

Interpreting Conservative Modernization: The Brazilian Sociological Imagination in Difficult Times

Fernando Perlatto

Fernando Perlatto

is a lecturer in the Post-graduate program in History at the Federal University of Juiz de Fora [*Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora*].
E-mail: fperlatto@yahoo.com.br

Translation by Frank Hanson

“Just as no-one can understand the Germany of the 19th Century (...) without their philosophers, Brazilians have been able to understand their own country through the social sciences” (Luiz Werneck Vianna, “Preface”, *Quem Explica o Brasil*, [Who can explain Brazil?] p.15)

Abstract

One of the main features of the Brazilian sociological imagination has been its widespread public involvement, which is witnessed by the way it has been effectively employed in investigating the historical background of factors regarding the modernization of the country. In the 1960s and 1970s, when there was a military dictatorship, Brazilian sociologists were engaged in the task of interpreting Brazil by highlighting contradictions in the conservative modernization of the country. The purpose of this article is to analyze some of the sociological studies that were carried out in this climate with a view to understanding the main features and ramifications of conservative modernization in Brazil. These set out from different perspectives, with special attention being paid to four works, namely: *Capitalismo Dependente e Classes Sociais na América Latina* [Dependent Capitalism and Social Classes in Latin America] (Florestan Fernandes, 1973), *O Liberalismo e Sindicato no Brasil* [Liberalism and Trade Unions in Brazil] (Luiz Werneck Vianna, 1976), *Espoliação Urbano* [Urban Despoliation] (Lucio Kowarick, 1979), and *A Embalagem do Sistema* [The Packaging of the System] (Maria Arminda do Nascimento Arruda [1979], 1985). Each of these studies will be linked to other works which address related issues and are drawn on as an example of specific approaches that have governed the sociological imagination in difficult times of repression and democratic openness.

Keywords

Brazilian sociological imagination; dictatorship; conservative modernization.

In the "Preface" to the second edition of his book *Sociology in an Era of Social Revolution*, published in 1976, Florestan Fernandes expressed regret that the original essays he wrote in the period between 1959 and 1962, seemed in the aftermath of the military coup of 1964, "like documents of a past that never materialized in historical terms". If they did not actually bear witness to a "a lost cause", at least they testified to the fact "that a *crucial experience* had been interrupted" (FERNANDES, 1976, p.9, our italics). In the opinion of Florestan, the question that was thus raised in the 1970s, was a) how to define and interpret what the interruption of this crucial experience would imply, b) how it could be related to the movements of social reform that preceded the military coup, and c) how it ushered in a new period of modernization in the country that was run by the military. On the basis of the sociology produced in Brazil in the 1960s and 1970s, it is possible to discern an intellectual effort made by sociologists both to understand the reasons that led to the military coup of 1964 – which was directly responsible for the "interruption" referred to by Florestan – and to analyze the main implications and ramifications of the regime which took control after the overthrow of the government of João Goulart. Despite their particular features and differences, the works produced against this background were characterized by this anxious desire to decode the meaning of this further stage in the conservative modernization of Brazil.

The period from the end of the 1960s and the 1970s underwent significant changes in Brazil, owing to the nature of the military regime that was entrenched in 1964, and these had a decisive influence on the institutional character of the sociological field in the country, as well as on the intellectual design of the Brazilian sociological imagination. In a climate that was paradoxically characterized by the serious setbacks that arose both from the repression of the military government and a broadening of the system in the country for teaching or doing research into sociology, the Brazilian sociologists made a notable attempt to understand and interpret the contradictions inherent in the regime. This government encouraged the growth of the economy through the rhetoric of the "economic miracle", and broadened the constitutional range of benefits that were politically regulated, such as pension funds, while at the same time that being responsible for a shocking rise in social inequality and the denial of civil and political rights through censorship and repression. These contradictions that were an intrinsic part of Brazilian conservative modernization, were turned into objects of inquiry through the excellence of the Brazilian sociological imagination in the period 1960-1970.

It should be stressed that the sociological field underwent a comprehensive expansion in this period and benefited from an increase in the number of programs devoted to post-graduate studies in the country. This extension relied on the support of bodies such as the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES), The National Council of Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) and The São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP), as well as considerable support given by the Ford

Foundation (MICELI, 1993). This financial support enabled several graduate and post-graduate programs to be set up in the country in the area of the social sciences such as the Department of Political Science of UFMG [Federal University of Minas Gerais] (1967), Social Sciences at UFBA [Federal University of Bahia] (1968), Anthropology at the National Museum (1968), USP [University of São Paulo] (1971) UNICAMP [State University of Campinas] (1971), and Sociology UFPE [Federal University of Pernambuco] (1967), UNB [University of Brasilia] (1970), USP [University of São Paulo] (1970) and UFRGS [Federal University of Rio Grand do Sul] (1973). As well as these institutions that are closely affiliated with universities, there was also the foundation of external institutes such as the Brazilian Center for Analysis and Planning (CEBRAP), the University Research Institute of Rio de Janeiro (IUPERJ), the Center for Studies of Contemporary Culture (CEDEC) and the São Paulo Institute for Economic, Social and Political Studies (IDESP). In addition, there was the publication of several important scientific journals — like *Dados*, *Revista de Ciências Sociais* (1966) and *Estudos Cebrap* (1971) — as well as the forming and strengthening of research associations in the area, such as the National Association of Graduate Studies in Social Sciences (ANPOCS), which was founded in 1977, and provided evidence of a scientific field that had undergone considerable institutionalization (MICELLI, 1989; ORTIZ, 2003; SORJ, 2001; WERNECK VIANNA, 2004; MOTTA, 2014).

This context bore witness to the appearance of a body of sociological work which was embedded in this growing movement of institutionalization and was both aware of, and closely bound up with, changes that were unfolding in the Brazilian political climate of that time. Although operating in repressive conditions, this sociology sought to combine a growing professionalization with an in-depth analysis of the key questions that emerged from the public agenda of the country (PERLATTO, 2013). In this study, I will seek to understand the powerful responsiveness of the Brazilian sociological imagination, in particular with regard to the investigation of different issues related to conservative modernization. The inquiry sets out from four particular studies, namely: *Capitalismo Dependente e os Classes Sociais na América Latina* [Dependent Capitalism and the Social Classes in Latin America] (1973), by Florestan Fernandes, *Liberalismo e Sindicato no Brasil* [Liberalism and Trade Unions in Brazil] (1976), by Luiz Werneck Vianna, *Espoliação Urbano* [Urban Despoliation] (1979), by Lucio Kowarick, and *A Embalagem do Sistema* [The Packaging of the System] (1979, 1985), by Maria Arminda do Nascimento Arruda. Each of these studies will be linked to other works with related issues and employed as an example of particular policies that dominated the sociological imagination in the difficult times of repression. Hence, rather than discuss in detail each of the three works that have been highlighted, the purpose of this article is to take these books as examples of specific issues ranging from *dependent development and the bourgeois revolution in Brazil*, to *inequality in the metropolitan world* and *the pattern of industrial culture*. As will be made clear, these acquired a public significance during the 1960s and 1970s, in different ways and from different angles, while the expansion of conservative modernization proceeded apace throughout these years.

Conservative Modernization , (Sub) Development and Capitalism

One of the main endeavours of the Brazilian sociological imagination in the 1960s and 1970s concerns its search for an understanding of the issues of the time. This is based on an analysis of different factors linked to the development of Brazil under the baton of the military government and their implications for the conservative modernization that prevailed in the country (VILLAS BÔAS, 2006). This argument can be corroborated

by simply looking at the titles of various works published by Brazilian sociologists at this time such as: *Politics and Development in Dependent Societies* (Fernando Henrique Cardoso, 1965), *Work and Development in Brazil* (Luiz Pereira, 1965), *The Sociology of Development* (Pedro Beltrão, 1965), *The Society of Classes and Subdevelopment* (Florestan Fernandes, 1968), *Economic Development and Social Transition* (Luis Costa Pinto, 1967), *Development and Social Change* (Juarez Brandão Lopes, 1968), *Industrialization, the National Bourgeoisie and Development* (Luciano Martins, 1968), *Social Changes in Latin America a* (Fernando Henrique Cardoso, 1969), *Dependence and Development in Latin America* (Fernando Henrique and Enzo Faletto, 1969), *Essays on the Sociology of Development* (Luiz Pereira, 1970), *Development and Marginalization. A Case Study* (Maria Célia Paoli, 1974), *Education and Social Development in Brazil* (Luiz Cunha, 1975), *The Sociology of Development* (José Carlos Durand, 1975), *State Intervention and the Developmentalist Ideology* (Maria Helena Oliva Augusto, 1978) and *Dependent Development in Brazil: Industrialization, Social Classes and the State* (Vilma Figueiredo, 1978).

485

It should be underlined that the issue of development attracted a great deal of attention in the 1960s and 1970s from Latin American as well as Brazilian sociologists and their works seek to understand both the underdevelopment of Latin American countries and their relations of economic dependence on the “central” nations, and to devise mechanisms that are able to overcome (or at least mitigate) these ties of dependence and subordination. The main concern centred on the debate about the “favorable” or “unfavorable” factors which could enable the “traditional” countries to develop and be turned into “modern” nations by breaking away from their traditional subordinate role in the international division of production and labor. The Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), a UN body that was set up at the end of the 1940s, was shaped as one of the main arenas for spreading the debate about development. The “dualist” concept which was largely spread by this institution – but which can also be found in the formulations of the Brazilian Communist Party (PCB) and among intellectuals attached to the Higher Institute of Brazilian Studies (ISEB) – embodies the explanatory principle of “functional causality”. According to this, the transformation of a variable leads to the change of other variables in a kind of ripple effect – and the theory of “successive stages” of development, has inspired the thinking of many Latin-American intellectuals who have sought ways to overcome the “backwardness” of Latin America with regard to the world economic “center”.¹ By opting for the State as the main catalyst for a kind of industrialization that is aimed at the inner market (and able to carry out economic development in the conditions that prevail in the periphery of Latin America), the dualist concept – in particular that supported by ECLAC, – ended up by, to a great extent, influencing not only the theoretical reflection found in Latin America but also the formulation of the public policies in the region (BIELSCHOWSKY, 2000).

As Octavio Ianni has pointed out correctly, the question of dependent development began to gather momentum in academic and political debates when the main countries of Latin America witnessed the fact that there had been a decline in the so-called “import substitution industrial policy” (IANNI, 1989). Unlike what had been previously believed from a functionalist perspective, the industrialization that occurred in these countries, did not trigger an economic emancipation in the Latin-American nations, but rather a renewal and extension of subordination and national economic dependence in the face of North-American and worldwide capitalism. In the light of this scenario, several Latin American social scientists and economists were confronted with the need to understand

the internationalization of capital and bourgeois markets, in so far as this could help them to understand the associated dependent development that characterized the Latin-American economies. Works such as *Imperialismo na América Latina* [Imperialism in Latin America] (Octavio Ianni, 1974), *Nação e Corporação Multinacional* [The Nation and Multi-national Corporations] (Luciano Martins, 1975) and *Desenvolvimento Dependente Brasileiro. Industrialização, Classes Sociais e Estado* [Brazilian Dependent Development, Industrialization. Social Classes and the State] (Vilma Figueiredo, 1978) should be understood in the light of the emergence and consolidation of this investigative program which was carried out in the 1960s and 1970s.

The concern with the question of development could, for example, be found in the works of Costa Pinto, who in his studies like *Sociologia e Desenvolvimento. Temas e Problemas do nosso Tempo* [Sociology and Development: Issues and problems in our time] (1963) and *Desenvolvimento Econômico e Transição Social*, [Economic Development and Social Transition] (1967) explored the questions of modernization and development both in Brazil and the rest of Latin America. Set against a background in which Brazilian society continued, in his view, to be a “gathering of the poor”, a “dependent economy, a satellite nation and a lethargic culture”, the ideas contained in this work can help overcome the attitude that perpetuates “economic subordination, social injustice and cultural restraints”. This encourages “a systematic and simultaneous criticism of the *status quo* (...) that can make these accumulated historic failings the point of departure for the far-reaching social reconstruction that we need” (COSTA PINTO, 1970, p.6). In the articles that comprise *Desenvolvimento Econômico e Transição Social*, [Economic Development and Social Transition] (the results of conferences held in 1964 and 1965), Costa Pinto set out his concept of “structural marginalization” in greater detail, with a view to understanding the contradictory “coexistence”, (at times compliant, at times conflicting) between the “archaic” and “modern” models of social organization which prevailed in the country. In the opinion of the author, it had become essential to draw a conceptual distinction between the categories of “modernization” and “development”, which tended to be regarded by the literature of that period as synonymous. According to Costa Pinto, whereas modernization involved more “superficial” changes in patterns of consumption, behavior and values, in the case of “traditional” institutions for those who lived in more “advanced” societies, development was related to more “radical” changes, that were able effectively to alter the shape of the economic and social fabric of the country. Thus the State would play an essential role as a strategic agent in a planned and deliberate policy of economic and social modernization of the country, in a way that could allow it to break away from the state of “structural marginalization” and its condition as an underdeveloped country.

The question of dependent development was particularly deployed in the works of authors linked to the so-called “Dependence Theories”, which became the main instruments for explaining the modernization of Latin-American countries. This is highlighted in the book by Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Enzo Faletto, *Dependência e Desenvolvimento na América Latina*.² [Dependence and Development on Latin America] Originally written as a Report for ECLAC, in 1966, but only published in Chile in 1969, and translated into Portuguese in 1970, it was prepared as a critical study aimed at opposing the “evolutionist” concepts (in stages) and functionalist ideas of development (especially the theory of modernization)”, which ended up by relegating the historical dimension of the processes that formed the capitalist system to a secondary plane (CARDOSO, 1970, p.27). The authors sought to analyze specific situations of dependence

— “dependence during the phase when the national State was constituted and it became an exporting bourgeois country”, “dependency in enclave situations” and “dependency in the stages of the internationalization of the market when the peripheral industrial economies were formed”. In undertaking this, the authors resorted to a methodological procedure that laid stress on “the analysis of the specific conditions of the Latin-American situation and the kind of social integration of classes and groups, as the main conditions required for development” (CARDOSO & FALETTO, 1973, p.21). As these authors underline, what mattered was to characterize the nature of the relationship between the social groups in the national plane, which depended above all, “on the kind of links to the economic system and international political blocs that can have a dynamic effect on an underdeveloped society” (Ibidem, p.21).

487

Florestan Fernandes was one of the key exponents of ideas on dependent development of a more general kind, and its particular effects on the conservative modernization of Latin American countries, especially in Brazil. His approach was made clear in the articles that comprise the books *Sociedade de Classes e Subdesenvolvimento* [Society of Classes and Underdevelopment] (1968) and *Capitalismo Dependente e Classes Sociais na América Latina* [Dependent capitalism and Social Classes in Latin America] (1973), in which he outlined the arguments, albeit in a rudimentary form, that would be later expressed in a more systematic way in *A Revolução Burguesa no Brasil* [The Bourgeois Revolution in Brazil] (1975). In analyzing various factors (such as the dynamics of socio-cultural change in Brazil, economic growth and political instability, as well as development as a national problem), Florestan attempted to obtain a fuller understanding of the nature and limits of the “bourgeois revolution” in the setting of dependent capitalism such as that in Brazil. With this in mind, the author undertook a criticism of the “investigators of the most advanced centers”, who, in his view, “addressed the problem of interpreting dependent capitalist societies as if underdevelopment was a contingency or transitory phase” (FERNANDES, 1968, p.12-3). In the case of Florestan, it was a question of overcoming this analytical and regulatory perspective by showing the structural nature of this subordination among the peripheral countries. This involved basing the question of a sociological investigation on the links that could be found between the social classes within each of the Latin-American countries and the foreign model of dependent capitalism — an association that established the patterns of underdevelopment. It is only from this perspective that it would be possible to break the deadlock which Latin American societies in general, and Brazil in particular, experienced in that political climate.

In the book *Capitalismo Dependente e Classes Sociais na América Latina*, [Dependent Capitalism and Class Divisions in Latin America] that was originally published in 1973, Florestan carried out an investigative program as a result of which his work is an exponent of the model of conservative modernization which has taken place in Latin-American countries. The essays gathered together in this work — written between 1969 and 1971 — in the words of the author himself, aimed at forming a “militant interpretation”, in so far as it “places Sociology at the core of the processes involved in the crisis” (FERNANDES, 1975, p.9). They concerned articles that were keen to understand the patterns of foreign domination in Latin America and included addressing the “new imperialism” that was driven by the United States against the backdrop of the Cold War, and was related to societies of unequal classes which were shaped within each of the countries in the continent. In the opinion of Florestan, the co-dependency relationship between Latin America and the central countries resulted in what was called “the dilemma of

dependent capitalism”, the main feature of which was the inner “overprivileged class” that could be found in each of these countries. This dilemma was bound up with the need to meet the challenge of finding an autonomous and equitable kind of development in a situation characterized by the imposition of imperialist policies in Latin America, that were buttressed by the large corporations and capitalist hegemony of the United States. Although on the one hand this foreign domination was a stimulus to the modernization of Latin American countries, on the other, owing to its pattern of dependency, it, *pari passu*, prevented a national revolution which could entail the real autonomy of these countries from being fulfilled and a resulting inner change of relations between the social classes.

488

The work *Capitalismo Dependente e Classes Sociais na América Latina*, [Dependent Capitalism and Class Divisions in Latin America] can thus be regarded as exemplifying the consolidation of a kind of approach adopted in the realm of Brazilian sociology. This attempted to understand conservative modernization in the period of the military regime by mainly focusing on the question of dependent development and the foreign relations of subordination and domination to which the countries of Latin America were subjected and that relied on the full acquiescence of the dominant social classes which directly benefited from this dependency. According to Florestan, the imperialist domination had two main consequences: on the one hand it conditioned and strengthened archaic economic structures that were grounded on a desire to retain the export-import pattern, which was based on the production of raw materials and primary goods. In the second place (and related to the first) the imperialist domination served to reinforce the conservative modernization of the peripheral countries. This was because far from increasing its wealth, Latin America was faced with the challenge of retaining and spreading the production carried out here with a view to, at least creating a real modern capitalist economy.

Florestan believed that, in the face of this picture of conservative modernization based on dependent domination, a new developmentalist agenda would only be possible in two particular scenarios: first by mediating “the establishment and improvement of a new type of State capitalism that was able to adjust to the speed and scale of economic development. In the second place, it meant that socio-cultural change had to be adapted to the requirements of ‘the revolution within the social order’ ” or through “a popular and radical rebellion of a socialist persuasion”, which, in turn, would pave the way “to the fulfilment of the highest standards possible for human reason and the real freedom of Latin-American societies.” (Ibidem, p.31-2). Thus it can be seen that the ideal perspective for Florestan himself was — either a “revolution within the social order” or a “popular and radical rebellion”. This is also an example of thinking about the challenges of carrying out a sociological agenda in those difficult years and finding ways to overcome the problem of dependent capitalism and imperialist domination which are the main pillars that underpin Brazilian conservative domination.

Conservative Modernization and the Bourgeois Revolution in Brazil: the Backward and the Modern

With regard to the debate about the contradictions of the development of the country under the military regime, a significant part of the sociological imagination of Brazil in the 1960s and 1970s was devoted to understanding the characteristics of the so-called “Brazilian bourgeois revolution”³. In this area, various Brazilian sociologists conducted macro-structural analyses to understand the nature of the conservative modernization of the country with the aim of deciphering the character of the authoritarian capitalism

which was in force under the military regime. In a general way, these studies were shaped as historical analyses — although focused on the political climate of the present. They sought to make a comparison between the modernization of the belated capitalism — such as that experienced by Brazil, post-risorgimento Italy, Russia and Japan — and those experienced in “advanced” forms of capitalism, the main models being Great Britain and France. It was regarded as an essential task to understand the Brazilian “Revolution” of 1930 to formulate an explanation about modern Brazil and the particular features of our conservative modernization.⁴

489

Among these studies produced by sociologists who have carried out research in this area, it is worth citing *A Economia Brasileira. Crítica à Razão Dualista* The Brazilian Economy. A criticism of Dualist Reason (Francisco de Oliveira, 1972), *São Paulo e o Estado Nacional*, [São Paulo and the National State] by Simon Schwartzman (1975), *Capitalismo e Tradicionalismo. Estudos sobre as Contradições da Sociedade Agrária no Brasil*, [Capitalism and Traditionalism. Studies on the Contradictions of Agrarian Society in Brazil] by José de Souza Martins (1975), *A Revolução Burguesa no Brasil*, [The Bourgeois Revolution in Brazil] by Florestan Fernandes (1975) and *Liberalismo e Sindicato no Brasil*, [Liberalism and Trade Unionism in Brazil] by Luiz Werneck Vianna (1976)⁵. Although there are differences between these works, they share a common goal which is to give evidence of the conservative character of the Brazilian bourgeois revolution, which operated through the establishment of a coalition between the modern and traditional elites. Thus, in contrast with what had supported most of the literature produced in the previous period, (which was based on “dualist” perspectives), the modernization of the country did not involve the disappearance of the old agrarian elites but, on the contrary, represented the renewal of their participation in the political control of the country. For this reason, the “modern” did not arise as a result of overcoming backwardness — it was the backwardness itself that drove modernization in Brazil.

Works such as *A Economia Brasileira. Crítica à Razão Dualista*, [The Brazilian Economy: a Critique of Dualist Reason] by Francisco de Oliveira (1972) and *Capitalismo e Tradicionalismo. Estudos sobre as Contradições da Sociedade Agrária no Brasil*, [Capitalism and Traditionalism: Studies of the Contradictions of Agrarian Society in Brazil] by José de Souza Martins (1975) provide evidence of the investigative attempts to understand the contradictions inherent in the Brazilian bourgeois revolution. Francisco de Oliveira, in *Crítica da Razão Dualista*, [A Critique of the Dualist Reason] confronts the challenge of examining the obstacles imposed by Brazilian capitalism in a situation marked by a new outbreak of conservative modernization in the country. In formulating an interpretation that combines political and economic dimensions, the author raises questions about the dualist theses, especially that of the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America, by highlighting the fact that in the capitalist expansion of Brazil, there is a close link between the backward and the modern. The “archaic”, in this sense, is what has been responsible for leveraging the accumulation and expansion of modern Brazilian capitalism. José de Souza Martins, in his work *Capitalismo e Tradicionalismo*, [Capitalism and Traditionalism] seeks to show how social backwardness, and the relations of “archaic” production in the field, do not represent obstacles to economic modernization and the social accumulation of the country, in so far as the process of accumulation embodied these social relationships and concepts in its operational structure.

Two other works that share this approach were undertaken by Simon Schwartzman (*São Paulo e o Estado Nacional*, [São Paulo and the National State] (1975) and by Florestan

Fernandes (*A Revolução Burguesa*, [The Bourgeois Revolution] 1975). As a result of this doctoral thesis which was undertaken in 1973, Schwartzman — by entering into a direct dialogue with the formulations of Raymundo Faoro, in *Os Donos do Poder* [The Power Brokers] — opposed the patrimonial model of Brazilian society that was characterized by administrative centralization, the relations of political co-optation and the precedence of the State over civil society. The other model represented by São Paulo, was characterized by the autonomy of civil society and the primacy of the representative pattern as a form of political organization. The reflection on the relations and tensions between authoritarianism and liberalism are evidence of the intellectual attempts made to understand the key dilemmas of authoritarian modernization in Brazil. Thus it is worth drawing attention to the fact that despite these differences, the analysis of Schwartzman shared a normative purpose with the “populist theories”, which supported the dismantling of the patrimonial relationships and thus opened up new opportunities for the release of civil society and its emancipation from the control of the State.

490

Understanding the Brazilian bourgeois revolution is clearly the subject, par excellence, of the classic study *A Revolução Burguesa no Brasil*, [The Bourgeois Revolution in Brazil] by Florestan Fernandes, published in 1975. In this study, which was written in exile, Florestan retraced the evolution of the capitalist economy in historical terms and examined the formation of the class system in the country. This entailed conducting an analysis over a long period, stretching from the Independence to the 1960s with the aim of understanding the gradual and small-scale Brazilian bourgeois revolution which was a “covert revolution”. Florestan was concerned with analyzing the dependency relations between the middle-classes of a peripheral country like Brazil and the imperialist domination. This dependency represented a key feature for maintaining the characteristic relationships of the “old regime”, as well as keeping the country in an undeveloped and socially unequal condition. By responding and adapting to the changes imposed by international capitalism, and dividing society into stratified forms, the Brazilian bourgeois was converted into an “autocracy” and succeeded in becoming the key player in reproducing the economic interests of the large corporations and thus turned the State into a mechanism, par excellence, for the reproduction of its autocratic power.

Another work that was devoted to understanding the nature of conservative modernization in Brazil and which can be taken as an example of the new way to understand the bourgeois revolution in the country is *Liberalismo e Sindicato no Brasil*, [Liberalism and the Trade Unions in Brazil] by Luiz Werneck Vianna, published in 1976, as the result of a doctoral thesis undertaken at USP [University of São Paulo] in 1975. In a similar way to the approach described above, this book should be viewed as a means of analyzing the conservative modernization in Brazil by entering into a dialogue with the approaches analyzed in the previous section. However, it was less concerned with exploring the foreign relations of dependence and more interested in examining the country from within, in a way that investigated the manner in which the relationship between the traditional and modern elites were shaped by history. As in the case of most of the studies that explore the features of the bourgeois revolution in Brazil, Werneck Vianna sought in this study to probe the enigma of the 1930 Revolution led by Getúlio Vargas, as a means of understanding the conservative modernization of the country. From the standpoint of the military dictatorship in the 1970s, which was characterized by the bureaucratic-authoritarian oppression of the Brazilian trade unions, the beginning of the 1930s was not an insignificant period. Moreover, evidence can be found of a continuity between

these two authoritarian cycles and there are grounds for believing that the bourgeois revolution should be regarded from the perspective of “long duration”, rather than the rationale of a “break with the past”.

491

Liberalismo e Sindicato no Brasil [Liberalism and the Trade Unions in Brazil] is related to the intellectual movement which is highlighted above, to the extent that it does not think of conservative modernization in Brazil as a break with “backwardness” and the “archaic”, but rather as a long continuous process which had already followed its course a long time before. It is also a criticism of the dualist reason which enlivens this research since it is concerned with understanding the intrinsic relations between the modern and backward in the formation of Brazilian capitalism. Werneck Vianna believes that capitalist modernization took place on the basis of a coalition between the dominant modern and traditional classes and elites and its objective was to retain a commitment to the old social order that was not compatible with the accelerated pace of capitalist accumulation. For this reason, the 1930 Revolution did not involve a dramatic break with two qualitatively distinct periods but rather is an assertion of the continuity of the bourgeois order in the country, – only this time, marking a shift which led to the prominence of the middle-class industrial sector. It was thus the feature of *continuity*, albeit with some changes, and not the “break” that led to Brazilian modernization and the constitution of the capitalist mode of production together with the socio-economic framework that was imposed on the country.

In seeking to understand this process, Werneck Vianna mainly draws on works by Lenin in his agrarian studies, which are gathered together in *O Desenvolvimento do Capitalismo na Rússia*, [The Development of Capitalism in Russia] in which the author points to the “Prussian path” as a paradigmatic case of a reactionary bourgeois transition. In this the traditional agrarian elites had been appropriated by the State and had led to a transition to the modern by preserving authoritarian means of social control. On the other hand, Werneck was very much under the influence of Gramsci, especially his writings about the Italian *Risorgimento*. Apart from these writers, Werneck entered into an extensive dialogue with the American political sociologist, Barrington Moore Jr. (and his influential work about the social origins of dictatorship and democracy), as a means of enabling him to understand the authoritarian nature of capitalist modernization in Brazil. The key question that Werneck Vianna raised, was how to provide evidence of the conservative character of our capitalist modernization (which pervades all his work on the way that liberalism has been accepted in Brazil). This is in contrast with the view enshrined in the work of Roberto Schwarz, *Ao Vencedor as Batatas*, [The Winner gets the potatoes] in which liberalism is regarded as “an idea that is out of place” and a façade, that opens up a perverse and dysfunctional distance between the “real” country and the “legal” country. Werneck follows the path already indicated by Florestan Fernandes in *A Revolução Burguesa no Brasil*, [The Bourgeois Revolution in Brazil] and shows that the liberalism that flourishes amongst us was not artificial. On the contrary, it was exactly this that gave rise to the driving-force for modernity and the transition to the bourgeois revolution. Werneck argued that Florestan’s work lay in the same direction, and provided evidence of the importance of liberalism for modernization in Brazil, since the great leap forward that was witnessed in the evolution of capitalism in Brazil, had previously been of a socio-cultural rather than an economic character.

As Werneck Vianna made clear, on the eve of the transition to modernization in the country, liberalism had found it impossible to broaden the terms of the social “compact”. At this time, it had lost the support of the entrepreneurs – the only social support

that could impose its view of the world. From that time on, its continuity required it to become attached to a political system that was exclusive and permanent. In a situation characterized by the impossibility of expansion and by the narrowness of the ongoing “compact”, an *interested third party*, emerged — the non-exporting agrarian elites who took on the leadership in the electoral disputes involving the urban working-classes, “by bringing from their landed estates a plan for a modernized and authoritarian State” (WERNECK VIANNA, 1999, p.21). The 1930 movement thus consisted of an institutional-legal reordering of bourgeois domination which, by creating corporate organizations, attempted to bring the social classes together in harmony, “and turned them into powerful instruments of industrial accumulation” (Ibidem, p.21).

By drawing on copious empirical material, Werneck Vianna illustrated the basic weakness of Brazilian liberalism and, although his study is confined to mercantile issues, showed it was unable to allow a free movement of the subaltern classes. From 1930 onwards, the authoritarian bourgeois order managed to bring about a separation between capitalism and the nation through the corporate formula implemented by Vargas. By employing an ideology that entailed a collaboration between the classes, the corporate institutions hoped to obtain a degree of solidarity between the State and civil society by linking the trade union apparatus of the State with social benefits granted to the urban wage earners. Capitalism was thus established in the country and installed through regulations, legislation and the attainment of social ends. Under the corporate system, the concept of State “particularism” formed a universal simulacrum through “regulated citizenship” and attempted to impose the idea of an ideological community that was based on a collaboration between the social classes and a grandiose national goal.

What is worth stressing is that unlike the “populist theories” which laid excessive weight on the negative aspect of heteronomous relations forged between the State and the unions, Werneck Vianna underlined their decisive role in giving labor relations a public character when workers had previously belonged to the private sphere. In this way, he was able to regulate areas that until then had been immune to regulatory legislation. Moreover, although he recognized its recessive nature — largely by representing a pattern of controlled social merging that interrupted the means of forming an autonomous identity of the subaltern classes — the public policies promulgated by the legislation of the Vargas government were a decisive means of allowing market activities to influence labor. They were carried out through capital and labor relations and by enacting legislation in the public arena, and not by relying on the possession of private funds by individuals. The corporate order thus appeared to be a complex body which included factors aimed at coercion — principally through attempts to control the trade unions — but accompanied by measures that could be accepted through a consensual agreement, in particular, mechanisms that could provide the workers with social security.

Thus, what can be inferred from the analysis of *Liberalismo e Sindicato no Brasil* [Liberalism and Trade Unions in Brazil] is that this work can be interpreted as an example of the concerns that pervaded the sociological agenda of the 1970s and their inquiry into the nature of the bourgeois revolution in Brazil and the emergence of a new authoritarian cycle in that particular climate. By showing that far from being in opposition, the modern and backward were closely intertwined with the history of Brazil, with the latter leading on directly to the former, this body of sociological work — in which Werneck Vianna’s book makes a significant contribution — successfully bore witness to the conservative nature of Brazilian modernization through an in-depth study and detailed examination of the bourgeois revolution in the country.

Conservative Modernization and the Inequality of Metropolitan Life

493

One of the ramifications of the changes that took place in Brazil between the 1960s and 1980s, was the notable change in the relations between the agrarian and urban sectors. This transformation which was to a great extent driven by “modernization from the top” was conducted by military governments and had a huge effect both in the countryside and in the towns and cities. It was a process that did not pass unnoticed by the Brazilian sociological imagination which directed their attention at understanding the changes that were linked to conservative modernization. In the case of the rural world, policies of agrarian development were pursued by the military governments. An example of this is the setting up of the Ministry of Land Affairs under the guardianship of the Military Council of National Security, the Army Civic Action Program and the Rondon Project. Its implications with regard to broadening the land ownership base and the spread of conflicts on farms, have been analyzed by several authors such as José de Souza Martins (*O Cativo da Terra*, 1979; [Held captive on the land] *Expropriação & Violência*. [Expropriation and Violence] *A Questão Política no Campo*, [The political question of land] 1980), Maria Nazareth Wanderley (*Capital e Propriedade Fundiária*, [Capital and the Landed Estates] 1979) and Glaucio Soares (*A Questão Agrária na América Latina*, 1976) [The Agrarian Question in Latin America]. In addition, the issue of development and colonization, was the key to expanding the frontiers of farming, especially in the Amazon and was bound up with the rhetoric of national security under the auspices of The Superintendent Board for the Development of the Amazon (SUDAM). This also caught the attention of the sociological imagination as is illustrated by the research of Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Geraldo Müller (*Amazônia: Expansão do Capitalismo*, [The Amazon: the Expansion of Capitalism] 1977) and Octavio Ianni (*Colonização e Contrarreforma Agrária na Amazônia*, [Colonization and Agrarian Counter-Reform in the Amazon] 1979).

In the case of the towns and cities, the upsurge of urbanization that was witnessed between the 1960s and 1980s, with all the accompanying problems that attend such a rapid social change, meant that the issue gradually became of immense significance to sociologists in Brazil. The “urban phenomenon” – to refer to the title of the classic work by the anthropologist Otávio Velho, published in 1976 – was analyzed from different perspectives, and particularly drew attention to studies that open up a debate about the question of exclusion and social inequality in the towns and cities. This investigative movement is reflected in research studies such as *Alagados, Mocambos e Mocambeiros* [the Alagados project for alleviating poverty and the communities formed by runaway slaves], (Daniel Bezerra, 1965), *Urbanização em Região Subdesenvolvida. O Caso de Eldorado Paulista* [Urbanization in the undeveloped region: the house of the São Paulo eldorado] (Eva Blay, 1975), *Marginalidade Social e Relações de Classe em São Paulo* [Social Marginalization and the Class System in São Paulo] (Manoel Berlin: the case of the São Paulo Eldorado] Paulista], 1975), *Passa-se uma Casa. Análise do Programa de Remoção de Favelas no Rio de Janeiro* [It was once a house: an Analysis of the Program to Remove the Shanty Towns of Rio de Janeiro] (Lícia Valladares, 1980), *Solo Urbano. Tópicos sobre o Uso a Terra* [Urban soil: questions on the use of land] (Luiz Antonio Machado, 1982), *Condições de Vida das Camadas Populares* [Living conditions among the working-classes] (Luiz Antonio Machado et. all, 1984) e *Cortiços em São Paulo. Frente e Verso* [Tenements in São Paulo – front and back] (Maura Vêras, 1985) and *Eu Não Tenho Onde Morar. Vilas Operárias na Cidade de São Paulo* [I don't have anywhere to live – workers' quarters in the city of São Paulo] (Eva Blay, 1985).

A work which clearly illustrates the ideas about the effects of conservative modernization on cities can be found in the collection *São Paulo 1975. Crescimento e Pobreza*, [São Paulo 1975: Growth and Poverty] published in 1976, and compiled by Candido Procópio Ferreira de Camargo. The book which had repercussions beyond the restricted world of sociology, was prepared in the ambit of CEBRAP [Brazilian Center for Analysis and Planning] at the request of the Commission for Justice and Peace of the archdiocese of São Paulo, through the mediation of Cardinal Dom Paulo Evaristo Arns, who also wrote the preface to the work. As the result of several research studies conducted in the metropolitan area of São Paulo, this book devoted a good deal of space to exposing the contradictions between the growth caused by the “economic miracle”, that was trumpeted by the military dictatorship and the actual reality of the city which was characterized by a rationale of disorder and alarming rates of poverty and social inequality. The work concludes with a chapter that shows the need for a democratic order based on a recognition of the people’s right to complete freedom, to ensure that there is a real improvement in the living conditions of the workers.

494

One of the most fruitful methods of inquiring into the effects of conservative modernization on the urban question was to link it to “social marginalization”. Several studies have been carried out on this question, either on the basis of particular geographical regions or by making comparisons with other approaches, in particular with countries in Latin America as for example *Desenvolvimento e Marginalidade. Um Estudo de Caso* [Development and Marginalization: a Case Study] (Maria Célia Paoli, 1974) and *Marginalidade Social e Relações de Classe em São Paulo* [Social Marginalization and Class Relations in São Paulo] (Manoel Berlinck, 1975). Most of the studies about marginalization were devoted to analyzing social exclusion which was believed to be associated with the form of dependent development the country had, since it was in a situation of peripheral capitalism. Concepts such as “marginalization”, “industrial reserve army”, “marginal polarity” and “the cost of the reproduction of labor power” were employed to raise questions about its adverse effects on the class system which became more evident as a result of the policies out into effect by the military government. The work *Capitalismo e Marginalidade na América Latina*, [Capitalism and Marginalization in Latin America] by Lucio Kowarick, published in 1975, was one of the main exponents of this investigative undertaking. In this work, which is conducted in the form of a dialogue with the formulations of the Dependence Theory, (in particular from the angle of Cardoso e Faletto), Kowarick uses the “development-underdevelopment” dichotomy as a benchmark for conducting an analysis of the issue of marginalization in the urban zones. The purpose of this is to understand the processes underlying the accumulation of capital and its implications, by embedding the marginalized groups in the social division of labor and viewing them from a broad perspective.

Kowarick’s ideas about marginalization combined with a more systematic approach to the urban question, are given special treatment in the book *A Espoliação Urbana*, [Urban Despoliation] published in 1979. This is an exemplary work in so far as it places the issue of cities within a more general concern about the paradoxical implications of modernization that have prevailed in the country, especially in the period of growth driven by the “economic miracle”. This work has the merit of displacing the urban phenomenon and putting it within a broader setting of global contradictions arising from the productive system and social and economic dynamics in force, in capitalist societies, as well as the more specific context of the underlying processes of conservative modernization in Brazil. The articles of this book bring together writings produced between 1973 and

1979, which, in empirical terms, are concentrated on the Metropolitan District of São Paulo. They analyze the implications for urban life “of a capitalist expansion which took on distinctly savage forms” (KOWARICK, 1979, p.13), with dire consequences for a more intense exploitation of labor and what the author calls “urban despoliation”. In the opinion of the authors, the degradation of city life — as borne out for example in the spread of shanty towns, dilapidated houses and slums, as well as the decline in wages and living standards for most of the workers — has affected the most vulnerable sectors of the outlying districts in the metropolis of São Paulo.

495

One of the factors discussed by Kowarick in this work, concerns the fact that, *pari passu*, the cities appear to be spaces of diversified social and economic exploitation (either directly or indirectly). This process is grounded on a system of urban territorial control and the conversion of urban features into the essential factors that cause social deprivation. As a result, there was a powerful system of control and repression driven by the armed forces which was aimed at workers’ associations, in particular the trade unions. Thus, while the economic growth that emanated from the “Brazilian miracle” led to a sharper deterioration of living standards in the city, it also took place in a period characterized by repression and the unsettling of the groups who were critical of this form of exclusion. In this scenario as Kowarick makes clear, the degree of exploitation and degradation of the workforce was accentuated, both by the huge supply of manpower in the cities and by the lacklustre political organization of the unionized working-class. However, it should be stressed that, notwithstanding the pessimistic outlook that pervades his work *Urban Despoliation*, Kowarick had enough sociological sensitivity to be aware of the birth and strengthening of a new trend that emerged at the end of the 1970s. This was linked to the appearance of groups and social movements that were increasingly critical of the kind of exclusive development that was carried out by the dictatorship. It began to gather momentum in the most industrialized parts of the country such as São Paulo, and played a decisive role in the struggle for social and political democracy in the country throughout the 1980s.

In broader terms, the work, *Urban Despoliation*, can be thought of as an imaginary paradigmatic model that can be used to diagnose the consequences of conservative modernization on the life of the cities. It achieves this by revealing, from several different standpoints, the deleterious effects of a “top-down” developmentalist strategy on the most vulnerable sections of society, in particular the residents of the shanty towns: “the most over-despoiled section of the working-class”. In a similar way to other sociological works produced in this climate, *Urban Despoliation* seeks to understand the mechanisms of production and reproduction of the structural despoliation of the cities. This entails combining the global forces of an unequal expansion of capital, with internal changes linked to the conservative guidelines for an authoritarian kind of modernization. The internal growth that arose from this ended up by exacerbating the inequality and deplorable conditions of the urban working-class rather than leading to a greater redistribution of wealth and better living standards. Kowarick gave a significant warning that this process could only be overcome through an organized struggle for the “conquest of space” on the part of the deprived workers, in a movement that presupposes the existence of a “debate and confrontation, organization and collective demands which constitute the raw material of what must be constructed for an effectively democratic future without any relativism” (Idem, p.202).

Conservative Modernization and the Culture Industry

The 1960s and 1970s were characterized by a striking consolidation of the market of cultural

and symbolic goods in Brazil. The military governments that had an interest in bringing about a greater degree of national integration, invested heavily in areas that strengthened the expansion of the markets responsible for consolidating the culture industry in the country. This involved an expansion of television services, record companies and publishing, as well as the public and private stimulus of advertising. This, it can be said in passing, achieved an international standing – by creating or stimulating different institutions and government agencies and shaped acquiescent movements that could be understood as the basic components of conservative modernization and Brazilian authoritarianism. Thus it is apparent that although the mass market was geared to the consumption and enjoyment of symbolic goods supplied by the emerging culture industry, this process took place in an exclusive way with only restricted parts of society being able to benefit from it. (ORTIZ, 1991; RIDENTI, 2000).

496

In a “Preface” written for the play *Gota D’Água*, [Drop of Water] 1975, Chico Buarque and Paulo Pontes showed a sensitive awareness and understanding of the inherent contradictions in this consolidation of the culture industry in Brazil. As the authors argue, a radical capitalist experience that was established in the country in the 1960s – on the basis of a ruthless acceleration of productive modernization – led to changes of great significance in the Brazilian cultural field. The military regime had been successful both in the sense of endowing the production of cultural goods with a striking industrial character and including the intellectual sector of the petty bourgeois in technocratic areas, means of communication, propaganda, technically-qualified positions and academic life, all of which were governed by an increasing sense of pragmatism. The 1950s had witnessed a significant drive in the direction of forming alliances between the intellectual middle-class and the subaltern classes which had resulted in one of the most creative phases of Brazilian culture. However, in the 1970s, a new cultural order was designed that was directly linked to the authoritarian modernization of “boutique capitalism” which was imposed on the country (BUARQUE DE HOLANDA & PONTES, 1975).

By looking at the sociological output in the 1960s and 1970s, it is possible to determine to what extent Brazilian sociologists sought to understand the order of change that took place in the cultural field of the country. In the theoretical field, the investigation of these changes took place by entering into a dialogue with the formulations of critical theory drawn up by the Frankfurt School of philosophers, in particular those set out by Adorno and Horkheimer, in their work *Dialectic of the Enlightenment*. When they analyze the culture of present-day societies, the authors seek to show how much it has been changed into an industry governed by the logic of capitalist production. Although the dialogue entered into by the Brazilian sociological imagination with the aim of understanding alterations in the cultural field of the country, was based on the pessimist outlook of the philosophers from Frankfurt with regard to the “culture industry”, it was extended to encompass other theoretical reference-points. In addressing this issue in Brazilian sociology, it is impossible to ignore the crucial importance of Gabriel Cohn – in studies such as *Comunicação e Indústria Cultural* [Communication and the Culture Industry] (1971) and *Sociologia da Comunicação. Teoria e Ideologia* [The Sociology of Communication: Theory and Ideology] (1973). This is shown by the widespread dissemination of this theoretical output and the setting up of a reflective field about the culture industry which is endowed with its own specific features. Moreover, it forms the basis for a more systematized understanding of the changes that have taken place in the Brazilian cultural field.

In his first work, *Comunicação e Indústria Cultural* – [Communication and the Culture Industry], Cohn assembles some key articles that have still not been published in the

country and written by authors devoted to studies about communication, public opinion formation and the culture industry in contemporary mass society, such as, Adorno and Habermas, who address several conceptual and sociological questions closely related to this subject. In his book, *Sociologia da Comunicação. Teoria e Ideologia*, [The Sociology of Communication: Theory and Ideology] based on his doctoral thesis, the author concentrates on reflecting about the particular features of a field of inquiry suited to the sociology of communication, by setting out from a complete dialogue with the relevant literature. To a great extent, it is a question of grounding a strategy of sociological inquiry on the relationships between symbolic and social systems. Through an analysis of the relationship between the public, the elite and the masses in a political dimension, Cohn argues that it is exactly in the investigation of the “messages”, regarded as the components of “ideological systems”, (produced and disseminated in complex societies on a large scale), that the methodological and theoretical problems most central to the sociology of communication, should be concentrated.

Various sociological works that were written or published in the 1960s and 1970s sought to understand distinct aspects of the way the culture industry is formed in Brazil. In a general way, apart from some specific concerns, there is a certain similarity in these works in so far as they are all attempting to understand the connections between the way the culture industry is formed and the expansion of conservative modernization in Brazil through a dependent capitalism that is peripheral and unequal. The books published by Renato Ortiz related to this question – in particular *Cultura Brasileira & Identidade Nacional* [Brazilian Culture and National Identity] (1985) and *A Moderna Tradição Brasileira* [The Modern Brazilian Tradition] (1988) – are examples that can illustrate the attempt made to obtain a global understanding of the emergence of the culture industry in Brazil and how this development is linked to national capitalism. Among other factors, the works of Ortiz lay bare several institutions and agencies that were set up in different situations by the Brazilian authoritarian State – especially the military regime that seized power in 1964 – in its attempt to shape a culture industry. This arose from the expansion of public policies and was aimed at television, the cinema, the publishing industry and advertising, and laid emphasis on the contradictions and processes of exclusion linked to this expansion of symbolic and cultural goods in the country.

With the aim of understanding the particular features of the culture industry in Brazil, that were driven by conservative modernization, the sociological imagination has given thought to the dynamics of change in different areas related to the production of cultural and symbolic goods such as television, newspapers, music and the cinema (ARRUDA, 2010). Several studies have been produced in this area on the basis of similar concerns, as can be witnessed by the following works: *Tio Patinhas e Os Mitos da Comunicação* [Uncle Scrooge and the Myths of Communication] (Orlando Miranda, 1976), *Acorde na Aurora. Música Sertaneja e Indústria Cultural* [Wake up in Aurora: Brazilian Country Music and the Culture Industry] (Waldenyr Caldas, 1977) and *Do Jornalismo Político à Indústria Cultural* [From Political Journalism to the Culture Industry] (Gisela Taschner Goldenstein, 1987). An exemplary book in the sense that it illustrates the kind of investigations that gathered force in the Brazilian sociological field (and involved a dialogue with the changes that occurred in the public sphere of the country) is *A Noite da Madrinha*, [The Night of the Godmother] by Sergio Miceli, published in 1972. Setting out from the study of the Game Show of Hebe Camargo, this was mainly aimed at a public comprising middle or high-income groups. Miceli attempted to understand specific aspects of the Brazilian culture

industry by entering into a dialogue with the thoughts of Pierre Bourdieu and by adopting different perspectives, theories and approaches such as semiology, structuralism, the analysis of “content” and the sociology of the mass media.

498

The analysis of this game show by Hebe Camargo included making a comparison with other programs of this genre such as those of the Brazilian entertainers Chacrinha and Sílvio Santos, and were aimed at the lower classes. They allowed Miceli to obtain a picture of the values conveyed by a kind of transmission disseminated by the culture industry which was designed to reach certain social groups as well as to understand the conditions and social factors that determine the relative effectiveness of the symbolic products selected. As Miceli makes clear, in a society like Brazil, where the material and symbolic goods are not unified, the mass media was formed as a set of strategic mechanisms for a “pedagogical” activity. By this is meant that they sought to “resocialize” large sections of the public by imposing the “habitus” of the dominant class while at the same time helping to establish the symbolic form of the middle classes that were already integrated with the dominant material and symbolic goods. In this way, the means of communication, especially television, would be “the service that could unify the material and symbolic goods which are transformed by the ‘differential’ imposition of the dominant culture” (MICELI, 1972, p.218).

The sociological output on the way the culture industry is constituted and its relationship with the expansion of modernization and capitalism in the country, has stimulated ideas about different aspects of Brazilian culture itself. The 1960s and 1970s bear witness to the strength of the sociological imagination in so far as they lead to speculations about the existence of a culture that has strictly Brazilian features. On the one hand, several studies have sought to investigate the role of the State and its agencies or intellectuals, with a view to shaping a national identity and Brazilian culture. On the other, several researchers have drawn attention to the sectors and specific social groups who have been involved in disputes about the shape Brazilian culture should take, whether in the sense of attempting to assess the positions adopted by the State on a national level or with the aim of showing resistance and constructing alternative ideas. It is worth noting that the extent to which the cultural question was politicized in Brazil in this period (whether on the Left or the Right) shaped one of the main areas of public dispute which was to define the course that the country should pursue.

The relationship between the State, intellectuals and national culture was analyzed from different perspectives by Brazilian sociologists. Some used a historical perspective as a benchmark — as is shown in the works *Intelectuais e Classe Dirigente no Brasil* [Intellectuals and the Ruling Class in Brazil] (Sergio Miceli, 1979) and *Tempos de Capanema* [The Times of Capanema (*reference to Gustavo Capanema, Minister of Education in Brazil 1937-1945)] (Simon Schwartzman, Helena Bomeny e Vanda Maria Ribeiro Costa, 1984) —, and also in the approach adopted by some contemporary authors — such as those found in the collection *Estado e Cultura no Brasil* [The State and Culture in Brazil] (Sergio Miceli et.al, 1984). In the first two works, despite their singularities and theoretical standpoint, there is a concern with addressing the relationships with the co-opted organizations that were established between the authoritarian State of President Vargas and key Brazilian intellectuals. There was also a desire to understand the institutional form of the cultural policy of the country in the 1930s and 1940s. However, the collection compiled by Miceli in the 1980s — which included articles by different sociologists such as Gabriel Cohn, Edmundo Santos Coelho and José Carlos Durand — sought to analyze the changes that

had occurred within the sphere of culture in the 1970s, on the basis of a reflection about public policies in the cultural scene, the mechanisms of nationalizing cultural activities and the dynamics of the market for cultural goods.

499

As well as examining the television, recording and publishing industries, the Brazilian sociologist investigated another facet of this period which was closely linked to the culture industry in Brazil – that of advertising. This was undertaken in 1979 as a Master's Dissertation at the Department of Social Sciences at the University of São Paulo and published in 1985. This work which is *A Embalagem do Sistema*, [The Packaging of the System] by Maria Arminda do Nascimento Arruda, clearly illustrates the importance that this issue has acquired in understanding the existing relationships between the expansion of cultural and symbolic goods and the establishment of capitalism in Brazil, by opening up new opportunities to think about the conservative modernization in the country from a fresh angle. In this study, the author seeks to understand (among other factors) how the country has become embedded in the world market of advertising, as well as the dynamics of the advertising industry in Brazil itself. This is carried out by examining the question together with the changes that occurred in the capitalist mode of production in Brazil after the modernizing drive by the military governments. This approach which was strongly influenced by the analysis of the culture industry conducted by Adorno and Horkheimer, resorts to a study of the advertising market. This involves examining the sector in entrepreneurial terms and undertaking an inquiry which involves reviewing the history of advertising and relating it to the most important periods of industrialization in Brazil.

What interests Arruda is to understand the exact nature of “*advertising as an essential component of accumulation in the monopolist stage*” (ARRUDA, 1985, p.18, author's italics) and its links through imperialism with the reproduction of the mature economies. Arruda is concerned with analyzing the peculiar configuration of the advertising system as one of the essential features of the reproduction of belated capitalism in Brazil in an oligopoly framework. The focal point of the author is on the form taken by the capitalist reproduction to the extent that this allows an analytical link between advertising and the monopolist capitalism established in the country. The underlying features of Brazilian capitalism – which were manifested “in the omnipresence of the State, the importance of multinational companies, the withering away of a part of the national productive sector, a concentration on the income groups that determine conspicuous consumption, advertising itself and the culture industry” (Ibidem, p.189) – explained why advertising played a leading role in modernization when compared with the “central” economies.

As well as conducting this diagnosis of the Brazilian advertising industry, Arruda attempted to show how the military governments deployed the instruments of the culture industry. This particularly applied to the mass media and the political propaganda of the regime, which included the main advertisers on a practice that had not had “any precedent in any country in the world” (Ibidem, p.137).

Hence, *A Embalagem do Sistema* [The Packaging of the System] can be regarded as an imaginative attempt to understand the belated dynamics of Brazilian capitalism based on a look at the particular branch of the culture industry – advertising. This provides evidence of its links with the conservative modernization that was driven by the military governments. Moreover, it brings in its wake all the contradictions of a country beset by a huge level of social inequality, running parallel with signs of a notable growth in advertising agencies supported by the consumption of the upper classes. Thus as in other

works of that time, the study of Maria Arminda do Nascimento Arruda has helped reveal a wide disparity between a significant broadening of the culture industry in general (and the advertising industry in particular) and the increase of internal inequality, together with the mechanisms of external domination. Hence, it can be said that by disentangling the threads of the advertising network in Brazil, it is possible to discern (from the range of different standpoints analyzed in previous sections) the conservative face of Brazilian modernization. This is characterized by an overwhelming presence of multinational companies through the undermining of the national productive sector and the abysmal concentration of income in the financial sectors.

500

Conclusion

The line of argument I have followed throughout this article has centred on ideas about the issue of conservative modernization and I have been able to corroborate the results of the analysis of the social sciences conducted by Luiz Werneck Vianna. This is made clear in the quotation, beneath the heading of this study: “just as Germany in the 19th Century cannot be understood without its philosophers, Brazilians have been granted access to an understanding of their country by the social sciences”. On the basis of a number of studies (Florestan Fernandes *Capitalismo Dependente e Classes Sociais na América Latina*, [Dependent Capitalism and Social Classes in Latin America], Luiz Werneck Vianna, *Liberalismo e Sindicato no Brasil*, [Liberalism and Trade Unions in Brazil], Lucio Kowarick, *Espoliação Urbana* [Urban Despoliation] and Maria Arminda do Nascimento Arruda, *A Embalagem do Sistema*, [The Packaging of the System]) related to other works written in the 1960s and 1970s, I have sought to show the importance of the sociological imagination for conducting an inquiry. This is based on a wide range of perspectives and insights, into the ongoing conservator of Brazilian modernization at the time of the military governments.

By conducting an analysis of a range of issues such as dependent development, the bourgeois revolution in the country, inequality in metropolitan districts and the pattern of the culture industry, the Brazilian sociological imagination can play an essential role in gauging the main contradictions of this ongoing modernization and allow it to be compared in different ways and from different standpoints with the expansion of capitalism in Brazil throughout the 1960s and 1970s. Having another look at the works produced at that time allows us to understand the role of sociology in that climate with greater clarity and also reveals the important role that the sociological imagination can play in raising questions from a broader perspective, about the conservative path taken in the long march to modernization in Brazil.

(Submitted on October 2014)

(Approved for publication on November 2014)

To Cite this Article

PERLATTO, Fernando. Interpreting conservative modernization: the Brazilian sociological imagination in difficult times [Interpretando a modernização conservadora: a imaginação sociológica brasileira em tempos difíceis]. **Revista Estudos Políticos**: online journal published twice a year by the Laboratory for the Hum(e)an Studies (Laboratório de Estudos Hum(e)anos, Fluminense Federal University, Brazil), and the Center for the Study of Political Theory (Núcleo de Estudos em Teoria

Política, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil). Rio de Janeiro,
Vol. 5 | N. 2, pp. 482 – 503, December 2014.
At: <http://revistaestudospoliticos.com/>

501

Notes

1. Works such as *Os Dois Brasis* (1959) [The Two Brazils] by Jacques Lambert, which had a great impact on the nation, *Dualidade Básica da Economia Brasileira* (1963), [The Basic Duality of the Brazilian Economy] by Inácio Rangel and *Teoria e Política do Desenvolvimento Econômico* (1967), [The Theory and politics of Economic Development] by Celso Furtado, are examples of the interpretations based on dualist perspectives that can help understand the challenges of development in Brazil and Latin-American countries.

2. Apart from the work by Cardoso and Faletto, there are other authors who have carried out work linked to the Dependence Theory and have adopted a wide range of theoretical perspectives, such as Gunder Frank, Ruy Mauro Marini, Theotonio dos Santos and Vânia Bambirra.

3. A The search for an understanding of the features of the Brazilian bourgeois revolution was not confined to the sociological field but was also found in studies of political economics (Caio Prado Junior, *A Revolução Brasileira*, [The Brazilian Revolution] 1966) and political science (Wanderley Guilherme dos Santos, *Ordem Burguesa e Liberalismo Político*, [The Bourgeois Order and Political Liberalism] 1978).

4. Other studies carried out in this area which are not restricted to the field of sociology have adopted a more backward-looking perspective and have resorted to analyzing the period of the Empire to understand the characteristics of the Brazilian State and the peculiar features of the modernization of the country. Among these studies it is worth mentioning: *Os Donos do Poder* [The Power Brokers] (Raymundo Faoro, 1975), *O Minotauro Imperial. A Burocratização do Estado Imperial* [The Imperial Minotaur: The Bureaucratizing of the Imperial State] (Fernando Uricoechea, 1978) and *A Construção da Ordem. A Elite Política Imperial* [The Building of Order: The Imperial Political Elite] (José Murilo de Carvalho, 1980).

5. It is also worth drawing attention to two theses published by sociologists in this period which are guided by the same concerns, namely: *Politique et Développement Économique. Structure de Pouvoir et Système de Décision au Brésil* [Politics and Economic Development: The Structure of Power and the Decision-making System in Brazil] (1930-1964), by Luciano Martins (1973) and *The Agrarian Roots of Conservative Modernization*, by Elisa Reis (1976).

Bibliographical References

ARRUDA, Maria Arminda do Nascimento. *A Embalagem do Sistema. A Publicidade no Capitalismo Brasileiro*. [The Packaging of the System: Advertising in Brazilian Capitalism] São Paulo: Duas Cidades, 1985.

- ____. "Sociologia da Cultura e Sociologia da Comunicação de Massa: Esboço de uma Problemática". [The Sociology of Culture and the Sociology of the Mass Media: Draft of an Inquiry] In: Martins, Carlos Benedito; Martins, Heloisa Helena T. de Souza. (orgs.). *Horizontes das Ciências Sociais no Brasil: Sociologia*. [The Horizons of the Social Sciences in Brazil] São Paulo: Editora Barcarolla, 2010, pp.253-277. 502
- BIELSCHOWSKY, Ricardo. *Cinquenta Anos de Pensamento na CEPAL*. [50 Years of thought in ECLAC] Rio de Janeiro/São Paulo: Record/Cepal/ Cofecon, 2000.
- BUARQUE DE HOLANDA, Chico & PONTES, Paulo. *Gota D'água*. [The Drop of Water] Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1975.
- CARDOSO, Fernando Henrique & FALETTO, Enzo. *Dependência e Desenvolvimento na América Latina. Ensaio de Interpretação Sociológica*. [Dependency and Development in Latin America : an Interpretative Sociological Essay] Rio de Janeiro: Zahar Editores, 1973.
- COSTA PINTO, Luiz de Aguiar. *Desenvolvimento Econômico e Transição Social*. [Economic Development and Social Transition] 2nd edition. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1970.
- FERNANDES, Florestan. *Sociedade de Classes e Subdesenvolvimento*. [The Society of Classes and Underdevelopment] Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1968.
- ____. *Capitalismo Dependente e Classes Sociais na América Latina*. [Dependent Capitalism and Social Classes in Latin America] 2nd edition. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1975.
- ____. *A Sociologia numa Era de Revolução Social*. [Sociology in an Era of Social Revolution] 2nd edition. Rio de Janeiro, Zahar, 1976.
- IANNI, Octavio. *Sociologia da Sociologia. O Pensamento Sociológico Brasileiro*. [The Sociology of Sociology: Brazilian sociological thinking] São Paulo: Editora Ática, 1989.
- KOWARICK, Lucio. *A Espoliação Urbana*. [Urban Despoliation] Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1979.
- MICELI, Sergio. *A Noite da Madrinha*. [The Night of the Godmother] São Paulo: Perspectivas, 1972.
- ____. "Condicionantes do Desenvolvimento das Ciências Sociais". [The Conditions for the Development of the Social Sciences] In: Miceli, Sergio (org.) *História das Ciências Sociais no Brasil*. [History of the Social Sciences in Brazil] São Paulo: Editora Sumaré, 1989, pp.72-110.
- MOTTA, Rodrigo Patto Sá. *As Universidades e o Regime Militar*. [Universities and the Military Regime] *Cultura política brasileira e modernização autoritária*. [Brazilian political culture and authoritarian modernization] Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2014.
- ORTIZ, Renato. *A Moderna Tradição Brasileira*. [The Brazilian Modern Tradition] *Cultura Brasileira e Indústria Cultural* [Brazilian Culture and the Culture Industry]. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1991.

_____. *Ciências Sociais e Trabalho Intelectual*. [The Social Sciences and Intellectual Work] São Paulo: Olho D'Água, 2003. 503

PERLATTO, Fernando. *Sociologia Pública: Imaginação Sociológica Brasileira e Problemas Públicos*. [Public Sociology: the Brazilian Sociological Imagination and Public Problems] Rio de Janeiro: doctoral thesis. Institute of Social and Political Sciences. University of the State of Rio de Janeiro, 2013.

RIDENTI, Marcelo. *Em Busca do Povo Brasileiro: Artistas da Revolução, do CPC à era da TV*. [In Search of the Brazilian People: Artists of the Revolution from CPC to the era of Television] Rio de Janeiro, Record, 2000.

SORJ, Bernardo. *A Construção Intelectual do Brasil Contemporâneo. Da Resistência à Ditadura ao Governo FHC*. [The Intellectual Formation of Contemporary Brazil. From the Resistance to Dictatorship, to the Government of President Cardoso] Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar Editor, 2001.

VILLAS BÔAS, Gláucia. *Mudança Provocada. Passado e Futuro no Pensamento Sociológico Brasileiro*. [Instigated Change: the Past and Future in Brazilian Sociological Thinking] Rio de Janeiro: Editora FGV, 2006.

WERNECK VIANNA, Luiz. *Liberalismo e Sindicato no Brasil*. [Liberalism and Trade Unionism in Brazil] 4ª edição. Belo Horizonte, Editora UFMG, 1999.

_____. *A Revolução Passiva: Iberismo e Americanismo no Brasil*. [The Passive revolution: Iberism and Americanism in Brazil] 2nd edition. Rio de Janeiro, Revan 2004.