

Guerreiro Ramos: peripheral epistemology, Brazilian political thought, and the Brazilian revolution (1953-1964)

DOI: 10.12957/irei.2023.79873

Pedro Paiva Marreca¹

Abstract

This article proposes an interpretation of the intellectual production of sociologist Alberto Guerreiro Ramos, from the perspective of the History of thought and Political Theory in Brazil. By analyzing the development of the concept of nationalism in the author's work, we intend to present some of his important contributions to the political thinking in Brazil and its disciplinary intersections with Sociology, Economics and History. To this end, we sought to organize its main articles in chronological order, enabling a diachronic and panoramic view of the concept. Initially, nationalism is mobilized predominantly under an epistemological key, concerned with the historical and political constraints imposed on intellectual production in a peripheral context. Subsequently, his approach turns to the field of Political Sociology, defending the relevance of the study of the periphery and the past theoretical production of Brazilian thinkers. After leaving ISEB, Guerreiro adopted a politically militant stance, which sought theoretical support in history to facilitate a political concertation that he called "Brazilian nationalist revolution".

Keywords

Alberto Guerreiro Ramos; Political thought; nationalism.

Guerreiro Ramos: epistemologia periférica, pensamento político brasileiro e revolução brasileira (1953-1964)

Resumo

O presente artigo propõe uma interpretação sobre a produção intelectual do sociólogo Alberto Guerreiro Ramos, a partir da perspectiva da História do pensamento e da Teoria Política no Brasil. Analisando o desenvolvimento da concepção de nacionalismo em um dos períodos de maior produção e engajamento político de Guerreiro, pretendemos apresentar algumas de suas importantes contribuições para "o pensar" a política no Brasil em suas intercessões disciplinares com a Sociologia, a Economia e a História. Para tal, buscamos organizar seus principais artigos em ordem cronológica, possibilitando uma visão diacrônica e panorâmica do conceito. Inicialmente, o nacionalismo é mobilizado predominantemente sob uma chave epistemológica, preocupada com os condicionantes históricos e políticos impostos à produção intelectual em

¹ Gerente de Pesquisa do Centro de Ensino e Pesquisa do Arquivo Geral da Cidade do Rio de Janeiro; pedro.marreca@csvgp.g12.br; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2583-5675>.

um contexto periférico. Posteriormente, sua abordagem se volta para o campo da Sociologia Política, passando pela defesa da pertinência do estudo da periferia e da produção teórica pretérita de pensadores brasileiros. Após a saída do ISEB, Guerreiro adota uma postura politicamente militante, que buscava subsídios teóricos na história para viabilizar uma concertação política que ele denominava “revolução nacionalista brasileira”.

Palavras-chave

Alberto Guerreiro Ramos; Pensamento Político; Nacionalismo.

Alberto Guerreiro Ramos (1915-1982), born in the state of Bahia, Brazil, played a pivotal role in the advancement of Social Sciences in Brazil. Throughout his career, he emerged as a leading theoretician and public intellectual, profoundly influencing the landscape of sociology, political science, and public administration in the country. Initially employed as a technician at Departamento Nacional da Criança[★] (DNC) and Departamento de Administração do Serviço Público[♦] (DASP), Guerreiro's journey began within the civil service. During the 1950s, he was affiliated with three influential think tanks that exerted significant influence in Brazilian intellectual circles: the Itatiaia Group, succeeded by Instituto Brasileiro de Economia, Sociologia e Política[▲] (IBESP), and later Instituto Superior de Estudos Brasileiros[•] (ISEB). However, by the early 1960s, Guerreiro departed from ISEB and entered the political arena as a federal representative, only to have his political rights lifted following the consolidation of the 1964 coup. Forced into exile in the United States, he assumed collaborative roles at various American universities, where he produced a body of work critical to the evolution of public administration theory in Brazil. Despite his substantial contributions across multiple disciplines within the social sciences, Guerreiro Ramos's work remains somewhat underappreciated compared to that of his more celebrated contemporaries in Brazilian intellectual history².

In the midst of 1981, just before his passing, Guerreiro granted an interview to Lúcia Lippi and Alzira Alves. Within this interview, amidst numerous captivating and evocative moments, one passage stands out, encapsulating the

★ T.N.: National Children's Department

♦ T.N.: Public Service Administration Department

▲ T.N.: Brazilian Institute of Economics, Sociology, and Politics

• T.N. Higher Institute of Brazilian Studies

² Despite this assertion, we cite as an example some of the reference works dedicated to analyzing the author's work: ABRANCHES, Aparecida Maria. *Nacionalismo e democracia no pensamento de Guerreiro Ramos* (in free translation, Nationalism and democracy in Guerreiro Ramos's thinking). Doctoral thesis. Rio de Janeiro: IUPERJ, 2006; AZEVEDO, Ariston. *A sociologia antropológica de Guerreiro Ramos* (in free translation, Guerreiro Ramos's anthropocentric sociology). Doctoral thesis. Florianópolis: UFSC, 2006; BARIANI, Edison. *Guerreiro Ramos e a redenção sociológica: capitalismo e sociologia no Brasil* (in free translation, Guerreiro Ramos and sociological redemption: capitalism and sociology in Brazil). São Paulo: EDUSP, 2011; OLIVEIRA, Lúcia Lippi. *A sociologia do Guerreiro* (in free translation, Guerreiro's sociology). Rio de Janeiro: UFRJ Publishing House, 1995.

challenges he faced throughout his career, his personal perception of his contributions, and a sense of frustration regarding the lack of recognition bestowed upon his work:

I don't think Brazil has given me what I deserve. When I had my political rights lifted, my file in the Security Council's inquiry began with: 'Alberto Guerreiro Ramos: a wannabe-sociologist mulatto.' I give you my word: 'wannabe-sociologist.' That's my Army record. I looked at the colonel and said: 'Where's Dr. Afonso Arinos' file?' He gave me Afonso Arinos' file, and I said: 'But colonel, you haven't mentioned Afonso Arinos' race! Why does my army file highlight my color? And then there is this issue: wannabe-sociologist. I am not a wannabe-sociologist. I'm one of the world's greatest sociologists'. You may read it in my file. (LIPPI, 1995, p. 162)

Although the author openly lacks modesty, as previously mentioned, his impact on the social sciences remains undeniable. We do not aim to delve into the reasons for the divergence in treatment, recognition, and reach, as such an analysis, based on our research findings, would veer into speculation. The author himself offered explanations, citing factors such as racism, social capital, political dynamics, and geographic biases utilized to legitimize knowledge production. Additionally, he acknowledged his own political stance and confrontational nature as potential contributing factors.

This article aims to examine the development of the concept of nationalism within the works of Guerreiro Ramos. To achieve this, we will outline a trajectory observed in his writings, structured as follows: 1. an examination of his initial formulations regarding sociological work within the periphery of capitalism; 2. an exploration into his efforts to validate the study of politics within the periphery of global capitalism; 3. an investigation into the political ideologies of nationalist authors from the 1930s; and 4. an analysis of democratic theory and popular nationalism. Our hypothesis posits that nationalism emerges in Guerreiro's work primarily through an epistemological lens, initially concerned with the production of knowledge in the social sciences within a peripheral context. Subsequently, his focus shifts towards political sociology, advocating for the significance of exploring the theoretical contributions of Brazilian intellectuals³. Following his departure from ISEB, Guerreiro adopts a politically engaged stance, drawing on historical theory to advocate for a political concertation that he terms the "Brazilian nationalist revolution."

Our proposal offers a methodical exploration of a specific segment of the author's body of work. Put simply, we have curated a selection of texts pertinent to our theme and arranged them chronologically⁴ for analysis. Many of the books

³ Something close to what we today identify as a sub-area of Political Science and call Brazilian Political Thought.

⁴ Other analyses with the same systematic orientation were previously undertaken in: LYNCH, 2015 and LYNCH; MARRECA (2021). This article is intended to follow on from these efforts and suggests an

published during the author's lifetime comprise compilations of articles written at various points, later consolidated into book form. Through this systematic analysis approach, we aim to trace the thematic evolution of the work, identify hypotheses, explore theoretical considerations, and evaluate the solutions proposed by the author in a coherent manner.

Our journey commences with an examination of several key texts—namely, *Cartilha brasileira do aprendiz de sociólogo* (1953), "Notas para um estudo crítico da sociologia no Brasil" (1954), and *A redução sociológica*^{*} (1958)—wherein the author advocates for a revitalization of the social sciences in Brazil. Grounded in an appreciation of Brazil's peripheral and post-colonial identity, these works underscore the historically contingent and politically charged nature of its social sciences. Continuing, we trace Guerreiro's exploration of global sociological models to comprehend national societies, a pursuit manifested in texts such as "A problemática da realidade brasileira" (1955) and "A dinâmica da sociedade política no Brasil"[♦] (1955). Here, the author endeavors to bestow sociological legitimacy upon the study of politics in peripheral nations. In the subsequent section, we delve into texts like "Esforços de teorização da realidade nacional politicamente orientados de 1870 aos nossos dias" (1955), "A ideologia da *jeunesse dorée*" (1955), "O inconsciente sociológico: estudo sobre a crise política no Brasil, na década de 1930" (1956), and "Caracteres de 'intelligentzia'^{♦♦}" (1957). In these works, Guerreiro immerses himself in the realm of Brazilian Political Thought, grappling with its constraints and exploring its potential to formulate a *theory of Brazilian society*. Lastly, we conclude our analysis by scrutinizing Guerreiro's phase of militant and revolutionary nationalism, as reflected in texts published between his departure from the ISEB and the 1964 coup, including "Princípios do Povo Brasileiro" (1959), "Cinco princípios do povo brasileiro" (1959), and *Mito e verdade da revolução brasileira*^{*} (1963)⁵.

The revitalization of sociology in Brazil and the epistemological transcendence of the peripheral "colonial" condition

In one of his initial treatises addressing the epistemological challenges facing the social sciences in Brazil, Guerreiro emphasized that the "acknowledgment of the situation of sociology in Brazil was a recent fact in the evolution of our sociological thought"

expansion and deepening of the analysis of an aspect that we believe to be central: the construction and various facets of the concept of nationalism in the author's work.

^{*} T.N.: In free translation, Brazilian sociologist's apprentice primer, Notes for a critical study of sociology in Brazil, The sociological reduction.

[♦] T.N.: In free translation, The problems of Brazilian reality, The dynamics of political society in Brazil

^{♦♦} T.N.: In free translation, Politically oriented efforts to theorize national reality from 1870 to the present day, The ideology of the *jeunesse dorée*, Characteristics of *intelligentzia*.

^{*} T.N.: In free translation, Principles of the Brazilian People, Five principles of the Brazilian people, Myth and truth of the Brazilian revolution

⁵ In his 1961 book, *A crise do poder no Brasil* [in free translation, The crisis of power in Brazil], there is a series of conjuncture analyses and theoretical essays on the country's situation in the early 1960s. Organized under the heading of "Panorama do Brasil contemporâneo" [in free translation, Panorama of contemporary Brazil], the material and the theme are absolutely pertinent to our analysis, but for reasons of space, it was not possible to include these texts. For a critique of some of its aspects, see: MARRECA, 2020.

(RAMOS, 1995, p. 36), since until recently it lacked "real pressures" that would favor the development of the discipline. The colonial logic was responsible for the lack of awareness that, to a large extent, prevented Brazilian sociology from "becoming the support for an objective interpretation of Brazilian society" (Ibid.). Guerreiro depicted this colonial situation as "a complex, a totality that imposed a certain type of evolution and collective psychology on the colonized populations" (RAMOS, 1995, p. 37), thereby disconnecting them from their immediate historical and social context.

Essentially, the logic of economic exploitation perpetuated various forms of dependency, extending to epistemological and cultural domains. In his *Cartilha brasileira do aprendiz de sociólogo* (1953), Guerreiro urged Brazilian sociologists to combat epistemological colonialism by "embracing a scientific approach grounded in their national context" – a sociology "in shirt sleeves," as he termed it – rather than importing "prepackaged ideologies" (RAMOS, 1995, p. 36). He criticized the doctrinal orientation, based on exogenous influences, prevalent in Brazilian and Latin American sociology study centers, arguing that it stifled the development of authentic scientific inquiry compatible with each country's unique historical trajectory⁶.

In his work *Notas para um estudo crítico da sociologia brasileira* (1954), Guerreiro delves deeper into the epistemological challenges that have shaped the development of the social sciences in Brazil within a post-colonial context. Taking, with admitted arbitrariness, the foundation of Benjamin Constant's "Sociedade Positiva[Ⓢ]," dated 1878, as the formal starting point for academic sociology studies in Brazil, Guerreiro identifies a series of issues plaguing sociological production over the span of more than 70 years of history. He highlights several habits ingrained within the practices of the "indigenous sociologist," aimed at demonstrating alignment with theoretical and methodological standards prevalent in central countries. These include tendencies towards linguistic *overcorrection*, favoring imported criteria which discarded community and living forms of expressions, and a predisposition towards *symmetry*, assuming theoretical orientations mirror those of central nations. Guerreiro also critiques *syncretism*, which he views as a form of "mental servility," wherein incompatible foreign doctrines are clumsily juxtaposed with national interpretations. *Dogmatism* emerges as a prevalent trait, characterized by

⁶ Guerreiro used the topic of racial studies in Brazil as an exemplary theme to illustrate his criticism of provincial patterns in Brazilian sociology; on these criticisms, see: RAMOS, 1995, pp. 163-202; _____, 1995, pp. 215-249. For an analysis of the author's thinking on blackness and its epistemological and political implications, see: CAMPOS, 2015. In terms of criticism of "bovarism" (RAMOS, 1996, p. 27) and academicism, Guerreiro's main interlocutor and opponent in this polemic was the sociologist Florestan Fernandes. The starting point for this dispute over the scientific standards of Brazilian sociology was the Second Latin American Congress of Sociology (1953). And this clash runs through much of Guerreiro's writings, since Florestan embodies, in the author's view, at different times, two sociological strands of which he will be deeply critical: positivism and Marxism. For a summary of Guerreiro's epistemological criticisms of Fernandes, at a relatively early and consolidated stage, see RAMOS, 1996. On the polemic between the two at the 2nd Latin American Congress of Sociology, see: BARIANI, 2006.

[Ⓢ] T.N.: In free translation, Positive Society

the “uncritical adoption of authoritative arguments” and the evaluation of facts through the lens of prestigious authors. Furthermore, Guerreiro identifies *deductivism* as a consequence of dogmatism, wherein foreign systems are uncritically regarded as absolute truths and transformed into a starting point for socially explaining Brazil, identifying its present with the present of countries at different stages of development.

The pursuit of explaining Brazil through the lens of general laws of evolution by positivists, along with the mechanical application of purportedly universal categories by certain Marxists, demonstrates a detachment from historical contingency. This *deductive approach* epitomizes an epistemological manifestation of the colonial situation. Lastly, Guerreiro critiques the *alienation* of Brazilian studies and scholars, attributing it to sociology's failure to “foster the self-determination of Brazilian society” (RAMOS, 1995, p. 41). He argues that Brazilian sociologists often viewed their own country from an outsider's perspective, leading to a “quietist-contemplative” stance akin to belletrism and diversionism. He exemplifies this critique with Paulo Prado's *Retratos do Brasil*^Ø (1928). By characterizing Brazilians with sadness, lust, greed, romanticism, and servility, it expressed, “in a paroxysmal way, a certain sadomasochism of our literate strata for whom the character of the Brazilian people is marked with pejorative notes” (RAMOS, 1995, p. 41).

In essence, the lack of authenticity pervasive in much of Brazilian social science literature stemmed from the aforementioned characteristics and the absence of “genuine cognitive experiences” to support sociological endeavors. Guerreiro identified the colonial situation as a decisive influence on sociology and knowledge production in peripheral regions. While he recognized these manifestations as inevitable, he remained optimistic about their surmountability. Guerreiro viewed sociology as a historical byproduct of European development, contingent upon specific contextual factors. Therefore, replicating the original conditions conducive to authentic sociology within Brazil proved impossible. Nonetheless, he discerned a potential for epistemological and ideological self-determination amid the ongoing “material transformations” within the country. His perspective did not entail valorizing contemporary thinkers over their Brazilian predecessors; rather, it emphasized the necessity of recognizing the adverse conditions hindering authentic thought. This awareness, Guerreiro argued, could only arise with the emergence of a particular economic-social configuration, which gradually coalesced and matured. Within this evolving context, he proposed the possibility of overcoming the epistemological inauthenticity of Brazilian thought through the “formulation of a national sociology” (RAMOS, 1995, p. 44).

Ø T.N.: In free translation, Portraits of Brazil

In delineating his concept of "national sociology," Guerreiro emphasized that while sociology, like any science, possesses universal principles, it attains scientific validity only when its historical context is acknowledged. This recognition enables a critique of the inherent ethnocentrism ingrained in the discipline's early development, facilitating its ascent to scientific rigor. Guerreiro reiterated that the "universality of science, as a method of thought, does not preclude sociology from adopting national distinctions." (RAMOS, 1995, p. 45). Indeed, the sociologists themselves are inevitably tethered to national reference points, "to the extent that their thinking is authentic, it will have to reflect the peculiarities of the circumstances in which they live" (RAMOS, 1995, p. 45). Guerreiro advocated for Brazilian sociology to engage in critical reflection on the historical and political constraints shaping knowledge production within the country. By aligning itself with the "most genuine scientific social theories" – such as those espoused by Hegel, Marx, and Dilthey – Brazilian sociology can fulfill its "essential role: to evolve into a militant theory of national reality." (RAMOS, 1995, p. 46). It is worth noting that Guerreiro initially frames nationalism in his work from an epistemological standpoint, underscoring the imperative of recognizing the historical and political dimensions of the discipline: "Sociology in Brazil will be authentic to the extent that it contributes to national self-consciousness, to the extent that it gains in functionality, intentionality and, consequently, organicity" (Ibid.).

Guerreiro vehemently criticized the disciplinary fragmentation within the social sciences, arguing for a holistic approach that transcended narrow boundaries. He rejected the notion of an ethnocentric science tethered to outdated paradigms and advocated instead for the development of a "new scientific theory of social reality" (RAMOS, 1996, p. 184). This emerging theory, he believed, should draw from diverse sources such as dialectics, the sociology of knowledge, historicism, and culturalism, fostering a convergence of ideas and insights.

In *A Redução Sociológica* (1996) [1958], Guerreiro elucidated his mature peripheral and post-colonial epistemological standpoint⁷, the basic assumption of which was that the "sciences are not immune to historical conditioning" (RAMOS, 1996, p. 160). He posited that all forms of knowledge, particularly within the social sciences, are inevitably influenced by the prevailing worldview of the era in which they emerge. Guerreiro underscored the role of intellectuals who, adopting a critical stance grounded in historicism and nationalism, spearheaded the liberation of marginalized communities from the epistemological bondage of colonialism and capitalist hegemony.

⁷ Reflection on the post-colonial nature of Guerreiro Ramos' sociology has already been the subject of recent studies, uc: LYNCH, 2015; BRINGEL; DOMINGUES, 2015; MAIA, 2015; MARRECA, 2020. Reflections on epistemology in Guerreiro's work can be found in: LIPPI, 1995; AZEVEDO, 2006.

Brazil stood at the brink of a transformative juncture poised to transcend its colonial legacy and the ensuing epistemological estrangement. Guided by peripheral epistemology, Guerreiro advocated for an analysis rooted in tangible historical realities, underscoring the imperative for intellectual products to actively engage with and intervene in these realities. However, he emphasized that this nationalist stance, while functionally oriented, did not imply provincialism or the exclusion of theoretical rigor. Rather, it rejected the superficiality and decorative nature inherent in knowledge derived from the uncritical replication of foreign techniques. (RAMOS, 1996, p. 126). Unlike intellectual operations in a colonial situation, the social scientist was given the opportunity to "contribute to scientific development, not just as a supplier of material, but as a creator of concepts". In this sense, the scientist abandons the colonized mentality, ceasing to be merely a "passive consumer of imported ideas" and becoming a "producer of new ideas destined for export" (Ibid.). Guerreiro harbored profound optimism, foreseeing Brazilian sociology surpassing its American counterpart. He believed this would be possible due to Brazil's avoidance of the pitfalls plaguing central nations, such as conflating the dynamics of a specific society with general social dynamics, excessive specialization, and oversimplified interpretations of social phenomena. Moreover, Guerreiro highlighted the existence of intellectuals in Brazil who, even prior to formal recognition of the sociological reduction technique, had already adopted a critical and methodologically adept stance.

Upon joining ISEB, Guerreiro's focus shifted towards investigating the historical intricacies of Brazilian politics. Employing a framework of critical reflection on the historical and political determinants shaping knowledge construction, he endeavored to integrate his theoretical models rooted in history and national intellectual production.

The historical-sociological legitimacy of the study of politics in the periphery

In *A problemática da realidade brasileira* (RAMOS, 1960), initially delivered in 1955 as the inaugural lecture of an extraordinary course offered by ISEB at the Ministry of Education and Culture (MEC) auditorium, Guerreiro embarks on a critique of prevailing sociological frameworks concerning the understanding of national societies. Engaging in dialogue with prominent thinkers such as George Gurvitch, Hans Freyer, Hermann Heller, György Lukács, and Ernst Bloch, he lays the groundwork for what he terms a "dynamic sociology," serving as a bulwark for his historical-sociological interpretation of Brazilian reality. Guerreiro's critique initially targets positivist sociology, which he characterizes as static, objectifying, disinterested, and outdated, thus rendering it inadequate for comprehending the nuances of national reality. This critique traces its

origins to figures like Comte and Durkheim, whose approaches fostered a rigid adherence to facts governed by absolute determinism or immutable natural laws—a dogmatic style of sociology influenced by French traditions. In contrast, Guerreiro critiques the American approach, which he perceives as limited to mere data collection, community studies, or local surveys. Dogmatism and empiricism were therefore the shortcomings of sociology practiced in Brazil by the sociologist of colonized mentality.

On the flip side, Guerreiro advocated for the development of a "global theory of local society," a framework capable of capturing the dynamic essence of the reality under examination in order to comprehend its constituent parts. This dynamic approach to interpreting national society was influenced by the insights of intellectuals such as George Gurvitch, Hans Freyer, and Hermann Heller, who recognized human freedom and the unique characteristics of each nation as crucial elements shaping sociological thought. Similarly, Guerreiro drew on the perspectives of György Lukács and Henry Lefebvre, who argued that facts were not isolated occurrences but rather moments within a larger social totality that evolved over time. Consequently, Guerreiro asserted that sociological studies lacking a foundational understanding of this social totality were inherently futile. He contended that the dynamic and organic nature of societies could only be apprehended through a different conception of sociology, one viewed as *praxis*, as elucidated by Ernest Bloch. Guerreiro posited that sociology emerged from the reformist ambitions of individuals seeking to address contemporary societal issues. Thus, he argued that social scientists must engage in active political involvement, as speculative endeavors devoid of practical application are inherently barren. As he succinctly stated, "sociology without praxis is nonsense. Only sociology professors and literati admit it" (RAMOS, 1960, p. 85).

According to Guerreiro, Brazil experienced a shift in its material conditions after 1930, moving towards a centripetal trend driven by the expansion of production for the domestic market rather than by external exports, which represented an exogenous and centrifugal force. By the mid-1950s, this shift resulted in a clash between an outdated societal model rooted in the past and centrifugal forces, and a nascent model that envisioned a yet-to-be-defined lifestyle. Guerreiro recognized that these objective material conditions underscored the need for a political resolution to the impasse facing Brazilian society. Drawing on the insights of Gurvitch, Freyer, and Heller, he developed his conception of national social reality, while the perspectives of Lukács, Bloch, and Lefebvre supported his totalizing and dialectical view of social and political development. Guerreiro's invocation of these authors aimed to underscore the inseparable link between the historical character and political motivation inherent in the social sciences. Additionally, it sought to challenge the notion that

only abstract and disinterested theoretical reflections occurred in developed centers, thereby legitimizing the study of political dynamics in the periphery.

In December 1955, Guerreiro participated in a series of conferences on Brazilian affairs hosted by the Institute for Higher Studies in Latin America at the University of Paris. This engagement led to the creation of the text "A dinâmica da sociedade política no Brasil" (1995) [1955]. Building on the trajectory outlined in his previous work, Guerreiro engaged with foreign authors to establish the sociological legitimacy of studying Brazilian Political Thought. He then proceeded to formulate an interpretation of social change in Brazil, linking the emergence of social groups and political ideologies to the structural transformations occurring within Brazilian society. It was imperative to develop comprehensive interpretations applicable in practical terms within the context of a peripheral society like Brazil, which was still socially and economically underdeveloped. As he articulated in *A redução sociológica* (1996) [1958], the objective was not to reject foreign ideas or pursue originality for its own sake. Rather, this task implied "less a creation on a theoretical level than a critical instrumentalization of imported science" (RAMOS, 1995, p. 59). From that moment, "we begin to stop reflecting symmetrically the changes in foreign scientific thought and to use it as a tool, in a theoretical elaboration aimed at enabling the self-consciousness of our society" (RAMOS, 1995, p. 60).

His initial step involves crafting "an abstract model of the dynamics of political society, influenced by real historical events." Drawing on insights from Gurvitch and Mannheim, Guerreiro asserts that the sociological examination of political thought must transcend mere description or acceptance of its inherent content. Instead, it should delve into the existential contexts from which these thoughts emerge, identifying the class or group they represent and the specific historical moment of their emergence. In essence, the analysis of political currents should center on the socioeconomic position of those who espouse them within the contemporary economic and social structure (RAMOS, 1995, p. 62).

According to this model, the political dynamics within capitalist societies are shaped by the clash between the mentalities of three distinct groups: 1. Advocates of a progressive outlook, focused on ushering in change and aligned with the ascending classes; 2. Champions of maintaining the status quo, adhering to ideals of order and typically associated with the ruling classes; 3. Proponents of a reactionary stance, propelled by their declining status and advocating for a return to past norms. Implicit in this schema is a fundamental dynamic: as contradictions stemming from material transformations intensify, the subordinate classes transition into "classes for themselves," shedding their *alienation* and asserting autonomy within the political sphere. Guerreiro thus refutes the primacy of factors such as individual or collective psychology in explaining power dynamics, emphasizing instead the pivotal role of economic

and material conditions in shaping political development. In essence, Guerreiro's overarching model portrays politics as inherently dynamic, with power structures continually evolving in response to economic and social imperatives.

Building upon this model of social change, Guerreiro embarks on a form of case study, examining the evolution of political society in Brazil through the lens of the aforementioned premises and categories. According to his interpretation, the "landowning class" held ascendancy until 1822 and maintained dominance over the Brazilian political landscape until 1930. At this juncture, its influence began to wane, giving way to the nascent "industrial bourgeoisie," which remained intricately linked to the interests of large landholders, alongside the mercantile bourgeoisie (RAMOS, 1995, p. 72). Subsequently, following the events of 1945, the "industrial bourgeoisie" would assume dominance through an ambiguous alliance – albeit one fraught with conflicts – with the declining landowning class.

This alliance found formal expression in the Social Democratic Party (PSD). Concurrently, the "proletarian class," which traces its origins to the emergence of manufacturing and the abolition of slavery, had previously been politically inconsequential prior to the 1870s-1880s. However, from 1930 onwards, it gained significance and political organization through the Brazilian Labour Party (PT.B).

Following the 1930s, despite the emergence of pivotal material conditions such as the development of an internal market and the onset of industrialization, the industrial bourgeoisie had yet to displace the mercantile bourgeoisie and establish itself as the dominant class. Guerreiro contends that, during this period, the tension between these factions was not decisive; rather, there existed more ambiguity than polarity in their relationship. Critiquing the "psychologistic conception of the social-historical process," which, from an elitist standpoint, advocated for societal transformation through mental, intellectual, and moral enlightenment, Guerreiro adopts a materialist perspective in interpreting social and political change. He posits that the stability between the dominant classes stemmed from a transitional process of economic structures, with industrialization serving as a determining factor – although insufficient – to alter the political dynamics of the social classes. According to Guerreiro, the elections post-1945 increasingly reflected the growing maturity of the proletarian class and its demand for political participation, particularly in urban areas. Nevertheless, he laments the absence of any "significant political movement" that transcended the "perspective of the middle class" up to that point (RAMOS, 1995, p. 72).

The author posits that due to the weakness of the domestic market, industry, and the proletariat, the middle class assumed the role of political vanguard for a significant period in Brazilian history. Up until 1930, it functioned as a sort of vanguard in revolutionary movements during the colonial period, aligned with progressive movements throughout the Empire, and actively

contributed to the establishment of the Republic. However, with the expansion of the proletariat post-1930, without displacing the hegemony of the mercantile bourgeoisie, the middle class began to adopt reactionary stances. Despite these shifts, Guerreiro contends that the middle class remained a crucial repository of ideas, forming the basis for his subsequent investigations.

The Brazilian political thought and the search for an organic ideology

During the First Brazilian Congress of Sociology in June 1955, held at the School of Philosophy of São Paulo, Guerreiro delivered a lecture that later became the basis for his work "Esforços de teorização da realidade nacional politicamente orientados de 1870 aos nossos dias" (1995) [1955]. In this lecture, Guerreiro delved into an analysis of the intellectual output of authors who advocated for middle-class ideals. He adopted a comprehensive analytical approach, which involved contextualizing the criticism of utopian idealism within the realm of political thought. The somewhat reflexive reliance on external theories, despite acknowledging their ideological nature, was seen as a constraint stemming from various factors such as historical, class-based, peripheral, and so forth. Guerreiro argued that despite the utilization of imported theories and concepts, certain intellectuals, while representing the interests of the ascending classes, inadvertently provided insights for the development of a *theory of Brazilian society*.

The republican manifesto of 1870 marks the onset of heightened contradictions within the political dynamics of its era. Reflecting the aspirations of liberal professionals who were gradually ascending to positions of influence in imperial society, this document embodied the "utmost level of awareness attainable" by the middle class at that time. According to the author, their demands were far from utopian; rather, they represented pragmatism aimed at advancing concrete interests, albeit veiled by verbose rhetoric. (RAMOS, 1995, p. 83). Similarly, the positivist movement was the first to articulate the necessity of formulating a "*theory of Brazilian society* as the basis for political and social action." (RAMOS, 1995, p. 83). Despite the efforts made by Teixeira Mendes to find this theory, in his booklet *Pátria Brasileira** (1883), Guerreiro states that the literal adoption of Comte's theses ended up damaging the general theses of Brazilian positivists. Nevertheless, the measures advocated by positivists often aligned with the practical concerns of the middle classes to which they belonged. Silvio Romero's political sociology, as evidenced in works like *O evolucionismo e o positivismo no Brasil* (1894) and *O Brasil social*• (1907), endeavored to theorize about national politics by critiquing oligarchies and advocating for institutional reforms, while also conducting the earliest sociological analysis of Brazilian

* T.N.: In free translation, Brazilian Homeland

• T.N.: In free translation, Evolutionism and Positivism in Brazil, Social Brazil

political parties, including the monarchist, socialist, Jacobin, military, and positivist factions.

The nationalist authors of the 1910s and 1920s, such as Jackson de Figueiredo, Álvaro Bomilcar, Gilberto Amado, and Oliveira Viana, were labeled as "ideologues of order and progress" and purportedly embodied the self-determination aspirations of their era. However, constrained by the absence of conducive conditions for a middle-class revolution, their expressions were deemed naïve, relying on moralistic and elitist rhetoric. At that juncture, the political forces and intellectuals of this class lacked the comprehension of the economic and social milieu driving political transformations, thus failing to cultivate a political ideology capable of comprehending, elucidating, and engaging with the contemporary events.

The 1930 Revolution fundamentally altered the landscape for the ideological shaping of the nation. By integrating segments of the middle class into the State apparatus, the regime formalized economic forces through unionization, contributing to the erosion of certain states' dominance and instituting the principle of State intervention in the economy. Consequently, the social class differentiation escalated, marked by the ascent of the industrial bourgeoisie, the wane of large landholdings, and the emergence of the working class. The pressing political conundrum—the imperative to ideologically structure social classes to eradicate clientelistic politics—surfaced in literature as an extraordinary endeavor to "theorize the national reality politically". Yet, despite notable but fragmented contributions, none of these theoretical endeavors culminated in "the formulation of an organic ideology reflective of the prevailing trajectory of Brazil's societal development" (RAMOS, 1995, p. 97). The resulting absence precipitated a crisis in political party organization, whose premises lagged behind the structural transformations undergone by Brazilian society. Overcoming this crisis necessitated a theory of Brazilian society that could yield a political ideology capable of steering "political forces towards the prevailing trend of the country's development process" (RAMOS, 1995, p. 97). This quest prompted Guerreiro to delve deeper into the political thought of the 1930s, leading to his scrutiny of the political literature from this period and the publication of texts that objectively analyzed Brazilian Political Thought according to two tendencies: "A Ideologia da *jeunesse dorée*" (1961 [1955]) and "O inconsciente sociológico: estudo sobre a crise política no Brasil, na década de 1930" (1961 [1956]).

The first of these tendencies, ironically dubbed *jeunesse dorée* (the golden youth), was typified by the author as a "normative academic stance, that is, a group of writers hailing from traditional affluent families, distanced from party politics, and primarily preoccupied with intellectual pursuits" (RAMOS, 1961, p. 152). Sustained by the bureaucratic State, which provided them with positions,

they generated intellectual discourse that evaded "clarifying even the essence of the prevailing social structure, always with the aim of averting the complete idleness of citizens who might otherwise succumb to subversive influences" (RAMOS, 1995, p. 138). They largely contributed to the "illusory nature of intellectual life and production in Brazil," and the crisis experienced by the *jeunesse dorée* post-1930 Revolution epitomized its decline. Reflecting subsequent socio-economic shifts, the *petite bourgeoisie* (middle class) and the proletariat, albeit lacking "significant ideological consciousness," clamored for increased participation in the social product, catalyzing a transformation in prevailing class relations. Gripped by fear, pessimism, and nostalgia for the bygone days of Empire, when the landed gentry held sway, the *jeunesse dorée* sought to interpret that era through a conservative lens and rationalize their threatened dominance. They construed the unfolding changes as stemming from "mental indiscipline, intellectual disorder," prescribing remedies that Guerreiro described as "psychological operations: re-Christianization, the empowerment of the literate elite, and the enhancement of the national character" (RAMOS, 1961, pp. 153-154) to counter this perceived malaise. The examination of the *jeunesse dorée* encapsulated the essentially alienated political literature propagated by the ruling elites until 1930 and the anachronism they embodied when replicated in the 1950s.

Among the prominent figures within this group were Alceu Amoroso Lima (Tristão de Ataíde), Afonso Arinos, and Otávio de Faria. Guerreiro observed that the culture of these authors was characterized by leisure and extravagance, as they acquired their understanding of culture solely through passive consumption of prepackaged ideas, oblivious to the objective realities from which they emerged. The members of the *jeunesse dorée* "tend to perceive the world as an ideal order par excellence, with the material realm merely serving as a reflection [...] Owing to their class background, they remain somewhat detached from the so-called practical aspects of life" (RAMOS, 1961, p. 160). Their literary output lacked scientific rigor, meriting attention solely as auxiliary material "for studying the particular psychology of a specific societal stratum during a particular period" (RAMOS, 1961, p. 164). Their intellectual authority could be attributed to the "widespread lack of education among our public and the prevailing absence of critical rigor within our literary and scientific circles" (RAMOS, 1961, p. 160). The remedy advocated by Alceu Amoroso Lima in his treatise *Política*[♦] (1932), namely, reChristianization, represented a "sort of geometry where formulas for salvation are deduced from eternal formal principles: those of purpose, respect for material properties, participation, and authority."

♦ T.N.: In free translation, Politics

These authors argued that Brazil's salvation lay more in culture and religion than in technology and politics, asserting that its regeneration depended on moral renewal. They lacked an understanding of social realities, discussing politics only at a generic level and never in concrete terms. When confronted with Alberto Torres—"one of our most objective thinkers, despite his scientific shortcomings"—Alceu failed to move beyond doctrinal debates (RAMOS, 1961, p. 155). Afonso Arinos, another exponent of the *dorée* worldview, remained steadfast in his views from the 1930s, maintaining racist beliefs and attributing the rise of Marxism to Jewish activities in a simplistic thesis. In *O Conceito de Civilização Brasileira*^ø, he contended that Brazilian society could only be well-governed by individuals of noble birth or pure bloodlines, as African or indigenous influences were seen as disruptive factors in national life. Asserting the primacy of tradition and customs, the utmost daring the *dorées* allowed themselves was reformism and "evolutionary methods of social and political reform" (RAMOS, 1961, p. 156).

According to Guerreiro Ramos, in a peripheral country like Brazil, the emphasis on tradition and its defense by the *dorées* was exaggerated. Their interpretation of national issues in terms of national psychology and the attribution of mystical qualities to aspects of people's lives were deemed pseudo-scientific, as they tended to regard "a temporary phase of collective psychology as permanent; or mistook a transitional condition of a people for its inherent nature" (RAMOS, 1961, p. 162). For the *jeunesse dorée* authors, there existed no objective social laws; instead, they attributed societal developments to chance and heroic individuals, leading Otávio de Faria to invoke Machiavelli—suggesting that intellectuals and elites were the sole forces shaping society.

Guerreiro identified the elitist notion of the country's salvation through intellectuals, coupled with their inflated self-image and disdain for the masses, as clear indicators of the parasitic nature of this school of thought. However, the fundamental flaw in the elite salvation thesis lay in its narrow view of social relations, attributing to intellectual factors a significant role in shaping the socio-historical process while overlooking its inherent ideological class dimension. Guerreiro concludes by underscoring the inherently conservative nature of this ideology, typical of an era dominated by the landowning social and political structure. The reduction of the political issue to a moral dilemma was a natural outcome of this intellectualist perspective on the historical and social process.

The opposition to the *dorées* was embodied by intellectuals who, prior to the formalization of the social sciences and the establishment of indigenous foundations for national thought, formulated theories, hypotheses, and arguments rooted in the empirical realities of the country, employing what Guerreiro termed the *sociological unconscious* or the empirical-inductive method.

^ø T.N.: In free translation, The Concept of Brazilian Civilization

With economic and social progress came the objective conditions for the development of organic and authentic intellectual discourse. The improvement in material conditions facilitated the emergence of an epistemological space for "autonomous" thinking in the peripheries of capitalism, fostering an awareness that found expression in intellectual output. Sociological inquiry became the domain of practical, politically engaged "middle-class" intellectuals. From this standpoint, Guerreiro revisited a cohort of authors often overlooked as social scientists, contending that they had produced some of the most sophisticated sociological analyses of their era.

Among them were José Maria dos Santos, Azevedo Amaral, Virgínio Santa Rosa, Martins de Almeida, and Caio Pardo Jr. Guerreiro critiqued the prevailing paradigms in the narrative of social sciences' development in Brazil, noting that even figures like Oliveira Viana were marginalized by those who considered themselves "scientists" in the 1950s, dismissing the significance of authors who operated before the institutionalization of the social sciences, such as Silvio Romero, Euclides da Cunha, and Alberto Torres. However, Guerreiro asserted that this early sociology had yet to contribute substantially to the understanding of Brazilian life, often merely skimming over themes borrowed from abroad and producing what he termed "society's smile," a phrase employed to critique Gilberto Freire (RAMOS, 1961, p. 169).

Authors such as Azevedo Amaral, Virgínio Santa Rosa, and Martins de Almeida exemplified objectivity and a keen ability to interpret the political events of their time. Guerreiro particularly highlights Francisco Martins de Almeida's *O Brasil Errado** (1932), which, even in the 1930s, addressed crucial issues such as the imperative of forming an internal market, integrating the national territory, the conflict between two production models, oligarchic dominance, the evolution of social classes, and the push for social reforms in Brazil. Guerreiro contends that Almeida's approach demonstrated an *empirical-inductive* character and made a significant contribution to the "understanding of the evolution of the theory of Brazilian reality." (RAMOS, 1961, p. 172). Similarly, Virgínio Santa Rosa's work *O Sentido do Tenentismo*® (1931) is hailed as "one of the most insightful books on the Revolution and an important document of our political sociology." While the *dorées* "succumbed to subjectivism and indulged in nostalgia for the 'old days,'" Santa Rosa foresaw the future more clearly, correctly identifying the differentiation of classes and the emerging demands associated with the rise of the *petite bourgeoisie* (RAMOS, 1961, p. 172).

* T.N.: In free translation, The wrong Brasil

® T.N.: The meaning of *Tenentismo* [A political-military movement that took place between 1920 and 1935, under the leadership of the "lieutenants", the name by which the revolutionary officers of the time were known, not all of them true lieutenants, but mostly low-ranking officers. Source: Atlas Histórico do Brasil - FGV CPDOC]

Among the writers of the period, Azevedo Amaral stood out as "the most complex and complete." However, Guerreiro cautioned against wholesale acceptance of his work due to its racist undertones and problematic theses⁸. Additionally, Amaral's lack of academic credentials and his apparent alignment with the ideological underpinnings of the Estado Novo⁹ regime hindered the recognition of his contributions. Nevertheless, Amaral's insights remained relevant, particularly his recognition of the impasse between the landowning and industrial bourgeoisie, advocating for an intervening and centralizing State capable of steering the Brazilian economy towards the internal market. This perspective bestowed historical significance upon the Estado Novo as a dictatorship of the national bourgeoisie. Guerreiro concluded that the works, theories, and hypotheses put forth by nationalist authors of the 1930s addressed enduring issues that remained pertinent in his time, warranting reevaluation and acknowledgment by scholars of Brazilian society and politics.

Ultimately, the quest for a *theory of Brazilian society* necessitated a reexamination of the works of nationalist authors from the past to glean theoretical, methodological, and practical insights. Guerreiro emphasized that these authors possessed a realistic understanding of the political and social process, as well as an intuitive methodological sensibility that set them apart from mere reproductions of imported formulas and ideologies. Their work should thus serve as a guiding light for the cultivation of a politically engaged intelligentsia. As part of this effort to study the nationalist authors of the 1930s, Guerreiro authored an article titled "Caracteres da *Intelligentzia*" in 1957, published in the Sunday supplement of the newspaper *Jornal do Brasil*. In this piece, he drew on the Weberian intellectual circle to define his concept of the *intelligentzia* as "intellectuals dedicated to producing and disseminating ideas that fundamentally contribute to social reform or revolutionary processes." (RAMOS, 1961, 185). In this context, intellectuals were seen as privileged actors capable of momentarily transcending their class perspectives to help break the deadlock between ascending classes, which struggle to assume ruling positions, and obsolete classes.

⁸ On Azevedo Amaral: "Strictly speaking, you have to pick out the great successes from his many mistakes. This writer was very faithful to the theme of Brazilian reality throughout his productive life. In 1930, he published *Ensaio Brasileiro*, in which, alongside the tribute he paid to racism and biologism, he already pointed out the correct methodological guidelines that would secure him a prominent position in national sociology." (RAMOS, 1961, 173).

⁹ T.N.: Estado Novo, or Third Brazilian Republic, was a Brazilian dictatorship established by Getúlio Vargas on November 10, 1937, which lasted politically until October 29, 1945, and formally until January 31, 1946. Source: Wikipedia.

Democratic theory and popular nationalism

Guerreiro's departure from ISEB⁹ between 1958 and 1959 signified not just a shift in paradigms, but notably in the author's political stance. While the nationalist approach initially centered on epistemological concerns, it progressively acquired clearer political and militant undertones by 1957, as evidenced in the preceding section. Subsequently, all of Guerreiro's intellectual output was geared towards topics that directly addressed the political contests surrounding the discourse on development and the democratization of society.

One example is the text "Controle ideológico da programação econômica"[•] (1960 [1958]), where Guerreiro unequivocally asserts: "economic development is currently a political problem. Its promotion is a political act" (RAMOS, 1960, p. 181). He credits Schumpeter and Mannheim with providing a suitable framework for understanding economic development from a sociological and political perspective. Guerreiro contends that with the advancement of the sociology of knowledge, the stance of social science scholars advocating for the political neutrality of sciences became "dramatic". Given its inherently political nature, development became intricately intertwined with the ongoing process of democratization. While in the past, development was perceived as "a process in which the masses did not consciously participate" [...] "and its promoters were minorities" (RAMOS, 1960, pp. 181-182), the maturation of Brazilian capitalism, political institutions, and the consciousness of the masses have now elevated them to the role of decisive actors in the social process of development.

In this interpretation, the theory of development, which emerged as a refined product in the post-war period, facilitated the systematic understanding of a process previously navigated through trial and error. Guerreiro attributed this evolution to the establishment of economics as an academic discipline during a time when the political influence of the masses was relatively limited. This hindered economists from grasping the "entrepreneurial role of the masses in the economic process" (RAMOS, 1960, p. 183) and the transformative nature of this process itself. With this "radical novelty" in the social sciences, economics should be viewed as a "subsidiary discipline of an applied political-social theory" (RAMOS, 1960, p. 184), aimed at "rationally guiding the action of collectivities in achieving concrete welfare goals" (Ibid.).

Guerreiro argued that regimes where economic development was steered by a political-social theory had been successfully implemented in socialist countries like Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union, and China. During times of crisis, policies of this nature were also adopted in the United States and England. The

⁹ Event related to the theoretical and political disagreements between Guerreiro Ramos and Hélio Jaguaribe. See: SODRÉ, 1978.

[•] T.N.: In free translation, Ideological Control of Economic Programming

favorable outcomes of these endeavors, resulting in development, demonstrated the accessibility of this potential to all societies, underscoring the need to actualize the entrepreneurial capacity of the people. The experiences of socialist countries prompted scrutiny of how surpluses, underemployment, and elite consumption patterns were managed. Despite Guerreiro affirming the alignment between economic programming and "liberally inclined minds" (*ibid.*, p. 189), the pervasive inequality in peripheral regions necessitated caution, recognizing that "all economic programming has a political-ideological presupposition." This caution extended to ensuring that economic planning was not driven by narrow or international interests.

Programming in a peripheral country should bear a national qualification, grounded in community-accessible criteria, given that "foreign economic aid is never politically disinterested" (RAMOS, 1960, p. 191). Consequently, Guerreiro concluded, "there is no national programming without national ideology" (RAMOS, 1960, p. 192). Guerreiro's efforts can be understood as a bid to elevate politics both theoretically and practically, advocating for a political vision of national development. This entailed rejecting the technocratic concept of development policy formulation and implementation as a panacea external to society and political representation mechanisms. Instead, it proposed an interactive process involving social actors and institutions, championing a project of popular nationalism imbued with socialist ideals. In this context, he asserted that "National programming only becomes effective when its support is an ideologically suitable political-party organization capable of taking the social character of private property and the means of production, in particular, to its ultimate consequences" (RAMOS, 1960, p. 192).

Hence, the "resolution of national economic challenges" must be acknowledged as "fundamentally political" (RAMOS, 1960, p. 216). This assertion stemmed from the recognition that emerging political forces lacked institutional channels commensurate with their demands, necessitating the establishment of a representative party apparatus to fulfill the prerequisites for development: the crux of the national dilemma lay in the deficiency of representation and political engagement. Institutions needed to strive towards empowering the community as the "genuine agent of social-historical events," with ideological clarity bridging the gap between societal pressures and governmental decision-making spheres. This encapsulates Guerreiro's theory of political development, characterized by a democratization movement aimed at elevating the ideological dimension of national politics, thereby enabling the expression of social demands and grassroots pressures on established power structures. Democratization was envisioned as a process where political pressures—interpreted positively—transcended exclusive access by privileged groups to the corridors of power. Democracy, in this context, represented a

system where, once the crisis of representation was resolved, conflicts inherent in community life could be addressed within political arenas. When institutions facilitated the community's emergence as the "authentic driving force of social-historical dynamics," a genuinely representative party apparatus would ensue, upon which development itself hinged. This inversion of values, subordinating development to democratization, encapsulated Guerreiro's political vision.

To Guerreiro, all the objective elements necessary for this revolution in Brazil appeared to be in place, with only the subjective element missing: political will. This represented "an axiological choice", distinguishing between the movements for political independence of the early 19th century and the "contemporary national revolution", which aimed at achieving genuine "independent historical agency." Although the Brazilian people had become the "actual support of power", they did not fully exert it due to a lack of awareness stemming from their distance from power, a condition determined by outdated institutions, or, as Guerreiro expressed it, "due to institutional deficiencies within the representative system" (RAMOS, 1960, p. 220) of the country. It was imperative for "political-ideological pressures" to permeate decision-making centers, enabling them to grasp the "levers of development" and assert effective control over the nation's political-economic programming. This laid the groundwork for the establishment of what could be termed an agonistic conception of democracy: a vision for democratizing Brazilian democracy, expanding the pool of qualified decision-makers, elevating popular pressure, mobilization, and bringing the people closer to the seats of power – the bedrock of the envisioned "Brazilian revolution".

In the same publication, *O problema nacional do Brasil*^{*}, we witness a shift in focus in Guerreiro's texts, particularly evident in the article "Princípios do Povo Brasileiro" (1960; [1959]), where themes of institutional democratization, nationalism, and the Brazilian revolution come to the forefront. The opening lines of the text illustrate how Guerreiro imbues nationalism with a positive connotation, viewing it through a revolutionary and anti-colonial lens. Nationalism is now framed within a strictly progressive and anti-colonial perspective: "nationalism is the ideology of peripheral peoples who, at present, are striving to liberate themselves from the colonial condition" (RAMOS, 1960, p. 225).

Guerreiro ascribed an instrumental character to nationalism in peripheral countries, distinguishing it from what he deemed as exclusivist and chauvinist expressions in central nations. For him, sovereignty was not innate but rather a contested and politically constructed element. He contended that a national revolution was imperative to secure the right to political self-determination and economic sovereignty. Only through this path could peripheral nations

* T.N.: In free translation, Brazil's national problem

contribute to a global worldview. Guerreiro stated, "Nationalism is not an end. It is a means," emphasizing that it was "the sole route for peripheral nations to attain universalism in the contemporary context" (RAMOS, 1960, p. 226). Establishing "sovereign national identities" was a prerequisite for realizing this desired universalism. He even posited that "peoples who successfully undergo their national revolution will inevitably outgrow nationalism in the future." This distinctly political perspective distinguished post-colonial and popular expressions from past essentialist nationalist traditions and the nativism of the modern, romantic, and regionalist schools.

The global perspective afforded by the advancements in social sciences enabled the realization of a "coherent project" for national construction, encompassing "economic, social, political, and cultural" dimensions (RAMOS, 1960, p. 227). Building on the sociological and political frameworks he had established, Guerreiro embarked on a theoretical exploration termed "typologies of nationalism" (RAMOS, 1960, p. 248). Here, he delineated what he termed as "true nationalism" or "nationalism as a science" in contrast to various forms of misguided nationalisms.

Firstly, he critiqued *naïve nationalism*, characterized by a simplistic, ethnocentric glorification of one's group coupled with uncritical rejection of the unfamiliar, often devolving into xenophobia and chauvinism. *Utopian nationalism*, in contrast, disregarded local material and historical realities, espousing an impractical belief in a "pure economic fact," ignoring the fact that "all capital is political," and adhering to harmful and anti-national interests, under the firm conviction that they were defending the country's development only if it were completely open to international capital.

Next, he scrutinized *top-down nationalism*, wherein the dominant strata co-opted nationalist rhetoric for personal gain, leveraging popular sentiments and psychological cues to bolster their own prestige and political power. *Chair nationalism*, attributed to intellectuals and professors of the *petite bourgeoisie* or the middle class, was criticized for its "superficial verbal support," lacking substantive action or commitment to the causes of the working class or bourgeoisie. Lastly, Guerreiro highlighted *circumstantial nationalism* as a "form of opportunism," wielded by surrenderists seeking immediate advantage.

In contrast to the flawed nationalisms outlined earlier, Guerreiro proposed nationalism as a science, offering a blueprint for "proletarian peoples" to transcend the confines of colonialism and embrace an "insubordinate stance" that positioned them as "the most authentic drivers of human advancement" (RAMOS, 1960, p. 253). Guerreiro deftly borrowed from Marxian theory, applying the concept of class struggle to the realm of nations; in this conceptual framework, proletarian peoples emerged as the vanguards of progress, embodying transformative and ethical forces propelling human development

forward. Guerreiro elevated utopian nationalism to the status of a scientific pursuit by interpreting the laws governing the historical evolution of nations. Essentially, he contended that these peoples epitomized universality by virtue of their trajectory toward the future.

Primarily, the newfound catalyst for this emancipatory movement's existence and necessity lay in its "fundamentally grassroots and patriotic" essence (RAMOS, 1960, p. 227)¹⁰. The grassroots nature of this nationalism stems from the acknowledgment that the rise of the people, as mentioned earlier, was pivotal in the nationalist discourse of the era. This ascent signified the presence of conditions previously absent for fostering unity and acknowledgment within a diverse landscape. The people serve as the cohesive force enabling such acknowledgment and integration, bridging specific local concerns with national ones¹¹. What's particularly intriguing is that this acknowledgment hinges not on a primal cultural essence but rather on a shared sense of destiny. This nationalism necessitated shared material conditions and ideological maturity to materialize as a forward-looking self-determination movement.

Guerreiro proposed that the emergence of the people was contingent upon the realization of tangible material conditions. In the Brazilian context, this "material substrate" encompassed the internal market and the establishment of an integrated production system. These factors facilitated the formation of the "Brazilian people as a political entity, empowered to assert and exercise the characteristic prerogatives of a mature historical persona" (RAMOS, 1960, p. 229). This newly formed people diverged from the aristocratic conception. Liberated from the tutelage of the ruling elite, this people solidified itself as the "primary actor in the political arena" in Brazil. Guerreiro contended that the electoral outcomes since the 1950s evidenced a palpable process of political democratization in Brazil, construed as a "progressive erosion of the efficacy of the caudillo, oligarchic, and patronage-based practices in our political landscape" (Ibid.). However, nationalism had yet to firmly take root due to the "aristocratic tendencies" of its leaders. It ought to be perceived as "fundamentally a grassroots ideology" to be crafted by eliciting the conduct of the people and adhering to their authentic principles (RAMOS, 1960, p. 230).

Popular nationalism formed the cornerstone of the author's political vision, which he advocated to be: 1. *Nationalist*, advocating for "national solutions to national problems," rejecting internationalism, yet embracing universalism by viewing nationalism as a means and endorsing "broad collaboration between peoples, provided it does not infringe upon their sovereign rights" (RAMOS, 1960, p. 247); 2. *Left-wing*, committed to championing unrealized possibilities in Brazilian society, opposing stagnation, regression, and the status quo; 3. *Inclusive*

¹⁰ For an interesting reading of the concept of nationalism and revolution in Guerreiro's work, under the key of "popular nationalism", see: KAYSEL, 2014.

¹¹ On Guerreiro's definition of people, see: RAMOS, 1960, p. 228.

beyond any single class, with "workers" playing a "pivotal role" but welcoming participation from other classes; 4. Led by the people through their vanguard, rejecting sectarianism and advancing interests that align with the "community's demands," while not precluding party or organizational affiliations; 5. Democratic, "opposing coup attempts and any disruptions to legal institutional functioning" (RAMOS, 1960, p. 248), advocating for democratic resolutions to national issues in line with the "natural progression of the Brazilian process," and as the sole means to nurture the "new leadership cadre essential for the nation" (Ibid.).

After delineating the characteristics of this emancipatory movement, which largely mirrored Guerreiro's political aspirations and ideology, our focus now shifts to an examination of his theory of the national revolution, as crystallized in his seminal work, *Mito e Verdade da Revolução Brasileira* (1963). Reflecting on Brazil's political landscape in the 1960s, Guerreiro asserted that its "traits warrant its characterization as revolutionary" (RAMOS, 1963, p.18). He posited that revolution was a "living concept within Brazil's contemporary history" (RAMOS, 1963, p.17), emphasizing the need for an analysis untainted by entrenched "habits" and "ossified concepts" (RAMOS, 1963, p.18) surrounding this theme. The author then embarked on a historical-sociological inquiry into the concept of revolution, aiming to shed light on the political ramifications of the revolutionary juncture the country was undergoing, ultimately formulating a theory of the Brazilian revolution.

The nationalist perspective, while critical of importing revolutionary models and internationalism, did not entail disregarding the history and evolution of revolutionary processes elsewhere. Neither did it reject the potential for organizing universalist agendas. However, Guerreiro contended that the nation's political trajectory could not be reduced to a clash between ideological factions tethered to "guidance from 'internationals', whether on the right or left" (RAMOS, 1963, p. 40). Analyzing Brazilian reality demanded employing indigenous criteria and perspectives aligned with a "national liberation movement". Echoing a Leninist sentiment, Guerreiro suggested that internationalism represented the "infantile ailment of the Brazilian socialist movement" (RAMOS, 1963, p. 41), positing that maturity would only be attained by conceiving the Brazilian revolution within its unique national context and objectives.

The circumstances of the era and a receptiveness to political engagement prompted Guerreiro to espouse and advocate for a non-Marxist socialist agenda as a framework for grassroots mobilization to combat colonialism in underdeveloped nations. While socialism was the prevailing orientation of the time, Guerreiro diverged from Marxism's approach to social change. He criticized Marxism's portrayal of a path progressing through successive modes

of production towards socialism via spontaneous insurrection. Guerreiro viewed this model as outdated and overly universal, particularly in societies where national capitalism had taken root. In these contexts, where awareness of exploitation by foreign economic sectors was acute, improvements in proletariat conditions or even the transition to socialism could feasibly occur in tandem with the development of productive forces, without resorting to violent upheaval. Conversely, if the ruling class, "apprehensive of the internal proletariat's growing strength," [...] "acquiesced to substantial foreign ownership in the capital accumulation process," thereby entrenching economic and social rigidity, Guerreiro posited that the "revolutionary imperative would inevitably manifest as a task of insurrection" (RAMOS, 1963, p. 44).

For Guerreiro, socialism was not merely a doctrine centered on State ownership of the means of production; rather, it embodied a "structural law" or "the dominant historical trend of the present time." Departing from the conventional Marxist interpretation, he favored its contemporary relevance in peripheral contexts as a "political and economic method, suited for catalyzing the rapid development of nations where capitalism either hasn't yet taken root or remains in rudimentary stages" (RAMOS, 1963, p. 73). While its universalist aspirations could eventually materialize, Guerreiro believed this would occur only "after peripheral nations significantly elevate their levels of productive forces" (Ibid.). Until then, the imperative of a global socialist revolution would be subordinate to the exigencies of national conditions in the process of constructing socialism in each respective country. Therefore, it fell upon nationalist movements to instigate democratization within their ranks to surmount the crisis of power and steer development toward a "feasible revolution" (RAMOS, 1963, p. 182). The objective of the Brazilian revolution was to reconfigure the State to reflect the prevailing class dynamics of that developmental moment, equipping it with the new functions demanded by the contemporary configuration of the economy and society (Ibid., pp. 182-183).

This analysis of the foundational concepts shaping Guerreiro's notion of national revolution underscores that it was not about orchestrating a coup or insurgent movement, but about advocating for a more dynamic and mobilizing conception of democracy. He critiqued the radicalism and "verbal fetishes" of communist stances that obfuscated and confounded the organization of a genuinely revolutionary process – what he termed a "suckers' journey". Yet, in his 1963 book, his final major publication preceding the 1964 coup, he himself struggled to provide an objective path forward from that moment of "transaction" – to borrow Justiniano da Rocha's terminology – in the absence of leadership. Revolution was the driving idea, the social classes and the people were organized, the political agenda centered on fundamental and State reforms. However, what was lacking was a "leadership capable of translating the

revolution into a national reality, a collective expression of the Brazilian people, shaped by new power" (Ibid., pp. 190-191). The immaturity no longer lay with the people, who historically had always been a potential yet-to-be-realized element. Now constituted, the deficiency resided in organization and leadership establishment. The conclusion of *Mito e verdade da revolução brasileira* carries a somewhat melancholic tone—even if the author still retained some hope—akin to reflecting a diagnosis of the squandering of revolutionary potential, which, somewhat paradoxically, in hindsight, epitomized a pinnacle moment in an intense democratization process on the verge of being obstructed and curtailed for many years.

The Brazilian revolution will be mystified if and for as long as those who claim to represent and serve it don't rid themselves of verbal fetishes. The Brazilian revolution today is faced with a dilemma: myth or truth. To the suckers—the myth. Let's make the revolution—according to the truth of national history." (Ibid., p. 191)

Conclusion

The narrative journey we embarked upon in this article reaches an abrupt halt with a pivotal moment in Guerreiro's career. Following the 1964 military coup and the enactment of Institutional Act No. 4 (AI-4), Guerreiro faced the revocation of his parliamentary mandate and a ten-year suspension of his political rights, compelling him into exile in California, United States. Prior to this, Guerreiro's analysis of Brazilian political evolution centered on the themes of nationalism and democratization. While initially rooted in epistemological concerns, his perspective gradually shifted towards a historicist and nationalist framework, which led him to revere past intellectual contributions. Eventually, Guerreiro's nationalism emerged as a cornerstone of his interpretation and political agenda. In the aftermath of the dictatorship's rise, Guerreiro found himself teaching Public Administration at the University of Southern California, barred from pursuing intellectual and political endeavors in Brazil. He distanced himself from the vibrant political discourse of earlier years, earning accolades as a distinguished professor and intellectual, publishing extensively¹², and gaining international recognition as a leading figure in public administration theory. Towards the late 1970s, he returned to Brazil to take part in seminars and made plans to take up a visiting professorship at the Federal University of Santa Catarina. However, before this plan could come to fruition, Guerreiro passed away in April 1981, leaving behind a profound legacy that continues to shape various facets of Brazilian social sciences.

¹² His book *The New Sciences Organizations* (1981) stands out.

References

- ABRANCHES, Aparecida Maria.
(2006). *Nacionalismo e democracia no pensamento de Guerreiro Ramos*. Tese de doutorado. Rio de Janeiro: IUPERJ.
- AZEVEDO, Ariston.
(2006). A sociologia antropocêntrica de Guerreiro Ramos. Tese de doutorado. Florianópolis: UFSC..
- BARIANI, Edison.
(2011). *Guerreiro Ramos e a redenção sociológica: capitalismo e sociologia no Brasil*. São Paulo: EDUSP.
- BRINGEL, Breno; DOMINGUES, José Maurício.
(2015). Teoria social, extroversão e autonomia: impasses e horizontes da sociologia (semi)periférica contemporânea. *Caderno CRH* [online], 28/73, p. 59-76.
- CAMPOS, Luiz Augusto,
(2015). “O negro é o povo no Brasil”: afirmação da negritude e democracia racial em Alberto Guerreiro Ramos (1948-1955). *Caderno CRH* [online], 28/73, p. 59-76.
- CANNONE, Helio Maurício Pirajá.
(2022). “*Um balé metafórico*”: as ideologias políticas e o ideário desenvolvimentista da República de 1946. Tese de Doutorado, Instituto de Estudos Sociais e Políticos, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro.
- LYNCH, Christian Edward Cyril.
(2013, dez.). Por que pensamento e não teoria? A imaginação político-social brasileira e o fantasma da condição periférica (1880-1970). *Dados*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 56, n. 4, p. 727-767.
- LYNCH, Christian; MARRECA, Pedro.
(2021, set.-dez.). Teoria pós-colonial e pensamento político brasileiro na obra de Guerreiro Ramos: o pensamento político. *Sociologia e Antropologia*. v.11. 03. Rio de Janeiro, 1025-1049.
- MARRECA, Pedro Paiva.
(2020). *Teoria política e nacionalismo periférico na obra de Hélio Jaguaribe, Alberto Guerreiro Ramos e Celso Furtado: epistemologia, história e política* (1953-1964). Tese de Doutorado, Instituto de Estudos Sociais e Políticos, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro.
- OLIVEIRA, Lúcia Lippi.
(1995). *A sociologia do Guerreiro*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora da UFRJ.
- RAMOS, Alberto Guerreiro.
(1953). *O processo da sociologia brasileira*. Rio de Janeiro.
(1960). *O problema nacional do Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Saga.
(1961). *A crise do poder no Brasil* (problemas da revolução nacional brasileira). Rio de Janeiro: Zahar Editores.
(1995). *Introdução crítica à sociologia brasileira*. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Editora da UFRJ.
(1996). *A redução sociológica*. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Editora da UFRJ.
(1961). *A crise do poder no Brasil: problemas da revolução nacional brasileira*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.
(1963). *Mito e verdade da revolução brasileira*. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Zahar.
(1981). *A Nova ciência das organizações: uma reconceitualização da riqueza das nações*. Rio de Janeiro, Editora da Fundação Getulio Vargas.
- SODRÉ, Nelson Werneck.
(1978). *A verdade sobre o ISEB*. Rio de Janeiro: Avenir Editora.

Received in
October 2023

Approved in
March 2024