1 The Intellectual Context of Abolition in Brazil

THE BRAZIL OF 1865

In 1865 Brazil stood out in the Americas as a political anomaly—an Empire with a hereditary monarchy. While the Spanish Americans had fought to expel the Spanish crown in toto, the Brazilians marched to independence under the royal banner of one Braganza fighting the rest of Portuguese royalty. Brazil also stood out as an economic and social anomaly—an essentially rural economy that continued to tolerate slavery, despite the end of the slave trade in 1850. Both the traditional sugar plantations of the North and the newly booming coffee plantations of the South were fueled by slave labor.

In 1865 Brazil was Catholic, although, compared to New Spain, the Brazilian Church lacked both the wealth and the personnel to operate as a powerful and independent institution.[1] The Catholic Church had been reorganized as the established church under the Brazilian Constitution of 1824. Cemeteries were owned and administered by the Church; public primary and secondary education was made a Church responsibility; neither civil marriage nor divorce was permitted; non-Catholics could not be elected to the national assembly; and non-Catholics (although permitted to gather for worship) could not give their meeting place the external appearance of a church. The same Constitution, however, brought a large part of Church finances under Imperial control. Along with this weak power base, the nineteenth-

century Brazilian Church had inherited a less militant tradition than that of the crusading Spanish Church. The Brazilian clergy's reputation for personal corruption reflected a similar spirit. As a result, although individual clergy were active in politics, especially in the early Empire, the Brazilian Church itself was not a center of vigorous thought on social and political questions.

The basis for both the philosophy and the political theory which prevailed in the Empire up to 1865 was a curious amalgam of ideas imported from France.[2] It was called Eclecticism, and as its name implies it was little more than a synthesis of the philosophical and religious ideas prevalent in France.[3] Its very vagueness made it the perfect companion to the weak religious tradition, and it carried the day among the leading thinkers of mid-nineteenth-century Brazil—hardly a center of philosophical thought.[4] As Antônio Paim has explained:

> Since it was synonymous with a simple juxtaposition of ideas and lacked any guiding principles, it [Eclecticism] lost any negative connotation in Brazil and was almost always combined with the label "enlightened," a qualifier doubtless meant to ennoble it. More important, the victory of political conciliation during the Second Empire can be attributed to the mentality identified with [it].[5]

In politics the climate was dominated by "party conciliation." Two political parties had emerged by 1860—the Liberal and the Conservative.[6] They competed in the national legislature according to the model of the English House of Commons—even their debating style was often derivative. The Liberals had originated as a party dedicated to defending Brazilian interests against the Portuguese. The Conservatives had begun as the defenders of absolutism, which some Conservatives took to mean defending Portuguese interests even when the latter opposed independence. By the 1840's, however, their original character was blurred. Regionalism and republicanism had divided the politicians along new lines, and by the early 1860's the two parties looked very similar (although the Liberals were soon to change). An equilibrium

had been reached between, on one side, the powerful planter oligarchies of the most important provinces (Bahia, Pernambuco, Minas Gerais, São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro) and, on the other side, the Emperor. Even the politicians were often straightforwardly frank about their lack of ideological differences.

This political system appeared stable until the strains produced by a war with Paraguay (1865–70) led Pedro II to assert his authority against the parliamentary majority, thereby provoking a torrent of criticism of the entire monarchical structure. In one sense the liberal critics of the crown were justified. However enlightened Pedro II might have been, he stood at the apex of a hierarchical society based on human enslavement. It was under the authority of the Emperor and his ministers that the police and the Army hunted down runaway slaves and returned them to their masters, sometimes for torture and mutilation. An authoritarian structure, however ameliorated in practice, extended down into the family system, where the male head of the household enjoyed a power over the women and children which could border on sadism.[7]

It was also true that the Empire was more centralized than could remain acceptable to the leaders of dynamically growing regions such as the province of São Paulo. They wanted more autonomy to exploit their own resources and demonstrate their ingenuity in areas such as education and economic development. The issue of overcentralization also offered a convenient vehicle for political "outs" who had been unable to break into power because they could not or did not wish to collaborate with the political oligarchies of their provinces. The role of court favor was enormous in the composition of the Senate, for example, since the Emperor had the power to designate the final winner among a short list of three senatorial nominees. Furthermore, the Emperor exercised an effective veto over appointees to administrative posts down to the provincial level, further accentuating the need of local politicians to earn personal support at court. Thus, it could be alleged with some reason that the unitary monarchy

was strangling local initiative and distorting the formation of local opinion.

Notwithstanding these complaints, however, established political authority and the cogency of its theoretical justification in 1870 were as weak as established religion. In both cases the object of criticism was more vulnerable than the critics could have believed. Far from being the tyrant depicted by the Republican pamphleteers, Pedro II was more liberal and open-minded on social issues than most of the older political elite, although he resisted liberal efforts to reduce the "moderating power."[8] His real role had been rationalized by the pragmatic constitutional lawyers and the Eclectic Philosophers.[9] This did not save him from becoming the convenient whipping boy of liberal critics, however, because he was easier to attack—more personal and visible—than the tradition of amorphous political thought that had blurred party lines and left the younger generation without a clear justification for the anomaly of a slaveholding, Catholic-oriented agrarian monarchy.

The accompanying intellectual and literary tradition that dominated mid-century literature amply deserved its title of "Romantic."[10] It originated with a small number of writers who had emerged in Brazil at the end of the eighteenth century. Their thought and work was greatly influenced by Europe, as could be seen in their pursuit of the cult of nature so characteristic of European Romanticism. When Brazil broke away from Portugal in 1822, these writers believed that they were articulating an independent national consciousness—glorifying *Brazilian* natural splendors. Couched in exuberant hyperbole, their romantic invocations of Brazilianness served as a literary mantle for the anti-Portuguese campaigns of the politicians.

In the years immediately following Brazil's independence in 1822 Indianism became a social and intellectual fad among the elite. Portuguese names were discarded in favor of Indian ones. Aspirants to high society even tried to prove they had noble In-

Tupí, the most widely spoken Indian language, and although the minor Indian languages of the Amazon basin and the interior highlands (Mato Grosso) went totally unstudied, Tupí was seriously proposed as the new official language to replace Portuguese. Gonçalves Dias, the first great popularizer of Indianist poetry, himself authored a dictionary of Tupí, published in 1857.

With the coming of age of literary Romanticism, the Indian became a symbol of Brazilian national aspirations.[11] He was transformed into a literary prototype having little connection with his actual role in Brazilian history. Like the Indian of James Fenimore Cooper, the Indian of Brazilian Romanticism was a sentimental literary symbol who offered no threat to the comfort of his readers. The parallel with Cooper was clearest in the novels of José de Alencar.[12] The Negro usually appeared in Romantic literature in stock roles such as the "heroic slave," the "suffering slave" or the "beautiful mulatta." The free man of color, who existed at every level of Brazilian society, was conspicuously ignored by the Romantic authors.[13] The contrast with the agonized attempts of later writers—Sílvio Romero, Euclides da Cunha, Graça Aranha—to come to grips with Brazil's ethnic reality could hardly be greater.

This, then, was Brazil in 1865. It was, as summed up by the literary historian Antônio Cândido, a Jesuitical traditionalism supported by an agrarian economy and a "Romantic" ideology.[14] It had its more distant roots in the clericalism and agrarianism of Portugal. This tradition, resting on a weak church, had been greatly altered by the Enlightenment in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century—bringing into the traditional culture a dose of political liberalism, thus producing the Brazilian hybrid of a liberal monarchy.

THE RISE OF A REFORM SPIRIT

The most immediate cause of a change in national mood was the

zilian elite to re-examine their nation. Even the Emperor called it "a good electric shock." The war dragged on and finally it took the aid of Argentina and Uruguay for Brazil to overcome Paraguay—a much smaller and poorer nation—and the effects of this drawn-out conflict on the Brazilian Empire were extensive. Brazil's ineptitude in initial mobilization for the war forced many civilians to wake up to their country's lack of modern facilities in such basic areas as education and transportation.[15] It also embarrassed the military, arousing in officers a consciousness that led them to become a powerful political pressure group after the war. Furthermore, when the Emperor refused a Paraguayan offer to negotiate a peace in 1868 (in the face of the war's general unpopularity in Brazil) he permanently alienated an important political faction and precipitated the founding of the Brazilian Republican party in 1870. Finally, the war dramatized Brazil's shortage of able-bodied freemen. The lack of acceptable volunteers for the Army necessitated the recruitment of slaves, many of whom proved to be good soldiers. They were given their freedom in return, and many became regular soldiers.[16] This, in turn, had an important secondary effect, because in 1887–88 the Army was asked to assume responsibility for hunting runaway slaves. The result was a contradiction, as Army officers had seen the value of ex-slaves when given their freedom. This anomaly, combined with growing doubts about slavery in principle, made Army officers more receptive to abolitionist and Republican ideas after the war.

All these changes wrought by the extended fighting in the Plata basin were reinforced by the penetration of ideas from abroad. Brazil, Puerto Rico, and Cuba were the only slave territories in the Americas after the United States abolished slavery in 1865. Meanwhile political and economic liberalism was moving from triumph to triumph in France and England.[17]

Change was also overtaking the social and economic structure. Urbanization was beginning to produce a social group not directly tied to the agrarian sector. Although class differences produced by urbanization were still minimal in the late Empire, and although economic, political, and family links between the city and the plantation remained very close, change was in the air. Many young men of the 1870's were ready to challenge the established political system and culture. Some were soon absorbed into the establishment structure, but others continued to criticize. A number of these younger men came from their fathers' plantations. Others came directly from urban backgrounds. By the decade of the 1880's they were caught up in the converging tide of abolitionism, anticlericalism, and republicanism.

Political developments were the most obvious harbingers of change. In 1868 the Emperor dismissed his Liberal party Prime Minister, Zacarias. The occasion was a disagreement over the conduct of the Paraguayan War. Pedro II then requested the Conservatives, who had only a minority in Parliament, to form a new government. The Conservatives were happy to cooperate. They immediately called a new election and came back with a majority produced by a degree of manipulation excessive even under the lax electoral standards of the day. The radical wing of the Liberal party, already highly sensitive to what they alleged to be the Emperor's "tyrannical" behavior, responded by splitting off to found the new Radical Liberal party in 1868 (their manifesto appeared in 1869), dedicated to radical political reforms that would include strict controls over crown powers. Two years later (1870) another group of dissidents went farther, founding the Republican party.

Although neither group included more than a small minority of the political elite (with the Republicans concentrated in São Paulo), they did represent a break with the conciliatory political culture on which the monarchy was based; and they appeared to constitute a direct challenge—posed in the language of democratic secularism—to the entire structure of hierarchy and privilege inherited from the colonial era.[18]

These political tremors were accompanied by new intellectual stirrings.[19] Beginning in 1868 a group of ambitious students, who

shared little respect for tradition, coalesced in Recife.[20] Their acknowledged leader was Tobias Barreto, a student who graduated from the Law Faculty in 1869.[21] For the following ten years Recife was the center of a small but self-confident cadre of young intellectuals. Barreto, who had taken a schoolmaster's post in the interior of Pernambuco, commuted regularly to Recife. He continued to be a leader among the young graduates and students, spreading the ideas of German materialist philosophy, of which he had become an avid student. Sílvio Romero, a young polemicist from Sergipe who had done his secondary schooling in Rio, was another energetic and influential member of this group (which he later labeled the "Recife School"). Other members, all to become prominent in Brazilian intellectual life, were Franklin Távora, a novelist, Araripe Júnior, a literary critic, and Inglês de Sousa, another novelist (who transferred to the law school in São Paulo to finish his degree).

Positivism, evolutionism, and materialism were studied intensely. Comte, Darwin, and Haeckel were all read, along with Taine and Renan. During the first few years the spell of Romanticism was not quite broken, but by the early 1870's Sílvio Romero and Tobias Barreto had launched a fierce campaign against Indianism and Eclecticism.[22] The Recife School entered a new phase when Tobias Barreto finally won a chair in the Faculty of Law in 1882, which he occupied until his death in 1889. From this prestigious position, he exercised a strong influence over yet another generation of students—among whom were Artur Orlando, Clóvis Beviláqua, Graça Aranha, Fausto Cardoso, and Sousa Bandeira. By the 1880's the defenders of traditional thought, or even of an up-dated militant Catholicism, were badly outnumbered in Recife.

Although Recife was one of the earliest, and remained one of the most influential centers of the new critical mentality, intellectual unrest soon appeared elsewhere. The province of Ceará became another center of intellectual innovation in the north. Some younger men who had studied in Recife started their own move-

ment in Ceará's capital of Fortaleza in 1874. Their leaders were Rocha Lima, Capistrano de Abreu (later to attain fame as Brazil's first modern historian), and Araripe Júnior, the literary critic.[23]

This new critical spirit was by no means limited to the north, however, as products of the Recife School often later claimed. In the rest of Brazil the break with traditional ideas was identified with the spread of Positivism.[24] The first Positivist Association was founded in Rio de Janeiro in 1876. The following year Miguel Lemos and Teixeira Mendes journeyed to Paris where their involvement deepened from philosophical sympathy to religious commitment. In 1881 they founded the Positivist Apostolate, which declared its loyalty to the Pierre Lafitte faction of European Positivists.

Positivism made rapid inroads among the young cadets at the military academy in Rio, where the doctrine was spread by the officer-professor, Benjamin Constant (Botelho de Magalhães).[25] Positivism was getting a similar boost from other teachers, such as Antônio Carlos de Oliveira Guimarães, a lecturer in mathematics at Colégio Pedro II, the most prestigious secondary school in Rio. Both Constant and Guimarães were founding members of the Positivist Society in 1876. In contrast to the Brazilian Apostolate, however, they adopted the doctrinal position of E. Littré, Lafitte's rival for the loyalty of the divided Positivists in Europe.[26]

One cannot understand the influence of Positivism in Brazil without remembering that it attracted followers of widely varying degrees of commitment.[27] At one extreme there were the orthodox religious Positivists, organized into a formal church in 1881 (the "Positivist Apostolate");[28] they eventually became so rigid they expelled their own Mother Church in Paris. At the other extreme were Brazilians who read Comte, or more often his popularizers, and sympathized with his general interpretation of the importance of science and the passing of religion without accepting his schematic theories of historical inevitability and his detailed formulae for social engineering. Between

these two extremes were the "heterodox" Positivists, such as Luís Pereira Barreto, who accepted Comte's historical theories but rejected the religion founded in his name and institutionalized in Rio de Janeiro. It was Pereira Barreto, a São Paulo physician, who published in 1874 the first Brazilian treatise written from a systematic Positivist position.[29]

Positivism proved influential in Brazil because it appeared at the moment when the traditional mentality was most vulnerable. Critical younger minds were ready for a systematic rejection of the Catholicism, Romanticism, and Eclecticism associated with the agrarian monarchy, Clóvis Beviláqua, a product of the Recife School, explained in the 1890's how Positivism had served a unique function:

> Previously Brazilian philosophy, as represented by Mont' Alverne, Eduardo França, Patricio Muniz, etc., went its way in isolation from the progress achieved in the old world. It seemed to us that Positivism was the best system to rescue our thought from this depression, because only Positivism contained a strong and coherent structure to pose against the Catholic structure that was dissolving.[30]

Furthermore, Positivism came from France, the country whose culture enjoyed greatest prestige among lettered Brazilians. It was logical, if ironical, that intellectual rebels should have used Comte to attack their elders' slavish imitation of Victor Hugo.

No less important, Positivism became quickly identified in Brazil with applied science, which was just gaining respectability among the elite. Brazilians studying mathematics or engineering in Rio in the 1860's met teachers who argued that the philosophical doctrines of Comte were the logical application of science to society. Such ideas led many students toward Positivism; and a number of these graduates of the military school and the Polytechnic School went on to become leading Army officers and engineers.[31] Even when they stopped short of becoming orthodox Positivists in later years, they often remained sympathetic to Positivist ideas and antipathetic to the Catholic humanistic culture which they had heard criticized by their teachers.

Positivism also had an appeal for those members of the elite who wanted economic development without social mobilization. Regarding the mass of their population as "ill-prepared" for full participation in society (because of illiteracy, inferior racial background, etc.), they could find in the authoritarian aspect of Positivism a model for modernization which rationalized the continued concentration of power in the hands of the elite. Comte's emphasis on the family as the basic social unit was another attractive idea for those Brazilians interested in modernization but worried by the strong emphasis on the individual (thereby possibly undermining the family) in European liberal thought.[32]

Finally, the orthodox Positivists were among the most diligent propagandists to be found in the late Empire. Their Church began publishing pamphlets and "annual circulars" in 1881. Its members contributed generously to the Church's educational mission—one of Positivism's prime tenets—and gained converts, or at least publicity, because they were willing to work hard at selling their doctrine in an era of few well-organized propagandists. Later Positivist enthusiasts often overstated the impact of their doctrine as such, but one cannot dispute the great influence of systematic philosophical Positivism in the training of engineers, Army officers, and medical doctors beginning in the 1870's. These men were exposed to a scientific dogma that challenged the entire structure of existing privilege in politics (monarchy), economics (slavery), religion (established Christian Church), and education (neglect of the sciences and the official sponsorship of religious instruction).

The new ideologies of progress and science were strong and attractive medicine for young minds in a nation whose social structure and mental heritage could hardly have been more different from the scenes of material progress in western Europe and North America. As Pereira Barreto, the Paulista Positivist, wrote in 1878 to José Bonifácio (moço), one of the political patriarchs:

> Your Excellency has been living in the clouds—you have clung to them and neglected earthly business. Your generation was all for literature and the imagination; ours is all for science and reason. Other times, other temperaments.[33]

ABOLITIONISM

It was in this atmosphere that the movement for abolition[34] finally gathered momentum.* Opposition to slavery took a long time to become an important political force in Brazil. A few isolated voices had called for gradual abolition earlier in the century. The most famous was José Bonifácio Andrada e Silva, a patriarch of Brazilian independence.[35] Few took notice, however, of his courageous proposal for total abolition in 1825, and rare was the Brazilian who wished (or dared) to oppose the slave trade, which continued at a high rate until British pressure finally forced its liquidation in 1850.[36] With the supply of new slaves finally cut off and with manumissions, the slave population steadily decreased. Remarkably enough, slavery ceased to be a live political issue for a decade and a half.

The calm was broken in 1866, once again after pressure from abroad. A group of French abolitionists appealed to the Emperor, asking that he use his great powers to end slavery in Brazil. In his reply Pedro II made the first official government commitment to abolition by noting that total emancipation was only a matter of time. He promised that as soon as the pressure of the Paraguayan war permitted, his government would "consider as an object of first importance the realization of what the spirit of Christianity has long since demanded of the civilized world."[37]

The war with Paraguay gave the occasion for a first step toward abolition. In an effort to recruit troops quickly for the campaign, as mentioned above, the hard-pressed Army accepted slaves into

* A fuller discussion of race relations in the late Empire and early Republic will be given in Chapter 2. Emphasis here is on the basic ideas underlying the abolitionist campaign.

its ranks. Aware of the apparent contradiction of slaves fighting alongside freemen, the Imperial government decreed in November 1866—shortly after replying to the French abolitionists—that slaves serving in the military would be given their freedom unconditionally. In the last year of the war the Conde d'Eu, son-in-law of Emperor Pedro II and commander of the Brazilian fighting forces, successfully forced the provisional Paraguayan government to issue a decree immediately abolishing slavery in that country.[38]

When the war was over, as the Emperor had promised, the government tackled abolition at home. Significantly, there was still no abolitionist movement. Liberal writers such as Tavares Bastos had already called for gradual abolition. So did the Liberal party manifestoes of 1868 and 1869. Yet there was no organized pressure group campaigning on the issue; nor was one to appear until the end of the 1870's.

It is worth noting that the Republicans said nothing about slavery in their founding manifesto of 1870. Unlike the Liberal reformers, whose statements invariably included calls for abolition (usually gradual), the Republicans chose to equivocate on slavery. They were playing politics on abolition in order to maximize their appeal to the slaveholding planters, especially in the fast-growing coffee province of São Paulo. This tactic continued as official party policy until final abolition in 1888, although it provoked many bitter arguments at the local level and led to some local Republican organizations unilaterally affiliating with abolitionist causes.[39]

And an effective tactic it turned out to be. The Republican party reaped the political rewards of the eclipse of royal authority. While the Liberal party continued its role as the perennial inspirer of reform, it never enjoyed the fruits of victory. The three great abolitionist bills, for example, were all passed by Conservative governments. Meanwhile the Republican party gained a fateful advantage.

The first legal step, well before the formation of the abolition-

ist movement as such, was taken by the cabinet of Viscount Rio Branco (1871–75). In 1871 Rio Branco guided to passage the "Law of the Free Womb," which declared that all children subsequently born of slave mothers would be free. (This bill proved distinctly less effective than advocates had hoped, because if the master did not wish to accept the government's indemnity payment for the child at age eight, he still had the option of retaining the "freeborn" child under his authority—i.e., in de facto slavery—until the age of twenty-one.)

It was not until 1879 that any national politician dared call for immediate and total abolition. The initiative came from Jeronymo Sodré, a medical professor and deputy from Bahia, who was not otherwise notable for his political leadership.[40] In that same year a man of greater promise entered Parliament as a deputy from Pernambuco. He was Joaquim Nabuco, the elegant son of a planter family and soon to become the leader of a rapidly growing abolitionist movement.[41] Emancipation societies sprang up in every major city. By 1883 the abolitionists had merged their efforts in a national campaign. They concentrated on two fronts: demanding liquidation of the legal basis of slavery, while at the same time mobilizing donations for voluntary manumissions.

Both goals were eventually achieved, but only after another five years. In 1884 the provinces of Ceará and Amazonas succeeded in voluntarily manumitting all slaves within their borders. In 1885 the Parliament passed the Sexagenarian Law, unconditionally freeing all slaves over sixty-five years old, while conditionally freeing those between sixty and sixty-five (they had to render three more years' "service" to their masters). By 1887 slavery was being undermined from every direction: Slaves were fleeing their masters, the Army had refused to hunt them down, and the judges began ignoring the owners' claims.[42]

The third and final abolition bill, which granted immediate and total emancipation on May 13, 1888, was the work of a Conservative cabinet led by planters (primarily from São Paulo) who had previously fought to preserve slavery. At the last minute they saw that replacement of slave by free labor was inevitable and could even be beneficial because free laborers would be less expensive and more efficient than slaves. Furthermore, to manage the final step to abolition would leave the planter elite in control of the government, thus preventing the rise to power of long-time abolitionists who might harbor radical ideas such as land reform.[43]

Most of the intellectuals caught up in other liberal movements, such as Republicanism and anti-clericalism, finally became abolitionists. In the 1880's, for example, most of the politically conscious students in the law faculties (and therefore, by definition, spokesmen for the future governing elite) were ardent abolitionists as well as supporters of either Republicanism or the radical wing of the Liberal party. Even those abolitionist leaders who chose not to attack the monarchy per se, such as André Rebouças and José do Patrocínio, subscribed to the liberal doctrine in virtually all its political and philosophical particulars. Rebouças read John Stuart Mill, and Joaquim Nabuco confessed in his autobiography that he owed his political inspiration to Bagehot.[44] Luiz Gama, a fiery mulatto lawyer and pioneer abolitionist from São Paulo, commended to his son's attention two books: the *Bible* and Ernest Renan's *Life of Jesus*.[45] He was thus recommending an amalgam of traditional religion and theological liberalism. Even the pseudonyms used by the abolitionists showed their longing for the Anglo-American model of liberalism: Rui Barbosa called himself "Grey," Nabuco used "Garrison," and Gusmão Lobo "Clarkson."[46]

The active abolitionists could be divided into two groups. As Nabuco noted in his memoirs, there was a "pioneer" group composed of José do Patrocínio, Ferreira de Menezes, Vicente de Souza, Nicoláu Moreira, and João Clapp. These men were primarily propagandists, relying upon emotional arguments; their forum was the press and speakers' platform. Skilled at arousing fervor in their audiences, some (like Patrocínio) came close to preaching revolution. The other principal group—led by Nabuco,

André Rebouças, Gusmão Lobo, and Joaquim Serra—was composed of moderates whose aim was manipulation of parliamentary opinion.[47]

Nabuco was the leading theoretician among the abolitionists. He wrote one of the first manifestoes—published by the newly founded Anti-Slavery Society (Sociedade Contra Escravidão) in 1880.[48] There the liberal rationale stands out as the heart of the abolitionist message. Slavery had made Brazil a shameful anachronism in the modern world, out of step with the "progress of our century." The moral condemnation of Europe and North America weighed heavily: "Brazil does not want to be a nation morally isolated, a leper, expelled from the world community. The esteem and respect of foreign nations are as valuable to us as they are to other peoples." It was no good arguing that only twenty years ago slavery was still readily accepted in the United States: "Social morality doesn't have to wait for us. . . . To isolate oneself is to condemn oneself."

Slavery, furthermore, was "a tree whose roots invariably sterilize the physical and moral ground they touch." It was inherently corrupting to all Brazil, since "man is free neither when a slave nor when a master." It corrupted family morals, demeaned the value of labor, and reduced religion to a "superstition." Worst of all it covered the land with a "network of feudal realms, where the master is the tyrant of a little nation of men who dare not face him." Brazil, he said, could never progress until it expunged slavery: "What we visualize is not simply the emancipation of the slave, but the emancipation of the nation; it is the development of free labor which must be the responsibility of this generation." Only then could Brazilians work to "found a free country, uniting around a common flag—emancipation of the soil."

Nabuco developed his abolitionist arguments further in *O Abolicionismo* (1883), which soon became a classic of the movement. In it he repeated many of the arguments of the 1880 manifesto, but the battles since 1880 had given him greater skill in combining humanitarian with practical arguments. Along with

the familiar moral injunctions went the claim that continued slavery inhibited Brazil's development according to the liberal capitalist model—because it "prevents immigration, dishonors manual labor, delays the appearance of industries, promotes bankruptcy, diverts capital from its natural course, keeps away machines, and arouses class hatred." Only by abolishing slavery could Brazil enjoy the "miracles of free labor" and "work creatively for the benefit of humanity and the advancement of South America."[49] Nabuco took the position—differing not only from Republicans but many members of his own Liberal party—that abolition was the most urgent item on the docket of liberal reform.

From the beginning Brazilian abolitionists were heavily indebted to foreign opinion. The slave trade had ended only after three decades of British pressure which culminated in a virtual blockade by the Royal Navy in 1850. And it was an appeal by French intellectuals in 1866 which had triggered the government's first formal commitment to abolition. Many of the younger generation, in fact, testified that it was foreign censure of Brazil which galvanized them into action. For Manuel Vitorino, for example, later to be governor of Bahia and Vice President of the Republic, "one experience made me politically militant—my trip to Europe showed me just how far they were slandering us and how our reputation bedevilled us, the fact that we were a country that still had slaves. After returning home [in early 1881] my abolitionist feelings became insistent and uncompromising and on this issue I never again conceded."[50]

And the abolitionists struggled to mobilize even greater foreign pressure on their countrymen. In 1880 Nabuco solicited the American Minister, Henry Hilliard, for an opinion about slavery in Brazil. Hilliard readily complied, arguing for abolition and the replacement of slave with free labor. His enthusiasm, notably indiscreet for a diplomat speaking on a domestic issue, delighted the abolitionists. They capitalized on their propaganda opportunity, all the greater since Hilliard himself had been a slaveholder

and Confederate soldier before he saw the error of his ways and the "happy transformation in the condition of the people in the great agricultural region when slavery formerly existed."[51]

French intellectuals remained a favorite weapon which the abolitionists used against the Brazilian government at every opportunity. In 1884 José do Patrocínio wrote Victor Hugo, pleading with him to intervene personally with Pedro II. Patrocínio's action was remarkable for two reasons—first, that he should have thought Hugo capable of such influence (perhaps he was considering the Emperor's exaggerated admiration for Hugo); second, that he should have thought it within Pedro II's power to bring abolition. Could it have been a gross overestimation of the crown's power, which liberals, after all, hoped to limit? Patrocínio—the passionate orator who sought to rouse the masses to action—apparently succumbed to the wishful thinking of an elitist, longing for the Emperor to realize the liberal vision in a single benign gesture.[52]

This practice of appealing for foreign help made the abolitionists vulnerable to the charge of being un-Brazilian. And indeed, at every stage of the campaign the defenders of the status quo tried to undermine their abolitionist opponents by questioning their patriotism. In 1871, for example, José de Alencar, the Romanticist author who was also a Conservative deputy from Ceará, ridiculed the "proclamations of European philanthropy" that produced "obeisances to foreign opinion." Alencar thought many other reforms (such as "emancipation of the vote") were more important than abolition—even gradual abolition as proposed in the Law of the Free Womb (passed in 1871). But he added pointedly, "these essential interests of the country [i.e., the reforms he thought most important] do not have a French voice to say to someone, 'Sir, by this act your name will acquire everlasting fame.' "[53]

The abolitionists were also charged with endangering Brazil's basic interests for the sake of arousing cheers in foreign capitals. One witty slavocrat argued as late as 1884 that all had been well

in the slave fields until the "wolves came from the city," and "whispered into their [i.e., the slaves'] ears the new ideas from the Court. They told them . . . of the hopes that European wise men have of seeing slavery abolished in Brazil, come what may, by the next centennial of the discovery of America [i.e., 1892]."[54]

The abolitionists, in their turn, tackled these charges explicitly. At the elaborate banquet attended by virtually all the leading abolitionists in honor of the American Hilliard (whose analysis had proved so obliging) the principal Brazilian speaker, Nabuco, went out of his way to rebut the charge of "foreign intervention." The Brazilian government itself, he said, had more than once found it worthwhile to respond to "foreigners" demands (as in the Emperor's reply to French intellectuals' 1866 appeal for abolition). And the government itself had even intervened in another country when the Brazilians chose to abolish slavery in Paraguay!

"This moral support which we [abolitionists] derive from world approval honors us and we seek it. No liberal cause can ever be debated in any country without the liberal forces in every other country organizing for its support." Nabuco made a conspicuous salute to the official American diplomatic representative as an ally in the cause. Pronouncing him an honorary member of the Anti-Slavery Society, Nabuco said Hilliard was in Brazil "just as Benjamin Franklin was in France—on the eve of a liberal revolution."[55]

What did the abolitionists think of the issue of race, as distinct from slavery? They were unavoidably aware of the racist theories pouring in from North America and Europe, although their full implications were not yet perceived. Nabuco, for instance, left no doubt that his goal was a whiter Brazil. He was honest enough to say that had he been alive in the sixteenth century, he would have opposed the introduction of African slaves, just as he now opposed the plan for "Asiatic slavery," referring to a current proposal to import Chinese workers to replace the slaves. In Nabuco's view, it was a shame the Dutch had not remained in Bra-

zil back in the seventeenth century. Although he carefully explained that the great Dutch contribution was "freedom of trade and freedom of conscience," the ethnic implications seemed unmistakable: "Our social evolution was delayed by the quick end of Dutch rule."[56]

The abolitionists were, however, very ready to take a position on whether a liberal society was possible if a large part of the population was non-white. According to the abolitionist manifesto of 1880 (written by Nabuco):

> If a nation can progress only by using the forced labor of an extra-legal caste, then it is a mere first approximation of an independent and autonomous state. If a race is able to develop in a latitude only by making another race work to support it, then that race has not yet attempted to acclimatize. Traditional Brazilians think that a Brazil without slaves would quickly perish. Even that result would be better than a life that can be maintained only by undermining national character and humiliating the country. If abolition should mean suicide, then humanity would be rendered a service by those incapable of surviving on their own. At least they would have the courage to leave to the stronger, heartier and braver, the incomparable heritage of a land that they could not cultivate and where they could not survive.

To this remarkably frank appraisal Nabuco added an optimistic conclusion:

> Instead of being suicidal, ending slavery would be a provident and just act. It would summon forth new qualities in our national character and launch the nation on an epoch of progress and free labor, which would be the true period of our definitive development and our real independence.[57]

Although worried about the "ethnic factor," the abolitionists shared the predominant Brazilian belief that their society harbored no racial prejudice. The debates over the abolitionist bills reveal the prevalence of this belief among all political factions. In 1871, for example, Perdigão Malheiro, a deputy from Minas

Gerais and a noted authority on slave law, condemned what he considered to be unjustified slurs on Brazil's racial harmony. "Since Negroes came to Brazil from the African coast there has never been that contempt for the African race to be found in other countries, especially the United States." Slavery had become less pernicious, especially since 1850, he argued. Color prejudice in Brazil? "Gentlemen, I know many individuals of dark skin who are worth more than many of white skin. That is the truth. In the schools, higher faculties, and churches do we not see good colored students alongside our distinguished men? In Parliament, government, the Council of State, the diplomatic missions, the Army, and the public offices do we not see men whose skin is more or less dark, men of the *mestiço** as well as the African race?"[58]

This was the accepted view among the elite: Brazil had escaped race prejudice. As Nabuco wrote in *O Abolicionismo*: "slavery, to our good fortune, never embittered the slave's spirit toward the master, at least collectively, nor did it create between the races that mutual hate which naturally exists between oppressors and oppressed." Furthermore, recent experience had shown that "color in Brazil is not, as in the United States, a social prejudice against whose persistence no character, talent, or merit can prevail."[59] Unlike in the United States, abolitionists in Brazil were seldom forced to discuss the question of race per se, because the defenders of slavery virtually never resorted to theories of racial inferiority. Their North American counterparts had earlier been forced to struggle with claims of Negro racial inferiority at the same time they faced political and economic arguments in defense of slavery.

Nonetheless, Brazilian abolitionists did talk about the role of race in history. Most foresaw an "evolutionist" process, with the

* The Portuguese term *mestiço* means "mixed blood," which can be any mixture of racial backgrounds, including Indian, African, and European. It should not be confused with the Spanish term *mestizo*, which has entered English with the primary meaning of a European-Indian mixture.

white element gradually triumphing. They were also prepared to accelerate this "evolution" by promoting European immigration, which they favored for two reasons. First, Europeans could help fill the labor shortage resulting from the elimination of slave labor, all the more necessary since the rate of reproduction of the free colored population was thought to be insufficient to meet the labor needs. Second, European immigration would help to speed up the "whitening" process in Brazil. Nabuco was startlingly forthright on this point. What the abolitionists wanted, he explained in 1883, was a country "where European immigration, attracted by the generosity of our institutions and the liberality of our regime, may constantly bring to the tropics a flow of lively, energetic, and healthy Caucasian blood, which we may absorb without danger. . . ."[60]

Other abolitionists, who also believed in "whitening," described the process more euphemistically. José do Patrocínio, a mulatto, argued that Brazil was more blessed historically than the United States: "We have been able to fuse all races into a single native population, because Portuguese colonization assimilated the savage races instead of trying to destroy them, thus preparing us to resist the devastating invasion of race prejudice."[61] Here was white predominance described in the more polite terms of "fusion."

Nowhere did the abolitionists' belief in "whitening" become clearer than in their reaction to the Chinese worker proposal. A group of planters and politicians who saw the inevitability of total abolition proposed in the 1870's that Brazil should import Chinese laborers to replace black slaves. This was not a new idea, having been proposed as early as the reign of Dom João VI (1808–21). In 1870 it had arisen again and was hotly debated among the members of the Society to Aid National Industry (Sociedade Auxiliadora da Indústria Nacional). The backers of Chinese labor were notably apologetic. They wanted only "temporary" workers, *not* colonizers who would "become a permanent part of our society." Their objective was merely a "means of transition" to a "system of completely free labor" when "measures on immigration, hygiene and religious education can produce their fruits and render superfluous Chinese cooperation."[62]

Although the proposal was rejected by the Society, it did not die. During the 1870's it reappeared among the many ideas for meeting the labor shortage, although very few who urged immigration could bring themselves to consider favorably the Chinese. Menezes e Souza, the persuasive author of an 1875 report urging government measures to attract immigrants, went out of his way to denounce the Chinese. Brazil needed "new blood," not "old juice" from "degenerate bodies." He based his racism on "anthropological truth," which had established that the "Chinese race bastardizes and makes our race degenerate."[63] Such a view, incidentally, was at least semi-official, since his book had been written as a formal report to the Minister of Agriculture.

The Chinese labor proposal surfaced again in the late 1870's, proposed by a group calling itself "the Society for Importing Asiatic Workers of Chinese Ancestry."[64] Their idea became a subject of major debate when the leader of the Liberal Government, Viscount Sinimbú, ordered an official study of Chinese immigration into the United States. The investigation was entrusted to Salvador de Mendonça, who was then the ambitious and successful Brazilian Consul General in New York. Mendonça soon became an enthusiastic supporter of Chinese immigration. His memorandum, later expanded into a book published by the Brazilian government, praised the Chinese as "intelligent, frugal and industrious workers." Since they would come from Canton, "where the climate is tropical, they would quickly adapt to Brazil," just as they had already adapted to Cuba and the mines of the United States.[65]

Mendonça knew the prejudices of his Brazilian audience. Like the earlier advocates of Chinese immigration, he wanted the Asian workers only "temporarily," to provide some continuity of labor supply "between the African and the European." The Chinese could not be considered as permanent immigrants because

they "don't learn to love the land to which they migrate," aside from the fact that he considered them "suspicious, disloyal, lying, and lustful."[66]

Such official support for an "investigation" of the practicalities of Chinese immigration made the question a subject for full-scale discussion. Once again it was attacked on racial grounds. Joaquim Nabuco was incensed at the Prime Minister's willingness to consider importing Chinese. Nabuco argued that there was no real demand for them in Brazil. A wave of Chinese immigration would, he said, "pervert and corrupt our race even further."[67] However limited the immigration, Nabuco argued, Brazil would inevitably become "mongolized, just as it was Africanised when Salvador Correa de Sá brought over the first slaves."[68]

Although Nabuco regarded the Chinese as racially inferior as he did the Negro, he thought they lacked the Negro's capacity to be assimilated in Brazil. On the contrary, since the Chinese could survive in "the worst of conditions," they were fated to "occupy" any country where they gained a foothold.[69] In sum, Nabuco opposed the Chinese "ethnologically because they will provoke race conflict and degrade our present population; economically because they will not solve the labor shortage; morally, because they will introduce into our society that leprosy of vices that infects all cities where Chinese immigration occurs; politically, because instead of freeing labor it will only prolong the present low moral level of labor and at the same time help to preserve slavery."[70]

As we saw above, Nabuco started from the assumption that Brazil should be "improving" herself eugenically. By this logic, importing the Chinese would be a step backward. In the parliamentary debate where Nabuco questioned the "civilizing" value of the Chinese, one deputy supported him, "We must raise the moral level of this country," to which another replied, "both things are needed: morality and workers." The Chinese did not fit into this picture. As another deputy explained, "the Negro improves himself, but the Chinaman is impossible."[71]

Despite this opposition, all the planters did not give up hope of importing Chinese laborers. As the slave population dwindled and European immigrants failed to appear, a planter group entered into direct negotiations in 1883 with a shipping company director, who proposed to supply them with Chinese. The abolitionists' loud opposition undoubtedly contributed to the failure of the scheme, which never gained the necessary cooperation from the Chinese. Furthermore, the English government, with the Royal Navy at its command, had threatened to intervene to prevent the scheme.[72] The controversy over Chinese immigration had forced many Brazilians, however, to make clear their racial views. What emerged was a strong commitment to a progressively whiter Brazil.

EUROPEAN THOUGHT AND DETERMINIST DILEMMAS

Abolitionist thought, like all reform thought in Brazil, grew out of the nineteenth-century European liberalism that had accompanied the Industrial Revolution, rapid urbanization and economic growth. These changes had been made possible, in turn, by the application of science and technology. European faith in liberalism seemed justified by European economic prosperity. In Brazil, however, liberalism came as a result of intellectual trends per se rather than any profound economic change. Although cities were growing rapidly after 1850, there was no comparable leap in Brazilian economic development. The Brazilians were applying liberal ideas, therefore, in a social context not significantly different from the world of their fathers.[73]

As the major European powers grew stronger economically and politically, and as they increased their dominance over more parts of the non-European world, European thinkers began to produce explanations for greater economic success. Their intellectuals offered "scientific" reasons for Europe's success. These apologias for European superiority were exported to Latin America along with European liberalism, and their juxtaposition created an uncomfortable paradox for the thinking Brazilian.

Such ideas emerged after the prestige of natural science (largely a European creation in its modern form) had buttressed Europe's intellectual authority. The argument was made that northern Europeans had achieved superior economic and political power because of their heredity and their uniquely favorable physical environment. In short, northern Europeans were the "highest" races and enjoyed the "best" climate, which carried the implication that darker races and tropical climates could never produce comparable civilizations. Some of these writers explicitly ruled out the possibility of civilization in an area that lacked European conditions. Not coincidentally, their analysis was directed at the area that had succumbed to European conquest since the fifteenth century: Africa and Latin America. Thus an expanding Europe found a scientific rationale for its political and economic conquests.[74] For our analysis it does not matter that in their popularized form these ideas were grossly oversimplified and often distorted. A great many people did, in fact, subscribe to them.

One of the best-known such writers was the English historian, Henry Thomas Buckle (1821–62), whose multi-volume *History of Civilization in England* (1857–61) contained a clearly stated philosophy of climatic determinism.[75] In eight pages Buckle analyzed the rainfall, topography, hydrographic system, and wind patterns of Brazil. Never having visited the country, and lacking almost any genuinely scientific studies for evidence, Buckle had to rely on travel accounts, which he cited copiously. His description of Brazil sounded much like the Romantic stereotype: "so rank and luxuriant is the growth that Nature seems to riot in the very wantonness of power." He went on to describe the "tangled forests," and "birds of gorgeous plumage." Unfortunately, however, "amid this pomp and splendor of Nature, no place is left for Man. He is reduced to insignificance by the majesty with which he is surrounded." Brazil came in for special censure in Buckle's survey of civilization. "Nowhere else is there so painful a contrast between the grandeur of the external world and the littleness of the internal. . . . And the mind, cowed by this unequal struggle, has not only been unable to advance, but without foreign aid it would undoubtedly have receded. For even at present, with all the improvements constantly introduced from Europe, there are no signs of real progress. . . ."[76]

It is unlikely that many Brazilian intellectuals read all of Buckle's ponderous work, but they certainly knew his eight-page indictment. Hardly a Brazilian social thinker for the next sixty years could avoid strugggling with this kind of pessimistic view of Brazil's potential, and they often referred explicitly to Buckle.

Another deterministic doctrine with a long history, racism, was also brought to the surface in a new form by European writers, of whom Arthur de Gobineau (1816–82) was a prominent example. Shortly before Buckle published the *History of Civilization in England*, Gobineau published his *Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines (1853–1855)*. It was read less widely in Brazil than Buckle, but Brazilians were very familiar with the basic ideas of racism which Gobineau expressed.

Racial determinism had already been politically endorsed in English North America, where separation of the "superior" and "inferior" races was a well-institutionalized system. Brazil, however, had been a multi-racial society for too long for strict segregation along biracial lines to be a practical possibility. Brazil's historical racial balance had led to widespread miscegenation, touching even the oldest families. But this fait accompli of social history did not prevent Brazilian social thinkers from worrying about the effects of racial mixing. Brazil was the largest single New World colony in which the black percentage of the population had been over 50 per cent for so long. The black population in the United States never approached 50 per cent of the total population, even in the South (although it did in a few individual states).

Unlike Buckle, Gobineau actually went to Brazil, although after his *Essai* was published. As an ambitious diplomat with political aspirations, he thought of Brazil as a professional dead

end, as well as living proof of his theories. From the moment he was assigned there as French Minister (landing during the carnival celebrations of 1869), he detested the country. He thought it a cultural backwater and a constant health hazard. He despised the Brazilians, whom he regarded as irretrievably sullied by miscegenation.[77] And he was terrified that he might contract yellow fever before he saw France again (not unjustifiably—there was an epidemic in 1869–70).

His aesthetic sense was offended by "a population totally mulatto, vitiated in its blood and spirit, and fearfully ugly."[78] He announced that "not a single Brazilian has pure blood because the pattern of marriages among whites, Indians and Negroes is so widespread that the nuances of color are infinite, causing a degeneration of the most depressing type among the lower as well as the upper classes." Gobineau did not hesitate to draw sweeping conclusions, noting in an official report on slavery that native Brazilians were "neither hard-working, active, nor fertile."[79]

The last point became central to Gobineau's analysis of Brazil's future. Although the climate and natural resources were favorable, he thought the native population was destined to disappear, due to its genetic "degeneracy." By a curious bit of arithmetic, he calculated that it would take "less than two hundred years . . . to see the end of the descendants of Costa-Cabral [*sic*] and the emigrants who followed them." The only way to avoid this dénouement was for the existing population to "fortify itself through joining with the higher value of the European races. . . ." Then the race would "revive, public health would improve, the moral temperment would be reinvigorated, and the best possible changes would occur in the social condition of this admirable country."[80]

None of this long-range philosophizing could soften the Frenchman's fury at having been relegated to a South American backwater. His letters reveal an unrelieved contempt for his colleagues of all other nationalities, but his harshest words were reserved for the Brazilians. "Everyone is ugly here, unbelievably

ugly, like apes."[81] His only consolation was his friendship with the Emperor. He echoed Buckle's description of an empty land: "Except for the Emperor there is no one in this desert full of thieves."[82] Gobineau's frustration even spilled over into his personal conduct. He quarreled frequently, culminating in a wild street brawl with the son-in-law of a Brazilian Senator. In 1870 he was recalled, on the insistence of his good friend the Emperor.[83]

Other foreign observors also reminded Brazilians of the implications of racist doctrines. José Ingenieros, the Argentine philosopher (1877–1925), influenced the Brazilian elite with his confused doctrines of the racial inferiority of non-whites.[84] Louis Couty was another foreigner who was very frank. A Frenchman who knew Brazil well, Couty was especially interested in the coffee-growing provinces of the Center-South. He collaborated closely with Brazilian reformers such as Viscount Taunay and other leaders of the Imperial Society for Immigration. In 1884 Couty published a book about Brazil with the title "Sociological Sketches." In the Preface he stated his racial views unambiguously: "I attempt to prove that the settlement by enslaved Africans has produced all Brazil's difficulties and I indicate that the settlement by freemen from Europe is the only possible solution."[85] There is no evidence that any of Couty's important Brazilian friends attempted to refute his unilateral interpretation of Brazilian history.

Perhaps the most famous indictment by a foreign visitor to Brazil was that of Louis Agassiz, who came to Brazil in 1865 on a scientific expedition, and three years later (with his wife) published an account of their trip. "Let any one who doubts the evil of this mixture of races, and is inclined, from a mistaken philanthropy, to break down all barriers between them, come to Brazil. He cannot deny the deterioration consequent upon an amalgamation of races, more wide-spread here than in any other country in the world, and which is rapidly effacing the best qualities of the white man, the Negro, and the Indian, leaving a mongrel

nondescript type, deficient in physical and mental energy."[86] Agassiz concluded his book with an attempt to pay tribute to his Brazilian friends, who were soon able to read his book in a French translation.[87] He acknowledged their "susceptibility to lofty impulses and emotions, their love of theoretical liberty, their natural generosity, their aptness to learn, their ready eloquence." But he could not avoid alluding again to race and climate, as he added: "if also I miss qualities of the Northern races, I do but recall a distinction as ancient as the tropical and temperate zones themselves."[88]

THE AGONY OF A WOULD-BE NATIONALIST: SÍLVIO ROMERO

A careful reading of Brazilian social thought before abolition leaves little doubt that Brazilians skirted over the problems posed for their nation by deterministic theories of race. Yet there were a few exceptional thinkers who struggled with issues that took the majority of their literate countrymen many more years to face. This chapter will end with a discussion of the liberal reformer who struggled as honestly and continuously as any with questions of race and environment—Sílvio Romero (1851–1914).[89]

In what follows we shall analyze Romero's thought on race and environment before 1889. His views in this period were worked out primarily between 1869 and 1881, and then summarized in the major work of his career, *História de Literatura Brasileira*, which first appeared in 1888.[90] His views after 1889, which underwent little basic change on the question of race, will be discussed in later chapters.

Romero earned his principal reputation as a literary critic. He followed a sociological approach to literature, arguing that race and environment were the keys to understanding artistic creations. He described himself as a Social Darwinist, and although harboring reservations about some of Spencer's ideas, thought they were the best guide for understanding history.[91] An incorrigible polemicist, he often contradicted himself in order to score a debating point.[92] Yet his inconsistencies had another more significant explanation—the fate of Brazil, as analyzed within the analytical framework of Social Darwinism, was not a comfortable issue for speculation.

He did, however, have one unswerving conviction: Brazilians had to master current scientific doctrines and apply them to their country. And he never surrendered his emotional commitment to his country, however depressing his conclusions became. The assumption from which he started was that any nation is the product of an interaction between the population and their natural habitat. The nation's specific character and culture was a product of long-term adjustment. How long? Romero's estimate varied. The implications of any estimate were serious because they inevitably reflected upon Brazil's status and future.

Romero tackled the question of environmental determinism directly, pronouncing Buckle's verdict on Brazil as "hard words but essentially correct."[93] Although contesting specific points, he thought Buckle should be read in Brazil, and he printed in translation virtually the entire eight-page section on Brazil from the *History of Civilization in England*. This appeared both in a series of articles printed in the *Revista Brazileira* in 1879–80 and in his *História da Literatura Brasileira*—undoubtedly helping to publicize the indictment.[94]

Romero thought that Buckle had overdrawn his analysis—his theory being "too cosmographic."[95] He "divides civilization into two great branches: European and non-European; in the former, man's energy prevails over nature, while in the latter one finds the contrary. The distinction is capricious."[96] Furthermore, he found Buckle misinformed about the facts of geography and climate in Brazil. Brazil had no huge mountains (as Buckle had suggested); it suffered from drought rather than excessive rain, just as impassable jungle was less serious than the semi-barren interior.[97] Nature's products had long been thought to be vaster in Brazil than anywhere else, "which is an advantage, say [Bra-

zilian] patriots; which is a hindrance, says Buckle; which is an error, say I."[98]

Romero had no doubt that the Brazilian habitat was seriously debilitating. The oppressive heat and periodic drought helped to make Brazilians "listless and apathetic."[99] He cited approvingly a handbook of hygiene which listed the supposed physical consequences of man's residence in the tropics—languid blood, slow digestion, and oversensitive skin. The physical condition of the Indian supposedly "proved" the enervating influence of the climate, where fevers and diseases were common. Romero quoted this depressing description at length and pronounced it "more or less exact" for Brazil. He added "we have a morbid population which for the most part leads a short, sickly, and unhappy life."[100]

Did Romero think this baneful influence of climate irremediable? Apparently not, because he flatly rejected the determinism of Buckle. Furthermore, he appreciated the importance of diet and hygiene as instruments in helping man to adapt to the tropics. He could not, of course, know of the impending discoveries in the field of contagious diseases and the treatment of parasites, so the tone of his discussion was equivocal.

Romero worried more, however, about race. He began by accepting the basic idea of a hierarchy of races, often using the phrase "ethnographic scale" and referring to "inferior" and "superior" races. At the same time, he was skeptical enough to see some of the inconsistencies in racial thought—noting that the definition of race itself was vague, and that the "historic races" (including the Aryan) "had experienced the most complete miscegenation."[101] These qualifications did not save him from repeating many of the current European theories about Indian and Negro inferiority.

Romero saw Brazil as the product of three racial streams—white European, black African, and indigenous Indian. The views he expressed about each of them were hardly encouraging. Of the particular white strain ("Greco-Latin") that came to Brazil—via the Portuguese—he held the same view as the Romantics who popularized cultural Nationalism, namely, that it was

inferior to the "Germano-Saxon" branch. He reminded his countrymen that "the robust peoples of the North, led today by the English and the Germans," had the historic role of "invigorating the blood and ideas of Latin, Celtic and Iberian peoples."[102] The Indian he regarded as "certainly the lowest on the ethnographic scale."[103] Of a low cultural level, they had barely managed to influence Brazilian culture. The African he described as "defeated on the ethnographic scale." He quoted Wilberforce approvingly on the inherent inferiority of the black compared to the white man, and repeated the familiar if ill-founded argument that blacks had never created a civilization.[104]

Having described these ethnic elements Romero argued that the particular character of Brazil was due to a mixture of the three. "The Aryan race, combining here with two totally different races, has contributed to the creation of a *mestiço* and creole sub-race distinct from the European. . . . It helps little," he said in 1888, "to discuss whether this is good or bad. It's a fact and that is enough."[105]

There were no pure racial types left in Brazil, he argued, and even when there were, no *pure-blood* Negroes or Indians had ever become "notable" in Brazilian history.[106] Yet the product of centuries of miscegenation showed widely differing degrees of influence by the three elements. Whites had predominated, because their culture had been more developed, the Indians had been annihilated by war and disease, and the African was brutalized by slavery. "The result is easy to discern: The white man, the unfeeling perpetrator of so many crimes, took what he could from the red man and Negroes, and then threw them away like useless objects. He was constantly helped in the process by the *mestiço*, his son and his collaborator who ended up replacing him, assuming his color and his power."[107] Romero thought the African strain had contributed much more than the Indian to the new race, going so far as to describe it as a "robust, civilizing agent," which had helped the new race adapt to the tropical climate.[108]

To the hard question of whether race mixture had been bene-

ficial his answer varied. Just as in the case of climatological determinism, the scientific arguments he needed in order to write a definitive rejection of racist determinism did not yet exist. In 1880 he wrote: "we are a people descended from the degenerate and corrupt branch of the old Latin race, to which were added two of the most degraded races in the world—the coastal Negroes and the American redskins. . . ." The result? "The senility of the Negro, the laziness of the Indian, the authoritarian and miserly talent of the Portuguese had produced a shapeless nation with no original or creative qualities."[109] At other times he felt more hopeful. In the same year (1880) that he published the preceding statement, he challenged Brazilians to study their real culture and not some artificial creation of the Romantic Indianists. "In this great work of civilization there are no privileged races or continents; there is only the privilege of creative effort."[110]

At heart, of course, Romero was uncertain. "If it is true that the mixture of diverse peoples guarantees vigorous growth, then no one can offer greater advantages than the Brazilian."[111] The conditional clause epitomizes his uncertainty. He was unflinching in declaring that miscegenation was at the center of Brazilian history. But his conclusions about its significance depended upon his estimate of the current progress in Brazil and his natural tendency to confuse historical analysis with predictions about the future. His equivocation was hardly surprising. Scientific thought about hybrids was changing rapidly in Romero's day. European science tended to denegrate human mixed bloods as weak and potentially sterile. Romero thought this was probably nonsense, but did not yet have any scientific basis for saying so.

His racial views became most intense when he talked of Brazil's future.

> My argument is that future victory in the life struggle among us will belong to the white. But the latter, in order to achieve this victory in the face of the hardships of the climate, will have to capitalize on the aid the other two races can furnish, especially the black race with which it has mixed most. After having rendered the necessary help, the white type will continue to predominate by natural selection until it emerges pure and beautiful as in the old world. That will come when it has totally acclimatized on this continent. Two factors will greatly contribute to this process: on the one hand the abolition of the slave trade and the continuous disappearance of the Indians, and on the other hand European immigration![112]

In other contexts he saw the final result as less than pure white.

> The proverbial tendency of . . . the mulatto to pass for white when his color permits the illusion is well known. We have virtually no purely Aryan families. Presumptive whites abound. Within two or three centuries perhaps this ethnic fusion will be complete and the Brazilian *mestiço* well defined.[113]

Elsewhere:

> The future of Brazilian people will be an Afro-Indian and Latino-German mixture if, as is probable, German immigration continues alongside Portuguese and Italian.[114]

Romero's vision of the future depended very much on whether he thought the existing racially mixed population was psychologically stable or not. We have already noted his inconsistency on this point. In 1880 he was cautious: "The two great agents of transformation—nature and the mixture of diverse peoples are still at work, and the result cannot yet be determined with certainty."[115] Elsewhere the same year he noted, "the three races among us have not yet disappeared into the combination of a single type and this process will be very slow. Meanwhile the mixture of colors and a confusion of ideas remains our inheritance."[116] By 1888 he was more confident. "If the Brazilian people as we see them today do not constitute a single compact and distinct race, they have the elements to develop forcefully and take on an original character in the future. Perhaps we shall yet represent in America a great cultural and historical destiny."[117]

a range of elite opinion wide enough to explain their prevailing assumptions about race. It should be noted, however, that this was done by the old-fashioned method of the intellectual historian—a wide reading of writers and publications which I thought representative. The opportunities for research remain inviting for historians who might wish to apply newer techniques, such as content analysis, to the study of Brazilian thought, whether of the elite or of those millions of other Brazilians who appear in these pages merely as objects of debate for the few who enjoyed the power of the printed word. Although the last decade has produced a number of highly useful secondary works on specific areas of thought, much research remains to be done in such fields as medicine and anthropology.[11] Much also remains to be written about the history of cultural and educational institutions—the faculties, institutes, and academies.[12] A careful analysis of the social history of these institutions will help put Brazilian intellectual history into the wider context of social and economic history which is only touched upon in this study.[13]

Notes

INTRODUCTION

1. I have not discussed the many parallels between race-thinking in Brazil and the rest of Latin America. In general, Spanish America (especially Argentina and Mexico) has received more attention from North American students of intellectual history than Brazil. Martin Stabb includes race as one of the central themes in his excellent analysis of the writings of the Spanish American essayists who diagnosed the "sick continent" in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Martin S. Stabb, *In Quest of Identity: Patterns in the Spanish American Essay of Ideas, 1890–1960* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1967). For discussion of the attitudes of Mexican intellectuals toward race before the Revolution of 1910, see T. G. Powell, "Mexican Intellectuals and the Indian Question, 1876–1911," *Hispanic American Historical Review,* XLVIII (No. 1, Feb. 1968), 19–36; and William D. Raat, "Los intelectuales, el positivismo y la questión indígena," *Historia Mexicana,* XX (Jan.–Mar. 1971) 412–27. For the cases of Argentina and Chile there is much valuable information on elite attitudes toward race in Carl Solberg, *Immigration and Nationalism: Argentina and Chile, 1890–1914* (Austin, 1970).

2. The manifesto is reprinted in Osvaldo Melo Braga, *Bibliografia de Joaquim Nabuco* [Instituto Nacional do Livro: Coleção B 1: Bibliografia, VIII] (Rio de Janeiro, 1952). The quotation is on page 17.

CHAPTER 1

1. Sources on Brazilian church history are few. The most authoritative secondary source for this period is George C. A. Boehrer, "The Church in the Second Reign, 1840–1889," in Henry H. Keith and S. F. Edwards, eds., *Conflict and Continuity in Brazilian Society* (Columbia, S.C., 1969), 113–40. A considerable amount of information may be

found in Nilo Pereîra, *Conflitos entre a Igreja e o Estado no Brasil* (Recife, 1970). Unfortunately Professor Boehrer's death deprived us of the larger study of the nineteenth-century Brazilian church on which he had embarked. A useful general treatment is found in chapter XII of J. Lloyd Mecham, *Church and State in Latin America,* rev. ed. (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1966).

2. My analysis of nineteenth-century Brazilian thought owes much to Roque Spencer Maciel de Barros, *A Ilustração brasileira e a idéia da universidade* (São Paulo, 1959), which is the leading exposition and critique of Brazilian Liberalism. A valuable survey is João Cruz Costa, *A History of Ideas in Brazil* (Berkeley, Calif., 1964). The influence of English ideas on Brazilian liberalism is well treated in Richard Graham, *Britain and the Onset of Modernization in Brazil, 1850–1914* (Cambridge, Eng., 1968).

3. Cruz Costa, *A History of Ideas in Brazil,* 53–57. An excellent analysis of Eclecticism in Brazil may be found in Antônio Paim, *História das idéias filosóficas no Brasil* (São Paulo, 1967), chapter II.

4. Sílvio Romero sarcastically underlined the lack of originality in nineteenth-century Brazilian thought when he referred to his countrymen as "smugglers of ideas." Sílvio Romero, *A Literatura brasileira e a crítica moderna* (Rio de Janeiro, 1880), 6.

5. Paim, *História das idéias,* 104.

6. The party platforms are found in America Brasiliense, *Os Programas dos partidos e o 2° Império* (São Paulo, 1878). Parties and political thought during the Empire are surveyed in Nelson Nogueira Saldanha, *História das idéias políticas no Brasil* (Recife, 1968), 127–216. For an authoritative analysis of the breakdown in the imperial political system, see Sérgio Buarque de Holanda, ed., *História geral da civilização brasileira,* Tomo II: *O Brasil monárquico,* vol. 5 (São Paulo, 1972). This entire volume was written by the general editor, Sérgio Buarque de Holanda.

7. Gilberto Freyre has described the psychological aspects of this social system. See especially his *The Mansions and the Shanties* (New York, 1963). One author has gone so far as to interpret the anti-monarchical movement of the late Empire as a patricidal impulse by the younger generation: Luís Martins, *O Patriarca e o bacharel* (São Paulo, 1953).

8. The standard biography of the Emperor is Heitor Lyra, *História de Dom Pedro II,* 3 vols. (São Paulo, 1938–40), which is very sympathetic to its subject, as is Mary Wilhelmine Williams, *Dom Pedro the Magnanimous* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1937).

9. These works are given detailed analysis in João Camillo de Oliveira Tôrres, *A Democracia coroada: Teoria política do Império do Brasil,* 2nd ed. (Petrópolis, 1964). In his ambitious study Tôrres offers a sympathetic account of the monarchical system.

10. Brazilian Romanticism has produced a large body of literary criticism and literary history. The outstanding work is Antônio Cândido [Mello e Souza], *Formação da literatura brasileira,* 2nd ed. (São Paulo, 1964), vol. II. See also Afrânio Coutinho, *An Introduction to Literature in Brazil* (New York, 1969), 119–51. These pages are a translation of Coutinho's introduction to the section on Romanticism in the survey which he edited: *A Literatura no Brasil,* 4 vols. (Rio de Janeiro, 1955–58).

11. David Miller Driver, *The Indian in Brazilian Literature* (New York, 1942), 41–42.

12. *Ibid.* 106–7.

13. *Ibid., passim;* Raymond S. Sayers, *O Negro na literatura brasileira* (Rio de Janeiro, 1958), 205–21. For an excellent analysis of the stereotypes of Negroes and slaves in the literary works associated with abolitionism, see David T. Haberly, "Abolitionism in Brazil: Anti-Slavery and Anti-Slave," *Luso-Brazilian Review,* IX (No. 2, Dec. 1972), 30–46.

14. Antônio Cândido, *O Método crítico de Sílvio Romero,* 2nd ed. (São Paulo, 1963), 134–35.

15. In 1907 Euclides da Cunha called the decade of the 1860's "the most decisive for our destiny," Euclides da Cunha, "Castro Alves e seu tempo," in *Obra completa,* 2 vols. (Rio de Janeiro, 1966), vol. I, 428.

16. Slaves serving in the Army were granted their freedom by Decree #3725 of November 6, 1866.

17. Richard Graham, *Britain and the Onset of Modernization in Brazil, 1850–1914,* 28–29. The cabinet of Viscount Rio Branco (1871–75) carried out a number of reforms whose necessity had been dramatized by the Paraguayan war. For an admiring brief biography of the Prime Minister, see Visconde de Taunay [Alfredo de E. Taunay], *O Visconde do Rio Branco* (São Paulo, n.d. [1930?]).

18. Sérgio Buarque do Holanda, ed., *História geral da civilização brasileira,* Tomo II: *O Brasil monárquico,* vol. III (São Paulo, 1967), 85–112; The best documented history of the Republican party during the Empire is George C. A. Boehrer, *Da Monarquia à república: História do Partido Republicano do Brasil, 1870–1889* (Rio de Janeiro, 1954).

19. My analysis of the intellectual history of the late Empire owes much to Maciel de Barros, *A Ilustração brasileira.*

20. The best secondary source on the Recife School is Antônio Paim, *A Filosofia da Escola do Recife* (Rio de Janeiro, 1966). Sílvio Romero, the most famous product of the School, later made sweeping but extravagant claims for the national impact of the Recife group. See, for example, his Preface ("Explicações Indispensáveis") to Tobias Barreto, *Vários escritos* (Rio de Janeiro, 1900). For further detail on

the Recife School including previously unpublished correspondence, see Vamireh Chacon, *Da Escola do Recife ao código civil: Artur Orlando e sua geração* (Rio de Janeiro, 1969).

21. The standard biography is Hermes Lima, *Tobias Barreto,* 2nd ed. (São Paulo, 1957). See also Paulo Mercadante and Antônio Paim, *Tobias Barreto na cultura brasileira: Uma Revaliação* (São Paulo, 1972).

22. Romero's attacks occurred in a series of articles published in 1879 and cited in Sílvio Romero, *História da literatura brasileira,* 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Rio de Janeiro, 1903), vol. II, 465.

23. José Ramos Tinhorão, *A Província e o naturalismo* (Rio de Janeiro, 1966).

24. The earlier standard studies of Brazilian Positivism tended to concentrate on the "orthodox" Positivists: João Camillo de Oliveira Tôrres, *O Positivismo no Brasil,* 2nd ed. (Petrópolis, 1957), and João Cruz Costa, *O Positivismo na república* (São Paulo, 1956). Later studies, such as Ivan Lins, *História do positivismo no Brasil* (São Paulo, 1964), and Tocary Assis Bastos, *O Positivismo e a realidade brasileira* (Belo Horizonte, 1965), have broadened the focus, although the wider influence of non-orthodox Positivism still awaits an in-depth analysis. The best account written during that era is Clóvis Beviláqua, *Esboços e fragmentos* (Rio de Janeiro, 1899), 70–137.

25. The "official" Positivist biography is Raimundo Teixeira Mendes, *Benjamin Constant,* 2nd ed. (Rio de Janeiro, 1913).

26. Fernando de Azevedo, *Brazilian Culture* (New York, 1950), 413–14.

27. A survey of the origins and growth of Brazilian Positivism is given in João Cruz Costa, *A History of Ideas in Brazil,* chapter 5.

28. The "Positivist Apostolate" began publishing its circulars, pamphlets and books in 1881, and has continued up to the present. These publications are a valuable source on orthodox Positivist opinion.

29. Luís Pereira Barreto, *As Três filosofias* (Rio de Janeiro, 1874). For details of this important Positivist's life and thought, see Roque Spencer Maciel de Barros, *A Evolução do pensamento de Pereira Barreto* (São Paulo, 1967). Maciel de Barros is also editing a new edition of Pereira Barreto's philosophical works, of which the first volume includes *As Três filosofias:* Luís Pereira Barreto, *Obras filosóficas,* vol. I (São Paulo, 1967).

30. Beviláqua, *Esboços,* 96.

31. Engineering education began as a part of military education in Brazil, and was not separated from the *Escola Militar* until 1874, when the Escola Politécnica was established as an independent institution. Both schools remained in Rio. Azevedo, *Brazilian Culture,* 175; Umberto Peregrino, *Historia e projeção das instituições culturais do exército* (Rio de Janeiro, 1967), 11–13.

32. I am indebted to Joseph Love and John Wirth for their ideas on this point.

33. *Província de São Paulo,* July 26, 1878, as quoted in Maciel de Barros, *A Evolução do pensamento,* 132. Pereira Barreto was born in 1840 and José Bonifácio (moço) was born in 1827.

34. The most comprehensive studies of the abolitionist movement are Robert Conrad, *The Destruction of Brazilian Slavery, 1850–1888* (Berkeley, Calif., 1972), and Robert Brent Toplin, *The Abolition of Slavery in Brazil* (New York, 1972), both of which draw heavily on contemporary newspaper sources, especially the active abolitionist press. An outstanding analysis of the decline of slavery and the introduction of free labor is Emília Viotti da Costa, *Da Senzala à Colônia* (São Paulo, 1966), which contains a wealth of information on economic structure and abolitionist thought. The close connection between abolition and the issue of land ownership is stressed in Nilo Odalia, "A Abolição da Escravatura" *Anais do Museu Paulista,* XVIII (São Paulo, 1964), 121–45.

35. His abolitionist manifesto is reprinted in *Obras científicas, politicas e sociais de José Bonifácio de Andrada e Silva,* ed. by Edgard de Cerqueira Falcão, 3 vols. (São Paulo, 1965), vol. II, 115–218.

36. For a detailed and well-documented study, see Leslie Bethell, *The Abolition of the Brazilian Slave Trade* (Cambridge, Eng., 1970).

37. The letter is reprinted in Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro, *Contribuições para a biografia de D. Pedro II,* Part I, Tomo Especial (Rio de Janeiro, 1925), 419. An abridged translation was published in Thomas E. Skidmore, "The Death of Brazilian Slavery, 1866–68," in Frederick Pike, ed., *Select Problems in Latin American History* (New York, 1968), 143–44.

38. Edmar Morel, *Vendaval da liberdade* (Rio de Janeiro, 1967), 89.

39. São Paulo was an area where the equivocal Republican stand on abolition caused much tension between party leaders and members of abolitionist convictions. The topic is subtly treated in José Maria dos Santos, *Os Republicanos paulistas e a abolição* (São Paulo, 1942). The manifesto of 1870 is reprinted in Brasiliense, *Os Programas.* There is a very useful analysis of the Republican manifesto and propaganda in Evaristo de Moraes, *Da Monarquia para a república, 1870–1889* (Rio de Janeiro, n.d.).

40. *Anais do Parlamento brasileiro: Cámara dos Deputados,* Primeiro Ano da Décima-sétima Legislatura, Sessão de 1878 (Rio de Janeiro, 1879), 3, 194–96.

41. The standard biography is Luiz Viana Filho, *A Vida de Joaquim Nabuco* (São Paulo, 1952).

42. In the last two years before final abolition there was significant mobilization in São Paulo against the slave system—including mass

escapes, revolts, and abolitionist infiltration of plantations. Robert Brent Toplin, "Upheaval, Violence, and the Abolition of Slavery in Brazil: The Case of São Paulo," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XLIX (No. 4, Nov. 1969), 639–55; Toplin, *The Abolition of Slavery*, 194–224; and Conrad, *The Destruction of Brazilian Slavery*, 239–56.

43. Richard Graham, "Landowners and the Overthrow of the Empire," *Luso-Brazilian Review*, vol. VII (No. 2, Dec. 1970), 44–56; Toplin, *The Abolition of Slavery*, 225–46; and Conrad, *The Destruction of Brazilian Slavery*, 257–73.

44. André Rebouças, *Diário e notas autobiográficas*, ed. by Ana Flora and Inacio José Verissimo (Rio de Janeiro, 1938), 135. Joaquim Nabuco, *Minha formação* (Rio de Janeiro, 1957), chapter II. On José de Patrocínio, see Osvaldo Orico, *O Tigre da abolição* (São Paulo, 1931); and Ciro Vieira da Cunha, *No Tempo de Patrocínio*, 2 vols. (São Paulo, 1960).

45. Sud Mennucci, *O Precursor do abolicionismo no Brasil* (São Paulo, 1938).

46. Carolina Nabuco, *The Life of Joaquim Nabuco* (Stanford, Calif., 1950), 109.

47. Nabuco, *Minha formação*, 196–98.

48. The manifesto is reprinted in Osvaldo Melo Braga, *Bibliografia de Joaquim Nabuco* [Instituto Nacional do Livro: Coleção B 1: Bibliografia, VIII] (Rio de Janeiro, 1952), 14–22.

49. Joaquim Nabuco, *O Abolicionismo* (London, 1883), 114–15, 252–53.

50. Odival Cassiano Gomes, *Manoel Vitorino Pereira: Médico e cirugião* (Rio de Janeiro, 1953), 161.

51. Sociedade Brasileira Contra a Escravidão, *Banquete oferecido ao Exm. Sr. Ministro Americano Henry Washington Hilliard* (Rio de Janeiro, 1880).

52. Osório Duque-Estrada, *A Abolição: Esboço histórico, 1831–1888* (Rio de Janeiro, 1918), 119–20. Patrocínio did get a statement from Hugo and it was used as Abolitionist propaganda, apparently on the assumption that Hugo's great prestige among the elite would help the cause. For the details on the admiration for Hugo, see A. Carneiro Leão, *Victor Hugo no Brasil* (Rio de Janeiro, 1960). Joaquim Nabuco exhibited the same longing for foreign intervention on the abolitionist side when he made a personal appeal to Pope Leo XIII in February 1888, asking that "Your Holiness speak in time for your message to reach Brazil before the opening of Parliament. . . ." Nabuco, *The Life of Joaquim Nabuco*, 160–61.

53. *Anais do Parlamento Brasileiro, Câmara dos Deputados*, Terceiro Ano da Décima-quarta Legislatura, Sessão de 1871 (Rio de Janeiro, 1871), 1, 134–35.

54. [A. Coelho Rodrigues], *Manual do subdito fiel ou cartas de um lavrador a Sua Majestade o Imperador sôbre a questão do elemento servil* (Rio de Janeiro, 1884), 73.

55. Carolina Nabuco, *Life of Joaquim Nabuco*, 76; Sociedade Brasileira Contra a Escravidão, *Banquete*.

56. Joaquim Nabuco, *Obras completas*, vol. XI: *Discursos parlamentares, 1879–1889* (São Paulo, 1949), 66–67.

57. Braga, *Bibliografia de Joaquim Nabuco*, 17.

58. *Anais do Parlamento Brasileiro, Câmara dos Deputados*, Terceiro Ano da Décima-quarta Legislatura, Sessão de 1871 (Rio de Janeiro, 1871), 295–96.

59. Nabuco, *Abolicionismo*, 22–23.

60. *Ibid.*, 252.

61. *Gazeta da Tarde*, May 5, 1887. Reprinted in Afonso Celso Júnior, *Oito anos de parlamento* (São Paulo, n.d.), 131–32.

62. Quoted in J. Fernando Carneiro, "Interpretação da política imigratória brasileira," *Digesto econômico*, no. 46 (Sept. 1948), 123.

63. João Cardoso Menezes e Souza [Barão de Paranapiacaba], *Theses sôbre a colonização do Brasil: Projecto de solução a's questões sociaes que se prendem a este difficil problema: Relatório apresentado ao Ministério da Agricultura, Commercio e Obras Públicas em 1873* (Rio de Janeiro, 1875), 419–20.

64. The group published a manifesto in 1877: *Demonstração das conveniencias e vantagens á lavoura no Brasil pela introducção dos trabalhadores asiáticos (da China)* (Rio de Janeiro, 1877). It was signed by Antônio Martins Lage, Roberto Clinton Wright, Manoel José da Costa Lima Vianna, João Antônio de Miranda e Silva, and Jorge Nathan.

65. The memorandum is reprinted in José Afonso Mendonça Azevedo, *Vida e obra de Salvador de Mendonça* (Rio de Janeiro, 1971), 361–79. The later book-length version of the memorandum appeared as Salvador de Mendonça, *Trabalhadores asiáticos* (New York, 1879).

66. Süssekind de Mendonca, *Salvador de Mendonça*, 118.

67. Nabuco, *Abolicionismo*, 252.

68. Nabuco, *Obras completas*, vol. XI: *Discursos parlamentares, 1879–1889*, 24.

69. *Ibid.*, 63.

70. *Ibid.*, 60.

71. *Ibid.*, 22–23. For a similar debate in the legislature of the province of Rio de Janeiro, see Odalia, "A Abolição," 129–32.

72. Fernando Carneiro, "Interpretação," 124; Toplin, *The Abolition of Slavery*, 157–60; and Conrad, *The Destruction of Brazilian Slavery*, 33–34.

73. The best analysis of social structure during the late Empire is Graham, *Britain and the Onset of Modernization in Brazil*, 1–49. Due

to the high degree of illiteracy, the literate elite was very small in nineteenth-century Brazil. As of 1867 only 10 per cent of school-age children were enrolled in school. Despite the "modernizing" efforts of the late Empire, the figure had increased to only 14 per cent by 1889. Azevedo, *Brazilian Culture*, 383, 406.

74. A succinct survey of the rise of racist thought is given in Michael Banton, *Race Relations* (London, 1967), 28–54; see also Marvin Harris, *The Rise of Anthropological Theory* (New York, 1968), 80–141. The complex story of changes in scientific thinking about race is examined with great subtlety in George W. Stocking, Jr., *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology* (New York, 1968). The influence of racist thought is examined in greater detail below in Chapter 2.

75. Henry Thomas Buckle, *History of Civilization in England* (London, 1857–61).

76. Citations are to the edition of 1872: Henry Thomas Buckle, *History of Civilization in England*, 2 vols. (London, 1872), vol. I, 104–6. Typical of the continuing influence of Buckle on Brazilians was the autobiographical essay of a Pernambucan essayist-politician (born in 1885) who concluded his description of the miserably poor rural workers near his family sugar plantation in the Northeast thus: "Rather than being a Canaan, the fields of Brazil will be the country of Buckle, where the brutal splendor of Nature diminishes and crushes man, who is unarmed for the formidable struggle against the adverse elements." José Maria Bello, *Ensaios políticos e litérarios* (Rio de Janeiro, 1918), 78. Elsewhere in this volume Bello revealed greater optimism about the ability of the Brazilian to control his surroundings.

77. Georges Readers, *Le Comte de Gobineau au Brésil* (Paris, 1934). Gobineau maintained an extensive correspondence during his fifteen-month stay in Brazil. For several revealing letters, as well as a listing of where other published letters of Gobineau's Brazilian sojurn may be found, see Jean Gaulmier, "Au Brésil, Il y a un Siècle . . . Quelques Images d'Arthur Gobineau," *Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg* (May–June 1964), 483–98.

78. Letter to Keller, cited in Ludwig Schemann, *Gobineau: eine biographie*, 2 vols. (Strassburg, 1916), vol. II, 127.

79. Raeders, *Gobineau au Brésil*, 73.

80. J. A. Comte de Gobineau, "L'emigration au Brésil," *Le Correspondant*, vol. 96 [Nouvelle Serie, vol. 60] (July–Sept. 1874), 369; Gaulmier, "Au Brésil, Il y a un Siècle," 497.

81. Gaulmier, *op. cit.*, 493.

82. A letter to Keller cited in Schemann, *Gobineau*, vol. II, 127.

83. Raeders, *Gobineau au Brésil*, 100–103.

84. For a brief analysis of the views of Ingenieros, see Martin S. Stabb, *In Quest of Identity: Patterns in the Spanish American Essay of Ideas, 1890–1960* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1967), 30–31.

85. Louis Couty, *Ebauches Sociologiques: Le Brésil en 1884* (Rio de Janeiro, 1884), iv. Similar sentiments were expressed by the French journalist Max Leclerc, who wrote in the early 1890's: "The Portuguese, ancestor of the Brazilian, was never averse to the colored races, nor repulsed by mating with black women. In Brazil the promiscuity of races . . . has long been total, so that the institution of slavery . . . was that much more pernicious for . . . the purity of the race. . . ." Max Leclerc, *Cartas do Brasil* (São Paulo, 1942), 157–58.

86. Louis J. R. Agassiz and Elizabeth Cary Agassiz, *A Journey in Brazil* (Boston, 1868), 293.

87. The French edition was published in Paris in 1869. The translator was Felix Vogeli, a professor at the Military School in Rio and a member of Agassiz' expedition to the Amazon.

88. Agassiz, *Journey in Brazil*, 517.

89. The best biography of Romero is Sylvio Rabello, *Itinerário de Sílvio Romero* (Rio de Janeiro, 1944). It has since been reprinted but without changes in the text of the original edition. I learned much from the penetrating analysis in Antônio Candido, *O Método crítico de Sílvio Romero*. For the sources of Romero's thought, see Carlos Süssekind de Mendonça, *Sílvio Romero: Sua formação intelectual* (São Paulo, 1938). The same author has written an invaluable reference work which includes a listing of all of Romero's works in order of publication: *Sílvio Romero de corpo inteiro* (Rio de Janeiro, 1963). For a thoughtful analysis of the historiographical assumptions in Romero, see Elaine Eleanor Derso, "The Historical Method of Sílvio Romero," in Andrew W. Cordier, ed., *Columbia Essays in International Affairs*, vol. IV: *The Dean's Papers*, 1968 (New York, 1969), 49–81. The chapter on Romero in Nelson Werneck Sodré, *A Ideologia do colonialismo: Seus reflexos no pensamento brasileiro* (Rio de Janeiro, 1961), is essentially sympathetic, as its title indicates: "Sílvio Romero: Um Guerrilheiro Desarmado."

90. Sílvio Romero, *História da literatura brasileira*, 2 vols., (Rio de Janeiro, 1888). The second edition was published in 1902, and included revisions and changes. All subsequent citations in this section are to the first edition.

91. Romero, *História da literatura brasileira*, vol. I, 26.

92. At the end of his career Romero published a defiant volume ridiculing his critics, asking the public to "forgive the impetuosity of language, the justified cry of a man constantly harassed by the petty attacks of perverse or impertinent would-be critics." Sílvio Romero, *Minhas contradições* (Bahia, 1914), 7.

93. Romero, "A Poesia Popular no Brasil," *Revista Brasileira* (2ª fase), vol. I (1879), 343.

94. Romero, "A Poesia Popular no Brasil," *Revista Brasileira* (2ª fase), vols. I–VII (1879–80). *História da literatura brasileira*, vol. I, chapter III.

95. Romero, *História da literatura*, 26.
96. *Ibid.*, 38.
97. *Ibid.*, 44–48.
98. *Ibid.*, 48.
99. Romero, *A Literatura brasileira e a crítica moderna* (Rio de Janeiro, 1880), 171.
100. Romero, *História da literatura*, chapter IV.
101. *Ibid.*, 64.
102. *Ibid.*, 130.
103. Romero, *A Literatura brasileira e a crítica moderna*, 98.
104. Romero, "A Questão do Dia: A Emancipação dos Escravos," *Revista Brasileira* (2ª fase), vol. 7 (1881), 191–203.
105. Romero, *História da literatura*, 65, 92.
106. *Ibid.*, 100.
107. *Ibid.*, 67.
108. *Ibid.*, 108.
109. Romero, "A Poesia Popular no Brasil," *Revista Brasileira* (2ª fase), vol. 7 (1881), 30.
110. Romero, *Literatura brasileira e a crítica moderna*, 72.
111. *Ibid.*, 155.
112. *Ibid.*, 53.
113. Romero, *História da literatura*, 67.
114. *Ibid.*
115. Romero, *Literatura brasileira e a crítica moderna*, 168.
116. Romero, "A Poesia Popular no Brasil," *Revista Brasileira* (2ª fase), vol. 7 (1881), 31.
117. Romero, *História da literatura*, 66.

CHAPTER 2

1. Some of the analysis presented here was included in my "Toward a Comparative Analysis of Race Relations Since Abolition in Brazil and the United States," *Journal of Latin American Studies*, IV (No. 1, May 1972), 1–28. The path-breaking research on Brazilian race relations by Florestan Fernandes includes much historical material. See especially his collaborative study with Roger Bastide, *Relações raciais entre negros e brancos em São Paulo* (São Paulo, 1955). Two of Fernandes' students have done important historical monographs: Fernando Henrique Cardoso, *Capitalismo e escravidão no Brasil meridional* (São Paulo, 1962), and Octávio Ianni, *As Metamorfoses do escravo* (São Paulo, 1962). The joint study by Cardoso and Ianni also includes a historical section: *Côr e mobilidade social em Florianopolis* (São Paulo, 1960). There are many interesting ideas and bibliographical leads in José Honório Rodrigues, *Brazil and Africa* (Berkeley, Calif., 1965), chapter 4.

2. Roger Bastide, "The Development of Race Relations in Brazil," in Guy Hunter, ed., *Industrialisation and Race Relations* (London, 1965), 9-29.
3. This discussion treats race relations as far as they concern the African and European and the mixtures of the two. The Indian is not considered here. A consideration of some contemporary attitudes toward the Indian—as reflected in government policy—may be found in Darcy Ribeiro, *A Política indigenista brasileira* (Rio de Janeiro, 1962).
4. One of the best general discussions of comparative race relations is Pierre L. van den Berghe, *Race and Racism: A Comparative Perspective* (New York, 1967). I have drawn also upon H. Hoetink, *The Two Variants in Caribbean Race Relations* (New York, 1967), and Michael Banton, *Race Relations* (London, 1967). All three place Brazil in comparative context. The most comprehensive comparison of race relations in Brazil and the U.S. is Carl Degler, *Neither Black Nor White* (New York, 1971), chapters III and IV.
5. Marvin Harris, *Patterns of Race in the Americas* (New York, 1964). The contrast is described as "race prejudice of mark" versus "race prejudice of origin" in Oracy Nogueira, "Skin Color and Social Class" in *Plantation Systems of the New World* [Pan American Union: Social Science Monographs: VII] (Washington, D.C., 1959), 164–79.
6. See, for example, the description in Florestan Fernandes, *The Negro in Brazilian Society* (New York, 1969), 360–79. Degler finds the essential difference between the two societies to be the "mulatto escape hatch," a graphic characterization of bi-racial versus multi-racial. *Neither Black Nor White*, 223–25.
7. The practical difficulties of describing this system in its modern form are discussed in Marvin Harris and Conrad Kotak, "The Structural Significance of Brazilian Racial Categories," *Sociologia*, XXV (No. 3, Sept. 1963), 203–8. There is an excellent analysis of the present-day multi-racial society (and a critique of some of the erroneous interpretations of it) in John Saunders, "Class, Color, and Prejudice: A Brazilian Counterpoint," in Ernest Q. Campbell, ed., *Racial Tensions and National Identity* (Nashville, Tenn., 1972), 141–65.
8. His neuroses in the nineteenth century have been poetically pictured in Gilberto Freyre, *The Mansions and the Shanties* (New York, 1963). The longing for whiteness could drive sensitive blacks toward contempt for their own color. Such was the case with João da Cruz e Sousa (1861–98), the posthumously famous Symbolist poet, whose desire to be an Aryan came through dramatically in his verse. Roger Bastide, *A Poesia afro-brasileira* (São Paulo, 1943), 87–95. For an analysis of the manner in which most mulatto and black writers embraced an ideal of "whitening" during the nineteenth century, see Richard A. Preto-Rodas, *Negritude as a Theme in the Poetry of the Portuguese-Speaking World* [University of Florida Humanities Monograph, No. 31] (Gainesville, Fla., 1970), 14–22. The persistence of