

A Cause for Reflection: Imagining Brazil at 100 Years of Independence

By

Joseph M. Pendergraph

Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Vanderbilt University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

History

August, 2015

Nashville, Tennessee

Approved:

Marshall C. Eakin, Ph.D.

Sarah E. Igo, Ph.D.

“O Gigante:
*Vossos irmãos na pátria nova passam
tranquillos com riqueza largos annos...
outro sistema de governo abraçam,
que julgam mais propício para os humanos,
porque nesse regimen, ali novo,
dizem que manda simplesmente o povo.*”¹

“For my part I will say that, if my body leaves [Brazil], my heart stays, and that, if one day it should split, on it will be seen the words Brazil and Portugal, so intensely linked, so intimately intertwined, that it shall not be possible to separate one from the other.”²

¹ Augusto de Lacerda, *As duas patrias: poêma em homenagem a Portugal e Brasil por ocasião do centenário da abertura dos portos brasileiros ao comércio do mundo* (Porto: Oficinas do Commercio do Porto, 1908), 116 – The passage reads roughly, “The Giant: Your brothers in the new *Pátria* calmly live long years with richness / embracing another form of government that they believe to be more propitious for mankind / because in this new regime it is said that the people simply govern.” The timing of this quotation is key for understanding the critique. The work was published in 1908 just two years before the overthrow of the Portuguese monarchy. The decadence of the throne in the nineteenth century had led to intellectual criticism in the 1870s and republican revolts and conspiracies in the last years of the century. Brazil, where the “*povo*” reigned was held up as an example, a dubious one in retrospect.

² Portuguese aviator Sacadura Cabral spoke these words at the inauguration of a monument to the Brazilian aviator Santos Dumont during Brazil’s centennial celebrations, September 1922. All translations from Portuguese into English are mine, unless otherwise noted. Occasionally, I have maintained the original Portuguese where the meaning is obvious and the original carries more force or nuance of meaning.

Nineteen twenty-two was a watershed year in Brazil's national identity formation process. In the early months, an influential group of artists and intellectuals came together in São Paulo and insisted that Brazilians should avoid derivative, Euro-centric assertions of national identity and instead focus on the country's mixed-race ancestry and character. To be Brazilian, according to the likes of Oswald de Andrade or Emiliano di Cavalcanti, was to devour all cultural influences indiscriminately and regurgitate something uniquely Brazilian. The significance of this cultural and artistic movement and of Andrade's *Cannibalist Manifesto* is undeniable and has been asserted time and again in the historiography.³ Historians have overlooked, however, the strategies that Brazilian political elites employed to combat these controversial ideas. During the middle months of 1922 two Portuguese aviators completed the first aerial crossing of the southern Atlantic – from Lisbon to Rio de Janeiro – and in September of that year Brazil celebrated one hundred years of independence from Portugal. Political elites in Rio used both events to strengthen Luso-Brazilian ties in an effort to convince themselves and the world that Brazil was primarily European in its socio-cultural and political heritage and that it was therefore both *white* and *modern*.⁴ Modernity, according to Brazilian elites, had always

³ Oswald de Andrade, "Manifesto antropófago," (*Revista de Antropofagia*. 1, no. 1, 1928). Modern Art Week has received a moderate amount of scholarly attention in the United States and a considerable amount in Brazil. Williams (2001) contains a thoughtful consideration of the *Semana de Arte Moderna* and its reverberations through the 1920s and 1930s. Much earlier, John Nist, *The Modernist Movement in Brazil: A Literary Study* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1967), examined the literary clashes of 1922. A broader literary study can be found here: Wilson Martins, *The Modernist Idea: A Critical Survey of Brazilian Writing in the Twentieth Century*. Noah Charles Elkin published an article from his dissertation, "1922: o encontro do efêmero com a permanência," *Anais do Museu Histórico Nacional* 29 (1997): 121 – 40. His dissertation is *Promoting a New Brazil: National Expositions and Images of Modernity, 1861 – 1922* (PhD dissertation: Rutgers University, 1999). In Brazil, see Mário de Silva Brito, *A história do modernismo: antecedentes da Semana de Arte Moderna* (Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1978); Aracy A. Amaral, *As artes plásticas na semana de 22: subsídios para uma história da renovação das artes no Brasil* (São Paulo: Editora 34, 1998); *ibid*, *Blaise Cendrars no Brasil e os modernistas* (São Paulo: Editora 34, 1997); and for the movement's manifestation in a more conservative Rio de Janeiro, see Angela Castro Gomes, *Essa gente do Rio: Modernismo e modernidade* (Rio de Janeiro: Editora Fundação Getúlio Vargas, 1999); and Mônica Pimenta Velloso, *Modernismo no Rio de Janeiro: Turunas e Quixotes* (Rio de Janeiro: Editora Fundação Getúlio Vargas, 1996).

⁴ For an example of the image that Brazilian elites were resisting at this time coming from North America, see Holland Thompson, *The New South: A Chronicle of Social and Industrial Evolution* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1919, pages 139 – 140): "It is perhaps a question worth asking whether any considerable number

flowed from Europe, but for the first time since independence their gaze fell not on the high cultures of Northern Europe – Germany, Great Britain, and especially France – but rather on their Portuguese brethren whose homeland juts into the Atlantic at the continent’s southwestern extreme. My dissertation will take on 1922 from a variety of angles, making the argument that this attempt to frame the Brazilian people as full-fledged members of the Portuguese “*Raça*” was both novel and short-lived but nonetheless crucial for understanding the ongoing debate of what it means to be Brazilian. The aims of this article are more modest. Here, I will focus on the language of republicanism that acted as the rhetorical glue that bonded Brazil and Portugal in the minds of their presidents, other political elites, and members of the Brazilian press. I argue that the status of these countries as young republics impelled leaders on both sides of the Atlantic to seek unity from their historically fraught postcolonial relationship at a moment when such unity was perceived to be mutually beneficial. The Portuguese president, António José de Almeida, desired political stability and personal stature and viewed the comparatively solid Brazilian Old Republic as a model because of its peaceful overthrow of the monarchy in 1889 and the orderly – though far from democratic – process by which power changed hands in Brazil according to elections and term limits. The goals that led the Brazilian president, Epitácio Pessoa, to invite Almeida to attend the centennial as a guest of honor were primarily cultural and secondarily political. Pessoa was using the language of republicanism, ironically, to deny the claim of

of white men of Northern European stock are without an instinctive dislike of those manifestly unlike themselves. The history of the contact between such stocks and the colored races shows instance after instance of refusal to recognize the latter as social or political equals. Indian, East Indian, and African have all been subjected to the domination of the whites. There have been many cases of illicit mating, of course, but the white man has steadily refused to legitimize these unions. The South European, on the contrary, has mingled freely with the natives of the countries he has colonized and to some extent has been swallowed up by the darker mass. Mexico, Brazil, Cuba, the Portuguese colonies in different parts of the world, are obvious examples.” Pessoa’s generation of political leaders would have objected to the idea that the Portuguese element was “swallowed up” and to their exclusion from the category of white. The imagery of being swallowed up also has interesting parallels with Andrade’s *Cannibalist Manifesto* (1928). Gilberto Freyre’s later theory of *lusotropicalism* is essentially a positive reinterpretation of these same sentiments.

Brazil's miscegenated masses to national cultural belonging and to thereby exclude them from the body politic. Almeida was using the same language to fend off diverse threats to his authority and the Portuguese First Republic, the direst of which came not from the masses but from those elites who supported the return of monarchical rule to Portugal. This example of a European nation looking to the Americas for political inspiration – of modernity flowing not from Europe to the Americas but vice versa – and of cultural linkages being emphasized in both directions is a late manifestation of James Sanders' theory of American republican modernity.

I. Luso-Brazilian Republicanism Historicized

Elite discourse during the centennial was saturated with lofty republican rhetoric. References to French republicanism and the French Revolution, however, were relatively sparse compared with the consistent desire to strengthen Luso-Brazilian ties along republican lines. Antonio José de Almeida, the Portuguese president between 1919 and 1923, emerged as the strongest supporter of liberal republicanism in the short history of Portugal's First Republic (1910 – 1926). Indeed, Almeida was the only president during this sixteen-year period to successfully complete his four-year mandate. The historical memory of the First Republic is hotly contested in Portugal. One historian explains:

... admirers recall the political experience of 1910-1926 as nothing less than the struggle and triumph of truly democratic visionaries, who heroically fought against an archaic Monarchy, and who, incorruptible and misunderstood, ended up being politically executed by reactionary traitors... On the other hand... we find the critics who have always insisted that the Republic was nothing more than an exceptional and permanently revolutionary stage, resulting in an endemic civil war, lacking legitimacy... in which a vanguard of radicals practiced a partisan dictatorship, forcing the country to live in a far less pluralistic regime than under the ousted Monarchy.⁵

Regardless of where contemporary observers lie on this spectrum – surely the dichotomy constructed by Sardica is exaggerated – none deny the instability that defined those sixteen

⁵ José Miguel Sardica, "The Memory of the Portuguese First Republic throughout the Twentieth Century," *E-Journal of Portuguese History* ((Summer 2011) vol. 9, no. 1, pp 63–89), 69.

years. Between 1910 and 1926, Portugal had nine presidents, thirty-eight prime ministers, one provisional government, and one constitutional junta. Almeida's motivations during his trip to Brazil in 1922, it will be argued here, are best understood as the result of a desire to shore up international support for his republican project by strengthening ties with Latin America's largest republic and Portugal's former colony.⁶ His strategy to achieve this goal consisted primarily of deploying high levels of republican rhetoric in his official speeches. Numerous examples of this type of language will highlight the irony inherent in the situation, given that no leader during the Portuguese First Republic was able to secure widespread, or democratic, support beyond Lisbon. Portugal's second largest population center, Porto, and the country's rural inhabitants generally remained royalist throughout the period.

Neither did Brazil realize republican or democratic ideals during the Old Republic (1889 – 1930), in spite of the relative stability of the government. The oligarchic nature of the *café com leite* power sharing system is well-documented, with eligible voters constituting less than five percent of the population and elite *coroneis* from Minas Gerais and São Paulo states dominating the electoral process.⁷ Epitácio Pessoa, from the northern state of Paraíba and president of Brazil from 1919 until 1922, was one of only two of the Old Republic's thirteen presidents not from these two states, yet his time in office did not challenge the status quo as power returned

⁶ Almeida's trip to Brazil (and Pessoa's 1919 visit to Portugal) has received minimal treatment in contemporary scholarship. The centenary itself has garnered at least some attention in the Brazilian and United States academies. From Brazil, see Marly Silva da Motta, *A nação faz 100 anos: a questão nacional no Centenário da Independência* (Rio de Janeiro: Editora da Fundação Getúlio Vargas / CPDOC, 1992). In the U.S., chapter two, "Cultural Management before 1930," in Daryle Williams, *Culture Wars in Brazil: The First Vargas Regime, 1930-1945* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001) contains analysis of the architectural neo-colonialism and overall conservatism of the 1922 celebrations in Rio de Janeiro. I support his hypothesis that this moment was unique in that it both rejected older conservative borrowings of Northern European culture, while embracing, still conservatively, Brazil's specifically Portuguese colonial past. Importantly, Williams does not discuss Almeida's visit or Coutinho and Cabral's achievement. The centennial is also mentioned briefly in David Goldblatt, *Futebol Nation: The Story of Brazil through Soccer* (New York: Nation Books, 2014).

⁷ For an excellent recent treatment of the period from the Paulista perspective see: James Woodard, *A Place in Politics: São Paulo, Brazil, from Seigneurial Republicanism to Regionalist Revolt* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2009).

immediately to another Mineiro politician at the end of his rule. He was a geographic outsider seeking insider status, not to disrupt the Minas-Paulista hegemonic order. Pessoa's highest priority in receiving the Portuguese president to celebrate one hundred years of Brazilian independence was to promote an image to the world of a white, European, and therefore modern, Brazil.⁸ The Brazilian leader emphasized historical linkages with Portugal at this moment for two reasons. First, the 1910 overthrow of the monarchy in Portugal meant that Brazil should no longer be embarrassed by its former colonial status vis-à-vis a decadent world power.⁹ The nineteenth-century Portuguese monarchy had found its harshest critics in the famous generation of 1870 – led by intellectuals like Antero de Quintal, Teófilo Braga, and Guerra Junqueiro – who, ironically, launched their critiques of tradition in a style that would later be echoed by the São Paulo *vanguardistas* of Modern Art Week.¹⁰ So while these nineteenth-century thinkers paved the way for a rocky, limited republican rule in their own country, which would allow for the ideological alignment of Pessoa and Almeida, they were also planting some of the seeds of Brazil's modernist movement, an attack on the bourgeois establishment of which Pessoa was a quintessential representative.¹¹

⁸ In addition to his aggressive reconceptualization of conservative Brazilian nationalism, Pessoa was a member of the Academia Parabaina de Letras, a branch of the conservative Academia Brasileira de Letras that came under specific attack during the *Semana de Arte Moderna*. He had also previously made his visions for Brazilian national identity crystal clear when “on the eve of the 1921 Copa América due to be held in Buenos Aires... Pessoa decreed that the national team would not field a black player in the tournament lest the nation be embarrassed by its African and mulatto elements” (David Goldblatt, *Futebol Nation: The Story of Brazil through Soccer* (New York: Nation Books, 2014), 40).

⁹ The theme of decadence is a powerful and recurring one in the historiography of post-1822 Portugal and in contemporary formulations of Portuguese national identity.

¹⁰ A good example of their intellectual project is represented by the newspaper founded in 1870 by Quental and Joaquim Pedro de Oliveira Martins entitled “A republica: journal da democracia portugueza,” available online via the Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal.

¹¹ I am indebted to Darlene J. Sadlier for drawing the conceptual links between the generation of 1870 and the avant-garde literary and artistic movements of the twentieth century in her article “Modernity and Modernism in Portugal: The “Questao Coimbra” and the Generation of 1870,” *Nineteenth-Century Prose*, Vol. 32, No. 1, Spring 2005, pp. 159 – 185.

The second reason that this early 1920s moment lent itself to a discursive strengthening of Luso-Brazilian ties on an international stage is that actual Luso-Brazilian ties had in fact been strengthened throughout the life of Brazil's Old Republic via a steady stream of Portuguese immigration. The dawn of scientific racism in the 1870s and the abolition of slavery in Brazil in 1888 had led to multiple and vocal calls for the promotion of immigration from Europe's northern regions at the end of the nineteenth century. The first thirty years of the Republic witnessed the opposite: a massive influx of migrants from Italy, Portugal, and Spain, and to a lesser degree from Japan and the Middle East.¹² Thus, with each passing year it became increasingly more difficult for Brazil's elites to frame their cultural inheritance in Francophile terms.¹³ By the time Pessoa came to power, he looked around and seized onto the elements of Brazil's population that were, let us say, white enough and definitively European: the Portuguese immigrant community and the Portuguese ancestral bonds that most Brazilians could undeniably assert.¹⁴ Marginalized, then, were the other immigrant groups mentioned above, along with

¹² The Southern European groups numbered approximately 500,000 immigrants each between the establishment of the Old Republic in 1889 and the centennial in 1922. Japanese and Middle Eastern immigrants, who began to come in large numbers only after the turn of the century, measured more on the order of 100,000 from each group (Jeffrey Lesser, *Negotiating National Identity: Immigrants, Minorities, and the Struggle for Ethnicity in Brazil* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999)).

¹³ This is a hypothesis that I will set out to prove in the dissertation.

¹⁴ Tim Engles places the formation of the field of "critical whiteness studies" in the mid-1990s in his bibliographic essay "Whiteness," in *Oxford Bibliographies Online: Atlantic History*, (accessed 20-Sep-2014). It is telling that only eleven of the eighty-four works that Engles reviews pertain to some aspect of Latin American history and exactly zero venture into the twentieth century. Most of the works reviewed deal with initial constructions of otherness (and therefore whiteness) in the expansion of European overseas empires. More nuanced studies of whiteness and those of far greater utility to the present project tend to focus on the period of great migrations to North America, where multiple groups were vying for inclusion in the dominant racial category by actively contributing to the explicit exclusion of other groups. David Roediger, *Wages of Whiteness* (London: Verso, 1991) developed his influential thesis based on the idea that racialized understandings of whiteness trumped any possibility of class solidarity as newly arrived groups like the Irish learned to scorn African Americans and others in pursuit of social mobility. Other examples of excellent scholarship in this category include: Noel Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White* (New York: Routledge, 1995); Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1998); Gary Gerstle, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001); Thomas A. Guglielmo, *White on Arrival: Italians, Race, Color, and Power in Chicago, 1890-1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003); Mae M. Ngai, *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2004); Eiichiro Azuma, *Between Two Empires: Race, History, and Transnationalism in Japanese America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005); and David R. Roediger, *Working Toward Whiteness: How*

Brazil's native peoples and the millions of African slaves who had toiled on the land for over 300 years and their descendants.¹⁵ Anti-Portuguese sentiment, or *lusofobia*, is a widely studied phenomenon in the Brazilian academy that had disappeared from Brazilian elite discourse by the early 1920s in favor of discourse based on goodwill and enduring brotherhood between the two nations.¹⁶ It is likely that anti-Portuguese sentiment persisted at other levels of Brazilian society

America's Immigrants Became White, the Strange Journey from Ellis Island to the Suburbs (New York: Basic Books, 2005).

¹⁵ The study of race in Brazil fills volumes across disciplines from the turn of the twentieth century and continues at full steam today. The briefest overview must include the contribution of Gilberto Freyre - *Casa-grande & senzala: formação da família brasileira sob o regime de economia patriarcal* (Rio de Janeiro: Maia & Schmidt, 1933) – wherein he lays out his thesis (only later deemed *racial democracy*) that racial mixture characterizes the Brazilian people and that the each strand of European, African, and indigenous heritage has contributed in unique and positive ways to national character. A basic polemic was established in the 1950s by sociologists at the University of São Paulo and a team of international researchers sent to Brazil by UNESCO who argued that Freyre's vision of Brazilian race relations was overly rosy and in fact made it more difficult for activist agendas to take root. The debate about levels of racial discrimination in Brazil has been raging since. For an excellent synopsis and comparative approach to this topic see Edward Eric Telles, *Race in Another America: The Significance of Skin Color in Brazil* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2004). A partial list of historians who have sought to understand the period of scientific racism that predated Freyre's *Casa Grande* follows. Thomas Skidmore's *Black into White: Race and Nationality in Brazilian Thought* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974) remains the classic in the field and continues to be cited heavily in both academies. Skidmore constructs a reference tool for future historians regarding the thought of Brazil's most influential racial theorists and policymakers from the 1880s to the 1930s, and he shows the lingering effects of whitening ideology in Brazil even after scientific racism began to lose global credibility at the hands of researchers such as Franz Boas and his students. Dain Borges, "'Puffy, Ugly, Slothful, and Inert': Degeneration in Brazilian Thought, 1880 – 1940," *Journal of Latin American Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (May, 1993): 235 – 256, examines a particular thread of social science rationality that linked notions of individual and national health, "a Spencerian and Comtean positivist" line of thinking that, he argues, continues to influence Brazil's social welfare state and national self-understandings (235 – 236). Borges' argument rests on a close reading of Skidmore's work along with a variety of primary source writings by Europeans such as Arthur de Gobineau and Gustave Le Bon, and Brazilian scientists (especially Nina Rodrigues) and cultural producers (Aluísio de Azevedo and Monteiro Lobato, among others). Brazilian scholars who have taken on this period include Lília Moritz Schwarcz, *O espetáculo das raças: cientistas, instituições e questão racial no Brasil, 1870-1930* (São Paulo, SP: Companhia das Letras, 1993); *ibid*, *Retrato em branco e negro: jornais, escravos e cidadãos em São Paulo no final do século XIX*. (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1987), and Nicolau Sevcenko, *A revolta da vacina: mentes insanas em corpos rebeldes* (São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1984); *ibid*, *Orfeu extático na metrópole: São Paulo, sociedade e cultura nos frementes anos 20* (São Paulo, SP: Companhia das Letras, 1992); *ibid*, *Literatura como missão: tensões sociais e criação cultural na Primeira República* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2003). In *O espetáculo das raças*, Schwarcz argues against the derivative nature of Brazilian social thought. She convincingly puts forth the idea that the institutions she describes (ethnographic museums, Historical and Geographical Institutes, law schools, and medical schools) fostered creative and original thought and the formation of an intellectual community, but she fails to link this thought to any sort of innovative social policy beyond the obviously derivative call for national whitening.

¹⁶ The treatment in English of *lusofobia* is limited and focuses almost exclusively on Rio de Janeiro. A near exhaustive list (by publication date) includes the earliest and by far the best study, Anne Marie Pescatello, "Both Ends of the Journey: An Historical Study of Migration and Change in Brazil and Portugal, 1889–1914," (PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 1970); June E. Hahner, "Jacobinos versus Galegos: Urban Radicals versus Portuguese Immigrants in Rio de Janeiro in the 1890s," *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 18.2 (1976): 125–154; Herbert S. Klein, "The Social and Economic Integration of Portuguese Immigrants in Brazil in the

through the 1920s but the sources examined herein do not allow for a definitive statement on this question.

II. American Republican Modernity

From a theoretical perspective, this article will engage primarily with the work of historian James Sanders, specifically the idea of “American republican modernity” that he first laid out in a 2011 article and that he recently expanded upon in monograph form.¹⁷ Sanders argues that historians have missed a crucial facet of mid-nineteenth century Latin American liberalism. Based on research in Mexico and Colombia he hypothesizes that political elites and leading intellectuals in these places conceived of a certain type of modernity that originated in Latin America, not Europe, and that hinged on a rhetoric of republicanism and citizenship. This

Late Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries,” *Journal of Latin American Studies* 23.2 (1991): 309–337; Rosana Barbosa, *Immigration and Xenophobia: Portuguese Immigrants in Early 19th Century Rio de Janeiro* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2009); and a chapter in Jeffrey Lesser, *Immigration, Ethnicity, and National Identity in Brazil, 1808 to the Present* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013). The historiography from the Portuguese academy comes primarily from two scholars active in the 1970s and 1980s. Their work, understandably, examines the emigration of Portuguese laborers, most of whom ended up in Brazil; *lusofobia* is therefore treated only tangentially. The two most important contributions are Joel Serrão, *A emigração portuguesa: sondagem histórica* (Lisbon: Livros Horizonte, 1977) and Miriam Halpern Pereira, *A política portuguesa de emigração, 1850 a 1930* (Lisboa: Regra do Jogo, 1981). Both scholars were instrumental in the opening of the Portuguese academy in the post-Salazar era. Finally, the topic has received substantial attention from Brazilian historians since the publication of Gladys Sabina Ribeiro’s master’s thesis *Mata galegos: os portugueses e os conflitos de trabalho na República Velha* (São Paulo: Editora Brasiliense, 1990). Similar to Serrão and Pereira, Ribeiro’s earliest work coincides with a political opening in her country that witnessed a boom in scholarly activity. She is undoubtedly the authority on the subject, having published another important monograph examining how the Portuguese presence in nineteenth century Brazil factored into the nearly simultaneous destruction of the monarchy and slavery: *A liberdade em construção: identidade nacional e conflitos antilusitanos no primeiro reinado* (Rio de Janeiro: Relume Dumará, 2002). Alongside the work of Ribeiro must be mentioned José Sacchetta Ramos Mendes, *Laços de sangue: privilégios e intolerância na imigração portuguesa no Brasil, 1822-1945* (São Paulo: Edusp, 2011). Mendes draws on his legal background to locate the ambiguity that characterizes Brazilian and other immigrant groups’ opinions towards the Portuguese in a long line of privileges built into law that made it easier for the Portuguese to immigrate than other nationalities. Finally, Eulália Maria Lahmeyer Lobo gathered data on the topic for the entire postcolonial period and published her *Imigração portuguesa no Brasil* (São Paulo: Editora Hucitec, 2001) shortly before Ribeiro’s more artful monograph. Lobo’s biggest contribution is a bibliographical essay that provides the reader with an overview of the scores of articles published on the topic in Brazil in the 1990s. Scholarly output since that date continues to be robust and to appear primarily in article form. The Brazilian works described above are the exceptions in a historiography that tends to focus on small communities or regions or one particular aspect of Portuguese immigrant life. The influences from North American racial theorists like Omi and Winant and the pioneering work of immigration specialist José Moya, even in the best works, are undetectable.

¹⁷ James Sanders, “The Vanguard of the Atlantic World: Contesting Modernity in Nineteenth-Century Latin America,” *Latin American Research Review* 46:2 (2011): 104-27.

James Sanders, *The Vanguard of the Atlantic World: Creating Modernity, Nation, and Democracy in Nineteenth-Century Latin America* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014).

modernity was, for Sanders, “inherently political” and demonstrated that “Latin America represented the future because it had adopted republicanism and democracy, whereas Europe, under the boot of monarchs and the aristocracy, dwelled in the past.”¹⁸ In addition to downplaying Europe’s role in the development of Atlantic World republican ideals, Sanders describes American republican modernity as a “countermodernity to the North Atlantic” that challenged “the material realities of capitalism in dictating the future.”¹⁹ Sanders’ definition of modernity, broadly conceived, is also useful for our purposes. Rather, than rehash the endless debate about what constitutes a modern society, the author focuses on the meaning of the term within the societies he studies. He concludes that “modernity does not exist as anything measurable but is only a normative and judgmental comparison... only what people at a certain time thought and categorized as ‘modern’ is useful for understanding the power of modernity not as an analytical category but as a potent discursive force operating in society.”²⁰ Sanders acknowledges his debt in this formulation to the ideas presented by Frederick Cooper.²¹ In this article, then, we are similarly indebted to Cooper, as the question of how Brazilian and Portuguese political elites and leading journalists sought to cast Brazil and Portugal in a modern light lies at its very heart.

Instead of dismissing Brazil as the exception to American republican modernity in Latin America, Sanders need only look a half-century into the future. His dismissal is subtle: “... [one] reason that Latin America’s or, more precisely, Spanish America’s, assumption of the mantle of modernity has been subsumed in historical memory is that the period of Latin America’s claim to modernity was short lived” (109). The fact that he allows Mexico and Colombia to stand in for

¹⁸ Sanders (article), 105.

¹⁹ Sanders (article), 105.

²⁰ Sanders (article), 107.

²¹ Frederick Cooper, *Colonialism in Question: Theory, Knowledge, History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005).

all of Spanish America, in itself, necessitates further attention from historians. If he had considered Brazil, however, he would have found that not only does the period of the Old Republic (1889 – 1930) conform perfectly to his three criteria of American republican modernity, it also upsets his thesis that this phenomenon was unique to the middle decades of the nineteenth century.²² My research, therefore, suggests not that American republican modernity was short lived but rather that it flourished at different moments across Latin America. Archival work regarding this question in countries around the region would likely uncover similar political cultures at different moments beyond the thirty-year time frame inscribed by Sanders, from the late colonial period through the early years of the twentieth century. In coming up with this time frame, Sanders places too much emphasis on the “triumph” of “Western industrial modernity” as a main factor in American republican modernity’s decline.²³ The evidence from Brazil’s centennial of independence in no way refutes the importance of industrial capitalism in shaping self-perceptions of modernity in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Rather, it shows that an “inherently political” notion of modernity – to again borrow Sanders’ phrase – based on republican rule and ostensible equality among citizens can comfortably coexist with the ideals linking capitalism and modernity. What was occurring in Brazil during the centennial was a simultaneous striving for both types of modernity. The similar treatment bestowed upon Charles Evans Hughes, the US Secretary of State, and Antonio José de Almeida, the Portuguese President, during their official visits in September 1922 – they were the only dignitaries, for example, to be housed at the sumptuous Catete Palace – is but one, somewhat superficial,

²² These criteria are “1) it emphasized republican politics as a marker of modernity; 2) it saw these politics as the culmination of a political tradition spanning the Atlantic World coming out of the age of revolution, ultimately bearing fruit in the Americas; and 3) it made claims to Latin America’s place as the locus of modernity in the Atlantic World” (Sanders, 105).

²³ Sanders (article), 109.

indicator of the young Brazilian republic's twin desire to showcase their country's economic prosperity and political modernity.

III. Luso-Brazilian Relations at 100 Years of Political Independence

The centenary celebrations of 1922 have left historians a rich array of sources. President Almeida was in attendance at twenty-two events during his stay in Brazil, between the 17th and 24th of September, and he spoke at eighteen of these. All of his speeches and those of the politicians and dignitaries who received or accompanied him have been preserved. A sampling of the articles produced in three São Paulo newspapers in July, August, and September of that year suggests that a comprehensive reading of the press that this event generated in Brazil and Portugal is too ambitious a goal for one article. The analysis that follows will therefore focus on the speeches and the press of Rio de Janeiro during Almeida's visit as he was in that city nearly the entire time.²⁴ Four sections will reinforce the argument that Pessoa and Almeida deployed rhetoric typical of American republican modernity in their speeches and that they were able to count on the support of their political allies and a majority of journalists in echoing their tone. The first section will examine the speeches offered by both men in 1919 during Pessoa's visit to Portugal and their opening speeches during the centenary celebration. Next, a close reading of speeches given by statesmen other than Pessoa and Almeida and of articles that reinforce their ideas of Luso-Brazilian cordiality will serve to complete the picture of the conservative nationalism that characterized the stance of most Brazilian elites. The third section will reflect on the elite, conservative, and transatlantic political sphere that was incubated at a Portuguese law school and that was most fully realized during the centennial. Finally, three articles and one

²⁴ Sixteen Carioca newspapers – *A.B.C.*, *Boa Noite*, *O Brasil*, *O Dia*, *A Folha*, *A Gazeta de Noticias*, *O Imparcial*, *O Jornal*, *Jornal do Brasil*, *Jornal do Comércio*, *A Noite*, *O Pais*, *A Pátria*, *Revista da Semana*, *Rio – Jornal*, and *A Rua* – produced 144 articles directly related to Almeida's presence in Brazil during the eight day window of his visit. Almeida also made brief stops in Santos and Salvador da Bahia.

speech will be highlighted for the subtle ways in which they challenged the hegemonic political views of the day and helped pave the way for a distinct conceptualization of Brazilian national identity that came to the fore in the 1930s.

a. Presidential Ideas

Pessoa never strayed from his argument that Portuguese and Brazilians are the same *Raça* and that they are uniquely capable of republican rule. The logical inference is that people who are not part of the *Raça* in Brazil are not worthy of republican participation, namely indigenous Brazilians, Afro-Brazilians, non-European immigrants, and people of mixed racial background. Pessoa did not admit to Brazil's long history of racial mixing, nor did he acknowledge the diversity of Brazil's population. Almeida, earlier Portuguese sources suggest, had a more forward-thinking stance on Republican representation, but as the guest of honor, he tended to toe Pessoa's line and avoid explicit statements concerning Brazil's racial composition beyond consistently acknowledging the predominant presence of Portuguese blood. The sources indicate that the elaboration and exaggeration of political, economic, and cultural ties between former metropole and former colony was of the highest priority for these leaders. Both Brazil and Portugal were young republics that were rhetorically committed to citizenship and equality; they were both interested in free and fair trade across the Atlantic; but what is curious is that Brazilians come across as culturally indistinct from the Portuguese in these sources. It is the *absence* of references to African, indigenous, or non-Portuguese immigrant influences that is remarkable about elite discourse in 1922. When differences are mentioned, and they seldom are, they are explained away with reference to the distinct American environment. Brazil and Portugal, according to the countries' leaders, had diverged only in the minor changes that Brazil's tropical climate had enacted on its people; or, in recognition of Brazil's relative

economic success, the country's vast natural resources are frequently invoked. Clearly, the abolition-era idea that Brazil was a country without people still lingered.

Many of the ideas that would circulate between political elites in 1922 first came to the surface in 1919 when then President-elect Pessoa traveled to Portugal on an official visit during his return voyage to Brazil after heading his country's delegation to the Treaty of Versailles peace conference. On June 9th, President Almeida received Pessoa in an "extraordinary" congressional session and delivered a lengthy speech outlining his understanding of Luso-Brazilian history. After some opening niceties, describing the two countries as possessing "a sentimental bond" and "linkages of the spirit," Almeida launched into an effusive, though somewhat typical, overview of Portugal's maritime greatness:

... there was a moment in which Portugal attained the culmination of power and glory... she was the leader and spiritual guide of other peoples. She discovered, conquered and evangelized. The energy of her arms corresponded to the vitality of her brain and the audacity of her soul. She possessed Africa and Brazil, India and Arabia, she reached China and Japan, and, unsatisfied, she advanced towards Canada and towards the poles, encircling the world, with Magellan, with an embrace of near-fantastical navigation. We were a fistful of men, fewer than three million inhabitants, and we dominated the world, being, in a certain sense, the *senhores* of the Universe.

The build-up here was meant to situate Brazil's achievements as a logical outgrowth of the intrepid national character of the famous Portuguese *nauta*. Almeida attributed Brazilian expansion on the South American mainland to the same "faith and such longing that at other times filled the chest of the Portuguese explorers" and employed a standard language of imperialism as a civilizing mission, insisting that Brazilians were able to simultaneously "tame the Indian and the wild beasts of their territories." His speech began to stray from predictable formulations of past glory, however, when his attention reached the nineteenth century. Almeida cited the 1878 election of Brazil's first republican deputy, Rodrigues de Freitas "the eminent citizen, with a methodical and serene voice, a logic of steel and a supreme moral prestige," as a

turning point in the histories of both countries. “From that point forward,” he proclaimed, “always and in every way, Brazil pulled out in the lead, supplying us with the stimulus, instilling in us the energy, giving us, in the revolutionary field, a noble and fecund example.” Almeida continued at length on the subject of Brazilian republican leadership, discussing the positive effect of the campaign for abolition on the country’s journalists, the peaceful example established by the monarchy’s overthrow in 1889, and the similarities between Rui Barbosa and Afonso Costa, famous republicans from each country. In summary, and in near perfect harmony with Sanders’ criteria for American republican modernity, Almeida stated, “Brazil truly was, for nearly half a century, somewhat of a political preceptor for us, dragging before us horizons of common aspiration and almost always stimulating our tendencies for revolt against arrogance and injustice.” Before returning to pleasantries, Almeida spent several minutes pointing out that Portugal had reverted back to its leadership position by being the first of the two countries to enter World War I to assist the Allies “to defend supreme human aspirations based on equality.” By making this final assertion, Almeida’s bias became crystal clear. He did not have to say explicitly that the 1910 overthrow of the monarchy put Portugal back on even footing with, or even ahead of, its former colony.

After a “thunderous applause from the congressmen” and many “*vivas e aclamações*,” Pessoa offered a concise response that affirmed each point made by Almeida. He began, in a similarly polite way, by referring to Brazil as “the young nation that from the other side of the ocean prolongs the irradiation of your noble and glorious traditions; the young nation that on the vast American continent represents, she alone, the glory of your explorers, the fruit of your culture, the energies of your intelligence and of your labor.”²⁵ And he continued in this vein,

²⁵ It is interesting that for Almeida, Brazil is the *filho* of Portugal and is referred to with the masculine “ele,” while Pessoa refers to his own homeland with the more traditional “ela,” or “she.”

making sure to appeal to the republican sentiments of Almeida and of the cabinet: it was in that very room, he noted, that “the most elevated liberal conquests were achieved and the most profound demands were made for rights and for democracy.” In his concluding remarks, Pessoa brings up a trope that would be repeated many times in 1922. He assured the assembled congressmen that Brazilians everywhere would rejoice upon receiving the news of his warm welcome in Lisbon, and that one would see “the Brazilian soul vibrating in unison with the Lusitanian soul... two brothers speaking across the ocean... two friendly hearts holding tightly, across the seas, in one long embrace of fraternal friendship and affection.” In Pessoa and Almeida, Brazil and Portugal found two leaders who were ideologically in sync to an unprecedented degree, both of whom were adept at emphasizing a shared harmonious past and both of whom were publicly – and, as time would tell, naively – optimistic about the future of the two republics.²⁶

In 1922, more details would emerge from the mouths of these two men, from other statesmen, and from interested journalists about what was at stake for the elites of both places in this rekindled relationship. The centenary celebrations were launched on 7 September 1922 and continued until 23 March 1923 with delegations from nine European countries, five in the Americas, and Japan. Pavilions were constructed in Rio to represent each of these countries, every Brazilian state, and a variety of governmental and industrial pursuits, and more than 6,000 people presented to some three million attendees over the course of seven months.²⁷ If press coverage is any indication, the unquestionable highlight amidst the excitement was the short visit

²⁶ Both speeches are reproduced in Antônio José de Almeida and Caetano Gonçalves, *Quarenta anos de vida literária e política* (Lisboa: J. Rodrigues, 1933), 259 – 278.

²⁷ The countries represented were Belgium, Denmark, France, Italy, England, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Czechoslovakia, Argentina, Brazil, the United States, Mexico, and Japan; and the other pavilions housed exhibits pertaining to administration, nutrition, statistics, celebrations, agriculture and transportation, small business, big business, hunting and fishing, the Antarctica brewery, jewelry, and a *Pavilhão de Honra de Portugal* (separate from the Portuguese pavilion). - <http://www.ichs.ufop.br/conifes/anais/CMS/cms1105.htm>

of the Portuguese president. Newspapers in São Paulo, for example, began to link Almeida's visit, the centenary, and the achievement of the Portuguese aviators Gago Coutinho and Sacadura Cabral as early as July.²⁸ And unlike Pessoa's brief 1919 stopover in Portugal, this was a time of grand ceremony and public visibility, with a purported crowd of 300,000 pressing into Rio's *Praça da Independência* on September 24th to hear the words of the 57-year-old Portuguese president.²⁹ The following day the *Jornal do Comércio* in Rio reported that "people from all social classes comprised the crowd without one single complaint, each attempting to be in a better position to not miss the unique opportunity to see up close, to hear, and to be able to acclaim the President of the *povo irmão*."³⁰ Several days prior to this event, the president of both nations had the chance to lay out the central tenets of their shared republicanism in a somewhat more intimate setting.



²⁸ The *Diario Popular*, *A Gazeta*, and the *Jornal do Commercio: Edição de São Paulo* all featured ongoing front-page articles about Coutinho and Cabral – *Os Nautas do Ar* – and about Almeida's visit as early as July 1st. The two topics are taken together as often as they are covered separately. It is evident that the authors are trying to restore greatness to Portugal (and Brazil by association) via the mastery of a new method of global exploration, from the seas to the skies as it were.

²⁹ The photo on this page was taken at the event and is from *Duas Pátrias*, page 261. The title is "A Document from Yesterday for the Future" and the caption reads "the great popular manifestation of 24 September 1922: an aspect of the crowd at the *Praça da Independência*, in Rio de Janeiro, listening to the speech of greeting for the Brazilian People offered by Sr. Dr. António José de Almeida."

³⁰ Reprinted in *Duas Pátrias*, 244.

It was at the official banquet held in honor of Almeida at Catete Palace on September 18th that both men reiterated in some detail their rosy understanding of Brazil and Portugal's shared history, one that could have easily been interpreted through the more familiar colonial lens of exploitation, domination, and bloodshed. Pessoa began the event with a short speech welcoming the Portuguese president and explaining why his presence at a celebration of Brazilian independence is a "natural occurrence that should fill both peoples with pride." In Pessoa's understanding, September 7th was a *data da Raça*, or a date of the Race, which 100 years previous had witnessed Brazilians and Portuguese *unified* against the injustices of the Cortes of Lisbon. The Cortes, in the rhetoric of Pessoa and Almeida, stand in not only for the ills of colonial rule but also for the ills of monarchical rule, with Pessoa using the words "retrograde and apolitical" and Almeida opting for "retrograde and reactionary" to describe that governing body. Thus the formal independence of 1822 was but one step towards the true liberation of each society that came with monarchical overthrow in 1889 in the former colony and 1910 in the former metropole. In spite of their staunch republicanism, both leaders took a charitable stance towards Kings João VI, who ruled the Portuguese empire from Rio de Janeiro, and Pedro I & II of the Brazilian House of Bragança, who ruled the new nation for most of the nineteenth century.

According to Pessoa, Dom João VI, during his thirteen years of rule in pre-independence Brazil, did more than anyone else to prepare the vast territory for its life as an independent nation. Among the achievements, Pessoa cited "opening the ports, giving [Brazil] art, schools, academies, libraries, press, freedom of commerce and of industry, means of transport, lines of communication, an army, an armada, cultures... everything that would guide us to a life of sovereignty." Pessoa went on to describe Pedro I's cry of independence – the *Grito de Ipiranga* – of 7 September 1822 as the "logical consequence of the actions of the father" and insisted that it

was received by “applause from the Portuguese and sons of Portuguese,” and that it was “not a declaration of war against Portugal but a vibrant protest against the Cortes of Lisbon.” And finally, to reiterate that September 7th should be celebrated as a *data da Raça* and a “Luso-Brazilian date,” Pessoa concluded that Portugal, “by its king, prepared Brazil for independence, as a father prepares his son for adulthood.” The focus on the benevolence of the Bragança monarchs is perhaps not surprising given the reputation garnered especially by Pedro II throughout the nineteenth century, but in trying to frame Portuguese and Brazilians as “two branches of the same people,” Pessoa effectively glossed the anti-Portuguese sentiment that emerged immediately following independence and that led to violent conflicts on Brazilian soil at several points in the country’s first 100 years.³¹

The first half of Almeida’s response was an extended affirmation of the ideas presented by Pessoa. He described Pessoa’s grasp of the independence process as one characterized by “firm exactitude and scrupulous truth” and interpreted the colonial era as one in which the Portuguese “discovered, populated and defended the vast territory of Brazil against the greed of foreigners.” For this, Almeida reasoned, Brazil was indebted to Portugal for its “legacy... such a grand and rich patrimony.” He was quick to add, however, that Portugal is also indebted to Brazil: “for the energy, the bravery, the intelligence and the love of the Race with which [Brazil] has sustained, augmented, developed... with the greatest majesty and beauty, this work of civilization, which was the greatest glory of [Portugal’s] grand past.” Statements such as these make it difficult to pin down exactly who was worthy of republican self-rule in Almeida’s regard. His reputation as Portugal’s greatest champion of republican ideals makes it tempting to conclude that, in his centenary speeches, he was merely telling Pessoa and Brazil’s political elite

³¹ For example: “Those Portuguese who stayed with us did not feel in 1822, as they do not feel today, in a strange land.”

what they wanted to hear about their own population: that the European elements were continuing the civilizing work of centuries past. In his own country, Almeida could largely avoid the thorny issue of political representation for non-whites because of Portugal's considerably more homogenous population.

If Almeida's commitment to republican ideals put him at odds with the Brazilian Old Republic's notoriously firm grasp on oligarchic rule, he did not view the centenary as the appropriate occasion for challenging the status quo. Rather, he accounted for the differences between Portugal and Brazil by turning to environmental explanations. In what follows, Almeida outlines a mini-treatise on Brazilian national identity:

I am recognizing on my own that which I had already known from the testimonials of others, that is, that Brazil has known how to create its own civilization, that is in part made from the old Portuguese tradition, that is in part due to the strong and healthy American environment, but above all is the result of the intrepid and intelligent force of the resolute men who populate it, and who in truth form a state of a collective soul, powerful and resplendent, which rightly should be called *brasilidade* – a new force, serene and daring that is intervening effectively in the destinies of the world.

In this succinct appraisal, Almeida sides with Brazil's Portuguese-descended political elites. If he was aware of the more audacious formulations of *brasilidade* that had emerged most recently during São Paulo's Modern Art Week, he chose not to acknowledge them directly. Almeida's supporters might insist that by "the resolute men who populate it" he was referring to all adult, male Brazilians regardless of skin color, but he missed an opportunity here to recognize explicitly the contributions of non-Europeans to the idea of what it meant to be Brazilian. If Almeida had been asked to speak during Modern Art Week, or if Rui Barbosa had won the presidency in 1919 and had received Almeida in 1922, then the Portuguese president may have

chosen to allude more specifically and more positively to Brazil's long history of racial mixing.³² As it was, however, with Pessoa at the helm, the idea of a Brazilian as a benevolent Portuguese colonizer in a tropical environment was not quite ready to cede to more progressive understandings. Almeida concluded his speech by citing republican institutions and the Portuguese language as the two strongest bonds that united the twin *pátrias*, two aspects of Luso-Brazilian relations that the press and other orators at the centenary were also keen to emphasize.³³

b. *A Loyal Messenger: the Press of Rio de Janeiro – September 1922*

One of the more remarkable aspects of the rhetoric deployed by Pessoa and Almeida during Brazil's centennial is the degree to which their ideas were reinforced not only by other political elites but also by the mainstream press of Rio de Janeiro. Of the 144 articles that were published in the sixteen Rio newspapers cited above, only three or four contained opinions that could be described as radically different than those presented in the presidential speeches. Before turning to the other speakers and to these exceptions among the articles, let us first examine how Rio journalists picked up on and strengthened the dominant political discourse of Luso-Brazilian republicanism and cordiality.

A sampling of the newspaper headlines from September 1922 is the first and most obvious indicator that the visit of the Portuguese president did not generate great debate in

³² Barbosa was a notorious critic of the Old Republic's political elite. See, for example, his speech cited in Woodard, *A Place in Politics*, 96 – 97: "All of this Brazil, anemic, oppilated, swollen-bellied, cretinous, enervated, crippled, without memory, initiative, industriousness, perseverance, or courage all this denaturation of our nationality does not come from the black, nor the caboclo, nor from the mestiço, nor from the Portuguese, whose vigor, insurrect and disordered, but virile, is right now reminding us of the heroic temper of the old race. It comes from the political evil, the chlorotic, the enervating, defibrinating *politicorrhea*, that submits the nation to all of the physical and moral ailments of a people without hygiene of the body or of the soul." In spite of Almeida's alliance with Pessoa, he frequently cited Barbosa as one of Brazil's greatest champions of republicanism, yet refrained – again, understandably, as the invited guest – from issuing these sorts of scathing critiques of the Brazilian political establishment. (The translation and the italics are Woodard's.)

³³ All citations from both presidential speeches at the banquet of September 18 were taken from their transcription in Luis Derouet, *Duas pátrias: o que foi a visita do António José de Almeida ao Brasil* (Lisboa: Mundo, 1923) 185 – 187.

carioca society, at least not in formal channels at the time. The headlines can be divided into the merely descriptive and the exalting, without a controversial one in the mix. In the first category, there appeared various articles with the simple title of “Brazil-Portugal,” and other mundane headlines such as “The Brother Arriving,” “The Sovereign Voice of Portugal,” “The Supreme Chief of the Lusitanian Democracy,” “Luso-Brazilian Relations,” “Luso-Brazilian Cordiality,” “Luso-Brazilian Solidarity,” etc. The second category is made up of slightly more colorful examples that nevertheless decline to challenge the decision of the Brazilian government to invite the head of the former colonizing power to celebrate the political separation of the two peoples. Among many others, these include: “A Historic Moment of Great Significance,” “The First Citizen of the Overseas Republic,” “The Definitive Approximation of the Two Sister Nations,” “A Vision from the Glorious Lusitanian Cradle,” “The Vibrant Soul of Brazil,” “A Destiny of Peace and Progress,” and the particularly telling “The Apogee of the Race.”³⁴ The interplay of race and republicanism that forms the principal concern of this article was also of high importance to Rio’s leading journalists.³⁵

³⁴ Articles with the title “Brasil-Portugal” appeared in *A Gazeta Teatral* (September 18) and *O Dia* (September 19), and one entitled “Portugal-Brasil” was published in the *Revista da Semana* on September 2. A list of the other headlines in the original Portuguese, along with the periodical and their publication date follows: “O irmão que chega,” *O Pais*, September 17; “A voz soberana do Portugal,” *A Pátria*, September 17; “O chefe supremo da democracia lusitana,” *Jornal do Brasil*, September 17; “As relações luso-brasileiros,” *A. B. C.*, September 17; “A cordialidade luso-brasileira,” *Rio – Jornal*, September 19; “A solidariedade luso-brasileiro,” *A Pátria*, September 20; “Um momento histórico de grande significação,” *O Dia*, September 17; “O primeiro cidadão da república de além-mar,” *A noite*, September 18; “A aproximação definitiva das duas nações irmãs,” *O Dia*, September 19; “Uma visão do glorioso berço lusitano,” *A noite*, September 19; “A alma vibrante do Brasil,” *O Jornal*, September 19; “Um destino de paz e progresso,” *O Brasil*, September 20; and “A epopeia da raça,” *O jornal do Brasil*, September 19.

³⁵ The majority of articles were unsigned. Some of the names that do appear include Mário Salgueiro, Dinis Júnior, Carvalho Neves, Rui Chianca, Medeiros e Albuquerque, Óscar Lopes, Gilberto Amado, José Severiano de Resende, Afonso de Carvalho, Pôrto da Silveira, Miguel Melo, Coelho Neto, Artur Pinto da Rocha, Afonso Costa, Gomes Leite, someone with the moniker Chrysanthème, and the appropriately named João Luso. Several Portuguese journalists accompanied Almeida on the voyage, including Avelino de Almeida, Tito Martins, Mário Salgueiro, and Luís Derouet. These individuals made up a crucial component of the republican public sphere that united Brazil and Portugal from 1910 until 1926, realized most fully in the cities of Lisbon and Rio de Janeiro in the early 1920s. I will interrogate this phenomenon further in a chapter of my forthcoming dissertation. The Portuguese newspaper *O Mundo* – published in Lisbon and marketed in Brazil to Portuguese immigrants – is a quintessential example of this Luso-Brazilian public sphere.

For the most part, however, these journalists were not eager to belie the fact that Pessoa was guilty of the same sin as countless other republican politicians across space and time: the tendency to cling to power by subordinating groups different from the one to which he belonged, or imagined himself to belong, all while espousing an ideology of equality. For Pessoa, a true citizen of Brazil was a European-descended, literate, adult male who spoke Portuguese.³⁶ His decision to invite Portugal's most famous republican to the centenary celebrations was a shrewd political maneuver designed to bolster his own image as a republican statesman while simultaneously emphasizing those elements of Brazilian society – perfectly embodied by Almeida – whom he deemed to be worthy of political representation. Not only was the press willing to let the discrepancies of Pessoa's platform slide in September 1922, they actually aided him, wittingly or otherwise, in his pursuit.

The majority of articles merely echoed the language that the two presidents used in their speeches. An example of this type of article was published on September 19 in the newspaper *Rio – Journal*. The unsigned article, entitled “The Voices of the Race,” begins by describing the two presidential speeches from the previous day's banquet in typically grandiloquent language: the speeches were “magnificent examples of erudition,” and “the genius of the race hovered in those moments, glowing over the heads of the two governing statesmen.” Similarly, the author insisted, “the spirit of high justice with which President Epitácio [Pessoa] greeted the Pátria of

³⁶ “European-descended,” I hypothesize, had by this time come to be an exact stand-in for white in Brazil. I reason that the large influx of Southern Europeans to Brazil, especially since 1888, led policymakers to abandon the previous distinction they had drawn between Northern and Southern Europe. This is not to say that prejudice did not exist in Brazilian society during this time towards poor immigrants from the rural regions of Portugal, Spain, and Italy; it most certainly did. I suggest, though, that enough of these immigrants were upwardly mobile that their industriousness came to be seen as an asset, and that 100 years was perhaps enough time for postcolonial tensions to dissipate to a degree that Brazilians began to embrace their Southern European roots. I cannot yet fully substantiate these claims with empirical source-based evidence. Furthermore, I do not argue that 1922 represents the end of *lusofobia* in Brazil. For a discussion of the phenomenon in mid-twentieth century Recife, see Luiz Paulo Pontes Ferraz, “*Deus te leve a Pernambuco*”: *antilusitanismo, legislação e estatística na história da imigração portuguesa para Pernambuco (1945 – 1965)* (Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, CFCH: Master's Thesis, 2014).

our ancestors, corresponded admirably with the form that the moral elegance of Portuguese sentiment took in the mouth of President António José de Almeida.” Later in the article, this author restated Almeida’s idea that the tropical climate was the primary factor accounting for the difference between Portuguese and Brazilians. He contends that Brazil of 1922 represented “the highest aspirations of the race, in spite of the differences that the American environment imprinted upon it.” In another article, the reader was enticed to believe that “since 1822 there is no memory of more vigorous, more vibrant, stronger, and more definitive manifestations of mutual friendship than these, currently, between Brazilians and Portuguese.”³⁷ This author attributes these strong bonds to the republican spirit of the two places – in other words, American republican modernity: the words of the presidents were of “highest significance... they translated with fidelity the sentiments of the populations of the two Republics, which their Excellencies worthily represent with such proprietorship.”³⁸ This vague language of high praise was typical of the press surrounding the event. In the end, the words of one commentator ring true: “We leave the sociologists to carry out the analysis of the phenomenon, to later give the complete explanation. We, simple journalists, register the fact of the matter, whose utility is evident, whose convenience meets the eyes of anyone, and whose moral reasons can only awaken highest praise.”³⁹

One author, who did write in a unique voice, reinforced the general sentiments of Almeida and Pessoa but also inflected the piece with his own more radically conservative ideas. In the case of “Luso-Brazilian Solidarity,” the author departed on a racialized diatribe, calling for the two peoples to shore up racial boundaries because “the West is on the cusp of being assaulted

³⁷ “As palavras dos dois presidentes,” *Gazeta de Notícias*, September 20.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ *Ibid.*

by an avalanche of savagery,” a savagery that remains vague and undefined.⁴⁰ After including the *lusíadas* on a long list of the world’s great races, this author lays out his argument:

The field of action of the *lusíada* will be, in the future, as it was in the past, the entire Universe. The *lusíadas* – Brazilians, Portuguese, all those who speak the admirable language that is ours – represent great and vigorous human potential... The fraternal embrace that Portugal extends in this moment to the heart of Brazil is a signal that the *lusíada*, beloved daughter of *latinidade*, is sealing with love an eternal pact in defense of and in affirmation of the West... so that human culture will not perish. On this radiant path is it necessary that the men of the State of Portugal and of Brazil pragmatically achieve the moral, mental, political, and economic solidarity of the two great Latino-Portuguese nations, that of Europe and that of America, in such a way that both peoples receive, from their indestructible confraternity, reciprocal advantages and utilities of a concrete nature.⁴¹

The ultimate message here remains ambiguous. It is easy to suppose that by “savagery” the author was referring Brazil’s indigenous and Afro-descended population, yet by defining the *lusíada* race as those who speak Portuguese, he seems to simultaneously include in his conceptualization nearly everyone within Brazil’s territorial boundaries. It is possible that he was worried about remote, unassimilated indigenous groups diluting *lusíada* purity, but this seems unlikely. What initially resembles a proto-fascist call for the maintenance of firm racial borders, ends with the promotion of solidarity between Brazil and Portugal framed in relatively more benign political terms.

c. A Luso-Brazilian Sphere: Conservative, Elite, and forged at Coimbra

The speakers who shared the stage with Almeida during his visit tended to avoid controversial statements regarding national belonging in Brazil, shying away from extreme notions of exclusivity *or* inclusivity but focusing intensely on the Luso-Brazilian bond. The homogeneity of ideas presented makes necessary only a brief comparison of the words of three

⁴⁰ “A solidariedade luso-brasileiro,” *A Pátria*, September 20.

⁴¹ *Ibid.* – Among the races of the world similar to the *lusíada* for their scope and spread, the author lists “*mongólica, etrusco-latina, indo-germânica, assírio-caldaica, anglo-saxónia, tártaro-industânica, [and] germano-latina.*”

speakers.⁴² Two of the three speeches considered here were offered at Brazil's National Congress on September 20, and the third was given the following day at the inauguration of a monument to the Brazilian aviator Santos Dumont. The vice president of the Brazilian senate initiated the proceedings on the 20th with what can only be described as a typical speech for this particular milieu. He began by acknowledging Brazil's debt to Portugal for the "formation of our nationality and the development of our civilization, around which revolve our progress and our greatness," later describing Brazil as "nothing more than a prolongation of Portugal." These words were mundane for Azeredo's audience but would certainly have inspired outrage at other times and in other settings. In his concluding remarks, Azeredo went on to insist that "here there is no distinction between Portuguese and Brazilians," describing the obligation of Brazilians to "proclaim the old and glorious traditions of heroic Portugal that were impressed upon the entire world, that belong to us as well, in the same way that we share with that noble Nation that good which we have done for the benefit of civilization and humanity, in these last 100 years." At the same meeting, the president of the Brazilian House of Representatives applied Azeredo's logic more explicitly to questions of race, linguistics, and religion:

Between people, neither more intimate nor stronger bonds exist than those that link Brazil and Portugal. They are bonds of family, created by the same hearty and glowing blood, originating from the same genealogical tree; interwoven by resistant fibers of the same gigantic musculature; fortified, day by day, by the enchanting story of the beauties and harmonies of a common language, splendid vehicle of their thoughts, of their emotions, of their hopes, of their high ideas, of their noble aspirations; consolidated by the glorious traditions of the same race; made robust by the unbreakable linkages of the same faith.⁴³

And finally, to show that these sentiments extended at least slightly beyond the halls of power, we see identical thoughts expressed when a Portuguese aviator saluted a Brazilian one. Sacadura

⁴² I argue that these three speeches should be taken as representative of the twenty-eight that were pronounced by people other than the two presidents at the many functions held to honor Almeida's presence.

⁴³ These words were spoken by Arnolfo Azevedo. Both speeches are reproduced in *Duas Pátrias*, 187 – 190.

Cabral, who earlier in the year had completed the first aerial crossing of the Southern Atlantic, waxed poetic about the bonds he felt with Santos Dumont and with Brazilians more generally. “As we know ourselves to be Portuguese by birth, we recognize ourselves as Brazilians at heart,” and, addressing the *Senhores Presidentes* directly, Cabral continued, “it is always with pleasure... that Portugal and Brazil come together to glorify any of their heroes, because, whomever it be, he belongs to both countries and in him the Race to which each nation has the pride of belonging is glorified.”⁴⁴

It would be overly simplistic to insist that the call to strengthen Luso-Brazilian ties flowed top-down from the minds of Pessoa and Almeida. Rather, as one historian drawing his conclusions from a different context reminds us, it is helpful to think of presidential oratory as “a highly structured affair... welded to massive subterranean templates of grammar and conviction.”⁴⁵ The speeches of Cabral, Azeredo, and Azevedo help to demonstrate that all of the actors considered so far were continually reacting and responding to the latest pronouncements of those regarded as intellectual equals. Journalists and other speakers abided by these “templates” of formality laid out in the presidential speeches and only very occasionally attempted to challenge the presidents on their ideas. These “presidential” ideas, however, did not occur to the leaders *ex nihilo* but rather from a biased observation of Brazilian and Portuguese society writ large, and, more importantly, from heeding their constituents, their advisors, and their speechwriters. Pessoa and Almeida should thus be considered the most important, but far from the only, actors in an elite and conservative intellectual sphere that coalesced across the Atlantic in the early 1920s.

⁴⁴ *Duas Pátrias*, 243.

⁴⁵ Daniel T. Rodgers, *Age of Fracture* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2011) 17.

One centenary event offers particular insights into the origins of this group. A journalist deftly summarized the coalition that accompanied the Portuguese president: “Along with politicians, diplomats, and military men of elevated rank, who figure in the Luso envoy, journalists and men of letters of great value and renown also came.”⁴⁶ Not coincidentally, this is also an apt summary of the Brazilian elite who received this group and who constitute the other half of the conservative bloc with which this article is concerned. Much of the solidarity that spanned the Atlantic during this period was initially formed in the halls of the famous Portuguese law school in Coimbra. Facing limited options for higher learning in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, with the notable exceptions of law schools in São Paulo and Recife, many wealthy Brazilians sent their sons to Coimbra to pursue a degree.⁴⁷ A banquet organized at Rio’s Jockey Club on September 24 served as a reunion for Coimbra alumni, receiving the title *Hora de Confraternização Coimbrã*.⁴⁸ In the official photograph of the event, there is only one individual in a group of twenty-six who could be described as being of mixed racial background.⁴⁹

⁴⁶ “Uma ideia,” *Gazeta de Notícias*, September 20.

⁴⁷ For more on the Brazilian institutions, see Andrew J. Kirkendall, *Class Mates: Male Student Culture and the Making of a Political Class in Nineteenth-Century Brazil* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002).

⁴⁸ The journalist Luís Derouet described the banquet, giving a good idea of who constituted the Coimbra nucleus: “The lunch at the Jockey Club was an enchanting celebration of high intellectual and sentimental importance, without a doubt among the most expressive of those realized in Rio de Janeiro from the 17th to the 27th of September 1922. In attendance, in addition to Drs. António José de Almeida and António Luís Gomes, rector of the University of Coimbra, who was the first to offer brief words of greeting, were all former students of the University of Coimbra, Drs. Barbosa de Magalhães e Duarte Leite, Silva Ramos – of the *Academia Brasileira de Letras* – Pinto da Rocha... Alberto de Oliveira, João de Barros, Álvaro de Almeida, João Lage, Alexandre de Albuquerque, Sousa Ribeiro, Albino Pacheco, Rui da Cunha e Costa, Elísio Sucena, Francisco Levita, Lebre Lima, Vítor Gonçalves, Sabino Teodoro, Montenegro Serra, Luís Filipe de Assunção, Berquó Coelho, Almeida Lopes, and Gilberto Amado. This last, federal deputy and notable writer, acknowledged with touching words full of admiration the honor he felt to be seated at the table of the ‘greatest orator he had ever heard’” (*Duas Pátrias*, 279). Other members of this elite group who were not Coimbra alumni and whose ideas merit further research include Jaime Cortesão, Carlos Malheiro Dias, Visconde de Morais, José Augusto Prestes, Dr. Barbosa de Magalhães, Dr. Coelho Neto, and Prof. Francisco António Correia.

⁴⁹ The photo is from *Duas Pátrias*, page 282. The caption reads “The guests of the *Hora da Confraternização Coimbrã* on 24 September 1922, at the center, seated, Sr. Dr. António José de Almeida.”



d. Subtle Challenges

The Luso-Brazilian sphere described above should not be considered a public sphere in the Habermasian tradition. Numerous scholars of Latin American history have productively interrogated this phenomenon across the region, successfully uncovering the myriad ways that middle and lower class Latin Americans exerted themselves politically in the face of limited or nonexistent voting rights.⁵⁰ The press has frequently been a crucial part of a public sphere that can bridge civil society and political life. The press of Rio in 1922, on the other hand, was an obedient mouthpiece of political conservatism, helping to silence dissenting voices in the ongoing conversation of Brazil's place in the postcolonial order and the average Brazilian's place in the national body. The political regime under Pessoa sought a hegemony of ideas wherein Brazil was the glorious manifestation of the Portuguese *Raça* in the Americas, and the average Brazilian embodied the triumph of his Portuguese heritage over inferior strains, to borrow the language of the time. Further research is necessary to determine if periodicals

⁵⁰ The best review of this body of scholarship is Pablo Piccato, (2010) "Public sphere in Latin America: a map of the historiography", *Social History*, 35: 2, 165 – 192.

elsewhere in Brazil or Portugal took a more critical stance of the bonds their leaders were forming over their shared, and superficial, republicanism.

Articles that did not wholly align with the dominant opinion were few and far-between, and their authors were careful to couch their ideas in a thick cloak of deference. The tone and most of the ideas presented were typical of those examined thus far, but on two occasions journalists launched a critique of the ruling elite, not by acknowledging their president directly, but rather by focusing on Almeida's republican characteristics. In the first case, the author began by praising Almeida's oratory skills, something reiterated time and again in Rio's newspapers, saying that he "in a few days... conquered the public sympathy of our capital" with "the exuberant sincerity of his truly democratic spirit." Then, employing rhetoric typical of American republican modernity and reflecting on Almeida's achievements in Portugal, the author surmised that Almeida integrated his country "into the ranks of the most genuine modern democracies." This praise laid the foundation for the most direct affront to Brazil's political leaders found in Rio's centenary press:

... far from adhering to the rigid formulas of a conservatism that is no longer in line with the spirit of the era, and which would be useless to try to revive, Dr. António José de Almeida, in the government of his *Pátria*... as well as here, in his current speeches, has always shown his soul to be open the purest democratic ideals, a republican of sincere conviction, with eyes always tolerantly seeking the demonstration of different ideas, ready to humbly respect the sacred sovereignty of the nation.⁵¹

While the author could make the case that he was alluding to the conservatism of Portugal, he indirectly indicts Pessoa and other members of Brazil's oligarchy by leaving them out of the conversation. He could have made reference to the coming together of like-minded statesmen, but he did not and this absence speaks volumes. The following day an article entitled "Speaking

⁵¹ "Um discurso excepcional," *Gazeta de Notícias*; September 21.

Face to Face with the Brazilian People” was published that continued in a similar line of argumentation. Here, the author made a rare effort to identify a non-elite contingent of Brazilians whose political potential was unrealized: Almeida, he supposed, must have been “happy with his contact with the immense, popular mass who applaud him...because he knows that more than in the elegant salons and in the embassies and parliaments, this mass, that has not yet understood its own worth, is the Brazilian people; it is the nation that commemorates the first century anniversary of its autonomy; it is in sum Brazil.” In this version of the nation, racialized ideas concerning Brazil’s Portuguese heritage were left aside and the actual residents of the country were deemed indiscriminately worthy of political representation. If a hypothetical “true” republic can be imagined, this author was certainly calling for its realization more than most of his peers. The author concludes that it is the responsibility of “Brazilians of all social classes to carry out our duty of saluting, today, Dr. António José de Almeida, the great President of Portugal, who with facility made the Brazilian soul ignite, talking, face to face, with its people.”⁵²

One article rebutted the idea that Brazilians and Portuguese were equal members of one of the world’s great races by laying out the thesis that the Portuguese language would continue to bind the two peoples even as they drifted apart as a result of continuing miscegenation in Brazil. In straightforward terms the author of this piece declared, “the dynamic and spiritual solidarity of the language is a stronger tie of understanding and of love than that of the race, which is diluted by fusion with other peoples and under the influence of the physical environment.” He went so far as to insist that the “rigorous syntax of the overseas language” was favorably altered in Brazil by the “more nuanced rhythm of thought of our *mestiço* mentality.”⁵³ His positive interpretation of racial mixing and his candor in granting it equal weight alongside the environmental factor in

⁵² “Falando, rosto a rosto, ao povo brasileiro,” *A Noite*, September 22.

⁵³ “Brasil-Portugal,” *O Dia*, September 19.

accounting for transatlantic differences make this article a distant outlier among those published in Rio in September 1922.

The last type of subtle challenge to the hegemony of Luso-Brazilian conceptions of national identity in Brazil was articulated in front of the largest crowd that gathered to see Almeida, at the *grande manifestação* of September 24th. Buried deep in the flowery language of Dr. Rafael Pinheiro, the lawyer charged with introducing the Portuguese president, was the recognition that indigenous languages had positively impacted Brazilian Portuguese and that African musical traditions had similarly influenced Portuguese music in Brazil. Pinheiro framed his nation as a crucible where various cultural elements were forged into something new and uniquely Brazilian. In his own words, “we bathed [these things] in the exotic honey of our wild bees; we made them melancholy with the African *urucungos* and *batuques*; we made sense of them by juggling the linguistic confusion of all races – human synthesis of the entire Universe – that, here, were welcomed as family.”⁵⁴ The elaborate style used by Pinheiro almost serves to mask his message, yet a distillation of this central point and the handful of newspaper articles considered above show that visions of Brazil like those promoted at Modern Art Week were beginning to tear at the seams of the Luso-centric model of Brazilian identity that predominated in the early 1920s.

The goal of this article has been to introduce another milestone along Brazil’s path of national self-understanding, a process that of course continues today nearly 200 years since the *Grito de Ipiranga*. For a brief period in the early 1920s, political elites in Brazil sought to frame their nation not in terms of *lusofobia* but in terms of *lusophilia*. They set about achieving this goal by using lofty republican language that was happily reciprocated by Portugal’s most famous

⁵⁴ The speech is reprinted in *Duas Pátrias*, 244 – 248. The quotation is from page 247, and this should be considered a loose translation.

republican statesman and a small cohort of his advisors. The existence of republican governments in both countries allowed for the formation of a short-lived but intense political sphere that was elite and conservative in nature. Its members perceived those most like themselves – adult, Euro-descended, Portuguese-speaking males – to be most worthy of full citizenship and political representation. The fall of the First Republic in Brazil and the diffusion of the ideas of Gilberto Freyre did not solve all of the nation's racial problems, but the early 1930s did represent the next turning point when more realistic assessments regarding Brazilian national identity gained wider purchase and further upset the central tenets of Pessoa's republican project.