Ruth Benedict were crucial.\textsuperscript{539} Thus, Lévi-Strauss’s use of the term anthropology also reflects Lévi-Strauss’s connection to a broader swath of international social scientists.\textsuperscript{540}

\textsuperscript{537} Claude Lévi-Strauss, \textit{Structural Anthropology}, 18.

\textsuperscript{538} Didier Eribon, \textit{Conversations with Claude Lévi-Strauss}, 43.

\textsuperscript{539} It was Lowrie who helped arrange for Lévi-Strauss position at the New School when he was seeking to escape Vichy France. Of Franz Boas, Lévi-Strauss writes that his work was essential in forming his own thoughts. See Didier Eribon, \textit{Conversations with Claude Lévi-Strauss}, 38.

\textsuperscript{540} Links between French social science and the international community were more common with Lévi-Strauss’s generation according to Terry Clark. Clark writes that “Through a certain detachment from their national traditions, they were able to build on the strongest at home and integrate the best from abroad, rather than rejecting their training and starting from scratch without the support of a critical mass.” See Terry N. Clark, \textit{Prophets and Patrons: The French University and the Emergence of the Social Sciences}, 233.
Although it may now be clear why Lévi-Strauss choose to employ the term anthropology rather than ethnology and how he envisioned it vis-à-vis sociology and history, it still remains to be seen what Lévi-Strauss’s positive project for anthropology entailed. As Christopher Johnson observed, Lévi-Strauss’s use of the term structural anthropology was somewhat provocative. On the one hand, the use of the term structural indicated that Lévi-Strauss intended to employ a highly theoretical approach to anthropology that drew inspiration from work being done in linguistics by figures such as Ferdinand de Saussure and Roman Jakobsen. On the other hand, anthropology had a connotation that was more empirically based. By wedding the term anthropologie to the broader theoretical concerns of structuralism, Lévi-Strauss generated a shift in the meaning of the term. Besides being more broadly defined as the comparative study of human cultures and civilization, Lévi-Strauss’s conception of anthropology was at base a theory of communication where the anthropologists ultimate aim was to uncover the categories the human mind used to impose order and frame experience.

Given the scope and singularity of Lévi-Strauss’s vision for the practice of anthropology, providing an exact definition of what he means by structural anthropology is tricky. This task is further complicated by the numerous

---

541 See Christopher Johnson, *Claude Lévi-Strauss: The Formative Years*, 12.

542 A passage in *Structural Anthropology* is a particular apt summation of his theoretical view: “In anthropology as in linguistics, therefore, it is not comparison that supports generalization, but the other way around. If, as we believe to be the case, the unconscious activity of the mind consists in imposing forms upon content, and if these forms are fundamentally the same for all minds—ancient and modern, primitive and civilized (as the study of the symbolic function, expressed in language, so strikingly indicates)—it is necessary and sufficient to grasp the unconscious structure underlying each institution and each custom, provided of course that the analysis is carried far enough.” See Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology*, 21.
contradictions present in Lévi-Strauss’s thought. Given the complexity of Lévi-Strauss’s mature vision, surveying these contradictions might very well be the most profitable means of illuminating his vision.

The contradictions are numerous. Among the first is the aforementioned tension indicated by the term Structural Anthropology. That is, the tension generated from Lévi-Strauss’s desire to have anthropology be rigorously theoretical while empirically based. Additionally, Lévi-Strauss generates another contradiction by seeking to put anthropology at the center of the human sciences while also imagining it as a marginal discourse functioning as a critique of the society that produces it. A somewhat related problem is that Lévi-Strauss envisioned anthropology as objective and detached; but yet, in Tristes Tropiques he melded it with autobiography and outlined its moral import. Together, these oppositions reveal a broader strain in the work of Lévi-Strauss between his desire for anthropology to play a central role in the general intellectual discourse of France and his drive to establish anthropology as a specialized field of academic research as defined against its rivals sociology, history, and philosophy.\footnote{Evidence of Lévi-Strauss’s desire to establish anthropology’s place in the broader intellectual environment of France can be seen in his battles with Jean-Paul Sartre, France’s premier intellectual figure in the 1950s and 1960s. Christopher Johnson smartly observes that in doing battle with Sartre, particularly in the last chapter of The Savage Mind, Lévi-Strauss was challenging the pride of place held by philosophy and literature in the country’s intellectual discourse. Christopher Johnson, Claude Lévi-Strauss: The Formative Years, 107.} And finally, perhaps the most striking of Lévi-Strauss’s contradictions is his desire to study humanity in all its diverse forms in order to dissolve it into a system of abstract relations. Although a fierce critic of Lévi-Strauss, Clifford Geertz credits this Janus-faced nature for making Lévi-Strauss’s thought so compelling. He writes that:
In Lévi-Strauss’s work the two faces of anthropology—as a way of going at the world and as a method for uncovering lawful relations among empirical facts—are turned in toward one another so as to force a direct confrontation between them rather than (as is more common among ethnologists) out away from one another so as to avoid such a confrontation and the inward stresses which go with it. This accounts for the power of his work and for its general appeal. It rings with boldness and a kind of reckless candor.\footnote{See Clifford Geertz, "The Cerebral Savage: On the Work of Claude Lévi-Strauss," in The Interpretation of Culture: Selected Essays, 345-359 (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 347. The passage quoted here ends in a more critical vein. Geertz continues, “But it also accounts for the more intraprofessional suspicion that what is presented as High Science may really be an ingenious and somewhat roundabout attempt to defend a metaphysical position, advance an ideological argument, and serve a moral cause.”}

As a general statement, it seems fair to say that while the contradictory aspects of Lévi-Strauss’s thought can be bewildering, they also provoke us to think and to care about his work.

For the purposes of understanding Lévi-Strauss’s thought, Tristes Tropiques is an ideal place to begin. Not only is Tristes Tropiques his most accessible work, but given that it was written in 1955 when Lévi-Strauss’s conceptualization of anthropology was reaching full maturity, it provides a compendium of his intellectual concerns and conflicts. The text combines personal and academic autobiography with thick description, reflections on the place of fieldwork in anthropology, as well as a broad conceptualization about the place of anthropology in the human sciences. The publication of this text followed the publication of a number of Lévi-Strauss’s earlier more specialized studies.\footnote{La vie familiale et sociale des Indiens Nambikwara (1948), Les structures élémentaires de la parenté (1949), and Race et histoire (1952).} Although a number of the essays that would be included in his 1958 Anthropologie structurale had been written prior to the publication of Tristes Tropiques—during the period when Lévi-Strauss was teaching at the New School for Research in New York—Tristes...
Tropiques provides a first instance of Lévi-Strauss’s broad conceptualization of anthropology. The text also permits us to see how Lévi-Strauss incorporated his experiences in Brazil, France, New York, and more recent trips to the Middle East and Asia into a science for an increasingly integrated world.

In the very opening pages of Tristes Tropiques, Lévi-Strauss provides a sense of the importance of theory to his anthropological practice. Theoretical astuteness is what, in part, distinguishes the anthropologist from the crass traveler. After pronouncing his hatred of traveling and travelers, Lévi-Strauss remarks on the relative lack of value that specific places and peoples have for his science. As he puts it, “the truths which we seek so far afield only become valid when they have been separated from this dross.”

Over the course of the text, Lévi-Strauss further explicates the relation between empirical observation and theoretical understanding. Writing of previous French expeditions to Brazil, he reflects:

Would it have been better to arrive in Rio in the eighteenth century with Bougainville, or in the sixteenth with Léry and Thevet? For every five years I move back in time, I am able to save a custom, gain a ceremony or share in another belief. But I know the texts too well not to realize that, by going back a century, I am at the same time forgoing data and line of inquiry which would offer intellectual enrichment. And so I am caught within a circle from which there is no escape: the less human societies were able to communicate with each other and therefore to corrupt each other through contact, the less their respective emissaries were able to perceive the wealth and significance of their diversity. In short, I have only two possibilities: either I can be like some traveler of the olden days who was faced with a stupendous spectacle, all, or almost all, of which eluded him, or worse still, filled

---

546 Following somewhat the argument of Christopher Johnson. Johnson argues that through the 1962 publication of La Pensée Sauvage, Lévi-Strauss’s conception of anthropology was in a revolutionary phase where the paradigm was still being formed; 1964’s Mythologiques cycle fit what Kuhn would call the normal phase where the paradigm was being applied to new research. He does not argue that Tristes Tropiques is the first instance of the mature science, but that in Tristes Tropiques you have CLS matching his personality to the science he developed. Or as Johnson suggests, Lévi-Strauss adopts a persona to match his science to his character. See Christopher Johnson, *Claude Lévi-Strauss: The Formative Years*, 150.

547 Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Tristes Tropiques*, 17.
him with scorn and disgust; or I can be a modern traveler, chasing after the vestiges of a vanished reality.

Lévi-Strauss’s reasoning here is similar to what Anthony Pagden has more recently argued with regard to the historical practice of ethnography. Pagden, influenced by Kuhn’s *Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, argues that the incredible descriptions we find in documents that describe initial European contact with Native Americans are understandable if we recognize that these observations were made by men whose mental landscape was considerable different than our own. Resting as it did on Thomist and Aristotelian epistemologies, their system of classification was woefully unprepared for the empirical reality that they encountered in the New World. As Pagden puts it, men like Léry and Thevet, would have “had to be able to classify before they could possibly see; and in order to classify in any meaningful sense they had no alternative but to appeal to a system which was already in use.”548 A paradigm shift in the natural sciences would have to occur before the empirical field presented by the New World could be put in comprehensible order.549

Theory and its importance in making comprehensible the field of empirical observation, plays an important role in Lévi-Strauss’s dissolution of the human into a field of symbolic relations. Lévi-Strauss’s structural reduction of the human


549 Lévi-Strauss offers a further reflection on the relationship between scientific method and empirical observation when he writes of the anthropologists Franz Boas and Robert Lowrie. He writes that “Since they were Europeans by birth and had been trained in Europe or by European professors, they represent something quite different: a synthesis reflecting, on the level of knowledge, that other synthesis which Columbus had made objectively possible four centuries earlier: the synthesis of a strong scientific method with the unique experimental field offered by the New World at a time when American anthropologists not only had the best available libraries, but could leave their universities and visit native communities as easily as we could go to the Basque country or the Riveria.” See Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Tristes Tropiques*, 13.
subject is observable throughout *Tristes Tropiques*. In one clear instance of this we see the São Paulo elite reduced to functions. Speaking of the São Paulo society, Lévi-Strauss writes that “[a]ll the occupations, tastes and interests appropriate to contemporary civilization could be found in it, but each was represented by only a single individual. Our friends were not really persons in their own right, but rather functions which had been selected less for their intrinsic importance than for their availability.”\(^{550}\) A second instance of this type of structural analysis can be seen in Lévi-Strauss’s analysis of the Bororo village where he looks at how the physical layout of the village reveals sociological and even cosmological patterns: “Not only does the structure of the village allow subtle interplay between institutions: it summarizes and ensures relations between man and the universe, between society and the supernatural world, and between the living and the dead.”\(^{551}\) Further, Lévi-Strauss argues that the village is not so much made up of individual huts, but by “a certain structural pattern such as has been described above and which is reproduced in every village.”\(^{552}\) Thus, although anthropology for Lévi-Strauss is nominally an attempt to study human beings, that study ultimate dissolves the human subject into their social environment and that social environment, in turn, into a set of basic patterns or symbols. Yet despite this dissolution of the subject in a network of symbols, Lévi-Strauss struggles to let go of the concept of human agency.

\(^{550}\) Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Tristes Tropiques*, 100.

\(^{551}\) Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Tristes Tropiques*, 232.

\(^{552}\) Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Tristes Tropiques*, 234.
and of purposeful action. In the concluding chapter of *Tristes Tropiques*, he writes that as an anthropologist:

I am no longer the only one to suffer from a contradiction affecting humanity as a whole and containing its own inherent cause. The contradiction remains only when I isolate the extremes: what is the use of action, if the thought guiding it leads to the discovery of the absence of meaning?"\textsuperscript{553}

He attempts to answer his own question through suggesting that:

\begin{quote}
[I]n order to reach this conclusion, I am constantly called upon to live through situations each one of which demands something of me: I have a duty to men, just as I have a duty to knowledge. History, politics, the economic and social world, the physical world and even the sky surround me with concentric circles from which I cannot escape in thought without ceding a fragment of my person to each one of them.\textsuperscript{554}
\end{quote}

Despite his effort in trying to answer to this dilemma, the tension between a dissipated human subject and a being capable of engaging the social and natural worlds does not seem adequately resolved in Lévi-Strauss's thought. In fact, it seems to reconstitute itself under another guise—the contradiction between Lévi-Strauss's aim to set up anthropology as a science along the lines of the exact sciences and his recognition of a moral dimension to the practice of anthropology.

The moral dimension that Lévi-Strauss attributes to anthropology, is most fully explored in the final section of *Tristes Tropiques*—entitled “The Return.” This section includes the analysis of the play the *Apotheosis of Augustus*, that Lévi-Strauss wrote as a young fieldworker. As commented upon in the first section of this paper, this play and the chapters that follow it analyze the place of the anthropologist within the home society. Within this section, Lévi-Strauss argues that because of the comparisons anthropology affords with other societies, it should provide a basis for

\textsuperscript{553} Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Tristes Tropiques*, 413.

\textsuperscript{554} Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Tristes Tropiques*, 413.
the transformation of unjust and inhumane practices. Within the corpus of his work, with its heavy dosage of thick description, linguistic theory and sociological analysis, this last section of *Tristes Tropiques* provides Lévi-Strauss’s strongest articulation of the moral function of anthropology.

Combined with the autobiographical parts of the text, it is this moral dimension of Lévi-Strauss’s work that lends the work its appeal to a general audience. While there are parts of the book, such as the discussions of the various kinship systems of the Bororo and Mbayá, that undoubtedly appeal to the specialists, the moral imperatives that Lévi-Strauss lays out for anthropology engage a much broader readership. For Lévi-Strauss, anthropology provides a potential check on a global process involving overpopulation, dwindling natural resources, and increasing communication among human societies that has tended toward a homogenization of culture. This type of culture, of which the West was exemplary in his time, is what Lévi-Strauss refers to as a 'hot society.'555 His diagnosis of the West’s destructive capacity, its general malaise and the question of its future viability are premised on his analysis of the West becoming increasingly hot. Extrapolating from his time in Brazil, Lévi-Strauss offers a reflection from a more recent trip to India where he clearly outlines the problem of development:

> When a community becomes too numerous, however great the genius of its thinkers, it can only endure by secreting enslavement. Once men begin to feel cramped in by their geographical, social and mental habitat, they are in danger of being tempted by the simple solution of denying one section of the species the right to be considered as human. This allows the rest a little elbow-room for a few more decades. Then it becomes necessary to

---

555 Christopher Johnson points out that Lévi-Strauss comes to embrace this term in his interview with Georges Charbonnier. See Christopher Johnson, *Claude Lévi-Strauss: The Formative Years*, 123. Johnson attributes this to the influence of Norbert Weiner who made a similar distinction.
extend the process of expulsion. When looked at in this light, the events which have occurred in Europe during the past twenty years, at the culmination of a century during which the population figures have doubled, can no longer appear as being simply the result of an aberration on the part of one nation, one doctrine, or one group of men. I see them rather as a premonitory sigh of our moving into a finite world, such as southern Asia had to face a thousand or two thousand years ahead of us, and I cannot see avoiding the experience unless some major decisions are taken. The systematic devaluation of man by man is gaining ground, and we would be guilty of hypocrisy and blindness if we dismissed the problem, by arguing that recent events represented only a temporary contamination.\footnote{Claude Lévi-Strauss, \textit{Tristes Tropiques}, 149-50.}

Here we see Lévi-Strauss offer a reading of the Second World War in broad demographic and geographical terms. In his view, for all their technological achievements, ‘hot societies’ with highly integrated communication and transportation networks tend toward their own destruction.

In contrast to the ‘hot society’ of the West, Lévi-Strauss found the societies he studied in Brazil admirable for their ability to maintain traditional arrangements with regard to both their own population and the natural environment. With regard to the Bororo, he writes that “When one is faced with a society which is still alive and faithful to its traditions, the impact is so powerful that one is quite taken aback: which strand in the multicolored skein should one first try to unwind and disentangle?”\footnote{Claude Lévi-Strauss, \textit{Tristes Tropiques}, 215.} This is what he tries to do by studying its kinship patterns and the special relations of the village. The broader value of these types of specialized study is that they provide ‘hot societies’ like the West with an alternate vision and can possibly throw a wrench in the wheels of progress. As he puts it:

When the spectrum or rainbow of human cultures has finally sunk into the void created by our frenzy; as long as we continue to exist and there is a world, that tenuous arch linking us to the inaccessible will still remain, to show us the opposite course to that leading to enslavement; man may be unable to follow it, but its contemplation affords him the only privilege of which he can make himself worthy; that of arresting the process, of controlling...
the impulse which forces him to block up the cracks in the wall of necessity one by one and to complete his work at the same time as he shuts himself up within his prison; this is a privilege coveted by every society, whatever its beliefs, its political system or its level of civilization; a privilege to which it attaches its leisure, its pleasure, its peace of mind and its freedom; the possibility, vital for life, of unhitching, which consists—Oh! Fond fare farewell to savages and explorations!—in grasping, during the brief intervals in which our species can bring itself to interrupt its hive like activity, the essence of what it was and continues to be, below the threshold of thought and over and above society: in the contemplation of a mineral more beautiful than all our creations; in the scent that can be smelt at the heart of a lily and more imbued with learning than all our books; or in the brief glance, heavy with patience, serenity and mutual forgiveness, that, through some involuntary understanding, one can sometimes exchange with a cat.

Paradoxically, we see here that anthropology, although a form of writing consonant with the expansion of communication in the West, can simultaneously expand knowledge and arresting the processes grown wild in the West. Thus, for Lévi-Strauss, beyond the particular knowledge gained from the study of foreign cultures, anthropology's central value lies in its ability to intervene in the destructive progress of Western development.

**France and Brazil in the Making of Structural Anthropology**

The privileged position enjoyed by the French at that time on the Brazilian coast raises some curious problems. It dated back at least to the beginning of the century, a period marked by numerous French expeditions, in particular the one led in 1503 by Gonneville, who brought back an Indian son-in-law from Brazil. About the same time (in 1500), the island of Santa Cruz was discovered by Cabral. Perhaps we should go still further back. Since the French promptly gave the name Brésil to the new territory (at least as early as the twelfth century, Brésil had been the closely guarded and secret name of the mythical continent which was the source of wood dyes), and since a large number of terms—ananas, manioc, tamandua, tapir, jaguar, sagouin, agouti, ara, caiman, toucan, coati, acajou, etc.—were taken over directly by French from the Indian dialects without first passing through the traditional Dieppe belief that Brazil was discovered by Jean Cousin, four years before Columbus's first voyage.558

The American anthropologist, James Clifford, has pointed out that one of the distinctive features of French anthropology is that it remains very much a part of general intellectual life. Clifford writes that “in the hothouse milieu of Parisian

---

558 Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Tristes Tropiques*, 82.
cultural life, no field of social or artistic research can long remain indifferent to influences or provocations from beyond its disciplinary boundaries." This is certainly true of Lévi-Strauss's work. One of the major reasons for this has been examined at some length above: the structure of the French university in the period of Lévi-Strauss's maturation emphasized the production of generalists who could teach a broad range of topics. A second reason was Lévi-Strauss's own ambition to have anthropology stand at the center of the human sciences. Doing this meant engaging in disciplinary warfare with philosophy. Lévi-Strauss did this most pointedly by taking on Jean-Paul Sartre, France's preeminent philosopher and public intellectual. Thus far, however, Lévi-Strauss's thought has been examined in terms of personal, institutional and disciplinary contexts. This section shall examine the broader political and intellectual contexts in which Lévi-Strauss's thought developed. After all, part of the attraction of Lévi-Strauss's work is that it is, as Geertz put it, "a way of going at the world." Given the importance of Lévi-Strauss's Brazilian expedition in the formation of his science, this section will connect Lévi-Strauss's thought to the historical context in which that expedition took place by looking at France and Brazil in the 1930s in transnational perspective.

As the quotation that heads this section suggests, the historical relationship between France and Brazil dates back to the early modern period. While Portugal became the dominant European power in Brazil, this outcome was not resolved in

---


the 16th century. Ever since a community of French Huguenot's sponsored by Gaspard de Coligny established a colony in modern day Rio de Janeiro, France and Brazil have been conjoined in an intimate relationship. As he acknowledges throughout the pages of *Tristes Tropiques*, Lévi-Strauss was part of a lineage of French intellectuals, artists and explorers that visited Brazil. In *Tristes Tropiques*, Lévi-Strauss prominently mentions Jean de Léry, André Thevet, and Hyacinthe de Bougainville. Lévi-Strauss’s participation in the 1932 French University mission to found the University of São Paolo, Brazil’s and perhaps Latin America’s finest university, was part of an official program sponsored by the government of France. As Jean-Paul Lefèvre has noted, George Dumas was instrumental in organizing this enterprise which was a collaboration between the French Universities and Grandes écoles and the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs cultural division, *le Service des Oeuvres françaises à l’étranger*.

The mission to establish the University of São Paulo was not an isolated phenomenon, however, but rather was part of a broader initiative that began prior to the First World War. According to Guy Martinère, it was the famous chemist, Henri Louis Le Chatelier, who was responsible for selling the idea of extending the French university and secondary school into Latin America upon his return from Buenos Aires. Given his position at the Collège de France, Le Chatelier was

---

561 Thomas Skidmore has referred to this as ‘a special relationship.’ See Thomas Skidmore, "Lévi-Strauss, Braudel and Brazil: A Case of Mutual Influence," 340. A primary source which relates the history of this French colony, or France Antartique, is Jean de Léry's *Histoire d'un voyage fait en la terre du Brésil* written in 1578.

successful in rallying French intellectuals and eventually the Ministère des affaires étrangères to back the university missions. From a political point of view, the allure of such a program was that it would promote the idea of ‘pan latinité.’ While the program was interrupted by World War I, relations between Latin American nations and France were strengthened as a result of the war and university exchanges resumed in 1922 now under the auspices of Jean Marx and le Service des Oeuvres françaises à l’étranger.

According to Thomas Skidmore, the impetus for founding the University of São Paulo was mainly driven by Brazilian national politics. As a result of the economic crisis in 1929, Getúlio Vargas was able to seize control of the federal government. With the exception of São Paulo, the Brazilian states fell into line with Vargas, a former governor of the state of Rio Grande de Sul. The Paulista elite, who felt their candidate for president had been usurped by Vargas, revolted and a civil war ensued that ended in victory for Vargas. Skidmore argues that in the wake of defeat, the Paulista elite needed to find an outlet to reassert their superiority—they choose to channel their energies into higher education. The choice of the French to


564 Martinère argues: <<Pourtant les relations entre la France et l’Amérique latine, loin d’être interrompus trouvèrent dans le conflit mondial la possibilité de mieux s’affirmer. Elles s’affirmèrent d’abord dans le domaine politique ou l’exaltation de la latinité devint un élément de solidarité face à l’ennemi germanique.>> See Guy Martinère, Aspects de la coopération franco-brésilienne, 62.

direct the establishment of the University of São Paulo was a natural one given the long history of Franco-Brazilian exchange. Lévi-Strauss provides evidence of this when he relates the benefits of being French in a scrape he had with a Brazilian official:

> Fortunately, at that time, every Brazilian official still had inside him a concealed anarchist, who was kept alive by the shreds of Voltaire and Anatole France which impregnated the national culture even in the depths of the bush. (Once in a village in the interior, an old man overcome by emotion had exclaimed, 'Ah Monsieur, you are French! Ah, France! Anatole, Anatole! As he clasped me in his arms; he had never seen a Frenchman before.566

Choosing France for the founding of the University of São Paulo was also motivated by the particular aptitude of French academics to communicate a broad mastery of a number of scientific, philosophic and literary fields. This, of course, had its downside as well which Lévi-Strauss suggests when he writes of the motivation of Brazilian elites:

> Cultured Brazilians devoured manuals and works of vulgarization. French ministers, instead of boasting about France's as yet unequalled prestige abroad, would have been wiser to understand the reasons behind it. Unfortunately, even at that date, it was due not so much to the wealth and originality of a diminishing scientific and intellectual inventiveness as to the ability, which many French scholars and scientists still possessed, to give an easily intelligible account of difficult problems, to the solution of which they themselves had made a small contribution. In this sense, the predilection of South America for France could be partly explained by a secret connivance based on the same inclination to be consumers, and to help others to be consumers rather than producers.567

What we see here, once again, is the particular predilection of the French university for valuing generalists who could teach in the lycées rather than specialists. Eventually, as Skidmore has argued, this lack of specialization would lead Brazilian universities to forge closer ties with the United States. This was a consequence, as


567 Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Tristes Tropiques*, 100-1.
of closer geopolitical ties between Brazil and the United States that were developed during the Second World War.\textsuperscript{568}

Besides featuring in the regional contestation of power in the Brazil of the 1930s, the founding of the University of São Paulo was to play a role in forging a new industrial elite. As Brazil shifted from an agrarian economy that was dominated by a handful of wealthy landowners, to a more diversified industrial economy, the state became more active in planning the economy. Recent scholarship on the Vargas era in Brazil, has argued that model of state sponsored and planned industrialization began in the 1920s—prior to Vargas's establishment of the Estado Novo along corporatist lines—and was fully realized during the military dictatorship that lasted from 1964-1985.\textsuperscript{569} The founding of the University of São Paulo figured in this process in so far as a new elite needed to be trained to function in both the new bureaucracy and the new economy. Lévi-Strauss, appears highly aware of the function he was serving in Brazil when he writes that students at USP were “anxious to obtain the posts that would be available to those who acquired the diplomas we awarded; there were also lawyers, engineers and established politicians who feared that they might soon have to compete against people with university degrees, if they

\textsuperscript{568} Thomas Skidmore, "Lévi-Strauss, Braudel and Brazil: A Case of Mutual Influence," 347. Lévi-Strauss seems prescient of this trend when he comments on his São Paulo students’ indifference to “intellectual feasts of the past,” and zeal for the latest intellectual theory. He credits these students for their role in bridging “an intellectual gap that one might have expected to hold up development for decades.” See Claude Lévi-Strauss, \textit{Tristes Tropiques}, 103-5.

did not have the wisdom to graduate themselves.\textsuperscript{570} As this group reached maturation and became the new elite, they rejected the French influence.\textsuperscript{571}

While Brazil, and even more so the state of São Paulo, was undergoing the transformation from an agrarian to an industrialized economy in the 1930s, France was undergoing its own political and cultural crises. In Eugen Weber’s poetic expression, “a book about the thirties must be directly or indirectly, a book about the wounds and mind-set of a host of survivors—veterans, widows, orphans, parents—grieving for the slaughtered and determined to avoid a repeat performance of the disaster whose ruins were still being repaired in 1939.”\textsuperscript{572} The wounded psyche of inter-war France could no longer sanction the narrative of progress; the sense of decadence was prevalent. Demographics were a significant factor in contributing to this mood—with the death of roughly a million and one half young men and a declining birth rate during the First World War, France, according to Eugen Weber, “was growing older; it became the European country with the fewest young and most old people.”\textsuperscript{573}

Contributing to this general spirit of malaise was the political instability of the interwar years. France was still divided along the lines that had been drawn in 1789. As Weber puts it, there were “many estates where decent folk would not set

\textsuperscript{570} Claude Lévi-Strauss, Tristes Tropiques, p. 102.

\textsuperscript{571} Although too young to be a student of Lévi-Strauss, Florestan Fernandes would be a prime example of this phenomenon. His book A Questão de USP portrays the university mission as an act of intellectual colonization. See Florestan Fernandes, A Questão de USP (São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1984).


\textsuperscript{573} Eugen Weber, The Hollow Years: France in the 1930s, 13.
foot because they had been acquired as national property in the 1790s, many clans, clubs schools, cafés, and shops that ideology, religion, and immemorial tradition made mutually exclusive so that in country towns like Caen, Right and Left even frequented different brothels.\textsuperscript{574} These tensions endemic to France, coupled with the structure of the Third Republic, made France particularly ungovernable in the interwar years. In his classic analysis of the ineptitude of French governance during the 1930s, Duroselle argues that the lack of executive power—an inheritance stemming from the Republic founding itself upon the ashes of the Second Empire—made France ungovernable. While the parliamentary structure of the Third Republic was a positive from the point of view of promoting a democracy where no one party could rule and kept the leaders of political parties from being ideologically rigid, it led to chronic instability.\textsuperscript{575} This instability is evident in the fact that there were fifteen cabinets under Gaston Doumerge from 1924-1931 and seventeen under Albert Lebrun from 1932 to 1940.\textsuperscript{576} Given the turnovers in the various government ministries, it was difficult for France to forge a coherent foreign policy. As Duroselle, puts it, domestic political position led to a situation where France's international position was left vulnerable.

\textsuperscript{574} Eugen Weber, \textit{The Hollow Years: France in the 1930s}, 113.


\textsuperscript{576} See Eugen Weber, \textit{The Hollow Years: France in the 1930s}, 111.
The economy was also a source of anguish in the interwar period. France experienced a currency crisis in 1927 with the Franc losing much of its value. Raymond Poincaré was able to stabilize the Franc, but the policy of maintaining a strong Franc that carried over into the thirties, hamstrung the French government in responding to the Great Depression.577 Eugen Weber suggests that the strong Franc policy may have delayed the Depression in France, but it also prolonged the downturn leading to a later recovery than other industrialized economies.578 The economic, demographic and political crisis that France experienced led French intellectuals to articulate a vision of France as a moribund, museum culture. Weber gives the example of Robert Aron and Armand Dandieu’s *Décadence de la nation française*. Given that his trek across Brazil occurred in this cultural context, it is hardly surprising that Lévi-Strauss would articulate a vision of France as society “incapable of thinking outside the framework of an epoch which came to an end a century and a half ago, and which was the one period when [France was] in tune with history.”579 What is more surprising is that in this economic environment, France would choose to support an enterprise like the University mission to São Paulo which required substantial funding. It is even more extraordinary given the

577 See Eugen Weber, *The Hollow Years: France in the 1930s*, 27. Even though Poincaré was successful in stabilizing the Franc, its value nonetheless declined from 5.45 Francs to the U.S. Dollar in 1919 to 25 to the Dollar in 1928.

578 Weber writes that in 1932 France just began to suffer and that its pain was less dramatic than Germany’s, the United States’s and Britain’s; however it did not experience recovery until 1939. France’s response to the economic downturn was counter-intuitive by Keynesian standards. France tried to balance the budget, shrunk the public sector by cutting public employment, and raised taxes. According to Weber, these policies caused enough grief to bring the Popular Front government to power in 1936. See Eugen Weber, *The Hollow Years: France in the 1930s*, Chapter 2.

limited access the French population had to the University system. Duroselle supports Leon Blum’s view that France experienced decline as a result of how restricted the bourgeoisie was as a class. In 1935, there were only 15,000 bachelors degrees awarded in France.580

Besides these domestic woes, the French Colonial Empire added to the sense of instability and decadence of the interwar years. This might seem contradictory given that, in geographical terms, France’s Empire was at its apex in this period. Including the mandated territory that France was awarded by the Treaty of Versailles, France’s colonial territories included Afrique Occidentale Française, Afrique Equatoriale Française, Indochine Française, Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Syria, Lebanon and a number of island territories scattered across the globe. Yet, the global reach of France combined with economic climate made the Empire unwieldy. Administrative structures varied tremendously in the colonies. In certain colonies, like Algeria, there was a strong bureaucratic presence; however, in French West Africa there were areas that were largely unstaffed by French officials and the French had no real control of local populations. As Martin Thomas has argued:

The colonial state was never monolithic nor an exclusively French affair. Imperial rule was upheld by a series of complex power relationships between officials, propertied elites, tribal leaders and differing ethnic communities. Distribution of authority was in constant flux, blurring the distinction between rulers and ruled. The bipolar paradigm of colonizers and colonized is unsatisfactory because it ignores the changing boundaries of power between colonial governments and indigenous populations.581

580 Duroselle notes that the Popular Front government eased access to the University in the mid 1930s, but the floodgated did not open until after WWII. By 1976, 285,000 bachelor’s degrees were awarded per annum. See Jean-Baptiste Duroselle, Politique étrangère de la France: la décadence 1932-1939, 26.

Colonial rule was further plagued by indecisions on cultural policy (i.e., assimilation vs. associationism), economic policy (i.e., to what degree should the state invest in the development of colonial possessions), and military policy (i.e., how would the empire defend itself). Combined with the problematic of administering a global empire, colonial uprisings like the one in French Indochina began to challenge the viability of French colonialism. Further, despite the French government’s expenditures in putting on *L’Exposition coloniale internationale de Paris* in 1931 and the *Palais de la Porte Dorée* to serve as a colonial museum, the degree to which the French populace embraced colonialism is questionable.\(^{582}\)

What might be said of the *L’exposition coloniale* is that it intended to generate a greater consciousness of what it meant to live in ‘Greater France.'\(^{583}\) Patricia Morton has offered a fascinating glimpse of the massive simulacrum of the French Colonial Empire that was on display in the Bois de Vincennes from May to November of 1931. There was a partial recreation of Angor Wat, the lake in Vincennes became the setting for a village of fisherman in Indochina, red stucco structures modeled the mosques and palaces of the Sudan. Yet, despite the attempt at an authentic recreation of colonial cultures and architectures, the monumental

\(^{582}\) Thomas argues that the populace had a certain fixation for exoticism as born out by trends in art, music, and literature, there was little popular reaction to events threatening the Empire in Indochina, Sudan, Madagascar and Morocco at least as compared with similar popular reaction in Britain to similar challenges. Of the colonial exposition and its success, he writes that this success “revealed not only how little the French public really understood what went on in ‘their’ empire, but also how little they wanted to know. As Prime Minister André Tardieu conceded in a famous article in L’Illustration, ‘the concept of empire has yet to be created.’” See Martin Thomas, *The French Empire between the Wars: Imperialism, Politics, and Society*, 201.

\(^{583}\) In *True France*, Herman Lebovics argues that the Colonial Exposition also functioned in providing an ‘internal’ definition of what it meant to be French. Through external definition vis-à-vis colonial subjects, the creation of an ‘integral nationalism’ by the right gained force. See Herman Lebovics, *True France: The Wars over Cultural Identity, 1900-1945* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992).
style and the presentations of colonial populations in sensationalistic fashion lent the exhibit an exotic air. From an aesthetic point of view, what can be said about the event is that despite its attempt at a monumental realism, the juxtapositions that resulted from trying to situate various cultures together in one locale, together with the coincidence of native structures with that of the French colonial state, had the effect of a surreal collage. In the Colonial exhibition, politics, aesthetics and ethnology fused, but Morton has argued that while the exhibition aimed to present a unified colonial empire and a cohesive display of power, the contradictions of France’s colonial empire produced a disjointed display. While the architecture announced itself as authentic and the grounds attempted to capture the space of the France’s empire, in reality the buildings were amalgams of different elements of the various cultures and were not faithful to the architecture of the various colonies. Likewise there was no logic to the placement of the various pavilions within the exhibit grounds that made for curious juxtapositions. Despite its pretensions to authenticity, Morton argues that the exhibit became something of a surrealist collage—despite itself.

584 Morton writes that the organizer of the exhibit, Maréchal Hubert Lyautey wanted to avoid exoticism but was constrained by the popular imagination of the French population with regard to the colonies. This was one of the contradictions of the exhibit. It could not help juxtaposing Western ‘rationality’ with colonial ‘savagery.’ See Patricia Morton, Hybrid Modernities: Architecture and Representation at the 1931 Colonial Exposition (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2000).

585 For example, the Somilian, French West African and North African pavilions were placed in with those of other geographic regions. What comprised the Indian pavilion was a mixture of elements that were never previously combined in Indian Art. See Patricia Morton, Hybrid Modernities: Architecture and Representation at the 1931 Colonial Exposition, Chapter One.
The surrealists, however, were deeply opposed to the Colonial exhibition and mounted a counter-exhibit—*La vérité aux colonies*.

Surrealism became an intellectual movement that challenged existing logic. This was a movement that shared important links to the ethnography’s development in France and is worth looking at in terms of understanding the intellectual context in which Lévi-Strauss’s thought developed. During the interwar years, when politically, economically and culturally, France experienced remarkable distress, surrealism burst on the scene with uncommon energy. As Eugen Weber, puts it, surrealism’s importance was due to the fact that it “was about everything new and about making everything new: action and reaction, creation and subversion, aggression—preferably verbal—enthusiasm and fantasy, banality, mystery, pranks, transgression[...].” In the 1920s and 1930s, ethnography and surrealism were fellow travelers in avant-garde circles, bridged by a number of intellectuals like Roger Callois, Georges Bataille, and Michael Leiris. Surrealists celebrated Lucien Lévy-Bruhl’s *Primitive Mentality* because in their eyes it demonstrated that the sacred was always present behind the prosaic regime of modern-day life. What the two had in common was a method of juxtaposing contemporary European culture to indigenous cultures of Asia, the Americas, and Africa. In so doing, both challenged

---


588 There is a debate about the extent to which the two cross-fertilized one another. James Clifford has argued that the research paradigm of ethnography grew out of surrealist practice such that we can speak of an ethnographic surrealism. Jean Jamin has contested the degree to which Clifford claims the two united in practice. For a précis of this debate, see Michel Beaujour’s “Anthropology and Ethnography,” in the *Columbia Encyclopedia of Twentieth Century French Thought*. 
the superiority of the West by a process of defamiliarization. As Clifford puts it, “Reality is no longer a given, a natural, familiar environment. The self, cut loose from its attachments, must discover meaning where it may—a predicament, evoked at its most nihilistic, that underlies both surrealism and modern ethnography.”

They differ, however, in their ends: “ethnographic humanism begins with the different and renders it (through naming, classifying, describing, interpreting) comprehensible. It familiarizes. A surrealist practice, on the other hand, attacks the familiar, provoking the irruption of otherness—the unexpected.”

In addition to employing some of the techniques of surrealism, Lévi-Strauss had a more personal relationship with surrealism as far as his friendship with André Breton was concerned. Lévi-Strauss met Breton on board the Capitaine Paul-Lemerle—the ship he booked passage on to New York after France fell to the Nazi’s. In New York, the two became friends with the influential intellectual spokesman of surrealism introducing Lévi-Strauss to the surrealists in exile in New York. The profound influence of aesthetics on Lévi-Strauss’s work is clear—from the attempt to view his society from afar to the metaphorical passages where science and art are conceived as being one and the same activity.

---

589 James Clifford, "On Ethnographic Surrealism," 541.


591 See Didier Eribon, Conversations with Claude Lévi-Strauss, 25.

592 Consider the following passage from Tristes Tropiques where Lévi-Strauss is speaking of our inherited superstitions: “But are they really superstitions? I see these preferences rather as denoting a kind of wisdom which savage races practiced spontaneously and the rejection of which, by the modern world, is the real madness. Savages have often succeeded in achieving mental harmony with a minimum of effort. What wear and tear, what useless irritation, we could spare ourselves if we agreed to accept the true conditions of our human experience and realize that we are not in a position to free ourselves if we agreed to accept the true conditions of our human experience and
aesthetic sensibility provides both breadth and theoretical depth to Lévi-Strauss’s vision of anthropological practice, it has also been a source of criticism. Particularly in Anglo-American circles, he has been criticized for being a philosopher who will accept evidence “so long as it fits with logically calculated expectations; but whenever the data run counter to the theory Lévi-Strauss will either bypass the evidence or marshal the full resources of his powerful invective to have the heresy thrown out of court.”

In looking at how conditions in France and Brazil in the 1930s helped shape Lévi-Strauss’s mature vision of anthropology, it is fitting to consider the path that he took as he traveled from Cuiabá in the Brazilian state of Mato Grosso up to the Utiarity Station, then on to Juruena, Juina, Campos Novos and finally Vilhena. He was traveling along a decrepit telegraph line that was built from 1907-1915 by Cândido Mariano da Silva Rondon. In Todd Diacon’s analysis of the Rondon’s

realize that we are not in a position to free ourselves completely from its patterns and rhythms! Space has its own values, just as sounds and perfumes have colours, and feelings weight. The search for such correspondences is not a poetic game or a practical joke (as some critic has had the audacity to say it is, in connection with Rimbaud’s ‘sonnet des voyelles,’ which is now a classic text for linguists who know the basis, not of the colour of phonemes—which is a variable depending on the individual—but of the relationship between them, which admits of only a limited scale of possibilities); it offers absolutely virgin territory for research where significant discoveries are still to be made. If, like the aesthete, fish divid perfumes into light and dark, and bees classify luminosity in terms of weight—darkness being heavy and brightness light—the work of the painter, the poet or the musician, like the myths and symbols of the savage, ought to be seen by us, if not as a superior form of knowledge, at least as the most fundamental and the only one really common to us all; scientific thought is merely the sharp point—more penetrating because it has been whetted on the stone of fact, but at the cost of some loss of substance—and its effectiveness is to be explained by its power to pierce sufficiently deeply for the main body of the tool to follow the head.” See Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Tristes Tropiques*, 123-4. We see here Lévi-Strauss’s attempt to merge the various human and social sciences, along with our aesthetic practices, into a single science of communication.

---

project, Rondon’s line was an inspired nationalist vision—it was an attempt to “incorporate different groups and provide a shared, national identity” as well as bring the Brazilian interior into contact with the coast through an available new technology.\textsuperscript{594} Positivism provided the ideological impetus for the project. This ideology was the philosophy of Auguste Comte brought to bear on the political development of Brazil. It was tremendously influential in Latin America during the later half of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth. “Ordem e Progresso,” the motto of the Brazilian flag, was adapted from the Comte’s philosophical vision. In terms of a historical genealogy, positivism was born from the excesses of the French revolution.\textsuperscript{595} To avoid revisiting the terror of revolution, Comte theorized that a social science could be founded on the model of the hard sciences. This social science would be capable of determining social facts and formulating natural laws so that society could undergo industrial development peacefully and profitably. Rondon sought to apply Comte’s philosophy as he traveled through the Brazilian hinterlands. He sought to establish peaceful relations with the natives—including the Nambikwara—that he met and tried to protect them from some the encroachments made upon them by settlers in the region. The ultimate aim was to assimilate these native populations into the Brazilian nation. Diacon explains that,


\textsuperscript{595} See Todd Diacon, \textit{Stringing Together a Nation: Cândido Mariano da Silva Rondon and the Construction of a Modern Brazil, 1906-1930,} Chapter Four.
ultimately, the practices of Rondon would influence Brazil’s policy towards indigenous groups for the next four decades.\footnote{See Todd Diacon, \textit{Stringing Together a Nation: Cândido Mariano da Silva Rondon and the Construction of a Modern Brazil, 1906-1930}, Chapter Four.}

By the time Lévi-Strauss trekked along Rondon’s line it was overgrown and dilapidated.\footnote{A case of nothing being so old as yesterday’s modern, Diacon relates that Rondon’s line was archaic almost from the moment of its completion by the development of radio. See Diacon, 156. Lévi-Strauss comments that it had one glory day in 1924 when São Paulo rebelled and Rio could stay in contact with Cuiabá via Belem and Manaus. See Claude Lévi-Strauss, \textit{Tristes Tropiques}, 263.} It is both ironic and fitting that he should do so—marking a metaphorical confrontation with positivism and its legacy.\footnote{This is particularly apt given the disciplinary war he wages with sociology. Durkheim, although rejecting the idealized progressive schema of Comte, did consider himself a heir to Comte’s legacy.} Where Comte had optimistically theorized about the progressive evolution of society, Lévi-Strauss, like Rousseau, was anything but an apostle of progress. The failure of Rondon’s project was a blessing for Lévi-Strauss. Left behind in Mato Grosso and the eponymous state of Rondonia were men from Rondon’s expedition who could help guide Lévi-Strauss into the interior. More importantly, Rondon’s failed expedition had left relatively intact indigenous populations like the Nambikwara that were “in the infancy of the human species.”\footnote{Claude Lévi-Strauss, \textit{Tristes Tropiques}, 274.} The failure of the Brazilian state to integrate its hinterland meant for Lévi-Strauss that he could “look for what Rousseau called ‘the almost imperceptible stages of man’s beginnings’” and find a society that “offered one of the most rudimentary forms of social and political organization that could possibly be imagined.”\footnote{Claude Lévi-Strauss, \textit{Tristes Tropiques}, 316-7.} What Rondon’s decrepit line symbolized for Lévi-Strauss
was one small preserve that had managed to resist the global monoculture that was developing in the 1930s. This journey sets in stark relief the assimilationist and progressive scheme of Rondon—and ultimately Comte—to Lévi-Strauss’s regressive yearnings for a more civilized age.

**Conclusion**

This chapter explained the emergence of Lévi-Strauss’s structural anthropology through his experiences in Brazil. To do this, it has argued that his fieldwork in Brazil and subsequent publication of *Tristes Tropiques* provided him with the intellectual capital to establish his vision of anthropology as the dominant research paradigm in France. It has also demonstrated the extent to Lévi-Strauss redefined and transformed the practice of anthropology in the postwar era. The final section of the chapter analyzed how political and intellectual currents how conditions in France and Brazil in the 1930s helped shape Lévi-Strauss's mature vision of anthropology and influenced the development of his thought.
CHAPTER 6

IMAGINING FRANCE'S POST-COLONIAL FUTURE: MALRAUX, SARTRE, AND DE GAULLE IN BRAZIL

Introduction

Chapters 3, 4, and 5, analyzed the impact of the French University Mission on the development of the social sciences in the postwar period (1945-1964). Chapters 3 and 4 demonstrated the substantial influence of Brazilian thinkers on Roger Bastide, Lucien Febvre, Fernand Braudel, and Pierre Monbeig. Brazilian intellectuals such as Fernando de Azevedo, Gilberto Freyre, and Sergio Buarque de Holanda provided the impetus for these contributors to the Annales to abandon romanticized conceptions of Brazil and think more substantively about race, modernization, and Europe's colonial legacy. Chapter 5 focused on the work of Claude Lévi-Strauss and argued that his experience in Brazil shaped the development of anthropology in France. Cumulatively, these three chapters demonstrate that Brazil served as a model to interrogate France’s colonial past and to formulate a new social scientific language for a post-colonial world.

This chapter shifts focus away from the academic field towards a broader political discourse about Brazil that developed in France in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Through examining the visits of André Malraux, Jean-Paul Sartre, and Charles de Gaulle to Brazil, the chapter argues that the idea of Brazil as a model for France's post-colonial future did not remain merely a matter of academic interest. These visits—which were highly visible international spectacles by a trio of France's most prominent public intellectuals—show that in the French public sphere, Brazil
became an important site of contention between the left and right. Despite the
different objectives of Malraux, Sartre, and de Gaulle, for all three Brazil served as a
flipside to the Algerian war. For Malraux and de Gaulle, Brazil offered the
opportunity to "replace the outdated violence of colonialism with cooperation with
the developing world." Representing the international left, Sartre’s efforts in
Brazil were aimed at articulating a socialist movement that transcended the nation-
state as well as geo-political blocs. Sartre was not alone in seeing the revolutionary
potential of Brazil. By 1964, the year of de Gaulle’s visit and the coup that
established a military dictatorship of Brazil, French intellectuals were asking
whether the social and political tensions in Brazil would lead it to follow China and
Cuba as the next example of a revolution that radically broke with the past.

As part of the argument that Brazil served as a guidepost for France’s post-
colonial future, this chapter has two subarguments. The first is political. Joaquín
Fermandois argues that most international history research focuses on U.S./Latin
American relations and that, as a result, the relationship between Europe and Latin
America post-1945 has been neglected. This is significant because the actions of the

601 Diario de noticias, Souvenirs du voyage au Brésil du Général Charles de Gaulle, 13-16 de outobro de
1964 (Rio de Janeiro: Diário de Noticias, 1964), 2. The original quotation and context is as follows:
"Notoirement, une nation qui après avoir traversé de longues et cruelles épreuves, a maintenant
guéri ses blessures, réformé ses institutions de telle sorte qu’elles lui assurent la stabilité et
l’efficacité politiques, entrepris une transformation économique et une rénovation sociale complètes,
 remplacé les astreintes périmées de la colonisation par des rapports cordiaux de coopération avec
des peuples devenus, en plein accord avec elle, des États indépendants."

602 See for example, Edouard Bailby, Brésil, pays clef du tiers monde (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1964). In
this work, published in the year of Charles de Gaulle’s visit, Edouard Bailby puts his finger on the
questions observers of the Brazilian military coup were asking: "En un mot, le Brésil allait briser
soudainement les chaînes du passé pour suivre l’exemple de la Chine ou de Cuba?" Or, would it be
possible to resolve "le déséquilibre économique et social" that generated Brazil’s manifold
contradictions through a reformist program? See Bailby,Brésil, pays clef du tiers monde , 10.
countries in these regions "are frequently misunderstood as simple responses to the actions of great powers or of global processes." By looking at de Gaulle's objectives and actions in Brazil, this chapter provides a more nuanced interpretation of what de Gaulle meant by an "independent" foreign policy. Additionally, a broader understanding of the history of Franco-Brazilian cooperation in education, science, and technology, allows us to see that de Gaulle's announcement of a politics of cooperation had a certain continuity with previous French efforts in the realm of 'soft power.' Malraux's visit to Brazil in 1959 in an effort to advance Franco-Brazilian cooperation as well as the French University Mission discussed in previous chapters provides evidence of this.

The second sub-argument advanced by this chapter is an intellectual argument in the realm of French ideas. In his influential work, The Obstructed Path: French Social Thought in the Years of Desperation, an overview of French intellectual life in the period 1930-1960, H. Stuart Hughes argues that French thought of this era could not break out of a narrowly national mode of thinking. It was confined by Cartesianism and a literary tradition that impeded an embrace of international social science. In this vein, Hughes writes that the best French thinkers:

had done their best to cast off the straightjacket of Cartesianism. But they had not allowed themselves to enjoy their liberty for long: they had hastened to embrace the new servitude of Hegelian or phenomenological discourse or of structural method. Still more, they were prone to falling back into the familiar Cartesian formulas.

---


Malraux, Sartre, and de Gaulle are among the figures Hughes treats. This chapter, and the dissertation as a whole, challenges Hughes findings by arguing that the attempts they made to imagine a post-colonial future while in Brazil were more pragmatic, innovative, and worthwhile than Hughes’s assessment would portray them. In a word, Brazil offered them a way out of the past.

**André Malraux’s Brazilian Sojourn**

André Malraux, Charles de Gaulle’s Minister of Culture, left Paris on the 23rd of August, 1959 for a trip to the Latin American nations of Brazil, Peru, Chile, Argentina and Uruguay. His wife, Madeleine, and his two associates Albert Buret and Pierre Moineu accompanied him.\(^{605}\) He visited Brazil from the 24th through the 29th of August, departed for Peru on the 29th and remained there until September 3rd, continued on to Chile and stayed until September 6th, travelled to Argentina and remained until September 10th, and then spent a couple of days in Uruguay before returning to Paris on September 13.\(^{606}\) Prior to his departure, Malraux met with the ambassadors of these five countries on Wednesday, August 19th at the Maison de l’Amérique latine in Paris where Foreign Minister Saenz gave a speech that expressed the enthusiasm of the host countries for his visit.\(^{607}\) These same ambassadors saw him off from the airport in Paris on the 23rd.\(^{608}\)


\(^{607}\) The five ambassadors were M. Abelardo Saenz of Uruguay, Carlos Alves de Souza of Brazil, Hector Boza of Peru, Alejandro Ceballos of Argentina, and Echenique of Chili. *See Le Monde*, "Le Voyage de M. Malraux en Amérique Latine," August 21, 1959.

Upon his arrival in Rio-De-Janeiro, Malraux met with honors appropriate for
a head of state. Shortly after leaving the plane, he gave a short radio speech in
which he explained the purpose of his visit that he broke down into two major
objectives. First, he wanted to work with Kubitshek to develop a global plan to
coordinate scientific, technical, and economic exchange that de Gaulle had
previously articulated. Secondly, he spoke of his vision of a collaborative endeavor
between France and Latin America, and Brazil especially, that would involve the
development of a cultural response to the challenges of postwar era.609

Malraux visited Brasilia on August 25th—his second day in Brazil. Malraux
baptized the city, still in the final stages of construction and yet to be inaugurated as
Brazil’s capital city, as "le capitale de l’espoir." In addition to giving a speech,
Malraux laid the foundation stone for the future French Maison de la Culture while
the Marseillaise played.610 He travelled to São Paulo on the 26th and gave a speech
at the University of São Paulo.

Perhaps the highlight of the trip, at least from the point of view of French
journalists, was Malraux’s press conference in Rio de Janeiro upon his return from
São Paulo on August 27th.611 The Brazilian press grilled the French Minister of
Culture on France’s conduct in Algeria—particularly the use of torture by French
troops in conducting operations against the F.L.N. From the perspective of Le


Monde's Raoul Rangel, Malraux won a victory before the Brazilian press assembly in his defense of Charles de Gaulle's policy aims with regard to Algeria.

Despite the positive reception Malraux received in Brazil, French policy in Algeria clouded his visit. The Brazilian Foreign Minister, Horacio Lafer, had to field questions about the extent to which he addressed the topic of Algeria with Malraux. Lafer denied broaching the issue during his meeting with Malraux on Malraux's first day in Rio de Janeiro (Monday, August 24). Nonetheless, he did clarify what Brazil's position on the Algerian conflict would be in the next session of the United Nations stating that Brazil would stand behind the principle of national sovereignty while also respecting the decision of the United Nations.612

When Malraux returned to France after visiting Peru, Chile, Argentina, and Uruguay, he remarked that he was pleased to see the continuing influence of France everywhere that he visited and singled out Brazil as having the potential to become a great power before the end of the twentieth century.613 In October of 1959, when he debriefed the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the National Assembly on his trip to Latin America, Malraux again singled out Brazil as playing a principal role in the region and suggested that cultural and technological cooperation with Brazil could yield enormous benefits for France. The committee reacted favorably to this as well


as to Malraux’s suggestion of a broader agreement for cultural and technological exchange between France, the European Community, and Latin America.614

Malraux’s Brazil: The Country of Hope

André Malraux ended his speech in Brasilia on a remarkable note—he baptized it "la capitale de l’espoir."615 He arrived at this formulation as a result of observing Brasilia’s "audacity, energy, and confidence."616 For Malraux, "great nations find in the course of their development great symbols" and, for him, "Brasilia is Brazil’s great symbol."617 Malraux even went so far as to call Brasilia "the most audacious city conceived by the West."618 Brasilia’s audacity partly consisted in its willingness to transcend the limits of modern architecture. Malraux argued that modern architecture, especially as conceived of in New York, was defined by an individualism that consisted of "an agglomeration of buildings."619 He explained that while the Soviet Union advanced a grander form of architecture, one that conceived of design in terms of cities rather than individual buildings, what set Brasilia apart was an architectural lyricism. In his typically grandiose style, Malraux declared that


616 André Malraux, Brasília na palavra de André Malraux, 10.

617 André Malraux, Brasília na palavra de André Malraux, 9.

618 André Malraux, Brasília na palavra de André Malraux, 10.

619 André Malraux, Brasília na palavra de André Malraux, 11.
Brasilia exemplified "the reconquest of the skyscraper by the earth; it was above all the resurrection of the lyrical architecture born in the Hellenistic world that caused Cesar to dream of Alexandria."620

But more important than its architectural daring, Brasilia represented the conceptualization of a new civilization. Despite making an analogy between Brasilia and the Acropolis, Malraux spoke of how Brasilia represents a movement away from the Western tradition of the Bible and Classical Antiquity. Malraux found the discovery of America encoded within these architectural forms and rhapsodized that "a new civilization unveils itself, and calls forth a new culture whose object is a notion of humanity without which the new civilization could not live because a civilization can not exist without spirit."621 He expressed this in somewhat simpler terms when he discussed the need for a culture to dream.

Malraux's remarks on Brasilia's aesthetic audacity and the role of this aesthetic in articulating a civilization in the making are consistent with his general view of art's redemptive function in a secular age. As Herman Lebovics explains in his study, André Malraux and the Reinvention of French Culture, Malraux developed his aesthetic philosophy in response to Walter Benjamin's "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction."622 In this essay, Benjamin argued that art

---

620 André Malraux, Brasília na palavra de André Malraux, 11.

621 André Malraux, Brasília na palavra de André Malraux, 13.

originated from religious rituals that conferred upon art their "aura." For Benjamin, the power of art to convey this ritualistic aura disappeared with the commencement of a modern, secular culture. As Lebovics puts it, "In our secular age, art has lost that aura which the windows of the Saint-Chapelle in Paris, for example, had for the thirteenth-century Christian." In an age of mechanical reproduction, where radio, film, phonographs, and photographs were the dominate means by which aesthetic works were consumed by the masses, Benjamin argued that the aura was lost because the sense of community that was an integral part of the relationship between the artist and the audience no longer existed. Instead of community there was "only a moment of communion." In Benjamin’s view, attempts to recreate this aura in the modern age—and here he had in mind fascist art—were both false and predicated on racial and national exclusion.

Malraux agreed with Benjamin that modernity entailed a loss of the aura that inspired and defined the work of art. Likewise, he saw the false premises upon which fascist art tried to "recreate an auratic art in our times." Nonetheless, Malraux departed from Benjamin in wanting to restore the lost aura of modern times. Malraux envisioned the act of artistic creation as modifying "the whole of the past heritage of the civilisation in which it is done." The art world—the cumulative sum of all artistic masterpieces past and present—became in itself a

---


religious community and substitute religion that expressed "the highest expression of the human, a liberation from the limits of the human condition."\(^{627}\) Or, as Lebovics later puts it, "The religious content of the art of other cultures, and that of Europe for that matter, is transformed by Malraux’s gaze into the sacrament of aesthetic modernism, the idea that art does not copy nature but rather other art."\(^{628}\) Once expressed, these limits would "enrich the human enterprise."\(^{629}\)

Predominantly, Malraux granted to France the responsibility for restoring the lost aura of modern times. Lebovics observes that in *Les Voix du silence*, Malraux articulates "France’s mission as controlling trustee of the European art heritage to become the imagined trustee of the world’s cultural treasures."\(^{630}\) In turn, Malraux linked France’s own postwar regeneration to art’s ability to act as "a daily act of will that a civilization gives to its past its particular form," thereby redefining the French nation and its history. Drawing on the French tradition as the guardian of the West’s cultural heritage, Malraux located Paris at the center of the artistic universe.\(^{631}\) Thus, his baptism of Brasilia as la *capitale de l’espoir* and the prestige he accords the city as heir of the classical heritage and elaborator of a new civilization


\(^{628}\) Herman Lebovics, *Mona Lisa’s Escort: André Malraux and the Reinvention of French Culture*, 82.


\(^{631}\) Lebovics has a wonderful chapter on France’s tradition of equating art with power in which he follows the story of France’s assuming the mantel of cultural leader of the West from the time of François I to Malraux’s time. See Lebovics, Chapter 2: "The Once and Future Trustees of Western Civilization" in Herman Lebovics, *Mona Lisa’s Escort: André Malraux and the Reinvention of French Culture*, 27-49.
is nothing short of surprising. This honor was not limited to the soon-to-be capital city, Malraux dubbed the Brazilian nation as a whole "le pays de l’espoir" upon disembarking from the plane in Rio de Janeiro on August 24, 1959. It is less surprising when we consider Malraux’s aims for developing together with Brazil a new Latin partnership.

The Culture of the New Latin World

Upon arriving in Rio de Janeiro, Malraux stated the official motives for the trip. The first was "l’élaboration d’un plan mondial de collaboration scientifique, technique et économique entre tous les pays de l’univers, dans la ligne du discours prononcé par le général de Gaulle le 25 mars dernier." The second was explicitly cultural. Here Malraux proposed a collaborative effort between France and Brazil:

Le second problème est celui des conditions dans lesquelles l’Amérique latine, et notamment le Brésil, d’une part, et la France d’autre part, peuvent concourir à donner la forme culturelle qui satisfait leurs aspirations communes à la civilisation nouvelle qui se développe sous nos yeux. Ensemble, et à l’égalité.

These two motives were naturally interrelated. As Malraux made clear in opening his speech in Brasilia, Brazil’s and Europe’s history of beneficial relations and

---


633 André Malraux, "Allocution à l’Arrivée à Rio de Janeiro 24, August 1959," 89. These aims were also discussed in contemporary news coverage. See ” Le Monde,”"Le Brésil est pour la France le pays de l’espoir et le monde a besoin d’espoir," August 26, 1959.

shared civilization would accelerate cooperative endeavors in natural resource policy.\textsuperscript{635}

Malraux was particularly eager to establish a heightened level of cultural and economic exchange with Brazil because he saw the enormous potential of Brazil and the degree to which France and Brazil could form a complementary partnership. When Malraux returned to Paris after visiting Brazil, Peru, Chile, Argentina and Uruguay, he singled out Brazil as having the potential to become a great power. In his remarks to the press, Malraux declared:

\begin{quote}
J’ai deux constatations à faire: tout d’abord j’ai rencontré partout une présence de la France qui dépasse très largement tout ce que l’on peut espérer. D’autre part ce qui se passe au Brésil est d’une immense importance. Le Brésil est en train de devenir l’un des pays sur lequel le destin du monde se jouera avant la fin du siècle.\textsuperscript{636}
\end{quote}

The next month when Malraux debriefed \textit{la commission des affaires étrangères} in the National Assembly, he again insisted "sure le rôle capital du Brésil dans cette partie du monde et sur les possibilités ouvertes à la France."\textsuperscript{637} Further, speaking of Brazil, he pointed out that "ce pays dont l’économie est complémentaire de la nôtre une collaboration culturelle et technique dont les résultats pourraient être considérables."\textsuperscript{638}

While Malraux spoke of this relationship between France and Brazil in very broad and vague terms, he was consistent in portraying this partnership as one of

\textsuperscript{635} As he puts it, "La France pense que les relations entre le Brésil et l’Europe, imposées par la nature même de la civilisation qui est en train de naître sous nos yeux, vont dépasser de loin ce que, dans divers domaines, on appelait naguère des échanges." See André Malraux, \textit{Brasília na palavra de André Malraux}, 9.


\textsuperscript{637} \textit{Le Monde}, "M. Malraux préconise un accord avec l’Amérique Latine," October 10, 1959.

equals. This came across in the above cited passage from his arrival speech in Rio
de Janeiro where he spoke of the equality between the two partners. This was
echoed in his speech in Brasilia where he spoke of how Brazil and France had "un
avenir fraterno." Likewise, the new Latin culture that Malraux envisions is
neither the old Mediterranean world nor Latin America exclusively, but a new
synthesis in which "le domaine qui unit au fond de notre mémoire" is consciously
evoked through taking stock of "toutes le formes d’art, d’amour, de grandeur et de
pensée qui, au cours des millénaires, ont successivement permis à l’homme d’être
moins esclave."}

In this invocation of latinity, Malraux did assign to France the role of mentor
in helping Brazil achieve the freedom to develop along its own path. Speaking at the
Ministry of Education and Culture in Rio de Janeiro on August 28, Malraux
explained: "Ce qui est la fonction de la France ici c'est qui a été sa fonction séculaire:
c'est dans la mesure où c'est encore possible de vous envoyer des hommes qui
puissent être pour vous de techniciens de la liberté." In describing France's ability
to aid Brazil by sending artists and intellectuals who would serve as 'techniciens de
la liberté,' Malraux was differentiating France from the two Cold War powers. He
warned:

639 André Malraux, Brasilia na palavra de André Malraux, 15.

640 André Malraux, Brasilia na palavra de André Malraux, 14-15.

641 André Malraux, "Discours Prononcé au Ministere de l’education et de la culture, à Rio de Janeiro le
officielle en août 1959, ed. Edson Rosa da Silva, 111-120 (Rio de Janeiro: Ministério da Cultura:
FUNARTE, 1998), 120.
En fait, ou bien le Brésil accepte de suivre la culture qui s’élabore aux U.S.A. ou en Russie, et dans ce cas, comme les affinités profondes du Brésil avec ses rêves ne sont pas les affinités de Russes et des Américains du Nord, le Brésil sera inévitablement colonisé dans le domaine de l’esprit. 

Although Malraux counseled Brazil not to align with either superpower, he also did not want Brazil to blindly follow France for that would lead to no less a colonization of spirit. In referring to France sending 'techniciens de la liberté,’ Malraux was instead suggesting it could help Brazil face the challenges of modernity.

**Malraux on the Challenges of Modernity**

Above, we saw that art played a redemptive role for Malraux. In a modern secular world, where the rituals and communal structures that had bound together artists and their audience had disintegrated, Malraux proposed the art world itself as a substitute for the loss of the religious community. In contrast to Benjamin, Malraux wanted to recreate the lost 'aura' of the artwork. He expanded upon these themes in Brazil with an emphasis on new media and globalization. In doing so, he also outlined the specific challenges France and Brazil faced in the 1960s.

When Malraux spoke of forming a new Latin culture during his speech in Brasilia, he referenced the need to overcome the nihilism of the Second World War. After mentioning the death camps, Malraux evoked the theme of regeneration insisting "<Lève-toi, Lazare>! Nous ne savons pas ressusciter les rêves, et ce que vous propose aujourd’hui la France, c’est que pour nous tous, la culture soit la
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642 André Malraux, "Discours Prononcé au Ministere de l’education et de la culture, à Rio de Janeiro le 28 août 1959," 120.

643 As he puts it "Lorsque je dis que le Brésil serait un pays colonisé, je dis qu’il rêvait de se mettre à la remorque de la France il ne le serait pas moins." See André Malraux, "Discours Prononcé au Ministere de l’education et de la culture, à Rio de Janeiro le 28 août 1959," 119.
résurrection de la noblesse du monde.\textsuperscript{644} In the fraternal future that he envisioned for France and Brazil, Malraux invoked the possibility of "créer une civilisation qui ressemble à notre espoir, et qui, la première, mette toutes les grandes oeuvres de l'humanité au service de tous les hommes qui les appellent."\textsuperscript{645}

This theme of art answering the challenges posed by the destructiveness of the twentieth century's wars also appeared in Malraux's speeches in São Paulo and Rio. After referencing the building of a new Brazil, "et peut-être d'un nouveau monde latin," Malraux explains why these new constructions are necessary.\textsuperscript{646} He says that the wars have forced his contemporaries to take stock of the brutal evolution that took place in the 19th century with science becoming dominant. The early twentieth century was a discovery of "les limites de la raison et du progrès, valeurs souveraines du XIX siècle."\textsuperscript{647} For Malraux, an intellectual of the nineteenth century, like Victor Hugo, could never have imagined the concentration camps of the twentieth century.

But perhaps even more fundamental than this discovery of the limits of reason and science, the global wars of the twentieth century exposed a fundamental problem in the relationship between humanity and the world. In Malraux's view, his era was the first "qui pose la civilisation comme un problème - qui se demande ce

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{644}] André Malraux, \textit{Brasilia na palavra de André Malraux}, 15.
\item[\textsuperscript{645}] André Malraux, \textit{Brasilia na palavra de André Malraux}, 15.
\item[\textsuperscript{647}] André Malraux, "Discours Prononcé à l'université de São Paulo le 26 août 1959," 104.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
qu'est la civilisation, et ce qu'est l'homme."\(^{648}\) For Malraux, up through the first half of the twentieth century, every historical conception of the cosmos implied a conception of what values humanity should live by. Modern physics, however, had radically called into question the organic connection between human values and the physical universe. As Malraux puts it "La Bible et Platon impliquaient des valeurs de vie, la théorie du champ unifié n'en implique pas; la philosophie de la science moderne propose un univers dont l'homme ne serait qu'un accident, elle n'implique aucune notion fondamentale de l'homme."\(^{649}\)

In confronting the fundamental challenge of restoring value and meaning to a world whose faith in science and progress—the religion of the nineteenth century—had been thoroughly shaken, Malraux's heroic conception of the art world as bulwark against nihilism also faced the challenge of a rapidly expanding media landscape which threatened to further debase humanity. Speaking in São Paulo, Malraux reflected on how modern media tended to infantilize the populace. He suggested that "Si Platon ressuscité découvrait à travers nos journaux, notre télévision et notre cinéma, les rêve les plus répandus de notre temps, il se croirait tombé à l'Ecole Maternelle."\(^{650}\)

On the flip side of Plato finding modern culture something like nursery school, Malraux marveled at the power of modern media to contribute to what he

\(^{648}\) André Malraux, "Discours Prononcé à l'université de São Paulo le 26 août 1959," 105.

\(^{649}\) André Malraux, "Discours Prononcé à l'université de São Paulo le 26 août 1959," 104.

called "la résurrection de la noblesse du monde." In short, he was not entirely pessimistic about the new media age. With regard to television, he comments that a recent airing of Racine's *Britannicus* on French television allowed more people to see the play in a single night than had seen it between its seventeenth century debut and its television debut. For Malraux, television and radio had the potential to bring to the masses the best of the artistic heritage of the world. As he put it, "Ce qui ne fut offert qu'à une classe sociale sera offert, sinon à tous, du moins à la plupart de ceux qui l'appelleront." He embraced these new media because of their ability to assist in the combat to reestablish the nobility of humanity. In addition to television and radio, Malraux likewise saw public art galleries and mass market paperbacks as new means through which to advance a new cultural vision.

While Malraux recognized the potential of the new media for the edification of the masses, he also saw that these new media were functioning in an increasingly global society. In Brazil, Malraux articulated a fundamental contradiction of his age. On the one hand, he argued that the history of the early twentieth century had discredited thinkers like Victor Hugo and Karl Marx who had envisioned Europe becoming increasingly internationalized and confirmed Nietzsche's intimation that "le XXe siècle serait le siècle des guerres nationales." On the other, Malraux

---


653 As he puts it, "la noblesse de l'homme est l'objet d'un combat, et ce combat est le nôtre." See André Malraux, "Discours Prononcé à l'université de São Paulo le 26 août 1959," 108.

pointed out that the highly nationalistic character of the twentieth century did not translate into a series of localizations, but rather a strange new form of history. As he puts it, "La première culture mondiale, la nôtre, a montré un de ses caractères assez étrange lorsqu'elle a pris conscience d'une nouvelle forme de l'histoire."  

This new global reality made it more imperative that countries to employ these new technologies with the aim of making artistic works available to the masses. Speaking of the dangers of modern media, and specifically the cinema, Malraux underlined the fact that "aucune menace comparable à celle-là n'a jamais touché l'humanité." Yet, he also emphasized that these media could serve to bring "nourriture pour le coeur des hommes," and that the role of artists and intellectuals in the new age was "est de faire que cette nourriture puisse être donnée à tous les hommes par les moyen dont nous disposons les premiers." It was in the spirit of this aim that Malraux hoped France and Brazil could work together. Because of the two countries complementary economies, Malraux felt they could create a new culture where "l'homme recourt millénairement pour échapper à la bête." 

While the historical legacy of the twentieth century's global wars and the contemporary phenomena of mass media and globalization vexed Malraux and

---


658 André Malraux, "Discours Prononcé au Ministere de l'éducation et de la culture, à Rio de Janeiro le 28 août 1959," 120.
inspired his call for a new Latin partnership, the Algerian war was France’s biggest challenge at the time of Malraux’s visit. Algeria was the most explosive topic Malraux addressed during his visit and also figured prominently in Malraux’s motivation to visit Brazil. It is to this issue that I now turn.

**Malraux and the Algerian question**

In the speeches André Malraux delivered in Rio de Janeiro, Brasilia, and São Paulo, Malraux chose not to discuss France’s colonial war in Algeria. The closest he came to doing so was by mentioning Charles de Gaulle returning as a savior to put France back on course despite all the wounds that had been inflicted.659

Nonetheless, despite not wishing to address the Algerian war in his speeches, the damage that France’s international reputation was suffering as a result of the Algerian war was one of the motivations for Malraux’s visit. Introducing Malraux’s speeches, Edson Rosa da Silva explains that it was evident that Malraux’s trip to South America was motivated by the need to defend de Gaulle’s politics.660 In his view, Malraux "savait que la position prépondérante que la France voulait assumer dans la scène mondiale rencontrait des difficultés en raison de la politique

---


colonialiste de la Ve République." 661 Herman Lebovics likewise comments that Malraux's visit to Brazil was motivated by the desire "to placate important Third World countries not at all happy about France's recent colonial war in Indochina and its current one in Algeria." 662

In any case, whether Malraux wished to address the issue of the Algerian war or not, he was pressed by Brazilian student demonstrators and the press to do so. When Malraux arrived at the Faculdade de Filosofia, Ciências e Letras of the Universidade de São Paulo to speak on August 26, 1959, some students held up a banner saying "Viva a Argelia Livre" and began fighting with elements of the DOPS (Departamento de Ordem Política e Social). 663 While at the Faculdade, student protestors presented him with an envelop containing two pieces of cotton and a note signed by the president of the União Nacional dos Estudantes, João Manoel Conrado Ribeiro. The note said:

Senhor ministro André Malraux, Os estudantes brasileiros pedemovs aceitar estes pedaços de algodão, Eles vos serão muto uteis porque, com eles véos podereis escrever em pas vossas críticas de arte sem serdes incomodado pelos gritos dos homens torturados proximo ao palacio do governo. Com nossos melhors votos, pelos estudantes brasileiros (a) J.M. Conrado Ribeiro — presidenta da UNE. 664


The message was clear—Malraux was being accused of complicity with the French Army's use of torture in Algeria. On this basis, in another note addressed to the Faculty, the students protested the granting of Malraux an honorary doctorate.

If things did not go smoothly for Malraux at USP, they went no better in the interview he conducted shortly thereafter at the Hotel Jaraguá. Upon initiating dialogue with the press, Malraux attempted to make it clear that this was to be a limited interview where he would not respond to certain questions of a political nature. He intended to put off those questions until the next day in Rio de Janeiro where a more extensive press conference was planned.\(^665\) Defending this stance Malraux claimed that he was not a politician but had joined de Gaulle and in the process married France. He wanted nothing to do with politics independently of de Gaulle and would retire when de Gaulle retired.\(^666\) While he claimed not to be a politician, he nonetheless held himself up as proof as to why de Gaulle was not a fascist by saying "A prova que de Gaulle não é fascista é que eu estou com ele" and held cited his role in the resistance against the Nazis to underscore this fact—"tenho 14 ferimentos pela Liberdade."\(^667\)

Despite this posturing, Malraux did take questions on Algeria. He was asked why, given that he described the twentieth century as an era of nationalism, France

\(^{665}\) As reported in *O Estado de São Paulo*, "Malraux Ministro e Homem em Um Encontro Incomum," August 27, 1959: 56.


did not concede independence to Algeria. He responded with a question of his own asking who said that Algeria wanted independence and challenging that militants spoke for the minority of the Algerian people. When pressed that Morocco and Tunisia opted for independence, Malraux disavowed the problem by saying that de Gaulle affirmed the right of the Algerians to be in charge of their own destiny. He responded affirmatively to a question about whether de Gaulle consulted with his cabinet for feedback on Algeria by explaining that at the moment there was a cabinet meeting in Paris dealing with questions of Algeria and Africa. The final question regarding Algeria had to do with whether there would be an army revolt similar to the one that brought de Gaulle to power if Algeria was offered the choice between independence and association. Malraux responded, "Entre o 13 de Maio e o presente havia de Gaulle. E de Gaulle era a França a unica forma de esperança, o seu encontro com o destino."  

Malraux faced further questioning on Algeria the next day in Rio de Janeiro. In his scheduled press conference, Malraux once again confronted the issue of torture. Confronted by a journalist’s question that alluded to Jean-Paul Sartre’s introduction to *The Question*, Henri Alleg's exposé of the use of torture by the French army in Algeria, Malraux replied with testiness:

> Moi, j'ai été devant la Gestapo. Pas Sartre. Pendant ce temps il taisait jouer à Paris ses propres pièces visées par la censure allemande. J'ai été ministre de l'information, et pendant quatre mois, affirme-t-il, il n'y a pas eu de torture. Elle a réapparu depuis, c'est parfaitement vrai. Mais le général de Gaulle a fait ce qu'on n'avait pas fait depuis Cambacérès: il a confronté les plaignants et les policiers mis en cause.

---

668 Quotation and summary of events taken from *O Estado de São Paulo*, "Malraux Ministro e Homem em Um Encontro Incomum," August 27, 1959: 56.

In short order, he questioned Sartre's ability to speak to the experience of torture under the Gestapo. Having been tortured by the Germans himself, Malraux was attempting to claim himself a more legitimate spokesman on the issue. And with regard to the question of torture in Algeria, he distanced himself from any personal responsibility when he was Minister of Information during de Gaulle's immediate post-war government from 1945 to 1946. But the main thrust of Malraux's response was to support the policies of de Gaulle. In addition to what he said above about de Gaulle looking into and stopping the practice, he claimed that de Gaulle had done more in Algeria in eighteen months than the entire Fourth Republic had in its

---

670 Sartre begins his introduction to Alleg's book, by speaking of the screams of Frenchmen coming from the Gestapo's headquarters in the Rue Lauriston and transitioning from the thought that it would be impossible for the French to inflict this upon others to the brutal fact that torture has become a regular and systematic practice in Algeria. Sartre emphasizes that the French have discovered a terrible truth—"that if nothing can protect a nation against itself, neither its traditions nor its loyalties nor its laws, and if fifteen years are enough to transform victims into executioners, then its behavior is no more than a matter of opportunity and occasion." In considering the questions torture raises for France and its citizenry, Sartre concluded that the "Algerian war cannot be humanised." See Jean-Paul Sartre, "Introduction," in The Question, trans. John Calder, 13-36 (New York: George Braziller, Inc, 1958).

671 Malraux's indictment of Sartre is not entirely unproblematic. Herman Lebovic's notes that "In 1941 Jean-Paul Sartre, accompanied by Gide, came from Paris to recruit him to a group Sartre called Socialisme et Liberté. But Malraux refused to take part in these and other Resistance efforts proposed to him. Rather, between 1940 and 1942 he devoted himself to his writing." See Herman Lebovics, Mona Lisa's Escort: André Malraux and the Reinvention of French Culture, 70. Nonetheless, once Malraux dedicated himself to the Resistance movement, he assumed a kind of heroic personality and was in fact captured and tortured by the Germans in Toulouse. See Lebovics's discussion of Malraux's alter-ego—Colonel Berger—in Mona Lisa's Escort, pp. 70-74.

672 Despite his reaction to the question about Sartre's introduction to Alleg's book, it should be noted that Malraux himself wanted the book published. Herman Lebovics notes that Malraux signed a letter along with Martin du Gard, François Mauriac, and Sartre to René Coty, President of France at the time, that condemned the confiscation of Alleg's book by French police. In the letter these intellectuals demanded further inquiry into the conduct of the French army. See Herman Lebovics, Mona Lisa's Escort: André Malraux and the Reinvention of French Culture, 83.
twelve years of existence. Further, he noted that de Gaulle was prepared to grant Algeria independence if that is what Algeria wanted despite all the obstacles.673

What comes across clearly in Malraux’s press conference in Rio is his passionate defense of de Gaulle. In addition to defending de Gaulle against any involvement in torture, Malraux also bristled at the suggestion that the General had suppressed the press in France. He felt it most important "que les Brésiliens aient d’autre opinions sur le général et son entourage que celles qui sont fournies par des journaux dont la circulation constitue la preuve éclatante qu’il n’y a pas de fascisme en France."674 Further, besides defending the General from the charge of fascism, Malraux wanted to show that France had turned the corner with regard to holding on to its colonies and as the journalist Raoul Raugel puts it, "il a essayé de montrer les côtés constructifs de la politique anticolonialiste du général de Gaulle."675

According to Raugel, Malraux also was at pains to dispel the false notion that somehow de Gaulle was attempting to trick the world.

After his press conference in Rio, Malraux departed Brazil. The question of Algeria, however, remained a constant throughout his Latin America travels. While Malraux was in Lima, Peru, the French press reported that Malraux continuing to
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673 As he put it "Si la France s’en va d’Algérie ce sera au nom de l’Algérie elle-même, a-t-il dit; le courage est donc de faire l’Algérie. Et de Gaulle la fera malgré tous les obstacles." See Raoul Raugel, "La visite de M. Malraux paraît avoir largement modifié les vues de la presse brésilienne sur la France et l’Algérie," Le Monde, August 29, 1959.


defend French policy in Algeria against the notion that the French colonial
government was enslaving nine million Algerians who wished to be delivered by the
FLN. He continued to express the faith that the majority of Algerians would choose
to remain with France in the referendum that de Gaulle was offering.676 Likewise, he
sustained his argument that de Gaulle and his policies were misunderstood by the
world community arguing that "Il est faux de dire que la France, au moment où elle
vient de créer la Communauté franco-africaine, veut maintenir le colonialisme en
Algérie. Il est vrai de dire qu'elle entend donner au peuple algérien les moyens de
choisir son destin."677 Malraux even took aim at U.N. Secretary General, Dag
Hammersjöld, saying that there were portraits of de Gaulle in all of the bazaars in
Algeria and that "Cette présence est l'une des données du problème qui ont surpris
M. Hammarskjoeld."678 In Argentina, Malraux had a somewhat easier time with the
press since Argentina was experiencing some political instability. French press
reports indicate that there were no hostile lines of questioning in Malraux’s
interviews with the press and that this permitted Malraux to make the argument
that the FLN represented a minority of Algerians with relative ease.679

676 See Le Monde, "La France entend donner au peuple algérien les moyens de choisir son destin
déclare le ministre d'État à Lima," September 1, 1959.

677 Malraux quoted in " Le Monde, "La France entend donner au peuple algérien les moyens de choisir
son destin déclare le ministre d'État à Lima," September 1, 1959.

678 Malraux as quoted in " Le Monde, "La France entend donner au peuple algérien les moyens de
choisir son destin déclare le ministre d'État à Lima," September 1, 1959.

679 See Jean Huteau, "Le voyage de M. André Malraux à mis en lumière a ferveru extraordinarie de
Assessing Malraux on the Algerian Question

How successful was Malraux's portrait of a shift in French policy in Algeria? Did he convince Brazilians that de Gaulle was successful in ending the abuses of the French army? Or that de Gaulle's offer of a referendum on Algeria was a shift towards an anti-colonial policy? Here coverage by the French and Brazilian press appears to diverge with *Le Monde* offering an overwhelmingly positive assessment of Malraux's visit and *O Estado de São Paulo* questioning the extent to which Malraux had calmed suspicions of France's colonial policy.

Writing of Malraux's tussles with journalists in Brazil, Michel Martine's article in *Le Monde* portrayed the visit as a success where "durant cinq jours Malraux le conquérant." To buttress this assessment, he cites the remarks of a Brazilian professor who said to Malraux, "Tout ce que nous vous donnons en confiance nous sommes sûrs que vous nous le rendrez en justice et en compréhension." This may be interpreted to mean that in exchange for Malraux christening Brasilia the capital of a new civilization, Brazil was extending to France its understanding with regard to Algeria. Raoul Raugel, reporting in *Le Monde* likewise interpreted Malraux visit as a victory. Raugel cited a particular moment in his press conference in Rio where Malraux was able to win the admiration of the press corps by saying in front of a representative of the FLN that "entre le plus

---


681 Quoted in Michel Martine, "La France entend donner au peuple algérien les moyens de choisir son destin déclare le ministre d'État à Lima," *Le Monde*, 1 1959, September.
News coverage in *O Estado de São Paulo* diverges from this triumphal portrait. In its coverage of Malraux’s visit to São Paulo, *OESP* portrays Malraux as a man of contradictions who dazzled with "um sopro de grandeza," but despite his conviction and intelligence, the paper found his powers of persuasion minor. Pointing to Malraux’s radical conversion from the revolutionary man of the left into the fervent supporter of the conservative nationalist de Gaulle, the paper described two conflicting views. Some saw a continuity between Malraux the author of *L’Espoir* and his Gaullism in this transition while others were disillusioned by the contradiction between Malraux the former revolutionary and the man of the day. After witnessing the whole of Malraux’s performance in front of the press corps, *OESP* leaned toward the latter view when it declared that "As suas verdades antigas entusiasmavam; as de agora, por brilhantes que sejam as roupagens em que as envolve, deixam em nós um sentimento de morna desilusão." Likewise, the title of the lead article on Malraux’s visit, "Malraux Embaixador da Inteligencia Admirado e Hostilizado em São Paulo," hardly suggests that his visit was an unequivocal triumph.

---


The Aftermath of Malraux’s Visit

Despite the sometimes hostile treatment of the press during his visit, Malraux’s visit is remembered fondly in Brazil. No less a figure than former President Fernando Henrique Cardoso, recalls Malraux as an insightful visitor who left an impression on the Brazilian nation. In his 1998 preface to Malraux’s speeches in Brasilia, Cardoso remarks that it is rare that a politician or diplomat’s speeches are remembered forty years after the fact, but this is the case with Malraux. He attributes this to the fact that with Malraux, "le discours n’a jamais été une formalité à remplir, mais toujours une occasion pour la célébration de la pensée. Au lieu de formules rhétoriques, des idées."685

More specifically, Cardoso found Malraux exceptional in his ability to understand Brazil and the challenges it faced in that era. As he puts it:

Comme peu de visiteurs étrangers, Malraux a eu de la sensibilité pour comprendre le Brésil. Il s’est rendu compte que, quoiqu’immergé dans un processus d’universalisation sur le plan culturel — pour la première fois, nous disait-il, les hommes étaient les "héritiers de toute la terre," — le Brésil construisait lentement une nouvelle civilisation, avec ses propres caractéristiques, ses particularités, ce qui nous obligeait, en outre, à éviter les divers modalités de "la colonisation de l’esprit."686

Malraux words attributing to Brazil the audacity and self-confidence to build a new civilization had "un impact important sur l’imagination des Brésiliens" according to Cardoso.687 By underlining the urgency "pour les sociétés de s’efforcer pour atteindre leur rêve, leur idéal, d’autant plus à un moment historique comme celui où


les horreurs des deux guerres avaient mis à découvert les limites de la raison et du progrès," Malraux provided perspective on both "les angoisses et les espoirs de notre siècle."  

Malraux's awarding to Brasilia the honor of being the "première capitale de la civilisation mondiale," also continued to resonate in terms of the way the French press covered Brasilia over the next couple of years. Shortly after Malraux's visit, André Chastel wrote an article in *Le Monde* juxtaposing the idealized Brasilia of Malraux against the impossible social contradictions generated by it. Speaking of Brazil in general Chastel remarks that:

> Les extêmes de la civilisation se rencontrent sur la terre australe: l'état de nature et le machinisme. Les situations paradoxales, insoutenables, abondent; il est difficile de ne pas sentir ici l'urgence de certaines évolutions et le sourd travail de l'humanité en marche.

Chastel finds these extremes of civilization reproduced in Brasilia itself. In the construction zone in Brasilia there were roughly 800,000 workers living in a provisional city outside Brasilia proper. This 'ville libre' was like a city featured in American Westerns and perfectly exemplified, in Chastel’s view, the contradiction of Brasilia and Brazil itself:

> Et cette ville, qui n'est guère faite que de deux longues rues interminables a déjà ses faubourgs et sa zones (ses "favelles"). Que fera Brasilia, avec ses boulevards solennels et ses blocs ordonnés, de cette masse active et misérable? Le problème social et urbain a ici ses deux pôles: l'ordonnance abstraite de l'architecture, la pression incessante et confuse de la vie...Le Brésil est sans doute le pays du monde où la tension est la plus évidente et l'avenir le plus ouvert.

---


Here we see that the disparity between Brasilia’s ordered and high modernist architecture contrasts violently with the social dislocation and poverty of the workers who constructed this vision of hope. What is significant here is that Chastel identifies Brazil as the country where this tension is most evident. Later coverage of Brasilia in *Le Monde* reinforced this image with Brazil being characterized as “moins sous-développé que déséquilibré et invertébré.”

While Chastel’s piece deconstructed Malraux’s idealized portrait of Brazil, Malraux’s “capitale de l’espoir” continued to be evoked in discussions of Brasilia. On the day before Brasilia’s inauguration on April 21, 1960, *Le Monde* ran a piece that spoke of the hurried efforts to complete work on the capital before the inauguration ceremony. This article cited Malraux’s Brasilia speech and provided an explanation of why Brasilia signified the beginning of a new civilization by quoting a key passage of President Kubitschek’s speech. Kubitschek described Brasilia as “une révolution géopolitique. Après avoir campé pendant presque deux cents ans au bord d’Océan, le Brésil va prendre possession de son territoire.” Relocating Brasilia in the center of the country symbolized that Brazil removing itself from European influence and taking control of its own destiny. As the article remarks, this was consistent with

---


693 In an article discussed below, Raoul Raugel elaborates on this idea noting that "Les sociologues y voient le début d’une nouvelle conquête et le point de départ d’un Brésil qui ne se construira plus exclusivement en fonction des sollicitations d’un littoral encore très européen." See Raoul Raugel, "La capitale de l’espoir," *Le Monde*, July 8, 1960.
vision of Tiradentes, Brazil’s martyr from its first independence movement, who had called for moving the capital in the geographic center of the country.694

Roughly a year after Malraux’s visit, Raoul Raugel reported on how Brasilia dominated conversations across Brazil. Replacing Kubitshek’s initiative, Operation Panamerica, to carve out a hemispheric policy of Latin America, Brasilia became the object of debate between those who approved and those who disapproved or had reservations about the way the project was executed. Again, Malraux’s Brasilia speech was brought up as Raugel reports that Malraux’s capitale de l’espoir was the name taken up by "tous les orateurs brésiliens."695 Raugel then goes on to detail the various difficulties Brazil was experiencing with the transfer of the capital from Rio to Brasilia. Among them was the delay in establishing a printing press in Brasilia which impacted the ability of Congress to check executive power because each issue up for discussion in Congress needed to be printed before the legislative chamber could take it up. This combined with the fact that all the senators and deputies had yet to take up residence in Brasilia led to the fear that there would a "rétablissement d’une dictature."696

**Concluding Thoughts on Malraux’s Visit**

One of the most interesting aspects of André Malraux’s visit to Brazil is his depiction of France’s vulnerability. Speaking with journalists, Malraux commented

---

694 The article notes that the dedication of Brasilia coincided with the anniversary of Tiradente’s death on April 21, 1792.


that "France fragile qui reste entre nos mains fragiles une part de l’espoir du monde, cette France qui n’est la France que lorsqu’elle est pour les autres une part d’espoir." He went on to plead with Brazil not to be among those nations that let France fall and invoked an image of Saint Sebastian: "La France avance avec une plaie au flanc; si on la fait trébucher, alors, Brésiliens, que ne soit pas vous." These comments referred to the challenges France was facing in Algeria and in the court of world opinion and were intended to garner Brazil’s support. Still, the degree of vulnerability shown by Malraux as representative of Gaullist grandeur is striking.

Combined with Malraux’s generous remarks about Brazil being 'the country of hope,' and Brasilia being 'the capital of modernity,' his comments on France’s weakness suggest the strength of his vision that Brazil could be a strategic partner in terms of economic, cultural, and technical collaboration. For its part, Brazil reciprocated the desire for stronger ties. The foreign minister Horacio Lafer proclaimed that he hoped Malraux’s visit would result in greater cooperation and that he was delighted that France "un jour plongée dans la souffrance et la destruction, est aujourd'hui un pays hautement développée, un pays de l’avenir rendu plus dynamique par sa jeunesse et son désir de pour suivre son destin historique." While Horacio Lafer was reserved with regard to Brazil’s attitude toward the Algerian question saying that Brazil would continue to respect the
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697 As quoted in Michel Martine, "La visite de M. Malraux au brésil a révélé le profond désir d’une entente plus étroite avec la France," Le Monde, September 1, 1959.

698 As quoted in Michel Martine, "La visite de M. Malraux au brésil a révélé le profond désir d’une entente plus étroite avec la France," Le Monde, September 1, 1959.

sovereignty of nations as well as the position of the United Nations, it was clear that he wanted to see France "continue à redevenir la France."700

Malraux's trip to Brazil during the height of the Algerian crisis suggests the importance of Latin America to de Gaulle's foreign policy. His generosity in describing Brazil as the country of hope and seat of the capital of modernity also suggest that Brazil symbolized a way out of France's struggles. Like the intellectuals discussed in earlier chapters, Malraux found in Brazil a possible future for France. He saw as essential a strategic partnership with Brazil as France turned the corner from fighting colonial wars to becoming the champion of anti-colonialist movements worldwide. In this partnership between two second-tier powers, both nations saw a way of at least moderating U.S. hegemony through alliance.

Jean Paul Sartre in Brazil: The International Left Responds to Malraux

If Malraux's visit to Brazil symbolized the importance of the country in de Gaulle's shift to a post-colonial politics of cooperation, Sartre's visit from August through October of 1961 underscores the importance of Brazil to the international left. In her autobiographical work, The Force of Circumstance, Simone de Beauvoir stresses the Cuban Revolution and the Algerian war as the two events motivating the trip. She explains that:

Our visit to Havana had given us new reasons for going to Brazil. Cuba's future would be settled for the most part in Latin America where Castroist currents were already becoming apparent; Sartre had made it his intention to talk to the Brazilians about Cuba. We had

700 The idea is that France should resume its role as a cultural and intellectual leader of the world. One of the Latin American ambassadors (unidentified in the article) who saw Malraux off in Paris said this in response to a reporter's question about what was expected of France in Latin America. Quoted in Le Monde,"M. Malraux est arrivé à Rio-De-Janeiro," August 25, 1959.
witnessed a revolution in triumph. To understand the world outside the Cold war, we had to get to know an underdeveloped, semi-colonized country where the revolutionary forces had not yet been unleashed, and perhaps would not be for some time. The Brazilians we met persuaded Sartre that by combating Malraux's propaganda in their country he would be rendering a useful service to Algeria and the France Left; their insistence finally convinced us that we should make the trip.\footnote{Simone de Beauvoir, \textit{The Force of Circumstance} (New York: G.P. Putnam, 1963), 509.}

From this sketch we can see that Sartre and de Beauvoir's trip was a direct response to Malraux's and that, once again, international public opinion surrounding the Algerian War played a fundamental role. Throughout the trip, Sartre focused his political lectures on the themes of colonialism and anti-imperialist revolution with the Cuban Revolution and the Algerian war as the two central examples.\footnote{See Luiz Roberto Salinas Fortes, "Introdução," in \textit{Sartre no Brasil: A Conferência de Ararquara [Filosofia Marxista e Ideologia Existencialista]}, trans. Luiz Roberto Salinas Fortes, 11-20 (São Paulo: UNESP, 1986), 11-12.} It was here in Brazil, writes H. Stuart Hughes, that "Sartre came closest to political greatness, as he voiced the shame and anger of professors and writers, of pastors and priests, revolted by the tortures and barbarities that France's war of repression had entailed."\footnote{H. Stuart Hughes, \textit{The Obstructed Path: French Social Thought in the Years of Desperation, 1930-1960}, 214.}

What follows is an analysis of Sartre's visit to Brazil that advances two arguments—one political and one philosophical. Politically, Brazil was important to Sartre because he saw the country as a hinge for world history. This explains why he was motivated to travel there in response to André Malraux's visit three years prior. He saw the country as playing an important role in the shift in power away from Europe towards developing nations. Like Malraux, Sartre saw Brazil as a key country within international politics. However, his politics differed from Malraux's
in so far as Sartre wanted to transcend politics based on the nation-state or geopolitical blocks. He wanted to build an international movement built around a socialist vision that he had recently formulated in his *Critique of Dialectical Reason*.

Philosophically, Sartre’s trip to Brazil was significant because it was a forum for him to work out the ideas he had conceptualized in his *Critique of Dialectical Reason*. More specifically, Brazil was central because it provided the subject matter for two major works that Sartre used to resolve the issue of history versus structure in the social sciences: Claude Lévi-Strauss’s *Tristes Tropiques* and Roger Bastide’s *African Religions of Brazil*. By engaging these works in a major lecture given in Brazil, Sartre articulated a philosophical anthropology that stressed the reflexive dimension of social scientific practice.

**Sartre: The Anti-Malraux**

De Beauvoir’s memoir cites Malraux’s earlier trip to Brazil as a principal motivation for her and Sartre’s trip to Brazil. The couple was invited to Brazil to take part in the *Congresso de Critica e Historia Literária*. The Brazilian writer, Jorge Amado, was most active in lobbying them. As de Beauvoir’s memoir demonstrates, Amado generously played the role of host and tour guide. Unlike
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705 On Amado’s role in influencing the couple to come to Brazil, Hazel Rowley writes: "Of the various voices that finally convinced them that it was almost their duty to visit Brazil, it was their friend Jorge Amado’s that was the most persuasive. For years, Amado had been saying that Sartre needed to spend more time in the third world and witness its contradictory realities close-up. He also felt that Sartre had a great deal to offer Brazilian progressives, particularly young people. Brazilian intellectual life was strongly Francophile, and the works of Sartre and Beauvoir were widely read, both in French and in Portuguese." See Hazel Rowley, *Beauvoir, Brazil, and "Christina T."*, http://www.bookforum.com/inprint/014_01/96 (accessed October 9, 2010).
Malraux, whose official visit to Brazil was limited to five days with stops in Rio, Brasilia, and São Paulo, Sartre and de Beauvoir's trip was a more far-ranging tour of the country with time spent in these cities as well as Recife, Salvador de Bahia, Ouro Preto, Belo Horizonte, Fortaleza, Bélem, and Manaus. In this way, the couple was able to see more of Brazil’s internal variances than Malraux.

Nonetheless, for the Brazilian press, Malraux's trip served as a central reference point for reporting on Sartre in Brazil and the two trips were set off in counterpoint to one another. For example, Sartre held a press conference on September 2, 1960 that sharply contrasts with the interview André Malraux conducted at the Hotel Jaraguá on August 26, 1959 discussed earlier in this chapter.

In reporting on Sartre’s press conference held at the Hotel Excelsior in São Paulo, O Estado de São Paulo directly contrasted Sartre’s manner and affect to that of Malraux reporting that:

\[\text{Ao contrario de Malraux, que deixou impressão pela riqueza dos gestos e pela teatralidade da voz, em Jean Paul Satre nada há, à primeira vista, que o distinga do individuo comum, nada que o identifique, fisicamente, com o escritor, com o corajoso homem de ação, com um dos mais discutidos homens do nosso tempo.}^{706}\]

We see here that Sartre’s comportment complied with the reporter Miguel Urbano Rodrigue's assessment of him as an engaged intellectual but not a man of action.\(^ {707} \)


\(^{707}\) See Miguel Urbano Rodrigues, "Sartre em São Paulo: Consciencia da Esquerda," O Estado de São Paulo, September 2, 1960: 9. Rodrigues goes on to draw a parallel between Sartre and the heroes of his novels and then contrasts them with the typical Malrauxian hero. He writes: "Os seus herois são quase todos frustrados, mornos, desesperados -- antítese dos herois malrauxsianos, também angustiados, mas com uma angustiados, mas com uma angustia que tem o calor do sol, o pefrume da terra e o cheiro da polvora."
If Sartre’s demeanor in this interview could be directly contrasted with Malraux, so too could the general atmosphere of the press conference. Where Malraux faced an at times hostile press and had received the censure of students in his appearance at the University of São Paulo, Sartre enjoyed a much more receptive audience. Students, whose overall number exceeded journalists, attended Sartre’s press conference and were attentive about what he had to say about contemporary affairs. OESP describes Sartre as entering the room ten minutes late, shaking hands with a few admirers, sitting on a sofa where some more admirers surrounded him, and then taking his place at the head of a large conference table and lighting up a cigarette. His reported answers to questions about the French youth, Algeria, Cuba, communism, Malraux, the United States, Nietzsche, existentialism, class war, and Brazil appear relaxed and uncontested.

Sartre was explicitly asked his opinion about Malraux both before and after his affiliation with de Gaulle. Although the press was well aware of the animosity of these two men, Sartre was diplomatic and responded playfully saying that:

Há uma peça de teatro de Molière na qual se encontram dois escritores que têm entre si uma disputa. Um se chama Vadius e outro Trissotin; ambos fazem todo mundo rir. Eu não tenho a intenção de fazer ninguém rir nem de Malraux, nem de mim se responder. Se tenho alguma coisa a dizer sobre Malraux é comente sobre o governo francês que poderia fazê-lo.708

Referencing Molière’s Les Femmes Savantes, as Malraux might be apt to do, Sartre extricated himself from the comedy of the two feuding intellectuals that the press was eager to play up. He instead opted for directing his criticism at de Gaulle’s government that he saw as a mystification attempting to referee between right and

left that was unequal to the task of resolving the Algerian crisis.\footnote{In this press interview, Sartre claimed that "O degaullismo quer apresentar-se como um árbitro mas não passa de um véu sob o qual se enfrentam a direita e a esquerda. Acredito que a solução do problema da Argélia poderá somente resolvar-se num conflito entre essas tendências. No início, será a direita que vencerá, porque a esquerda ainda não se acha preparada." \textit{See O Estado de São Paulo,} "Cabe à juventude fazer renascer o anarquismo dentro do marxismo," September 3, 1960: 9} It should be pointed out, however, that according to de Beauvoir, Sartre did not always take the high road with regard to criticizing Malraux.\footnote{Simone de Beauvoir, \textit{The Force of Circumstance}, 538.}

Of course, where Sartre differed most from Malraux was the position he took on Algeria and anti-imperialist revolution more generally. As noted above, Algeria and the Cuban Revolution were the two topics that motivated his trip to Brazil in the first place. Sartre’s thinking on these topics help contextualize his thoughts on Brazil and its importance within the geopolitical framework of the Cold War era.

\textbf{Sartre on Algeria, Cuba, and Brazil}

Sartre’s opposition to the continuing French presence in Algeria after the independence movement took hold is well known and documented. So it is unsurprising that Sartre would continue to speak of Algerian war as a betrayal of France when he was in Brazil.\footnote{As he put it in his interview before the São Paulo press corp, the Algeria war was "uma ruina para a França, que ela representa a tração de uma parte de nação—a menor parte—contra a outra, achamo-nos atualmente numa situação de violência." \textit{See O Estado de São Paulo,} "Cabe à juventude fazer renascer o anarquismo dentro do marxismo," September 3, 1960: 9.} What is surprising is the importance Sartre attributed to his presence in Brazil when events surrounding the Algerian war were pressuring him to return home. In \textit{The Force of Circumstance}, Simone de Beauvoir recalls that she and Sartre were in Brazil when the "Manifesto of the 121” appeared
on September 5 and the Jeanson trial began on September 7, 1960.\footnote{As Alistair Horne aptly summarizes, the manifesto "incited French conscripts there to desert" and was signed by "celebrities, including Sartre, de Beauvoir, Françoise Sagan and Simone Signoret." As for Francis Jeanson, he "spun together a remarkable network—reminiscent of the French resistance—of no fewer than forty like minded French men and women. For three years he operated, without receiving any pay or direct orders from the F.L.N. Jeanson's motives, as he explains them, were the "ignoble behaviour of the forces of order" that he had witnessed in Algeria between 1945 and 1954, and he did not want to be yet another of the French "theoreticians" always giving advice to the Algerians, of which they were tired." See Alistair Horne, \textit{A Savage War of Peace: Algeria 1954-1962} (New York: Viking, 1977), 238.}

In lieu of traveling back to France to be present at Jeanson's trial, Sartre wrote his famous letter in support of his friend and biographer, which famously claimed, "If Jeanson had asked me to carry dispatch cases or give shelter to militant Algerians, and I had been able to do so without risk to them, I should have agreed to do so without hesitation."\footnote{Quotation taken from Horne, Alistair Horne, \textit{A Savage War of Peace: Algeria 1954-1962}, 238. On Sartre's letter in defense of Jeanson, Michel Winock notes that "The letter was in fact written in Paris by [Sartre's] lieutenants Lansmann and Peju; after making his position clear in a telephone conversation, Satre had given them carte blanche, and had expressed complete solidarity with Jeanson." See Michel Winock, \textit{Did Sartre Always Get it Wrong?}, at http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/fr/IMG/pdf/0203-winock-GB.pdf (accessed September 10, 2013).} According to de Beauvoir, Jeanson's lawyers had requested Sartre's presence at the trial, but Sartre "had accepted commitments in Brazil and did not want to abandon the action he had engaged there on Algeria's behalf."\footnote{Simone de Beauvoir, \textit{The Force of Circumstance}, 545-8.}

According to de Beauvoir, the French press reacted by opining Sartre's letter to be so scandalous that it was "a challenge that the government must, for its self-respect, take-up." While Sartre was still in Brazil, de Beauvoir recalls that the French embassy in Rio happily circulated the rumor that Sartre would be arrested upon returning to France. Although Sartre was not arrested upon his return, while he remained in Brazil the special edition of \textit{Les Temps Modernes} dedicated to
Algerian independence was seized. Additionally, there was backlash from the French right involving a demonstration of French soldiers marching on the Champs Elysées and shouting 'shoot Sartre!' Given all of this, Sartre's decision to remain in Brazil may be attributed to a desire to let the situation cool down. Nonetheless, it is worth investigating what he said regarding Algeria while in Brazil and why he thought this was important forum for his political work.

As de Beauvoir's remarks that opened this section indicate, Sartre travelled to Brazil both because he wanted to counter Malraux's defense of French policy in Algeria and because he felt that the future of the Cuban Revolution was to be decided in Latin America more broadly. Just a year prior to his Brazilian trip, in 1960, Sartre and de Beauvoir went to Cuba at the invitation of Fidel Castro and had extensive discussions with Fidel and Ché Guevara. As a result of the trip, Sartre published his reflections on the Cuban revolution as a series of articles entitled *Ouragan sur le Sucre* in *France-Soir.*

Luiz Roberto Salinas Fortes comments that in writing up these reflections, Sartre attempted to provide a theoretical model for understanding this revolution.

---


717 On the rather surprising choice of *France-Soir* as the medium through which to publish these reflections as well as the recent republication of these articles in *Les Temps Modernes,* n° 649, April-June 2008, see John Ireland, "«Ouragan sur le Sucre»: Sartre, Castro et la Révolution Cubaine," *Les Temps Modernes,* no. 656 (Nov.-Dec. 2009): 9-37. These articles were translated and published in book form in English in 1961 as *Sartre on Cuba.* See Jean-Paul Sartre, *Sartre on Cuba* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1961).
along the lines set out in his recently published *Critique of Dialectical Reason.* But while there was no doubt an attempt to formulate a theoretical model, John Ireland emphasizes the personal sense of excitement that Sartre felt and was able to convey through these articles. Further, Ireland points out that Sartre's portrait of Cuba served as perfect foil to France at that moment with "Castro incarne pour lui l'idéal d'un chef dans ses rapports avec un peuple, aux antipodes de la mystification qui propulsa de Gaulle au pouvoir et l'y maintint." Also, in Castro, Sartre found a model: "l’ambition antihéroïque de Castro, son désir farouche de se défaire de tout attribut personnel, et surtout de toute forme de prestige ou de distinction individuelle, fait de son intinéraire un parcours exemplaire pour Sartre." Given the correspondences that Sartre set up between Cuba and France during the Algeria crisis, it is no accident that while in Brazil, Sartre brought Algeria and Cuba into close relief with one another and suggested a number of similarities between Algerian, Cuban, and French youth movements.

---


719 Commenting on Sartre's fascination with the Revolution, Ireland writes: "Cette fascination comporte de multiples facettes: elle est intellectuelle—comment formuler la spécificité de cette transformation révolutionnaire, son moteur, sa logique? (Rappelons que la *Critique de la raison dialectique,* où Sartre se livre à des analyses approfondies de révolutions sociales antérieures, est sous presse lors du séjour cubain.) Mais elle est surtout personnelle et viscérale, car cette révolution est vivante, très vivante pour Sartre, subjugué par les gens et les rencontres dont il est le témoin parfois éberlué." See, John Ireland, "«Ouragan sur le Sucre»: Sartre, Castro et la Révolution Cubaine," 13.

720 John Ireland, "«Ouragan sur le Sucre»: Sartre, Castro et la Révolution Cubaine," 15.

One of the most substantial lectures Sartre gave in Brazil with regard to Algeria, Cuba, and France took place at Faculdade de Filosofia, Ciências e Letras at the Universidade de Ararquara (now the Universidade Estadual Paulista). At Ararquara, Sartre gave a talk about politics for students and a lecture on Marxism and existentialism to the faculty. In his talk with the students, reported on by *O Estado de São Paulo*, Sartre linked Cuba and Algeria as youth movements responding to fundamental problems of land, hunger, and colonial imposition.

For Sartre, Cuba was fundamentally a revolution of youth where "os jovens afastaram uma geração de adultos." In his view, Fidel's 28th of July Movement displaced a generation of men in their thirties and forties, themselves exiled by the dictator Fulgencio Batista when he took power in coup d'etat in 1952. For Sartre, this older generation failed to take power because they were still beholden to the notion that Cuba must stay the course in terms of being a sugar producer. Rather than see the injustice in the system of land tenure, as Fidel did, this older generation simply saw Cuba as the "vitima de um destino injusto e magico." Meanwhile, Fidel, who was twenty-four when he became a revolutionary, saw that the government was in the hand of the big landowners who were in turn acting in the interest of the United States. In Sartre's analysis, the United States was responsible for Cuba's dependency on sugar because the U.S. wanted to protect domestic beet farmers and sugar producers from competing on the world market and thus bought
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sugar from Cuba at inflated prices. This in turn led to the paradoxical situation in which Cuba, with its extraordinarily fertile soil, was unable to produce enough food for its own nutrition and relied upon the U.S. to sell them foodstuffs. Fidel, in contrast to the older generation, knew that the sugar cycle needed to be broken because he saw the peasants starving and understood that sugar created dependence on the United States.

For Sartre, Algeria "estava na mesma situação dos cubanos, isto é, devia escolher sua maneira de morrer: a bala ou a fome." Although there was not an absolute division between the generations, as in Cuba, Sartre divided the population between those who were adults between 1945 and 1950 and those who were still coming of age in that period. He explains the difference by an anecdote involving Ben Sadok, a youth of twenty, who killed a fifty-five year old Muslim man who was for assimilation and had taken the part of France. Sartre elucidates the ideological gulf between these two men by saying: "O pequeno havia conhecido a famosa chacina de 1945: houve antes uma revolta argelina e néos depois, massacramos 40 mil argelinos. O rapaz soube disso, conheceu, viveu esta tragédia. O outra já tinha definido sua atitude, quando conheceu essa chacina." In short, the Algerian revolt of 1945 in which 40,000 were killed formed the boy's perspective on the French whereas the older man had a worldview already in place.

---


In terms of issues of land tenure and hunger, Sartre sees the Algerian situation in remarkably similar terms. Since 1898, the growth rate of the population was extraordinary with eight million Muslims living in lands that had previously sustained a million. In Sartre’s analysis, besides a rapidly growing population, the food supply was diminishing. In Algeria, the French occupied the best lands and produced wine and citrus fruits on them. This essentially made these lands sterile from the point of view of Algerians. One particularly interesting aspect of Sartre’s analysis is the role he attributes to Algerian guest workers in France. With machines replacing the needs for Algerian workers on French estates in Algeria, young Algerians sought work in France as common workers. Taking work in French factories, "Eles vêm proletariazar-se na França e voltam com uma consciência política proletarizada." This transnational dimension of the Algerian war, where the Algerian youth become radicalized through working in French factories further explains the generational divide between those who favored assimilation and those that saw this solution as no longer possible.

While Cuba and Algeria were the frontlines of history when Sartre visited Brazil, Sartre’s visit awakened his interest in Brazil itself. By 1967, when Les Temps Modernes published a special edition on Brazil, the volume was introduced with a short note indicating that Brazil had moved to the center of the world historical stage. Les Temps Modernes announced that:

---

La violence de ces contradictions signifie que le jour où le Brésil ne subira plus son histoire mais la fera, son influence sera considérable. C’est en Amérique latine que se décidera la réussite ou l’échec du projet impérialiste des États-Unis, non seulement dans ce continent mais dans les autres régions du monde: s’il ne réussit pas à y prendre corps, il n’y parviendra pas non plus ailleurs. Or l’avenir de l’Amérique latine dépend principalement de ce qui se passera au Brésil.727

The prodigious contradictions of the country—the enormous disparity in resources between rich and poor both in terms of income and in terms of land tenure—signified that the day would come when Brazil no longer submitted to its colonial history, but remade itself and became incredibly influential. In turn, given Brazil’s size and influence in Latin America, identified here as the key region in Cold War politics, the path it took was crucial for world history.

Sartre’s statements during his trip to Brazil suggest his growing interest in the region and laid the basis for the importance that he attributed to the country by the time he published the special edition of *Les Temps Modernes* on Brazil. Although Sartre was occasionally dismissive of Brazil’s historical potential, he generally identified it as playing an important role in the shift in power away from Europe and towards the developing nations. Responding to a question about the future of socialism during a press conference in São Paulo, Sartre asserted that the postwar years had brought about a shift where Europe was no longer the motor of history:

Direi apenas que hoje em dia a Europa é objeto da historia. Isto é: ela não faz a historia, mas a obedece e que o momento historico mais importante é certamente o da descolonização e, ao mesmo tempo, do nacionalismo dos paises subdesenvolvidos.728


With Europe relegated to the margins of history, Cuba and Algeria were at that moment the most obvious frontlines of world history. Sartre, however, also included Brazil in the mix because of the extraordinary tensions between the left and right that he observed in the country.

Like a number of his countrymen, Jean-Paul Sartre remarked on the geographic and economic dualism of Brazil: "de um lado a miseria do campo e de outro, o extraordinario desenvolvimento industrial."729 But Sartre is somewhat distinctive in translating that geographic and economic dualism into political terms. Elaborating on Brazil's contradictions in an exclusive interview with OESP while in flight from Rio to São Paulo, Sartre commented:

Duas coisas chocam realmente: primeiro uma unidade de pontos de vista que venho encontrando desde Recife e que, possivelmente, encontrarei em São Paulo — este País conhece sua força, sua originalidade, sua democracia racial e reivindica sua plena personalidade. Desse ponto de vista, a impressão que causa a um francês é que todo mundo no Brasil é da esquerda. Depois, quando se desce até o fundo das coisas vê-se que há uma grande diferença entre os homens, dependendo de como eles olham uma realização do mundo brasileiro, etapa por etapa, ou quando eles pensam que alguma coisa deve ser rompida. Aos meus olhos o Brasil é, ao mesmo tempo, a mais completa democracia do Ocidente já riu, por exemplo uma universidade pode convidar um escritor estrangeiro e deixá-lo com liberdade completa de pensamento. E, ao mesmo tempo, o Brasil é a ditadura de 10 milhões de homens sobre 60 milhões.730

Here Sartre speaks of the way that Brazil's racial democracy and originality as a culture and nation led him to conclude that this was a nation of the left, but that the vast differences in material life broke this impression and led him to think of the


country as a dictatorship of the minority over the majority. The fundamental political contradiction generated by this split between left and right led Sartre to conclude that:

E a situação extrordinária que está em movimento, que faz com que o Brasil de hoje seja tão profundamente apaixonante. O Brasil é realmente o País em que a História se faz no momento atual. É dependo da solução que será encontrada, este País pode ter influencia consideravel sobre a historia da humanidade.

A passage such as this suggests that although Sartre intended his visit to Brazil to oppose André Malraux's politics, he at least agreed with Malraux in one fundamental area—he saw Brazil as central to the current historical moment.

**Sartre’s philosophical moment in Brazil**

Sartre arrived in Brazil a year after publishing the principal philosophical work of his later years—*The Critique of Dialectical Reason*. The *Critique*, published in 1961, was an attempt by Sartre to systematically think through the "relationship between his earlier ontology and his later ideological allegiance." In other words, Sartre was trying to reconcile the existential philosophy set forth in *Being and Nothingness* with his Marxist commitments. The effort Sartre poured into the creation of this work has become legend. From Simone de Beauvoir we know that Sartre wrote at an incredible pace—for days at a time—and forgoing sleep by

---

731 It may be helpful here to remember the distinction Edward Telles made when examining Brazil's racial politics. Telles explained the force of Brazil's myth of racial democracy through recognizing that in terms of sociability racial relations were quite fluid; whereas, in terms of economics, there was significant stratification by race. See Edward E. Telles, *Race in Another America: The Significance of Skin Color in Brazil* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004).


popping an endless stream of pills.\textsuperscript{734} This process bore a physical toll on Sartre and we see that when he arrived in Brazil a year later, "he was not in very good shape; he was suffering from an attack of shingles brought on by overwork and persistent depression."\textsuperscript{735} None of this stopped him, however, from the practice of drinking scotch at the hotel bar and "stuffing himself with gardénal [phenobarbital] so he could sleep."\textsuperscript{736}

Besides a general agreement that Sartre was attempting "to reconcile the hopes of socialism and the imperative of freedom," through his \textit{Critique of Dialectical Reason}, the reception of this work has run the critical gamut. Jonathan Judaken suggests that Sartre's conceptualization of "racism and its enmeshment in the system of production and exchange," was most fully realized "in his existential Marxist writings," of which the \textit{Critique} developed most completely.\textsuperscript{737} H. Stuart Hughes writes that "It was neither Marxism nor social science—nor did it offer the prolegomena to a new understanding of man. Both amateurish and old fashioned, it closed rather than inaugurated a major phase in French intellectual history."\textsuperscript{738}
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\textsuperscript{735} Simone de Beauvoir, \textit{The Force of Circumstance}, 511.
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\textsuperscript{736} Simone de Beauvoir, \textit{The Force of Circumstance}, 566.
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\textsuperscript{738} H. Stuart Hughes, \textit{The Obstructed Path: French Social Thought in the Years of Desperation, 1930-1960}, 222.
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When Sartre arrived in Brazil, the attitude among Brazilian intellectuals towards the *Critique* was more inquisitive and uncertain than either of the above positions. This can be attributed in part to the *Critique’s* recent publication and the need to sort through the challenges and puzzles it presented to its reader. This can be seen in newspaper coverage of Sartre’s visit as well as in the central question posed by Fausto Castilho, Professor of Philosophy in the Faculdade de Filosofia, Ciências e Letras at Araraquara, that drew him to speak in Araraquara. For example, *O Estado de São Paulo* ran a profile of Sartre, "Um escritor do seu tempo," on September 3, 1960 that suggested that it was possible to say that Sartre’s historical moment had passed. The paper reasoned that 1960 was far removed from 1947 when Sartre’s fame and philosophical powers were at their height. It was unclear if the *Critique* was a regression in relation to *L’Être et le Neant* or was attempting to extend Marxism or supercede it. Professor Fausto Castilho’s question, that Sartre responded to in his philosophy lecture at Ararquara likewise attempted to figure out more precisely what Sartre meant by denying that philosophy could transcend Marxism.739

739 The complete question was as follows:

Depuis 1943 nous connaissons les termes par lesquels vous définissez le philosophe et les rapports qui se nouent dans l’Histoire entre lui et son oeuvre -- l’Histoire, c’est-à-dire la limite infranchissable pour le subjectif et pour l’objectif. Toutefois, dans la *Question de méthode* et plus récemment encore dans la Critique vous rénoncez formellement au nom de philosophe. Faut-il se demander si une déclaration de telle sorte n’implique pas chez vous une nouvelle idée des rapports entre le subjectif et l’objectif? Et comment peut-on se dire un idéologue aujourd’hui et cependant ne pas tomber dans les difficultés que Marx signale à propos de toute idéologie? En somee, peut-on jamais dépasser la philosophie sans la réaliser?"

In the first part of his lecture at Ararquara, which he entitled 'Philosophy and Ideology', Sartre rephrased what he said in the *Critique* about Marxism and existentialism. As reported by *OESP*, Sartre identified Descartes and Locke as the basic philosophies of the 18th-century bourgeois, Kant and Hegel ushering in a new era of philosophy at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th centuries, and Marx articulating a philosophy in response to the crisis of capitalism. Given that this crisis of capitalism continued into the 20th century, Sartre argued that Marxism could not be transcended and that philosophers needed to complement Marx rather than launching new solutions.740

The second part of his lecture, "Existential Ideology and the Foundation of Anthropology," was far more interesting. In this section, Sartre discussed a basic conflict in the social sciences between a structural and historical approach to anthropology, or in Lucien Febvre's idiom, a *science de l'homme*. In doing so, Sartre engaged the work of Claude Lévi-Strauss and Roger Bastide, the featured subjects of earlier chapters, and in the process attempts to reconcile a profound division in the social sciences. Through this engagement, Sartre articulated a reflexive dimension that is often overlooked—and has received more contemporary articulations in

---

740 See *O Estado de São Paulo*, "Sartre falou de politica e de filosofia em Araraquara," September 6, 1960. This corresponds neatly to H. Stuart Hughes's summary of Sartre's *Critique*: "Maxism figured as the third and last of the classic philosophies of the modern era—the first two having been the rationalism that had sprung from Descartes and Locke, and the German idealist tradition of Kant and Hegel. After these great "moments" had come the time of the epigoni, whose work deserved to be called "ideology" rather than true philosophy. Such was existentialism. Yet existentialism ranked as an ideology with a pressing claim to attention, since its purpose was to rejuvenate the teaching of Marx." See H. Stuart Hughes, *The Obstructed Path: French Social Thought in the Years of Desperation, 1930-1960* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), 217.
George E. Marcus and Michael M.J. Fisher’s *Anthropology as Cultural Critique*. It is worth looking at what Sartre has to say about the relationship between historical and structural approaches to anthropology. In this aspect, if no other, Sartre seems to have something to contribute despite H. Stuart Hughe’s contention that "In the second phase of his intellectual endeavors, Sartre succeeded in illuminating no significant facet of human society."

In describing the conflicting approaches to anthropology, which Sartre places at the foundation of all the social sciences, Sartre claims that on the one hand, "Vous avez des sociologues et des ethnographes qui étudient essentiellement les structures, les structures, c’est-à-dire, dans une société donné, les caractères qui la définissent à la fois dans une particularité et dans son rapport à une totalité." He identifies Lévi-Strauss as falling into this camp and explains that "Si Lévi-Strauss, par exemple, était interrogué il vous répondrait en ce moment que les structures conditionnent l’histoire au moins autant que l’histoire conditionne les structures et que, d’ailleurs, il y a des structures qui échappent à l’histoire." On the other hand, Sartre identifies the historical and philosophical anthropology of Marxism as juxtaposed to this structural definition. This approach "consiste à faire l’étude de

---


l’homme en tant qu’il est changé par les circonstances et en tant que, changé par les circonstances, il change à son tour les circonstances." Sartre goes on at some length to explain that Marx actually combines both approaches to anthropology in a dialectical relation. In Sartre’s view, Marx thought of anthropology structurally when he defined the human relations as defined by the structures of capitalism. And, Sartre saw that Marx treated the structures of capitalism as arising historically from feudalism. So for Marx, both the structural and historical approach were necessary features of a full-blooded philosophical anthropology. He also identifies Bastide as combining the two approaches on a practical level without being able to theoretically articulate what he is doing.

Sartre read Bastide’s Les religions africaines au Brésil, during his visit to Brazil because he was interested in candomblé and observed several rituals while visiting Bahia with Simone de Beauvoir. Sartre assesses the work as "contient un ensemble extrêmement intéressant de sociologie des structures et d’histoire." He goes on to say that in the work, economic history conditions social history but that it is not fully recognized as doing so. This is why Sartre claimed that Bastide’s work


746 While in Bahia, Sartre and de Beauvoir met up with Pierre Verger, a French photographer who moved to Brazil in the 1940s and played an important role in making connections between candomblé practices in Brazil and contemporary African religion. On Verger’s role in connecting these two worlds, see the film, Pierre Fatumbi Verger: mensangeiro entre dois mundos, directed by Luiz Buarque de Hollanda, Latin America Video Archives, 1988. Verger also authored an important work on the slave trade to Brazil. Pierre Verger, Fluxo e refluxo do tráfico de escravos entre o Golfo do Benin e a Bahia de Todos os Santos, dos séculos XVII à XIX, 4th edition (São Paulo: Editora Corrupio, 2002).

was excellent in the practical dimension without being theoretically up to speed. He faults Bastide's preface in particular:

Quand il veut dans une préface expliquer la liaison de l'histoire et des structures, le rapport du marxisme avec sa propre théorie sociographique c'est très inférieur, parce que le problème est au fond un problème qui échappe à la science elle-même, alors que c'est la science, comme vous le voyez, la science de l'homme, qui le réclame. Autrement dit, il faut un fondement de l'anthropologie. 748

Sartre then goes on to say that the key to resolving this theoretical problem is "man himself." 749

Admittedly, Sartre is either stating the obvious here, or being a bit obtuse. In his defense, however, he does expand on this idea through talking about the reflexive dimension in anthropology. Citing Lévi-Strauss as a positive tendency of this example, Sartre looks to emphasize the anthropologist as subject. He elaborates on Lévi-Strauss's work as follows:

Remarquez qu'à aujourd'hui il y a toute une catégorie d'ethnographes qui savent se nommer et donner leur carte de visites, qui disent: "Nous venons, nous sommes d'une société capitaliste," il y en a beaucoup et Lévi-Strauss en est un, mais dans l'ethnographie classique nous avons la description de l'Indien comme objet et nous avons en filigrane la description comme sujet du questionneur. D’ailleurs je n’ai jamais compris le caractère de Lévi-Strauss aussi bien, c’est un des mes amis, que j’aime beaucoup, que le jour où j’ai lu sa relation de sa vie chez les Indiens. C’est lui que je voyais, plus encore que les Indiens, parce que je voyais ce qu’il a aimé, je voyais ce qu’il souhaitait, et j’entendais par là, je comprenais qu’il est conditionné là par rapport à sa société capitaliste à lui. 750

In pointing out that the value of Claude Lévi-Strauss's *Tristes Tropiques* lies as much, if not more, in what Lévi-Strauss has to say about himself and his own society,

Sartre shifts the object of anthropology towards the questioner. While Lévi-Strauss

---


749 Sartre declares that "il ne peut pas y avoir d'autre fondement à l'anthropologie que l'homme lui-même." Jean-Paul Sartre, "A conferência de Ararquara," in *Sartre no Brasil: A Conferência de Ararquara*, 58.

himself was aware of this and emphasized this (see Chapter One), he was somewhat exceptional. This, for Sartre, was one of the central problems of the social sciences:

Autrement dit, il faut considérer que le trouble des sciences sociales, aujourd'hui, vient de ce que le questionneur se considère comme regard absolu par rapport au questionné, alors qu'en réalité le fait qu'ils puissent parler, correspondre, se dire des choses, et se comprendre, vient de ce qu'ils sont en situation l'un par rapport à l'autre. Ce que le sociologue ou l'ethnographe ne fait pas dans beaucoup de cas, c'est de se situer.751

By stressing this reflexive dimension and situating knowledge by making the conditions under which knowledge is produced clear, Sartre advances his notion of *comprehension* as a means of resolving the inadequacies of both the purely structural and purely historical approaches to social science.752

**Concluding Thoughts on Sartre in Brazil**

Sartre's visit brings into relief a number of important elements. The very fact that he spent roughly two months in Brazil highlights both his intellectual interest in the country as well as the importance he attributed to the country. As noted earlier, while the Cuban Revolution and the Algerian War were the most obvious fault lines for a postcolonial and post-capitalist society, Sartre also included Brazil as a hinge for world historical development. The fundamental contradictions Sartre saw between Brazil's leftist and rightist tendencies made the country a frontline for the

---


752 Sartre defines *comprehension* in these reciprocal terms: "C'est-à-dire, qu'il y a un type de connaissance qui ne peut pas se déterminer directement et tout de suite par des chiffres, par des statistiques, par les liasons légales, mais qui est tout de même une connaissance, c'est la connaissance du questionneur par le questionné ou à travers le questionneur du questionné lui-même; c'est-à-dire, la compréhension. Autrement dit, la sociologie et l'ethnographie d'aujourd'hui font usage d'une notion qu'elles n'utilisaient pas autrefois, mais dont nous faisons l'usage tout le temps, comme Monsieur Jourdain, dans une pièce de Molière, faisait de la prose: c'est la notion de compréhension." See Jean-Paul Sartre, "A conferência de Ararquara," in *Sartre no Brasil: A Conferência de Ararquara*, 70.
future of socialist revolution. Further, as the *Critique of Dialectical Reason*
represented not only an attempt to square Sartre's earlier existentialist notions with
his more recent ideological commitments, but also a rather explicit effort to de-
Stalinize Marxism, Sartre's efforts in Brazil were aimed at articulating a socialist
movement that transcended geopolitical blocs.753 So for example, *Le Monde* reported
that in his press conference in Rio, Sartre said that "il ne croyait ni à la naissance
d'un troisième bloc ni à la coexistence pacifique, mais à la "collaboration de toutes
les forces pacifiques pour la désintégration des blocs."754 Like de Gaulle, whose
visit to Brazil will be explored in the next section, Sartre did see Brazil outside of the
two existing Cold War power blocs, however, unlike de Gaulle he refused to imagine
a third bloc.755

---

753 On the *Critique* as an effort to de-Stalinize Marxism, H. Stuart Hughes comments: "the Stalinists
had turned it [Marxism] into a cult of fixed ideas. The task for existentialism, then, was to restore to
the Marxist method its feeling for the specific and the actual--to rediscover a "supple, patient
dialectic" that would cling to the contours of human events." See H. Stuart Hughes, *The Obstructed
Path: French Social Thought in the Years of Desperation, 1930-1960*, 217. Hazel E. Barnes remarks
along similar lines: "Stalinist Marxism, as Sartre sometimes calls it, suppressed the individual fully as
much as Hegelianism, allowed him no more specifically "human" traits than behaviorist psychology.
But a Marxism which has been de-Stalinized, which recognizes that it is still in its infancy, a Marxism
which reinstates the individual and his praxis at the very heart of history--this seems to Sartre
the proper place for an existentialist freedom to commit itself." See Hazel E. Barnes, "Introduction," in

754 *Le Monde*, "J.P. Sartre à Rio: des deux impérialismes, américain et soviétique, c'est le premier qui
est le plus dangereux," August 27, 1960.

755 This idea of Brazil as a potential exit from the unpleasant realities of the Cold War era was shared
by a number of French writers, Camus among them. In his journal written during his 1949 trip to
Brazil, Camus writes: "The faster the airplane flies, the less important are France, Spain, and Italy.
They were nations, now they are provinces, and tomorrow they will be the world's villages. The
future is not ours, and there's nothing we can do against this irresistible movement. Germany lost
the war because it was a nation and modern warfare requires the means of empires. Tomorrow the
means of entire continents will be necessary. And now the two great empires seek the conquest of
their continents. What's to be done? The only hope is the birth of a new culture, and a South
America that can perhaps mollify the mechanical folly." See Albert Camus, *American Journals*, trans.
On the more abstract level of philosophy, Sartre’s visit to Brazil is significant in that Brazil served as a forum to work out ideas initially expressed in the *Critique of Dialectical Reason*. Even if one agrees with H. Stuart Hughes that the *Critique* "was incomparably more cumbrous than anything Sartre had written earlier," it is possible to grant that there were some ideas that needed time to germinate and were worth reformulation. Also noteworthy is Sartre’s attempt to wrangle with the ideas of two fellow French thinkers who engaged themselves in Brazilian realities: Claude Lévi-Strauss and Roger Bastide. In engaging these two thinkers, Sartre attempted to resolve the broader issue of the role of history versus structure in the social sciences. In so doing, Sartre articulated a philosophical anthropology that stressed the reflexive dimension of social scientific practice. Even if the results of his efforts were not breathtakingly original, his statement of the basic philosophic challenge facing the social sciences holds value. But given the praise later articulations of the reflexive aspect of social science received, Sartre’s notion of *comprehension* in the social sciences should be recognized as a theoretical advance.

---

756 H. Stuart Hughes argues that Sartre’s appreciation for figures like Lévi-Strauss, Georges Lefebvre, Marc Bloch, and Fernand Braudel "were confined to a passing comment or an unnecessarily lengthy paraphrase; they failed to establish any intrinsic connection between twentieth-century social science as its most perceptive practitioners had understood it and the venture on which Sartre himself was embarked. These bows to contemporary scholarship figured as highly un-Sartrian endeavors to legitimate his *Critique*—to prove that it had an impeccable pedigree." See H. Stuart Hughes, *The Obstructed Path: French Social Thought in the Years of Desperation, 1930-1960*, 221. This judgment seems unnecessarily harsh—particularly if one takes the view that one of the aims of philosophy is to provide a synthesis for existing fields of knowledge.

757 In addition to *Anthropology as Cultural Cultural Critique*, see, for example, Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc Wacquant, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).
Charles de Gaulle in Brazil: A Consecration and Commencement

Despite often being quoted as saying that "Brazil is not a serious country," Charles de Gaulle took Brazil very seriously during his visit to Brazil from October 13th to 16th, 1964. Roughly five months before de Gaulle's arrival, on April 1, 1964, the Brazilian military overthrew the democratically elected president João Goulart. As reported by Irénée Guimaraes in Le Monde, the Brazilian military coup, or "Revolution" in the parlance of its backers, put Brazil in the center of the Cold War map with U.S. ambassador Lincoln Gordon calling it "l'un des faits les plus remarquables de la deuxième moitié du vingtième siècle." Gordon went on to equate the dictatorship with the Korean War, Marshall Plan, and the Cuban Missile Crisis. The French press did not fail to note the historical significance of this development in Brazil's own history—"pour la première fois dans l'histoire du Brésil, l'armée, fière d'une longue tradition d'apolitisme, et gardienne farouche de la Constitution, ait soudainement décidé de franchir le Rubicon." Reflecting on the meaning of this crossing of the Rubicon, Irénée Guimaraes suggests that the military coup raised the issue of whether one could significantly reorder the economy, as Goulart wished to do, while maintaining democratic institutions.

---


By 1964, French social scientists and policy makers identified Brazil as the key nation in Latin America and beyond that as a laboratory for the future. For example, M. David Rousset wrote:

Le Brésil est la clef stratégique de l'Amérique du Sud. Le Brésil se place à l'avant-garde des pays qui opèrent leur mutation industrielle. Le Brésil est un des quatre ou cinq laboratoires qui comptent parce que quelque chose de notre avenir planétaire s'y fait. Pour ces raisons majeures et pour bien d'autres, les événements sociaux et politiques brésiliens revêtent une importance qui dépasse de beaucoup la chronique provinciale.\textsuperscript{762}

During his sojourn in Brazil, de Gaulle's comments echoed Rousset's in terms of Brazil's leading role in Latin America and the part it was destined to play in global history. In a speech during his visit, de Gaulle reflected that:

En arrivant au Brésil, à votre amiable invitation, il me semble que ma visite est à la fois une consécration et un commencement. Une Consécration. Car, pour la première fois au cours de l'Histoire, la France est présente ici dans la personne de son chef de l'État parce que le destin de l'Amérique latine et spécialement, celui du Brésil, auxquels la lient depuis si longtemps tant de liens--d'amitié, sont aujourd'hui reconnus par elle comme l'un des éléments principaux de l'avenir du monde entier. Un commencement. Car la France croit qu'il est conforme au mouvement général de ce siècle qu'une sorte de nouveau départ soit donné à ses rapports avec votre Continent et, notamment avec votre pays.\textsuperscript{763}

Besides emphasizing Brazil's potential in directing global affairs, de Gaulle does something else noteworthy. He points out France's recognition that a new start should be given to relations with Latin America in conformity with the general trajectory of the Twentieth Century.

This represented the development of a novel foreign policy agenda that de Gaulle had just begun to formulate. It was only in late 1962 that de Gaulle made one of the most striking foreign policy shifts in French history arguing that cooperation


with developing nations, in contrast with its former colonial politics, should guide France's foreign policy.\textsuperscript{764} Along these lines, Alfred Grosser notes that it was only in 1963 that de Gaulle began to speak about enlarging France’s strategy of cooperation with Africa, Asia, and South America.\textsuperscript{765} Thus, one of the primary reasons why de Gaulle’s trip to Brazil is important, and which also helps us to understand why he took the country seriously, is that his trip was an attempt to further define and work out a politics of cooperation with the developing world.

The French media at the time commented on the connection between this new stage in de Gaulle’s strategic vision and his trip to Latin America. P. Viansson-Ponté neatly summarized de Gaulle’s foreign policy swings in the following terms:

\begin{quote}
Pendant six mois, en 1958, tout fut subordonné à la volonté d’établir solidement son pouvoir et d’en fixer le cadre. Puis, durant quatre rudes années émaillées de complots, d’attentats, de rébellions, mais aussi de consultations populaires et de discours, l’enjeu fut le retour de l’armée dans la discipline, la fin de la guerre d’Algérie, l’achèvement de la décolonisation. La "grande" politique étrangère a pu ensuite pimenter un moment la vie quotidienne, mais elle ne débouchait pas sur des résultats immédiats et spectaculaires et elle a vite déçu. Après une phase de découragement et d’ennuis de santé, voici qu’il a retrouvé une nouvelle raison de calculer, de parler et d’agir: fonder l’avenir.\textsuperscript{766}
\end{quote}

Here we see in outline de Gaulle moving away from the violence of French colonial policy in Algeria, to a politics of grandeur, and finally towards a postcolonial foreign

\textsuperscript{764} In a speech before the National Assembly on December 11, 1962, de Gaulle argued: "Pour que soit peu à peu résolu le plus grand problème du monde, autrement dit l’accession de tous les peuples à la civilisation moderne, de quel poids peut et doit peser la France, à condition qu’elle sache développer ses capacités économiques techniques et culturelles de manière à prêter une large assistance à d’autres et pourvu que ses pouvoirs publics soient à même d’y appliquer un effort ordonné et prolongé." As quoted in Osmar Santos Fonseca, \textit{Confrontation de la presse brésilienne et de la presse française pendant le voyage du Général de Gaulle au Brésil}, 35.

\textsuperscript{765} See Osmar Santos Fonseca, \textit{Confrontation de la presse brésilienne et de la presse française pendant le voyage du Général de Gaulle au Brésil}, 35. Santos Fonseca relies heavily and quotes often from Alfred Grosser’s \textit{La politique extérieure de la Ve République}.

\textsuperscript{766} P. Viansson-Ponté, "Fonder l’avenir," \textit{Le Monde}, October 10, 1964.
policy that brought France closer to that "cette partie du monde qui est en train de passer au premier rang de la scène."\textsuperscript{767}

Yet as much as de Gaulle wanted to turn the page on the Algerian war, its memory haunted him in Brazil. This was partly because Georges Bidault, a former Prime Minister of France who became a political leader within the Organization de l'Armée Secrète, was living in exile in Brazil. Bidault's presence drew the attention of the French media and although the French ambassador in Brazil downplayed the threat of Bidault and other exiles to de Gaulle, there was serious concern for his safety.\textsuperscript{768}

During de Gaulle's visit, the memory of the Algerian war also made itself present in comparisons between the 'new Brazil' established by the military coup and de Gaulle's France. During de Gaulle's visit to the Escola de Comando e Estado-Maior do Exército (ECEME), General Bina Machado compared de Gaulle and the Brazilian president Castelo Branco in the following terms:

\begin{quote}
L'école de formation des généraux voit côte à côte en sa tribune d'honneur deux officiers généraux: ensemble combattants de Deux Grandes Guerres, ensemble présidents de grandes nations chrétienne ensembles élevés d'une même manière à la plus haute magistrature, avec pouvoirs amplifies en période critique des deux nations.\textsuperscript{769}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{767} Le Monde, "Il ne peut y avoir de paix durable tant que la pauvreté n'est pas vaincue déclare le chef de l'État," October 16, 1964.

\textsuperscript{768} This was especially true during de Gaulle's visit to São Paulo because Bidault lived in Campinas--about 100 miles outside São Paulo and had apparently invited 200 other French exiles who were suspected of having ties to the OAS for a feijoada to a fazenda in Minas Gerais. One of the ironies of the visit is that the French consul to São Paulo at the time, M. Geoffroy de La Tour du Pin, had served in the cabinet of Bidault. See Marcel Niedergang, "Le Gouverneur Carlos Lacerda a décidé d'ignorer la visite du général de Gaulle," Le Monde, October 13, 1964 and Le Monde, "M. Georges Bidault: la visite au Brésil est accomplie au nom de la France," September 14, 1964. On the activities of members of the OAS in Latin America and their affiliation with military governments, see Marie-Monique Robin, Escadrons de la Mort: l'école française, directed by Marie-Monique Robin, First Run/Icarus Films, 2003.

\textsuperscript{769} Quoted in Diario de noticias, Souvenirs du voyage au Brésil du Général Charles de Gaulle, 13-16 de outubro de 1964 (Rio de Janeiro: Diário de Noticias, 1964), 11.
Most striking about this comparison is that de Gaulle’s 1958 accession to power and the Brazilian military’s seizure of power in 1964 are put forward as equivalent. Osmar Santos Foseca writes that this type of comparison was commonplace among the Brazilian press during de Gaulle’s visit. There was a great deal of difference, however, in terms of what purpose the comparison was supposed to serve—depending on whether it was the opposition press (left-wing) or the revolutionary (right-wing) press. For papers on the right (Estado de São Paulo, Jornal do Brasil), the 13 May, 1958 and 1 April, 1964 events amounted to the same thing. On the left, the Correio da Manhã and Ultima Hora made contrary assertions identifying de Gaulle as "l’homme qui a rétabli l’autorité et la responsabilité de la République Française, sans blesser la légalité et les libertés publiques."\footnote{Osmar Santos Fonseca, Confrontation de la presse brésilienne et de la presse française pendant le voyage du Général de Gaulle au Brésil, 28.}

The persistent memory of the Algerian war, as expressed in these comparisons between de Gaulle and the Brazilian dictatorship, coupled with the expression of Brazil’s growing importance in world affairs, links de Gaulle’s visit with the earlier visits of André Malraux and Jean-Paul Sartre. In what follows, the broader dynamics of Franco-Brazilian relations and their connection with de Gaulle’s attempt to distance France from its former colonial policies will be explored in greater depth. Examining de Gaulle’s motivations for traveling to Latin America, the broader geopolitical considerations of the era, the state of Franco-Brazilian relations at the moment of his visit, and the reception he received, allows us to see
greater continuity between de Gaulle’s politics of cooperation and former colonial policy.

**De Gaulle, Brazil, and French Foreign Policy**

De Gaulle’s motivation for undertaking an ambitious trip to Latin America and Brazil, in particular, has both a personal and political dimension. That being said, given de Gaulle’s political nature, these should not be understood as mutually exclusive. On the personal level, de Gaulle's health and fitness for another seven year term were in question in 1964. As reported by P. Viansson-Ponté in *Le Monde*, de Gaulle was to make a decision in April of 1965 whether he would run for another seven-year term and the trip was to serve as a test of de Gaulle’s physical and intellectual vigor.771 It was thus a "galop d’essai," or trial run for the campaign. At the time of this trip to Latin America, it is worth noting that de Gaulle was in his mid-70s and was suffering from health problems. As Jonathan Fenby has pointed out, de Gaulle had a secret operation for prostrate cancer on April 1, 1964 just after his return from a special trip to Mexico.772 With regard to his health, it may be concluded that the Latin American trip was a success since newspaper coverage suggests that the General seemed in better shape after this impressive journey than before.773


On the political level, the trip’s most direct purpose was to improve bi-lateral relations between the two countries. This was to be achieved through further technical cooperation in the area of natural resource development. While in Brazil, de Gaulle spoke of what had already been achieved in this area as well as how the possibilities had amplified as a result of Brazil’s industrial development. As he put it:

D’autre part, nous, Français, savons quel effort fut accompli ici pour exploiter les richesses du sous-sol et créer partout les industries riches du sous-sol et créer partout les industries les plus diverses. Nous nous faisons, d’ailleurs, un honneur d’avoir nous-mêmes coopéré dans les domaines technique et financier à cet étonnant développement. Mais il nous semble que le Brésil aborde à présent une phase nouvelle de sa vie intérieure et extérieure. Il nous semble que, par un sourd travail qui s’accomplit en profondeur dans ses élites en même temps que dans sa conscience populaire, il est en train de préparer, aux points de vue intentionnel, politique économique, social et énergique impulsion, Monsieur le Président, une sorte d’avènement prochain et exemplaire. Sans doute est-ce le cas, dans des conditions variées, pour l’Amérique Latine tout entière. Mais nous pensons qu’il en est ainsi d’abord, pour vous Brésiliens, le plus grand État du continent. A cet égard peut-on d’ailleurs imaginer signe plus impressionnant de votre destinée que Brasilia, votre nouvelle et extraordinaire capitale et se splendide palais du Planalto.

Here we see de Gaulle acknowledging what has been accomplished thus far in the relationship between two countries and suggesting that the future held extraordinary promise. De Gaulle’s focus on technical cooperation, as well as his impressions of Brasilia, link his visit with the earlier trip of his culture minister, André Malraux, discussed earlier in this chapter.

In this regard, de Gaulle’s visit to Brazil was also linked to the French university mission to Brazil of the 1930s. In an article originally appearing in the October 13, 1964 edition of the Diário de Noticias, the President of the paper, Ondina Dantas linked de Gaulle’s pursuit of greater scientific, educational, and technical

---

cooperation to the French University Mission of the 1930s. In a thoroughly Francophile mode, Dantas wrote:

On dit toujours que tout homme à deux Patries: la sienne et la France. Ceci est vrai surtout pour notre années et scientifiques français venus nous apporter les lumières de leur savoir, quant nous commencions à peine à tisser la toile de notre système éducatif.

De ces enseignements, nous essayé de ne pas nous en éloigner. Nous voulons non seulement les maintenir, mais en renforcer les liens à travers d'autres moyens qui nous rapprocheront encore davantage et faciliteront une mutuelle compréhension.  

After expressing gratitude for the French role in helping establish the system of higher education in Brazil, Dantas continued on to urge Brazilians to make "tous les efforts nécessaires dans le sens d'une parfaite confraternisation au point de vue politique, économique, technique et culturel avec la France Eternelle."  

One of the areas where de Gaulle sought to extend Franco-Brazilian cooperation was nuclear research and development. In 1964, de Gaulle saw Franco-Brazilian cooperation in a nuclear program as propitious. At the time of his trip, the French nuclear force de frappe was still very much in development and Brazil was considered a likely source of uranium reserves although these were not yet proven reserves. Marcel Niedergang and André Passeron underscored the symbolic potential of Franco-Brazilian cooperation in the area of nuclear power and energy in an article for Le Monde:

Il est évident, disent les collaborateurs du chef de l’État, que le Brésil est, avec le Venezuela, mais plus encore que ce dernier, le pays d’Amérique du Sud ayant actuellement les liens les plus étroits avec les États-Unis. Aussi les perspectives de coopération atomique entre la France et le Brésil sont-elles à la fois très intéressantes et symboliques d’un certain choix. Les Brésiliens demandent des techniciens nucléaires Nous avons déjà au Brésil quatre 

---


This quotation shows that by the time of de Gaulle’s visit, there was already low-level cooperation in the area of nuclear technology. More importantly, it outlines how further cooperation would bring to both nations greater independence from the United States in terms of strategic defense and high technology. Although furthering the Franco-Brazilian relationship in terms of nuclear technology was one of de Gaulle’s hopes during the visit, this did not come to pass. Vasco Leitao da Cunha, the Brazilian minister of foreign affairs, and Luis Cintra do Prado, the president of the nuclear energy commission both declared there would be no negotiation of a contract for the exploitation or sale of Brazilian uranium while de Gaulle was in Brazil. Both claimed this was because that uranium was not being mined; however, neither commented on whether there were known deposits of uranium.

De Gaulle’s aims for developing greater cooperation between France and Brazil in a nuclear program, and more broadly in scientific and technological development, are indicative of his larger desire to position France outside the bipolar framework of the Cold War. As Joaquín Fermandois summarizes de Gaulle’s

---


foreign policy, "It was not in itself a policy of dissent or hostility toward the
superpowers, but rather one that tried to go beyond bipolarity and, to a certain
degree, to make use of it in order to show a different dimension of the international
system." A report commissioned by de Gaulle’s government to redraft foreign
policy in the wake of France’s failed colonial policies, identified Latin America as a
region where France could seek influence without gravely provoking the United
States or Soviet Union. The report states that:

Le recours exclusif aux États-Unis ou à l’U.R.S.S. fait du pays aidé un enjeu de la guerre
froide: une action décisive de l’U.R.S.S. en Amérique du Sud, ou une dépendance trop étroite
d’un pays africain envers les États-Unis risque de provoquer des réactions adverses, tandis
qu’une présence européenne, notamment française, n’est de nature à inquiéter gravement ni
l’U.R.S.S., ni les États-Unis.

This report’s identification of strategic interests where France could operate outside
the bi-polar Cold War structure together with de Gaulle’s stated aims during his
Latin American trip strongly illustrate de Gaulle’s strategy of carving out an
independent space for France in this period.

Likewise, de Gaulle’s use of the term latinité to describe the Franco-Brazilian
partnership provided distance from the Anglo-American world. Gaullist resistance
to American hegemony was a characteristic feature of the Fifth Republic with de
Gaulle’s insistence on keeping its distance from the Atlantic Alliance by developing

779 Joaquín Fernandois, “The Hero on the Latin American Scene,” in Globalizing de Gaulle:

780 The report in question is La Commission d’Étude instituée par le décret 12 mars 1963, La
Politique de coopération avec les pays en voie de développement, Government, Ministère d’état chargé
de la réforme administrative (Paris: Éditions du secrétariat général du Gouvernement, 1963). This
quotation comes from Osmar Santos Fonseca, Confrontation de la presse brésilienne et de la presse
française pendant le voyage du Général de Gaulle au Brésil, 36.
its nuclear weapons and opting out of its commitments to NATO. As Philip H. Gordon has noted, even before the 1966 decision to withdraw from NATO's integrated command structure, de Gaulle made minimal contributions to European defense despite its resources and strategic position.781 After a critical meeting with the British Prime Minister, Harold Macmillan in December of 1962, de Gaulle had also given up on the idea of an alliance between France and Great Britain as a counterweight to American hegemony. Despite Macmillan meeting President Kennedy shortly thereafter and achieving "an extraordinary diplomatic success" by "obtaining direct deliveries to England of the Polaris missiles" while securing the same advantages from France, de Gaulle rejected the gift Macmillan had secured for France.782 Jean LaCouture explains this rejection by arguing that de Gaulle "recognizes only victories he himself has secured."783 In any case, since the beginning of 1963, de Gaulle had essentially "slammed the door to Europe in the face of Mr. Macmillan," by rejecting "access to the famous Atlantic partnership to which [de Gaulle] had long aspired."784

In Brazil, de Gaulle appealed to latinité to differentiate the two countries from the Anglo-American Atlantic Alliance and substitute an alternative vision of the Atlantic world. He employed latinité to urge the Brazilians toward greater scientific

---


and technical cooperation. In one speech, de Gaulle made the case for the two countries to come together as follows:

chrétiennes et latines, de l’élémentaire solidarité qui les porte à coopérer dans certaines entreprises industrielles et institutions culturelles, ou bien s’ils jugeront bon de resserrer leurs rapports en vue d’agir vraiment de concert pour leur propre développement scientifique, technique et économique et pour aider le monte à s’établir dans le progrès, l’équilibre et la paix. Comment ne pas être assurés que tous les deux ont choisi?  

This appeal to latinité as part of a foreign policy that emphasized cooperation with developing nations was integral to de Gaulle’s larger aims of providing France with independence from the United States while remaining present on the global stage.

With regard to both of these larger aims, Philip H. Gordon provides important clarification. In terms of independence, he argues against the view that the term, for de Gaulle, ”meant largely denying the reciprocity of external relations and pretending that France could exercise complete autonomy in dealing with the world.” Instead, it ”was part of an overall strategy for ensuring French interests in what de Gaulle believed to be an environment hostile to, or at least indifferent to, those interests.” This was important because for de Gaulle, ”pursuing a rhetorical goal of independence was the best way to avoid the feeling of dependence, a condition with degenerating effects.” De Gaulle’s politics of cooperation furthered this independence by allowing France to remain ”more preoccupied with its global

---


than with its European role.”789 While the Fourth Republic attempted to fulfill this role through maintaining France's colonies, de Gaulle saw cooperation as the way to maintain its national ambition.790

De Gaulle’s Reception in Brazil

Osmar Santos Fonseca's analysis of Brazilian press reports and internal Brazilian politics provides a general sense of the political canvas of responses to de Gaulle. He identifies two levels on which the Brazilian press discussed de Gaulle's appeals to *latinité*. On one level, France's universal political cultures, its spirit of self-renewal, and abilities were discussed with reverence across the political spectrum. To the extent that *latinité* was poetic and literary, all the Brazilian journals had positive things to say. On the other hand, when the issue was one of whether Brazil should embrace France's foreign policy, there was a basic division between the press on the left and right. The right wing press—identified as *OESP*, Jornal do Brasil, and Tribuna da Imprensa—was critical and apt to point out serious differences between Brazilian and French policy objectives. The left wing press—Correio da Manhã and Ultima Hora—were more open to allying Brazilian and French foreign policy as part of a *troisième force*.791

---


790 As Alfred Grosser puts it, what Gaullism does is "faire admettre aux français que domination et coopération ne sont que des formes différentes d’un même ambition nationale; que le XXe siècle veut qu’on ne soit pas dominateur mais coopératif; domination et coopération s’exerçant toutes les deux au nom de l’ambition nationale." See Alfred Grosser's *La politique extérieure de la Ve République* quoted in Osmar Santos Fonseca, *Confrontation de la presse brésilienne et de la presse française pendant le voyage du Général de Gaulle au Brésil*, 35.

791 Osmar Santos Fonseca, *Confrontation de la presse brésilienne et de la presse française pendant le voyage du Général de Gaulle au Brésil*, 41-46.
Thus, for a right-wing press such as *OESP*, France was a faded power who owed its prosperity to the United States. This paper explained de Gaulle's provocation of the United States as due to the U.S. position on liquidating the French Empire "qui était si cher aux sentiments d'orgueil de la nation française." Besides an unflattering portrayal of de Gaulle's motives, the right-wing press pointed out substantial policy issues such as the divergent positions France and Brazil took with regard to the United Nations, nuclear power, the priority France gave to its former colonies in trade relations, as well as Cuba.

The hostility or favor demonstrated by a particular Brazilian paper towards de Gaulle's foreign policy was, of course, related to the attitude that paper took towards the military coup. As Santos Fonseca puts it, "Dans la mesure où un quotidien brésilien est d'opposition, l'adhésion à la politique étrangère française est plus forte, et vice versa." Although Brazilian President General Castelo Branco spoke warmly of de Gaulle and made overtures to France, de Gaulle's visit was

---

792 Osmar Santos Fonseca, *Confrontation de la presse brésilienne et de la presse française pendant le voyage du Général de Gaulle au Brésil*, 43.

793 The *Jornal do Brasil* pointed out that with regard to the U.N., Brazil offered wholehearted support whereas France was at odds with the UN over the U.N.'s right to intervene in areas where France had colonial interests. Likewise, Brazil's position was for denuclearization and anti-Castro whereas France was developing its nuclear weapons and pro-Castro. See Osmar Santos Fonseca, *Confrontation de la presse brésilienne et de la presse française pendant le voyage du Général de Gaulle au Brésil*, 44.

794 Osmar Santos Fonseca, *Confrontation de la presse brésilienne et de la presse française pendant le voyage du Général de Gaulle au Brésil*, 45.
arranged while João Goulart was still president.795 Further complicating the issue was that the right saw de Gaulle as an ally of Goulart's.

This link between de Gaulle and Goulart dated back at least as far as the 1963 Brazilian referendum on whether Brazil would maintain a presidential regime or switch to a parliamentary regime. Prior to the military coup, this was an attempt by the Brazilian right to limit the power of Goulart and keep him from developing a popular front style government.796 As this referendum went forward, Brazilian political elites compared it to de Gaulle's similar referendum on whether there should be a direct election of the French President (this referendum was held on October 28, 1962). Thus in the Brazilian public sphere of this era, an analogy was made between a vote for Goulart and a vote for de Gaulle.797

Besides this symbolic analogy between the deposed president of Brazil and de Gaulle, the French president was seen as supportive of Goulart. De Gaulle's resumption of normal relations with Goulart's government at a critical point in early 1964, threw Goulart a political lifeline. As Irénée Guimaraes reported in Le Monde:

Sur le plan de la politique étrangère, finalement, la récente reprise du dialogue avec la France a ouvert pour le Brésil une soupape de sûreté dont il avait un urgent besoin. Les dernières mesures prises par le général de Gaulle ont contribué de ce côté-ci de l'Atlantique


796 See Osmar Santos Fonseca, Confrontation de la presse brésilienne et de la presse française pendant le voyage du Général de Gaulle au Brésil, 26.

France opening this lifeline to Brazil occurred just as tensions between Goulart, Congress, and the military were reaching their height. Goulart had just signed a decree doubling minimum wage and his finance minister, Thiago Dantas, advanced a plan for agrarian reform that was backed by the Communist party. Prior to this diplomatic breakthrough in early 1964, Franco-Brazilian relations had been strained by somewhat outrageous War of the Lobster.

The War of the Lobster was a dispute between France and Brazil over whether French lobster boats had the right to capture lobsters while those lobsters were on the continental shelf, but in international waters off of Brazil. While even the French public acknowledged the absurdity of this conflict, “accueilli avec des sourires les dépêches qui parvenaient du Brésil sur la guerre de la langouste,” the war severed relations between the two countries — Goulart’s government ordered Breton lobster boats to back up more than 100 miles from Brazilian coasts to which de Gaulle responded by sending a warboat, the Tartu to protect the French.

---


801 At the time, there was no international text defining the right to fish on the continental plateau. See Le Monde, "La Guerre de la Langouste," March 2, 1963.
fisherman.\textsuperscript{802} Despite its seemingly farcical nature, this conflict set off a crisis in Franco-Brazilian relations with ambassadors withdrawn and diplomatic relations cut off.\textsuperscript{803} Reconciliation between the two countries only came early in 1964, when Goulart was in a particularly vulnerable position. The \textit{Jornal do Brasil} reported that this reconciliation strengthened Goulart's plans for the interior as well as his broader economic and diplomatic plans.\textsuperscript{804}

It is thus unsurprising that Goulart's most ferocious domestic critics, like Carlos Lacerda, Governor of the State of Guanabara, expressed hostility towards de Gaulle's visit. Lacerda, who along with Governor Ademar de Barros of São Paulo and Magalhães Pinto of Minas Gerais, called for the military ouster of Goulart, was such an ardent anti-communist and supporter of the military regime that he claimed a monument to the Berlin wall should be built in Rio because: "Il est important qu'on en construise un en Amérique du Sud, et en particulier au Brésil, qui a pu détruire son mur alors qu'il était encore en construction."\textsuperscript{805} He claimed that de Gaulle's visit would be used by the fallen regime for purposes hostile to the military government.\textsuperscript{806} Lacerda also decided to ignore de Gaulle's visit and refused to be


\textsuperscript{804} As reported by Iréné Guimarães, "La presse brésilienne unanime salu la réconciliation avec la France," \textit{Le Monde}, October 25, 1964.

\textsuperscript{805} See Roland Delcour, "Um homme aussi intelligent que le général de Gaulle comprendra le Brésil lorsqu'il l'aura connu déclare à Bonn le gouverneur Lacerda," \textit{Le Monde}, May 27, 1964.

\textsuperscript{806} See Roland Delcour, "Um homme aussi intelligent que le général de Gaulle comprendra le Brésil lorsqu'il l'aura connu déclare à Bonn le gouverneur Lacerda," \textit{Le Monde}, May 27, 1964. Lacerda is quoted as saying, "La visite du général de Gaulle? Elle prendra maintenant une dimension différente.
awarded the Legion of Honor which the French press attributed to "des considérations subtiles et complexes de politique intérieure brésilienne." Adding insult to injury, Lacerda made declarations suggesting that de Gaulle's visit represented the past whereas the prior visit of President Léopold Sédar Senghor of Senegal represented the future. And he caused quite a stir when he claimed de Gaulle's visit would amount to nothing more than "speeches and banquets."

**Concluding Thoughts on de Gaulle**

When it came to expressing a view towards the military regime, de Gaulle held his cards close to the vest. He did give a speech at the Escola Superior da Guerra in Rio where he praised the army for being "un exemple de devouement dans l’accomplissement de sa mission." The French press saw this as an implicit and careful criticism of the military regime because the institutionalization and

---


legalization of the coup by congress did not change the fact that the army had deviated from their tradition of standing outside politics.\textsuperscript{811} Regardless of the other outcomes of de Gaulle’s trip, it seemed clear that de Gaulle’s remarks would be reflected on by the military.\textsuperscript{812}

While de Gaulle’s trip to Brazil was not considered the greatest success—at least as compared with his visits in the other Latin American nations—it did pave the way for the intensification of scientific, economic, and cultural ties.\textsuperscript{813} Clear evidence of this is provided in the fact that a few years later de Gaulle’s government signed l’Accord de coopération technique et scientifique entre la France et le Brésil on January 16, 1967.\textsuperscript{814} This accord accelerated institutional and individual ties between French and Brazilian scientists, engineers, and intellectuals.

Apart from specific results, de Gaulle’s trip to Brazil helps us to understand the evolution of French foreign policy as a result of the Algerian war. De Gaulle’s attempt to shift from a French colonial politics to a politics of cooperation with the developing world was an effort meant to preserve France’s global role while creating space between French foreign policy and the Atlantic alliance. While the


\textsuperscript{812} Marcel Niedergang and André Passeron, "Le coup de théâtre de Moscou a quelque peu estompé l’éclat de la visite du général de Gaulle," \textit{Le Monde}, October 17, 1964.

\textsuperscript{813} \textit{Le Monde} reported that the most fruitful visits on de Gaulle’s Latin America itinerary were to Chile, Uruguay, and Colombia. Argentina’s Peronism posed problems for de Gaulle as did Brazil because the military regime "sont résolument tournés vers les États-Unis." See \textit{Le Monde}, "Le Bilan d’un Voyage," October 21, 1964.

\textsuperscript{814} See Guy Martinière, \textit{France-Brésil: vingt ans de coopération (science et technologie)} (Grenoble: Institut des hautes études de l’Amérique latine, 1989), 5. Martinière’s book provides the text of this document and details the various individual and institutional ties between France and Brazil that developed partly as a result of this accord.
gains of de Gaulle’s trip were limited, it nonetheless provides a concrete example of his pragmatism. As Philip H. Gordon, has pointed out, de Gaulle’s "own views have often been exaggerated or misread" with his rhetoric being mistaken for how he truly viewed the reality of his position.\textsuperscript{815} According to Gordon, an absolute independence—or isolation from the superpowers—was never what he intended; rather independence "was a way to make sure French interests would not be overlooked by bigger, stronger powers or even smaller ones that did not share France's goals."\textsuperscript{816}

In this regard, de Gaulle’s trip to Brazil must be seen as a success given that it managed to irk the United States and provided both France and Brazil with a modicum of leverage in their relations with the U.S.\textsuperscript{817} This trip also suggests a continuity in French foreign policy despite a seemingly radical shift between the violence of French colonial politics and the 'soft power' approach of the politics of cooperation. De Gaulle’s attempt to build an alliance with Brazil and the rest of Latin America through the shared bonds of latinité was only conceivable given the

\textsuperscript{815} Philip H. Gordon, \textit{A Certain Idea of France}, 21.

\textsuperscript{816} Philip H. Gordon, \textit{A Certain Idea of France}, 20.

\textsuperscript{817} See \textit{Le Monde}, "Washington et l'Amérique Latine," March 26, 1964."Washington et L'Amerique Latine," in \textit{Le Monde}, March 26, 1964. Apparently, the U.S. was very annoyed with de Gaulle's trip to Mexico in March of 1964 and was anxious about his South American trip. The American government was afraid that de Gaulle would stir anti-American sentiment at a time when it was in tenuous position negotiating the contract for the Panama canal and was revising its attitude toward military regimes. The article reports that Thomas Mann, the new secretary for South American affairs in the State Department, was in favor of hardening the U.S.'s stance towards progressive regimes that threatened American interests. This was a departure from Kennedy's aims under the Alliance for Progress which, as the article points out, attempted to oppose Castroism by attacking two of its causes—underdevelopment and the existence of oligarchical regimes.
already strong presence that France had in the region—and, in the case of Brazil, the role France had played in educating its elites.

∴

Given that the central aim of this dissertation has been to show the impact of Brazilian ideas on French intellectuals as they struggled to make sense of France as a modern multi-racial and post-colonial state, Charles de Gaulle’s visit provides a fitting end to this study. De Gaulle’s trip demonstrates that even France’s foremost statesman thought of Brazil as central to helping France adapt to a new post-colonial order. While he may have had a certain idea of France his entire life, during his 1964 South American journey, de Gaulle envisioned Brazil as an important strategic partner in France’s attempt to shift its foreign policy away from its violent colonial wars towards a politics of cooperation with the developing world. In Brazil, he articulated the idea that Brazil was on the forefront of global history and as such served as an example France could benefit from.

More broadly, by combining Malraux’s, Sartre’s, and de Gaulle’s experiences in Brazil, this last chapter has revealed that the ideas about Brazil as a model for a modern multi-racial and post-colonial nation extended beyond the academy to a broader political discourse as France underwent the challenge of decolonization. Ending the dissertation with de Gaulle’s 1964 trip to Brazil also highlights the continuity between the Franco-Brazilian cultural politics of the interwar years and de Gaulle’s attempt to reformulate France’s foreign policy around the idea of cooperation with the developing world. The extensive cultural ties that France developed with Brazil through the French University Mission of the 1930s were a
necessary foundation for a new foreign policy initiative that would allow for a
degree of independence vis-à-vis the United States.
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