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As a Brazilian from the one of the "less-developed" countries, I have always been skeptical about the political intentions of assistance to my country from developed societies, and in particular from the United States. Born in 1944, I am from the generation that was taught to view the United States as a model of the most technologically advanced society — democratic, honest, generous, and free, "good guys" in the Hollywood movies that I saw and in the novels, biographies, and history books that I read. Brazilians, such as Sam Carioca in the Disney cartoons, were not. My generation was raised with an inferiority complex in relation to "American ideals:" we were corrupted (by nature), untrustworthy, lazy ("ai que preguiça," says Macunaima*), too emotional, subjective, family-bound, selfish and impatient with unfamiliar conditions.

* Macunaima is the protagonist of Mario de Andrade's book (Macunaima, in Paulo Eugenio Cupolo, 1928). Mario de Andrade was one of the main writers of the Modernist movement in Brazilian literature and arts in the 1920's. In Macunaima he critically evaluates Brazilian society, its racial mixture, its history and its problems of national identity. "Ai que preguiça" roughly translated means: "Oh, what laziness," in reference to Brazilians' indifferent attitudes toward work and productivity.
My favorite joke about Brazil concerns God's reply to a question as to why He created Brazil with an ideal climate, free of volcanoes and seasonal storms—indeed, a paradise. God said, "Don't worry about it — just wait and see what kind of people I'm going to put there." Most Brazilians, ashamed of their cultural heritage, turned their attention to and learned to admire the European and then the American "ideals." The notion that "equality," "property" and "liberty" in the United States are equally shared by all were especially idealized parts of American culture.

My eldest brother, who encouraged me and provided support for me to study in the United States, (in 1966) gave me the following advice: "You are going to a country where a President states: 'Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country.'" This was a year after the Brazilian military had ousted the populist, democratic, nationalist, anti-American, and anti-imperialistic government of Goulart. After this coup d'etat, my closest friends were jailed for participation in subversive activities. Others disappeared. I was hesitant to go to a country that had been involved in combating leftist ideas and activities in Brazil. My brother, a U.S. admirer, firmly believed that coming to the United States was a chance no one could afford to miss. Kennedy's words sounded like universal truth to me and made me ashamed once more of being a Brazilian — an underachiever. I never stopped, however, being skeptical of the United States.

Kennedy's "Alliance for Progress" fit nicely with Brazilian and Latin American desires to overcome the causes of underdevelopment through rapid industrialization. Brazilian President Kubistcheck, elected to replace Vargas, wanted to make 50 years of progress in five years — so the slogan went.
American businessmen established multinational companies in Brazil. Diplomats and scholars went to Brazil to "help the people help themselves." The self-help approach was a powerful tool to defuse collective grass-roots movements that instilled class-consciousness. It was congruent with American ideals: independence, self-reliance, achievement, individualism, freedom from tradition, and equal opportunity to all in spite of race, sex or creed. It was a powerful package for Brazil, a country with an inferiority complex about self-determination.

My skepticism had an opportunity for expression in a seminar about Brazilian society at the University of Florida. The class was taught by Professor T. Lynn Smith, a sociologist widely known for his professional dedication and his studies of Brazil even before I was born. Professor Smith was explaining about Brazilians' inability to produce reliable statistics or quantifiable data and about the generally poor conditions for scientific research. Naively, I asked why North Americans had become so interested in studying Brazil and other Latin American countries after the Second World War if the statistics were bad? What, I asked, were the relationships between the United States' alliance with these countries and the interest of U.S. scholars in studying them? Professor Smith was surprised at these questions. I was puzzled and afraid I had committed a heresy by asking such questions. My North American colleagues showed disapproval and made me feel that these questions were not suitable for the seminar. I was sure I had been petulant to my professor and unsure of the meaning and the importance of my questions.
Although the idea for this study began in Professor Smith's seminar, it took shape while I was attending graduate school at The Ohio State University. On one side of the river, at the Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, I was exposed to a critical assessment of rural sociology; while on the other side, to the challenges of understanding sociological theory — perhaps for the first time. Professor William L. Flinn, my adviser, is credited with introducing me to the general criticism of that subdiscipline, and Professor Roscoe Hinkle, to general sociology. The opportunity of working on a project about sociology in Brazil with Professor David O. Hansen helped me to "bridge" the two intellectual concerns and to organize my thoughts in this study. I wish to also acknowledge Professor Donald W. Thomas and Larry Brown to my committee. Without the intellectual guidance, unfaltering support and extraordinary personal stimulation of Bill Flinn — first through correspondence (while I was in Brazil) and then on a daily basis — this research would not have been completed. Few students, I am sure, have had the chance to experience such open, supportive and non-directive orientation from an adviser as I have, and I am forever grateful for that. My only hope is that I can share Bill's unique guidance and approach with others, as a professor in my country.

I am also grateful to the CNPq and MEC (respectively, the National Council for Research and the Ministry of Education of Brasilia, Brazil) for financial support. The Department of Social Sciences at the Federal University of Espirito Santo in Vitoria, Brazil, where I am employed, has also been
instrumental in helping me to conclude my studies. Roberto Belling's comments and discussion of my very first draft (1981), helped to set the tone for the socio-historical analysis. Celso Perota's criticisms, suggestions and particularly James Roy Dossey's orientation and constant encouragement, have contributed to the successful accomplishment of this project.

Many friends and relatives from Brazil gave me personal and emotional support. Among these is Ms. Fernanda Maria Ferreira Frasson, who maintained an abiding emotional support and affection (through weekly letters and telephone calls).

I was very lucky to be able to count on the facilities at the office of MUCIA (Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities) at The Ohio State University, under the directorship of my adviser and Donald McCloud, along with the cooperation of the staff. Words are not enough to express my indebtedness to each one of them. Although Gloria Gardner claims she "did not have anything to do with (my) dissertation," her administrative coordination was vital. Thanks to Lisa Kettler and Anna Murtagh, clerical assistants and copyists; also to Pamela Brown and especially Jayne Allison, who typed, edited, and were very patient with me, I want to say, from my heart, "muito obrigado" (the translation of which goes beyond "many thanks").

I am very honored that Professors Frederick H. Buttel (Cornell University) and Eugene A. Havens (University of Wisconsin) took the time to read and make useful comments on my manuscripts. Their concern and interest boosted me in the writing of my final draft. I hope we can maintain contact in future projects. Professors Archibald O. Haller (University of Wisconsin) and Lisandro Perez (Louisiana State University) have sent me valuable information about...
the role of Wisconsin's rural sociologists in Brazil and on T. Lynn Smith's influences; my gratitude goes to them for their time and attention as well. Finally, I want to acknowledge the expert editing of John Bielefeldt and especially his leniency towards a "non-native" writer of English.
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CHAPTER 1

RURAL SOCIOLOGY IN THE UNITED STATES AND IN BRAZIL:
THE CHALLENGES FOR THE 1980'S

In a recent essay, a Brazilian sociologist asserts that "knowledge about our rural world still struggles with our inability to exorcize two evil spirits: evolutionism and economicism." "The haunted house of Brazilian reality continues to be occupied by ghosts of the past," he adds (Martins, 1979:243). Both notions view rural society as backward, unproductive and laggard in comparison with modern industrial societies.

"We still run a serious risk and are likely to accept dogma, superficial analysis, poorly constructed research questions, and distorted explanations or ideologically slanted interpretations, simply because of our 'petty-bourgeois' view of the world and past theoretical heritage. We tend to see what we wish and are quite happy with the results, but rarely we see what is actually happening around us. Brazilian sociology persists in trying to separate what capital has already unified — the rural and the urban" (Martins, 1979: 243-6).

Martins (1979:244) further states that Brazilian social sciences are still influenced by research questions and theoretical concerns from the past, "as though we have not advanced one step forward during all the years of our academic obscurity."

Martins' critical appraisal of an "ideologization" of sociology in the name of science as a response to the social and intellectual contexts from which this discipline has emerged — is illustrated by the Brazilian tale, Jeca Tatu (Country Hick). The story is intended to educate children about the importance of personal hygiene and sanitation but has precipitated a stereotype of Brazilian
rural society that will remain for many decades. The Jeca Tatu, an ignorant, barefoot, indolent, debilitated, shabby rustic, is transformed into a prosperous farmer surrounded by urban services — closed circuit television, radio, chic clothes, shoes, fine cuisine and medical care. The subliminal message for the Brazilian subconscious is that through the intervention of urban agents (the doctor and modern medicines) the Jeca-Tatu is now healthy, wealthy and "civilized."

For Martins (1975:4) this tale expresses the ideological underpinnings of an urban consciousness that socializes the Brazilian mind toward a disdain for country people and rural life. It also demonstrates, he says, the inability of agrarian society and its inhabitants to develop culturally and economically by their own efforts because they are bound by their indolence. The deduction from this stereotype is that in order for rural communities to progress, an external impetus must be introduced to the rural world; the rural must adapt itself to the urban in order to form an integrated social system and become a consumer of market commodities. In this view, agricultural technicians (engenheiro agronomo) and credit agents are substituted for the doctors of the Jeca-Tatu tale, and mechanical farm implements, fertilizers, pesticides, bank loans, and other urban goods and services are the "medicines" (Martins, 1975:1-14). These introductory remarks set the stage for a basic assumption of this study — that sociology as a discourse on society cannot be understood apart from its social and intellectual context.
Statement of the Problem

This study concerns a "body of scientific knowledge" (see Smith, 1970) institutionally organized as a "subdiscipline" (see Friedland, 1982) to conduct research and to theorize about rural society. It concerns the institutionalization of sociology and rural sociology in Brazil under the particular influences of North American sociology after the Great Depression and World War II. This study is not an appraisal of the valuable personal contributions of many U.S. sociologists such as Horace B. Davies, Samuel H. Lowrie, Donald Pierson, T. Lynn Smith, John H. Kolb, Archibald O. Haller, Frederick C. Fliegel, E. A. Wilkening and many others who followed. It is instead a study of the social and intellectual contexts from which sociology and rural sociology has emerged in Brazil. The main purpose of this study is to relate rural sociology, as a science "transported" to study Brazilian rural society, to the political and ideological relationships between Brazil and the United States, especially after World War II, when different ideologies (capitalism, socialism and fascism) competed for the control of markets and raw materials in Latin America.

In order to understand the influence of North American post-war sociology on the institutionalization of rural sociology in Brazil, this study will examine social tendencies in Brazil in the decades of the 1920's, 30's, and 40's as well as intellectual influences from the 1800's. During these decades Brazilian society underwent crucial changes at all levels: an agricultural crisis in an economy entirely dependent on agricultural production for export, a rapid process of industrialization and urbanization, and a growing intervention of the State in key sectors of the economy. Socially, there was also the growth of an urban working class and the emergence of a small but powerful group of
industrialists and entrepreneurs, followed by an expansion of higher education in the technical and administrative professions in both public and private sectors. Politically, these decades were marked by the decline of the rural oligarchy, a militant rebellion of young lieutenants (the tenentes), the organization of new political parties (including the communist party under the leadership of a young army officer), urban class struggles, and the expansion of an authoritarian State apparatus. At the ideological level, the decades of the 1920's and 30's were characterized by an intellectual movement searching for a unique Brazilian culture. This ideological movement, the modernismo, was a reaction to imported models in art and literature, but it accepted North American scientific thought (including applied sociology) and a cooptation of intellectuals by the State.

Plan of Study

The organization of the chapters follows the logic by which research questions unfold in the historical process. Chapter II deals with the social and intellectual setting for the institutionalization of sociology in 1933 in Brazil. It analyzes the main influences of the so-called Brazilian revolution in 1930 and of President Vargas' drive toward nationalism and a welfare state, the modernismo and tenentes movements, the founding of the communist party, the influence of positivism and Comte's notions of "order and progress," and the struggle of a national bourgeoisie for political power. These factors were important in the formal introduction of a discipline aimed at preparing a technocratic elite that would study and seek solutions to Brazilian "problems." Chapter III deals with the United States' concerns for national security in the
western hemisphere through cultural exchanges of scholars and social research and examines the economic, political and ideological relationships between Brazil and the U.S. in terms of Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy and Rockefeller's inter-American cultural interests. It is suggested that sociological research projects sponsored by the U.S. Department of State and the Department of Agriculture were institutionally restrained in their orientation and their selection of problems to be studied. In chapter IV, the development of rural sociology in Brazil and the endorsement of North American sociology, between world wars, are seen as related. It is suggested that early sociological studies and a search for national unity by Brazilian intellectuals had laid the foundation for a prompt acceptance of empirical and utilitarian approaches to sociology in Brazil. Finally, chapter V summarizes major conclusions of each chapter and develops a synthesis of the "ideologization" of sociology and rural sociology in their "search for a community of values and norms" (see Therborn, 1980) and an alternative to the study of society from a historical materialist perspective. Before proceeding, however, some general remarks about the current state of rural sociology in both Brazil and the U.S. are necessary.

**Rural Sociology and its Challenges for the 1980's**

Flinn (1982:1) in his presidential address to the Rural Sociological Society, avowed that rural sociology is entering a new era in which problems facing the discipline in the next decade will be different from those diagnosed in earlier decades. Today in rural sociology, more attention is being paid to socio-political and theoretical questions linked to the discipline's role in the land-grant system. The "land-grant system" refers to federal land granted to
colleges of agriculture under the Morrill Land Act of 1862, to the state agricultural experimental stations created twenty-five years later (1887) by the Hatch Act, and to the agricultural extension network formed by the Smith-Lever Act of 1914. These legislations tying rural sociology to federal agencies constitute what Friedland (1979:1) calls a "dense institutional network influencing the knowledge production system directly" (see also Flinn, 1980 and Gilbert, 1981). Teaching, research and extension services in agricultural colleges have been under the tutelage of U.S. government agencies for more than 120 years, according to Friedland (1979). In its formative years rural sociology in the United States was part of a movement, led by Protestant churches, to solve "farm problems." Smith (1957) reinforced this point when he noted that many surveys and courses in rural social problems were sponsored by church organizations. U.S. farm problems were perceived as moral decay, and inquiries about social structures usually began at the individual level without relating the individual's problems to a social totality. Rural sociology depended on early American sociological theory for concepts, basic theory, and methods of analysis (Hooks and Flinn, 1981).

Another crucial feature inherent in U.S. rural sociology since its birth, has been a question about its conceptual right to exist (Gilbert, 1982:613). The issue of what is "rural" and so the discipline's object of study has troubled sociologists everywhere. In the United States, Picou et al. (1978), Bealer (1978), and Falk and Pinhey (1970) have assessed the discipline's "internal troubles" and according to a recent textbook "rural sociology has given every appearance of having lost its way" (Buttell and Newby, 1980:1). In Europe, Galjart (1975) and Benvenuti et al. (1973) have criticized rural sociology's
concept of science. He also claimed that most of the problems with U.S. rural sociology arise because it has ignored Eastern European and Third World discussions of rural society and neglected Marxist work that bears on rural questions.

Recent politicization of land-grant institutions themselves (internal criticism by faculty, students, and other disciplines) has also contributed to visions of a "new rural sociology" or a "critical rural sociology," as called for by Buttel and Newby (1980). Friedland (1982:591), one of the most influential and articulate critics of the discipline, delivers the following ultimatum to rural sociology:

"either it will become an ideological exponent and justifier of the final destruction of family-based agriculture in the United States and a supporter or corporate agribusiness or it will undertake a gadfly, critical role that could lead to its expulsion from the land-grant complex."

Friedland's calls for more critiques of rural sociology's commitment and its object of study. What is the object of study of this new and critical rural sociology? What are the challenges for 1980's?

Until the last decade most of the research in rural sociology (Buttel and Newby, 1980:15), especially in the United States and Western Europe, focused attention on:

1) adoption and diffusion of agricultural technology,
2) quality of life and social indicators,
3) community development,
4) demography, and
5) the process of educational and occupational achievement among rural youth.
In the 1980's different theoretical concerns and lines of research have emerged. According to Buttel and Newby (1980), recent meetings of the Rural Sociology Society and the European Society of Rural Sociology have given more attention to the structure of agriculture in advanced capitalist societies. This tendency is attributed to "the rapid decline in the number of the family farms during the post-war period along with the emergence of a significant trend toward corporate farming in the 1960's and 1970's" (also see Vogler, 1981). The agricultural labor process and in particular the environment problems of agriculture are also on research agenda of rural sociology during the current decade.

Friedland (1982) thinks that rural sociology should abandon its focus on "rural society" and the rural community, and concentrate instead on agriculture as a production process. Gilbert (1982) also criticizes the traditional concepts of "rural" as cultural, ecological, or occupational (the Sorokin and Zimmerman rural-urban paradigm), and suggests an alternative "capitalist space" in the form of uneven regional development and a "mode of primary production" distinguished by its direct interaction with the natural environment (see Lefebre, 1979:285-295). Changes in lines of research also require change in theoretical perspectives. The new perspectives that challenge rural sociology in the 1980's are the issues of internal colonialism, dependency theory and structural Marxism (see Buttel and Newby, 1980:18-27).
The Development of Rural Sociology in Brazil: An Overview

Rural sociology, as a body of scientific knowledge for study of rural society, was born in the United States and transported to European and Latin American countries (see Nelson, 1967 and 1969).

In Brazil, rural society was first studied (as will be discussed in Chapter IV) by European travelers and scholars; they were followed by Brazilian intellectuals. These earliest studies from 1873 to 1933 attempted to define a national character in terms of racial mixture, environmental factors and Iberian traditions. This sixty year period of study was marked by a search for a national integration of Brazilian society based on the coexistence of contrasting realities (Black, White and Indian races, rural-backland and urban-coastal societies). These studies were historiographical and anthropological in nature and were consequently influenced by racial, natural and social evolutionistic theories predominant at the time. Some authors perceived different sectors of Brazilian society as harmoniously fused; others saw conflict and danger to national unity. These authors were the founding fathers of social science in Brazil.

Before U.S. sociologists arrived in Brazil in the 1940's, U.S.-authored textbooks on rural sociology had appeared. Brazilian research on rural conditions was theoretically and methodologically influenced by these texts and by North American sociology, and this influence increased during the following decades and lasted until the early 1970's (see Pereira de Queiroz, 1978 and Medina, 1966). Hansen et al. (1979:32) found that in contrast to the U.S., where rural sociology has gone through an identity crisis during the last decade, Brazilian rural sociology has blossomed during the last fifteen years. Graduate programs
were initiated primarily through the encouragement and support of several sociology departments in U.S. land grant universities and secondarily through the Ford Foundation's support. In the early 1960's, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) funded "institution building" agreements between several U.S. and Brazilian universities. The University of Arizona signed a contract with Ceara, in the Northeast; Purdue with the University of Vicosa, in the State of Minas Gerais; Ohio State University with the University of Sao Paulo; and Wisconsin with the University of Rio Grande do Sul. The primary objective of their agreements was to establish graduate programs in agricultural sciences including rural sociology (Hansen et al., 1979:32). The University of Paraiba and Brasilia also started graduate programs with options in rural sociology (see Appendix B and Fig. A). The results of Hansen's survey in 1977 of the five centers counted 45 active faculty members, 24 with doctoral degrees. All Ph.D.'s except one were trained in the U.S., five were non-Brazilians. Ph.D.'s were earned at Wisconsin, Ohio State, North Carolina, Harvard, Florida, and Sussex in England (Hansen, 1979:35). Hansen et al. (1979) also analyzed the content of 45 masters theses defended that year in the centers and concluded that:

Clearly the most popular areas have been social organizations and social change. They reflect concern with documenting rural structure and process as well as providing contributions to governmental attempts to modernize the agricultural sectors. Half of the theses completed on social organization touched on topics of stratification and class structure. Those completed at ESALQ [in Sao Paulo] and IEPE [Rio Grande do Sul] students mainly used methodological and theoretical framework generated by research in the U.S., and were based on community studies. Those completed at the UnB [Brasilia] used a European conceptual framework, having focused on social classes and class dynamics and peasantry as a special group. Several descriptive and descriptive community studies were defended at ESALQ and one regional study at the UnB. Others included a study of agricultural cooperatives defended
at the ESALQ, and two of the rural labor unions and one on rural education at IEPE."

Although many Brazilian social scientists criticized North American influences in the 1960's (see Ianni, 1971; Pereira de Queiroz, 1978; Medina, 1966; and Fernandes, 1977), U.S. influences and/or rural sociology's traditional paradigm — the rural-urban continuum — continue to dominate teaching and research in Brazil. However, for universities and institutions that have not taken part in the "institution building" contracts, there is a different tendency. This difference is partly because of the changing social, political, economic and ideological contexts and the intellectual consciousness of young scholars trained in Brazilian universities and abroad.3 According to Aguiar (1979:1):

"After completing their training abroad, these authors returned to Brazil and began their research work as an inquiry on the crisis affecting the country. They sought to analyze the nature of the authoritarian state, the social structure within which such a regime could emerge, the modifications and continuities observed at the outbreak of the crisis, the continuities and differences found in comparing the current administration with previous authoritarian regimes in Brazil, and the Brazilian case as compared with equivalent situations experienced by other countries whether under liberal or authoritarian rule."

She adds that "from six graduate programs in the social sciences which were declared centers of excellence (by The Brazilian Council on Science and Technology), 64 percent of a total of sixty-one graduate professors had done their graduate studies in the United States, two in France, and two in England. The remaining 36 percent had completed their work in Brazil" (1978:12, note 3). Aguiar's (1979:223-247) selected bibliography on the output of social sciences in Brazil during 1960-1977, shows that the leading subjects studied by Brazilians are issues on "industrialization and socio-political development." In fact, the quantity of articles, monographs, books and theses which bear the
title "polítioco" is overwhelming — especially analysis of the political process such as power structure, political parties, the electorate, forms of government, ideology, bureaucratic organizations, occupational structure, the work process, industrialization, social change, social movements, unionization of the working classes, elites, and mass communication. During this same period, research in anthropology on Afro-religious influences and Indian studies are highly represented. Urban sociology also ranks high, if a number of population studies on demographic trends, internal migration, housing conditions, government policies for the poor, and general research of peripheral urban communities (favelas) are included under the notion of "social marginality." A small but growing concern for women's studies — the role of women in Brazilian society, fertilization, abortion and other issues — is also noteworthy. Subjects concerning rural societies, such as agricultural expansion versus industrialization, rural migration, temporary workers' conditions (os boiás frias), land ownership and the expansion of capitalism in rural areas were also noted. Although some of the major criticisms of U.S. sociology by Brazilians will be explored in chapter IV, this study will not discuss the discipline's epistemological and methodological contributions. It concentrates rather on U.S. influences during the development of sociology and rural sociology in Brazil after the 1930's. By way of introduction we shall highlight, chronologically, the major theoretical tendencies of sociology in Brazil within an international context.

Linhares and Silva (1981) point out that political and economic crises, as a result of the international relations between Brazil and the United States, shaped the way that agriculture in Brazil was perceived. Their analysis helps to understand rural sociology as a discipline of study of rural conditions. The
first crisis occurred at the turn of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th century during the demise of the colonial system. It was characterized by a decline in production of precious stones and a return to reliance on agriculture for exports. At the same time, Europe and the United States underwent drastic changes with the American, the French and the Industrial revolutions, and the consequent rise of liberalism. A second crisis in the mid-19th century was characterized by rapid industrialization in both Europe and the United States. In Brazil this period saw a prolonged shortage in foodstuffs and rising prices that resulted in several social and legal movements. Slavery was gradually abolished and administrative, fiscal and political reforms followed. The third crisis took place after World War II, when U.S. capitalism and Soviet socialism struggled for political and ideological control of other countries. Brazil, and the Third World countries in general, began to raise their consciousness about the causes for underdevelopment. The urban and industrial bourgeoisie, in control of the socio-political processes, made proposals for reconstruction of society under a liberal reformist ideology and technological investment, particularly from the United States.

Brazilian intellectuals have advanced two proposals — one in the early 1900's and the other after the war — that help to understand why U.S. sociology and its underlying assumptions encountered favorable conditions for establishing themselves in Brazil. The first proposal was advanced in the 1890's by a statesman, Tavares Bastos, who was interested in introducing Brazilian social reforms congruent with the development of capitalism and "progress" as observed in the United States. He lived during the colonial crises and it was only natural that he sought abolition of feudal structures. His proposal called
for "the adoption of free-labor, a land tenure system, like the 'Homestead Act' in the United States, more roads to facilitate the transportation of commodities, decentralization of the state administration, more efficiency in delivering services such as credits, loans, and other rational and modern measures" (Linhares and Silva, 1981:23). The second proposal was advanced in the 1960's by Roberto Campos, an economist and influential statesman in Brazilian politics. He also proposed modernization of the economic structure to promote the efficiency of capitalism in Brazil's rural sectors. It must be stressed, however, that the impacts of the Great Depression and World War II caused countries producing foodstuffs and raw materials, such as Brazil, to undergo revolutionary internal changes. As a result of the war, the United States and Soviet Union controlled the world's political and ideological context. There was struggle between capitalism and socialism, the former seeking to consolidate its allies into a market-oriented economy and the latter seeking to influence groups to carry out a struggle against imperialism and colonization. Brazil, which flirted with German fascism before the war, submitted to the influence of the United States and sought to develop via capitalism. After the war and throughout the 1950's Brazilians sought to explain and find solutions for their underdevelopment. Social reality was still viewed in terms of dichotomies. The racial climate and cultural differences were transformed, but not changed, into traditional and modern: rural versus urban, capitalism versus feudalism, or bourgeoisie versus aristocracy. Social evolution and racial theories were substituted with dualism.

Rural peasants and small property owners were characterized as traditionalists reactionaries, and conservatives tied to the past and resistant
to change. The middle class, industrialists, and urban workers (bureaucrats and small businessmen) were considered "progressives." Consequently political and cultural movements, such as the Abolition of the Slaves, Proclamation of the Republic, tenantismo (the young army officers' movement), the modernist movement in art and literature, the Revolution of 1930, were all attributed to the Brazilian bourgeoisie. Problems in Brazilian society, from this dualistic perspective, were due to the aristocratic, feudalistic, paternalistic "survivals" of a traditional structure. Brazilian workers were viewed as "too passive," and industrial entrepreneurs were not as "aggressive" as they ought to be. The dualistic model had no difficulties in adjusting to a theoretical frame based on collective experiences of the time. After 1950, Brazilians, free from dictatorship, believed that democracy and economic development could be obtained through rapid modernization. Brazilians were convinced they could repeat the successful development experiences of other countries. This conviction, some feel, inspired President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress.

Toward the end of the 1950's, the dualism model began to fade from prominence in intellectual circles and a "national developmentalism" spawned a more or less traditional Marxist view of development. There still remained, however, the belief that national problems stemmed from the fact that Brazil was characterized by the existence of two modes of production: one capitalist and the other still feudalist. Foreign capital was tied to the "archaic" sector of Brazilian society (latifundios). It was believed that a "national bourgeoisie" in struggle against imperialism and feudalism would bring about economic autonomy and social development. Brazilian sociologist such as Cardoso (1973; Cardoso and Falleto, 1979), for instance "suggested that 'associated dependent
development' in some situations might permit some local participation in production and yield growth (see Chilcote, 1983:13ff). The expectations of the 1950's and early 1960's — that a national bourgeoisie would promote a nationalistic liberal and democratic revolution — died in 1964, when a civilian government was replaced by the military dictatorship. "Dependency theory" is born within this context (see Kahl, 1976).

Importance of the Study

Rural sociology as a sub-discipline of sociology was transplanted to Brazil during the years that followed the Great Depression and World War II. Sociologists from the United States, and particularly those trained between the two world wars, had a noteworthy and lasting influence on the development of sociology and rural sociology in Brazil. More than half a century has passed since a North American brand of sociology established its hegemony to conduct research and to interpret Brazilian society.

Among all social sciences in Brazil, rural sociology was the one that profited the most from the presence of North American rural sociologists in Brazil. In fact, rural sociologists were the pioneers among U.S. scholars with an interest in Latin America:

Not only was Latin America, the first major (foreign) area into which, American rural sociology ventured, it is also an area in which more rural sociologists have worked...than any other portion of the globe (Hopper, 1964:266).

Diegues (1962a:245) argues that interest in Brazilian rural society parallels the formation of Brazilian society itself: "Brazil was born rural: in the cotton, tobacco and sugar plantations."
Some authors, such as Ramos (1936), Bastide (1945), Hopper (1964), and Stavenhagen (1964) have specifically pointed out U.S. theoretical influences on Brazilian social scientists. Ramos (1956), Diegues (1962a), Stavenhagen (1964) and Rios (1972) all stressed the contributions of U.S. sociologists in the institutionalization of a "scientific and applied sociology in Brazil," especially during the 1950's and 1960's. Even urban research on the favelas (city slums) appeared as an extension of research in rural areas. Rios (1972), who terms the 1960's the "booming period" of rural sociology in Brazil, characterizes this decade as one of political optimism and economic "developmentism." Under President Juscelino Kubistcheck (1956-1961), Brazil strove to overcome "social" obstacles to speed up "economic" development. The 1950's witnessed many political initiatives for change in rural areas — campaigns for better education, health and welfare. These initiatives, it was said, would revitalize already established services and create new services for rural society (Rios, 1972:121). It was during the 1950's that U.S scientific and applied sociology made its ascent. According to Medina (1966), during this period a holistic and historical approach to sociology was considered "out-dated" and invalid in social analyses. He also asserts that this was a time in which many U.S. community studies were replicated in Brazil.

In later decades, however, Ianni (1967; 1971) and Stavenhagen (164:235) and others would criticize the analysis of Brazilian reality on the basis of U.S. models. Wagley (1964) and other North American anthropologists show the interaction between the city and the country. Their criticisms are found in Pahl's (1966) discussion of theoretical power of rural-urban explanation. Pereira de Queiroz (1978a) found North-American atomistic and functionalist
approaches incapable of sociological synthesis, and Martins (1981) saw rural-urban dichotomies as a conservative reaction, inherent in sociology, to the expansion of capitalism, not as sociological theory that explains contradictions within rural society.

Criticisms by young Brazilian sociologists have had a bearing on recent reassessments of the discipline in both the United States and Europe. These critics have suggested that the dissemination of U.S. scientific sociology and applied rural sociology in Brazil (and other Latin American countries) is an extension of capitalism and cultural imperialism (see Ianni, 1976; Graciearana, 1978; Martins, 1975; Veron, 1968). Few, however, have examined this relationship in a comprehensive fashion (Ianni, 1971; Pereira de Queiroz, 1978a) and no study has linked the social, intellectual and political contexts of the two countries. Wagley (1964:25) writes that:

"Bilateral relations between the United States and the various Latin American republics, and the treaties, institutions, and attitudes that have come to be the 'inter-American system'...is an important and much neglected field of social science research."

Newby (1982) in "A Content Analysis of 'Rural Sociology' and 'Sociologia Ruralis'" (the two leading U.S. and European journals in the field), stated that "it is difficult to understand the character of American rural sociology unless in is related to its institutional setting: the conditions of knowledge of production, which lay behind the act of publication. Flinn (1982:3) found it essential for rural sociologists to understand the heritage of the sub-discipline if they are to deal effectively with the promise and pitfalls of the discipline in the coming years. He has also asked (Flinn, 1982:10) for a broadening of the comparative base of rural sociology through regional research in other societies because internationally-oriented non-land-grant sociologists represent
the single most promising group for research breakthroughs. Analyses of the formation of sociology and rural sociology in Brazil, its epistemological and ideological underpinnings, within an international context, and the contributions of young Brazilian sociologists (most of them unknown outside Brazil) to the "state of the art" of this sub-discipline is an attempt to meet some of challenges of the 1980's. Rural sociology's world-view has changed a great deal since its introduction in Brazil. These changes are affected by events outside of sociology and it is hoped that this study will shed light on the social contexts in which Brazilian sociology arose.
FOOTNOTE FROM CHAPTER 1

CHAPTER 2

THE SOCIO-HISTORICAL SETTINGS

AND INTELLECTUAL CONDITIONS FOR THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF

SOCIOLOGY IN BRAZIL

This chapter examines the social and intellectual and socio-historical contexts in which the institutionalization of Brazilian sociology took place during the 1930's. Sociology, the science of society, was officially introduced in Brazilian universities in 1933 with two definite objectives: (1) to educate new generations for economic, administrative, and political leadership; and (2) to seek rational and peaceful solutions for Brazilian social problems (Lowrie, 1937; Pinto and Carneiro, 1955; Berlinck, 1958 and 1961; Fernandes, 1963; and Lopes, 1973).

Positivism formed the intellectual base for Brazilian sociology and fitted the dominant nation-building ideology of the time. The basic assumption in this study is that sociology, as a discourse on society, its system of concepts, propositions and investigations, and its relation to social practice, cannot be understood apart from the social and intellectual contexts from which it has grown (Hinkle and Hinkle, 1954; Hinkle, 1980; Ianni, 1974; and Therborn, 1980). Hinkle (1980:22) defines these contexts as
"...domains, settings, or situations to which theory (and/or the discipline) are more or less consciously oriented. They may be more or less concrete or abstract, immediate or remote, stable or variable. Manifestly they possess both a spatial and a temporal character."

In Therborn's (1980:415) words:

"Scientific enterprises do not subsist in a separate self-contained world. Neither are they related only to a very broad and general value. They occur in specific societies at particular points in time and are, therefore, part of particular historical, economic, political and ideological conjectures. These social contexts are, naturally, especially important to the emergence and formation of enterprises whose specific objective is a scientific grasp of the contexts themselves."

This chapter analyzes the socio-historical and intellectual conditions that shaped the institutionalization of sociology in Brazil.

The Socio-Historical Setting in the 1930's

In 1929 Brazil faced a serious crisis in international coffee trade, as part of the general collapse of world commerce (Ianni et al., 1965: 15-17). Overproduction of coffee promoted a decline in market prices and in employment in the coffee industry. World War I had brought sweeping changes in the international market that made the importation of manufactured goods to Brazil costly, and the decline in coffee prices complicate this situation.

On November 3, 1930, a military junta installed the recently defeated candidate for the presidency, Getulio Dornelles Vargas, as the provisional chief of the State of Brazil. This act terminated the Old Republic (1889-1930) and brought to a close forty-one years of control by the rural landed oligarchy of the major states of Sao Paulo and Minas Gerais. The new provisional regime, a diverse coalition of interests united chiefly by their opposition to the ousted government, introduced aggressive socio-political changes in Brazilian society. At the same time, however, Brazil from 1930
to 1945 remained inherently conservative, paternalistic, and dominated by the personal rule of one man.

The year 1930 represents a turning point in Brazilian society. During the Old Republic, the economically strongest states in the central and southern part of Brazil controlled political parties and chose candidates for public office who represented their personal interests. When President Washington Luís (1926-1930) endorsed the presidential candidacy of his protegee, Julio Prestes, governor of Sao Paulo, this violated a gentlemen's agreement between leaders of the two most powerful states. The governor of Minas Gerais elicited support of leaders of the other states to oppose the candidacy of Prestes. The result was the formation of the Aliança Liberal (liberal alliance) that supported Getulio Vargas as a presidential candidate against Julio Prestes. Vargas' campaign was aggressive and demagogic. His program included revolutionary changes that appealed primarily to urban industrialists and the emergent working classes. In spite of his great popularity, Vargas lost the election. He charged election fraud and subsequently called upon his supporters to take the presidency by force. In this he had the support of dissident young army officers (the tenentes). These officers were committed to political and social change and had rebelled earlier against the government. Conniff (1978: 61) wrote that "most of the social transformations in the Vargas era may be traced directly to the tenentes, who were the advance guard of revolutionary reform."

The tenentes movement began in Rio de Janeiro in 1922, when idealistic army cadets and officers revolted against the government which they accused of political corruption and abuse of the army. Their nationalism and popular appeal caught the attention of the Left, especially the Brazilian Communist
Party (PCB), which courted the tenentes' leader Luis Carlos Prestes, "who soon took over the party leadership and ran it for half a century" (Chilcote, 1982: ix). Exiled tenentes returned to Brazil as the 1930 presidential election approached and placed themselves at Vargas' disposal as advisers in the revolt against the incumbent regime. The tenentes represented a status-incongruent elite in terms of their middle-class origins. In addition they were born in states that had little political power in the Republic. This partially contributed to dissent over ideology and split political support of Vargas' regime. The more radical tenentes allied with Prestes and saw socialistic reform as the precondition for the destruction of the oligarchs' control. Conservative or hard-line tenentes favored the continuation of government by decree and advocated free enterprise programs for national development. Because of the impacts of worldwide depression, which showed Brazil's vulnerability as an exporter of raw materials, demands for economic independence from foreign domination and diversification were forwarded by regional governments. Centralized governmental control and nationalism were the key issues. Those reflecting the nationalistic tenentes' ideology, such as military officers, intellectuals, industrialists, and politicians from the less powerful states, urged Vargas to dismantle the broadly federal structure of the Old Republic and its commitment to orthodox economic liberalism. In opposition stood the anti-tenente liberal constitutionalist bloc, which stirred tensions in 1932 in Sao Paulo and almost placed the country into a full-scale civil war.

Vargas' effort for national integration, particularly in the period from 1937 to 1945, was not peaceful nor orderly. This period was known as the Estado Novo (New State). There were tensions and conflicts among political
groups and social classes. Although the 1930 bourgeois revolutionary movement was a reaction by urban-industrial interests against a rural and colonial system tied to foreign domination, not all political groups and social classes who contributed to the fight to oust the rural elite had the same interests in national integration.

"Vargas' Machiavellian political style encouraged each of these groups to press their claims," says Skidmore (1967: 14). The Brazilian Communist Party (PCB), founded in 1922, had negotiated a united front program with Luis Carlos Prestes, one of the leaders of the tenentes or lieutenants' movement. The PCB program called for nationalization of the land and industrial firms, abolition of the foreign debt, freedom of the press, the right to strike, workers' benefits, and the legality of the party (Chilcote, 1970: x). The PCB's call for a radical transformation of Brazilian social structure threatened Vargas' alliance with the national bourgeoisie, which still maintained linkages with the rural elite.

The demands of the working class for better working conditions, more rights, and increased wages pressured Vargas to launch his demagogical campaign of trabalhismo (the organization of workers into unions and an implementation of social benefits under the tutelage of the Federal government). A "corporate" or interventionist state sought to organize and institutionalize labor for capitalistic expansion. Vargas' nationalism paved the way for growth of the industrial sector and the development of material and ideological apparatuses to establish capitalism. When both material and social forms of production are organized toward this end, any intellectual project — such as the institutionalization of a discipline of study to assist in the solution of social problems — cannot be separated from the total process of the society's
development. Industrial and urban productive sectors predominated over rural sectors, and production for the market began to acquire more importance over production for subsistence. Culture became more secularized. Efficiency and achievement, notions derived from technologically advanced societies, were prized and rewarded. Government and its intellectual supporters saw a growing need for more objective and scientific knowledge.

Vargas rose to power with the aid of a group of industrialists who were still landowners who controlled the socio-political process. Thus was born the Brazilian bourgeois revolution. Industrialization and urbanization began, and the state intervened in the economy to protect and stimulate private enterprises. Wages and prices were fixed. The organization of the urban working class into unions and left wing parties was controlled ideologically. It was a time of social unrest and conflict between the rural aristocracy, which was losing its political and economic power, and the growth of urban middle classes.

This period also witnessed the formation of the proletarian classes, which were augmented and influenced by European migrant workers.

Ianni et al. (1965: 27) show that Vargas attempted to implement several social reforms to protect national resources from foreign control and exploitation but had little power to impose these decisions on a rural oligarchy that profited from its foreign commercial ties. As the leader of the new urban and industrial class in power, Vargas did, however, attempt to formulate an ideology and a national program geared to the preservation of resources and the products of the country's labor. Several ministries (Labor, Commerce, Health, Housing, Education, and Welfare) were created and legislation was passed to protect the working class. Critics such as Ianni et al. (1965: 15-
17) argue that "this legislation to reduce the working hours, laws regulating women and children in the working force and other benefits of a welfare State, such as policies which favored the immigration of foreign workers, establishment of a minimum wage, and reforms of the educational system, were attempts to control and stimulate the new social category of free workers with preparation for specialized jobs." Sociology, as a scientific study of society, was readily accepted as an integral part of Vargas' national ideology in the interests of the national bourgeoisie. The emergent bourgeois class, under Vargas' leadership, sought to destroy the old regime and create a new one. The bourgeoisie reacted to the political power held by the land-owning elite; they reacted to both internal and external domination and control.

Brazilian sociology was institutionalized in this social context in Sao Paulo in 1933 with the foundation of the Free School of Sociology and Politics, "a private institution financed by Sao Paulo's industrialists (Lopes, 1973: 135). The following year, a Faculty of Philosophy, Science and Letters, was also founded. It introduced sociology to its curriculum. Sociology was known, however, among Brazilian intellectuals before this date. In the intellectual centers of Recife and Sao Paulo, the works of Comte had profound influence among intellectual and political leaders of the 1889 Republican movement (Carneiro Leao, 1958: 41). Carneiro Leao (1958: 52) states that "...up to 1927, the study of sociology was limited to the law faculties," but in fact sociology was taught a year earlier in the secondary school, "Colegio Pedro II" in the state of Rio de Janeiro. Later, in 1928, a leading educator, Fernando de Azevedo, proposed as part of educational reforms the inclusion of sociology in the curriculum of the Escola Normal (secondary school for elementary
teachers). It was felt that sociology was "indispensable" to the school's educational objective of training teachers:

"It is important that they be acquainted with social problems, especially the present problems in Brazil, and that they initiate social investigations in society. If secondary schools continue to ignore the social facts, and young people are not aware of current problems, we will see demagogues and daring adventurers confusing, poisoning and controlling public opinion" (Carneiro Leao, 1958: 52).

After the "Constitutional" Revolution of 1932 — a political movement in Sao Paulo against Vargas' takeover — the discipline of sociology was introduced to higher education in Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro, the most important industrial and cultural centers of Brazil, through a manifesto signed by influential industrialists and intellectuals. This leading social class believed that a new elite of social scientists, professors and technocrats needed knowledge of social factors to maintain and guarantee the organization of society. Lowrie (1937: 262) stated that sociology and the

"...opening (of) this school was the recognition of the need for a trained body of civil servants. The founders hoped to be able to interest and train a group of the more capable individuals in the community for leadership, as they expressed it, they wished to prepare an enlightened elite to direct society."

Social and political unrest, conflict among interest groups, emergence of urban middle and working classes, a search for industrial development, and the growth of urban centers all led to the belief that through scientific knowledge and re-education of the working classes, social peace would be achieved. The manifesto of 1932 also called for the creation of institutions to promote social assistance and a better understanding of Brazilian social problems. In short, says Fernandes (1977: 58):
"...the Brazilian urban and industrial bourgeoisie readily embraced empirical research and use of applied sociological studies in an attempt to master the social techniques which could guarantee more efficiently the organization of the power structure and the maintenance of peace in society."

The purpose of teaching and sociological research was to prepare an elite of social scientists and administrators to analyze Brazilian problems and act upon them to alleviate social unrest and conflict within the society. Berlinck (1958: 128) analyzed the ideas of those who participated in the Constitutional Revolution.

"These young intellectuals participated in several meetings, in which they debated what guidelines to follow. They decided that in the midst of social crises of the modern world, the political leaders needed specialized knowledge, which was not being offered by our traditional higher education. It was concluded that the simple change in government leadership was not the solution. New generations need to be trained objectively to study social, economic and political problems of Brazil and furnish guidelines to the government. It became patent from these meetings that the foundation of the Free School of Sociology and Politics would be justified by the necessity of educating a thinking and administrative elite, which would be indispensable to social progress."

According to Berlinck (1958: 131), those who signed the manifesto for Brazil's first school of sociology felt that the prevailing system of higher education in Brazil, with emphasis on traditional schooling, the bacharelismo, did not permit study of social problems within a scientific perspective. Due to social crises in the modern world, the young intellectuals felt that they should not abandon the scientific method used by physical and biological sciences.

Berlinck (1958: 131) also believed that the manifesto expressed the strong feelings of nationalism of the period:
"We need to stimulate interests in young people for scientific study of the nation's problems. We need to educate an elite in the scientific method, to study Brazilian society. Even the study of technical problems lack a national perspective in their understanding," he concluded.

Although the manifesto came as a reaction to Vargas' unconstitutional government, the call for scientific study of society is clearly an intellectual inheritance of Comte's positivistic ideas. It seems also that nationalistic beliefs were not divorced from notions of order as a prerequisite to social progress.

Sociology in Brazil, as it emerged after the bourgeois revolution of 1930, embraced conservative positivism and was used later by a bureaucratic, elitist and paternalistic state in a political and ideological campaign for the expansion of capitalism. Ianni (1967) says that sociology was not institutionalized in Brazil to attend to the growing demands of the working class for greater social justice, but as a part of an ideological campaign for nationalism, social organization of labor, and expansion of capitalism.

Smith (n.d.: 19), however, does not see the parallel between Vargas' nationalism and the institutionalization of sociology. In fact, he argues just the opposite. After

"...long conversations with Paul Vanorden Shaw, then teaching at the University of Sao Paulo and many hours of professional exchanges with Arthur Ramos, Delgado de Carvalho and others at the University of Brazil in Rio de Janeiro...I began to perceive the disastrous effects of governmental repression of sociological work at Brazilian universities, a phenomenon which unfortunately has occurred from 1939 to the present" (in 1942, when Smith first went to Brazil).

"Apparently, either unwilling or unable to make a distinction between 'sociology' and 'socialism,' Getulio Vargas and his henchmen had completely suppressed the excellent work in sociology that had been started at the University of Distrito Federal (later the University of Brazil) in Rio de Janeiro. (In Sao Paulo, fortunately, the position of Fernando de Azevedo was so firmly established that even Vargas lacked the will or the way to abolish his chair or transfer his activities to
another department.) Be that as it may, in Rio de Janeiro, Gilberto Freyre's position in sociology was eliminated entirely; Delgado de Carvalho's work in sociology was discontinued, and he was transferred to a professorship of geography; and Arthur Ramos' work was all labeled as anthropology. Undoubtedly, these and other changes at the time set back by decades the development of sociological teaching and research at Brazilian institutions of higher learning."

It has been argued that most works of modern Brazilian literature on Brazilian society were suppressed by Vargas' dictatorship (see Motta, 1977). Sociological writings were no exception — especially because of their mistaken association with socialism, not because sociology had revolutionary objectives in its intellectual positivistic heritage but because of phonetic similarities. It is true that Vargas' ignorance of sociology's conservative roots (see Nisbet, 1966) and the strong influences of Comte's ideas of "order and progress" in Brazil led to his view that any study of Brazilian society — literary, historical or sociological — was threatening. Yet the "sociologists" mentioned by Smith did not conduct critical and/or controversial sociological research. Ramos was more of a cultural anthropologist and drew his theoretical explanations from psychology. Bernard's (1937: 266) analysis of one major Ramos work, states that

"An attempt is made to trace the fetishistic practices, prayers, songs, and dances in the Brazilian Negro rituals back to the Gold Coast, Sudanese and Islamic sources in Africa from which they sprang. There is a good chapter on religious syncretism, and others on fetishistic magic and possession. The author has a strong psychoanalytic bias, chiefly after the manner of Jung, and, in the second part of the work, presents a considerable number of standard complexes, which he has discovered in the fetishistic practices of the Negro. He also has chapters on phallic symbolization, totemism (trend), the cult of twins, and Levy-Bruhl's theory of prelogical thinking as applied to his subject matter."

Ramos (1936: 376) also published a textbook in social psychology which used the "methods and doctrines from North Americans." In fact he is responsible for introducing the works of Ross, Ellwood, Allport, Kimball Young, Folsom, Murchinson, Dunlap and others" to Brazil. Other sociologists, cited by Smith
as threatening to Vargas' dictatorship, were not Marxist oriented in their sociology. Delgado de Carvalho, who wrote *Sociologia* (1931), *Sociologia Educacional* (1933), *Sociologia Experimental* (1934) and *Sociologia Aplicada* (1935), was also strongly influenced by North American sociology. Ramos (1936: 375) himself indicates that Delgado was responsible for the dissemination of names and "theories" of "Lester Wards, Giddings, Park, Burgess, Cooley, Ross and other representatives of the North American school." Fernando de Azevedo, at the University of Sao Paulo, the author of *Principios de Sociologia* (1936), was likewise influenced by U.S. sociology (Ramos, 1936: 375).

Although sociology appears to be threatening to Vargas' dictatorial state and indeed those concerned with the "social question" were viewed as threats to the establishment of a new order, Brazilian "sociologists" and their sociologies did not seek a radical transformation of society. This will be discussed in chapter 5.

**Positivism and Institutional Social Reform in Brazil**

An understanding of the intellectual setting for the institutionalization of sociology in Brazil after 1930 must start with overwhelming influence of Comte's ideas and positivism. Carneiro Leao (1958:44) calls Comte "the godfather of sociology in Brazil." According to Zea (1963), positivism influenced most countries in Latin America. "In fact," says Davis (1961:99), "in no other part of the modern world did positivism as a general pattern of thought achieved a stronger hold on the minds of a dominant elite than it seemed to have achieved in Latin America...and in Brazil...positivism became nearly an official philosophy of the Republic."
Silvio Romero has written that positivism made its way to Brazil as part of "a wave of new ideas" that came between 1868 and 1878 (Davis, 1961: 111). Sons of the modest commercial, bureaucratic, and middle class began to appear on the political and intellectual scene in the second half of the nineteenth century. They opposed the landowners' aristocracy, and it was this new generation "of military men, doctors, and engineers, who tended to be more in touch with the positive sciences as a result of their professional activities," that reacted against the bacharelismo or the influences of philosophy of law (see Barnes and Becker, 1938) and abstract thinking in dealing with national problems. The bacharel (law graduate) was associated with the Old Republic, and blamed for the inadequate education of the old elite. Cruz Costa (1964: 85) says that

"Some of the adherents of the movement were men who became disillusioned with the widely taught spiritualist Eclecticism...they were men who turned to science and who believed that in it they had found a satisfactory answer and a definite solution for all problems."

Positivism was accepted in Brazil, says Nachman (1977: 7), "because it mirrored Brazilian culture: paternalistic, hierarchical, family oriented, and socially conservative." 6

August Comte (1798-1857) attended the Ecole Polytechnique in Paris, the foremost center of research and teaching of science and mathematics in Europe at the time. According to Henri Gouhier, Comte's biographer, the "polytechnicians" believed that "one could create a religion in the same ways as one learned at Ecole to build a bridge" (cited in Thompson, 1975: 9). Living in "chaotic and amoral post-revolutionary" France, Comte perceived the promise of modern science and technology "as the means to create human conditions"
for a peaceful society (Nachman, 1977: 2). Order and progress are not irreconcilable or contradictory, he argued, and he taught that social and moral anarchy are the result of intellectual anarchy (Zeitlin, 1968: 71). Sklair (1970: 35) argued that "the idea of progress is the cornerstone of the Comtean system." In his definition of progress, Comte mentions "a gradual amelioration of the fundamental order, by a series of modifications gradually tending to the completion of one design." In analyzing this definition Sklair sees three elements that connote the idea of progress. First is the notion that each type of theoretical conception requires a corresponding type of social organization. This is Comte's Law of Three Stages, sometimes called the Law of Human Progress. As explained by Thompson (1975: 13), the human mind in its theological or fictitious state "searches for origins and purpose... and supposes that all phenomena are produced by immediate actions of supernatural beings;" society is dominated by priests and the military. In the metaphysical state, "personified abstractions" produce all phenomena and society is controlled by the church and lawyers. "In the final stage, the positive state, the mind gives up the vain search for absolute notions, the origin and destination of the universe, and the causes of phenomena, and studies their laws, that is, their relations of succession and resemblance." Society is then governed by industrial administrators and scientific moral guides.

The second element in Comte's definition of progress, "the completion of one design" refers to the hierarchical classification of science. He saw the progress of branches of knowledge developing at different rates, depending on their degree of generality, simplicity and independence. Astronomy was at the top of the list as the most general, simple and independent. Physics,
chemistry, biology, and finally "social physics," as he first called sociology, followed in descending order. Each builds on the prior development of their predecessors in a hierarchy of increasing complexity and decreasing generality.

The third element in Comte's definition of progress was "the gradualness of change." This is the motto of positivism: "Progress through the development of order." Comte sought a corporate Hobbesian state, whose "goal was to promote industrial progress as the best means to create the condition for social well-being in a stratified society." Through order, progress and education, the masses "would create a popular consent necessary to elevate a benevolent dictator...to rule for life with the aid of a technocratic elite, his sociocracy" (Nachman, 1977: 4).

The "Positivist Church" in Brazil was founded in 1881 by a positivist study group first organized in 1878. In 1888 the Brazilian Empire fell, slavery was abolished, and in the following year, the First Republic was declared. The first wave of European immigrants arrived in Brazil. More aware of their rights in the labor market, these newcomers demanded changes in Brazil's still-unchanged social structure. Freed slaves and rural workers migrated to urban centers. Social unrest threatened the social order. Practicing positivists suggested national integration, promotion of industry, and development of education as means to achieve social harmony. They called for expansion of educational opportunities to help create a technocratic elite, incorporation of the proletariat into society, and a more equitable distribution of wealth. They condemned foreign domination, colonization, and imperialism, and they preached nationalism. They encouraged scientific investigation of national culture. According to Nachman (1977: 13), some of the earliest scholarly studies in
folklore, customs and society were carried out by positivists such as Celso Magalhaes, Basilio Magalhaes, Alfredo Varella, Luis Bueno Horta Barbosa and Edgard Roquette-Pinto.

The Brazilian positivists put Comte's ideas, philosophies and theories into action. "Between 1890 and 1915," says Nachman (1977: 11), "while the bourgeoisie was still in formation and seeking guidance, positivists developed a middle class program to change Brazil." He further states that:

Where they had power they acted on their ideas, involving government in planning for development and industrialization, restricting the influence of foreign enterprise, modernizing and reforming agriculture, developing the infrastructure, expanding education, controlling immigration, and offering advanced social legislation.

Lauro Sodre, the governor of the State of Para in northern Brazil during the periods 1891-1897 and 1912-1917, modernized and greatly expanded education, launched port reform and road constructions, and created state monopolies where private enterprise failed to provide sufficiently for public services. He also promoted agrarian reforms to stimulate immigration and called for agricultural syndicates and mutual assistance programs modeled on those of France, Germany, and Belgium, and agricultural experiment stations patterned after those of the United States (Nachman, 1977: 15). During the first twenty years of the Republic, the positivists averaged 7 of the 63 seats in the senate, and Senator Lauro Sodre was the "leader of the opposition" (Nachman, 1977: 17). In Rio de Janeiro, positivists improved hygiene, constructed ports, developed programs to rehabilitate the Indians, and began exploitation of rubber in the Amazon state. Positivist educational policies predominated, especially in the Army. As Minister of War, Benjamin Constant thoroughly reformed the military schools along positivist lines. Later, as Minister of Education, he
implemented a national reform modeled after those used in the military schools. The Colegio Nacional Pedro II, Rio de Janeiro, served as model for the rest of the country.

Alves Filho (1978), analyzing the work of Alberto Torres, a critic of Brazilian politics and society at the beginning of the century, indicated that Torres believed that legal institutions should not be philosophical abstractions but should grow out of the nation's customs and traditional values. Social criticism under the influence of Torres held that economic crisis, social disorganization, political favoritism, and individualism were caused by lack of cohesion, national consciousness, or sentiments of solidarity among Brazilians. Torres argued that this could be corrected by organizing interest groups to develop collective values on a national stage. These proposals by the traditional intellectual elite were in line with liberal ideals still prominent at the time. Ridings (1977: 250) showed that these predominant interest groups were business groups that worked toward consolidating and preserving the state of economic dependency because of their "strong overseas ties and large foreign representations among commercial association leaderships." Thus, positivism and Comte's ideas of "order and progress" played a remarkable role in forming conceptions of social change as a natural unfolding toward scientific and orderly stages of development. The Brazilian traditional elite, self-appointed for the strategic realization of this project, saw the importance of "knowing" social reality and searched for the "real Brazil." Sociology appeared, then, as an instrument able to offer to this elite a picture of Brazilian reality and the necessary body of knowledge to guide intellectual and political leaders on the road to "national salvation." (see Oliveira, et al., 1982:16).
The Intellectual Setting Prior to the 1930's

A conservative-positivist, elitist and authoritarian mode characterized social and political thinking after 1930, when sociology was institutionalized in Brazil. It is possible to find the roots of these tendencies in the intellectual movements of the 1920's. Most authors agree that the Modern Art Week Exhibition staged in Sao Paulo in February 1922 represented a break with the literary and artistic influences of the nation's past and provided an important foundation for the political revolution eight years later. "So striking was the Modern Art Week...in its breaking of formal artistic canons, its liberation from classical ideas and academic rules, that like a declaration of the rights of man it burst upon the conservative sensibility of Brazil as a revolution," stated Nist (1965: 4). In a "public demonstration and aesthetic manifesto" writers, poets, painters, composers and the national intellectual elite responded to the "archaic" modes of expression inherited from colonial and cultural domination. The Modern Art Week symbolized a search for cultural symbols uniquely Brazilian. The movement was also geared toward a desire to participate, to understand one's own country and its social character. In the opinion of Mario de Andrade, one of the leaders "who worked for a complete break with academic subordination and for the destruction of the conservative and conformist spirit," the Modernist movement attempted:
1) the development of an interest in Brazilian man that led to the social novel and the documentary on his origins, conditions of life, and sociological problems;
2) transformation of the growing interest in folklore into a scientific study worthy of national support; and
3) the fostering of artistic identification with social, political, and economic problems (Nist, 1965: 99).

This search for the Brazilian character had already been influenced by the publication of Os Sertões, or The Rebellion in the Backlands, by Euclides da Cunha in 1902. Os Sertões, once classified among the world's one hundred best novels (Nist, 1965: 15), was the first treatise on Brazilian sociology. Euclides da Cunha (1866-1909), an engineer working in the hinterland of Brazil or the Brazilian sertão, reported a São Paulo newspaper, O Estado de São Paulo, on the struggle between the army and the sertanejo, the inhabitants of the sertão. The struggle was between the cultures of the seaboard, which had been affected by European influences, and the sertão and its native influences (see Bastide, 1945). Cunha not only described these differences but tried to understand this sertanejo culture, both mystical and warlike. He sensed that this isolated backland area, with its harsh extremes of climate and topography, was giving birth to something distinctively Brazilian, "a mixture of the Indian, the Negro and the European under the influence of the hinterland" and the "very case of Brazilian nationality, the bedrock of the Brazilian race" (David, 1961: 210). Os Sertões was interpreted as a warning to the traditional elite and their preoccupation with coastal and outside influences while leaving the "interior" unexplored and misunderstood. Cunha's book was a call for more research and a better understanding of rural populations and regional differences. Nist (1965: 15) stated that "...it presented to Brazil, for the first time, a picture of all its miseries, grandeurs, and despair."
Oliveira et al. (1980: 41 and 1982: 14) said that a new generation of Brazilian intellectuals had conducted a "social diagnosis" of Brazilian "social illness," and had blamed the traditional elite from the Old Republic for its inability to mold the country's historical and social destiny. Calling themselves the "good elite," these new intellectuals thought themselves the saviors of Brazil. Influenced by social theorists such as Mosca, Pareto and Gumplowicz, this elite reaffirmed the role of an intellectual minority in combining knowledge of social reality with political power in the enlightenment of nation-building. Elitism, based upon the notion that social inequality was a "natural" and scientifically verifiable fact, strengthened the concept of a government ruled by progressive, industrial and intellectual leaders. Oliveira et al. (1982: 16) believe that

The existence of an elite as a 'given' and its domination as an expression of concrete 'science' fit like a glove for the generation of post-1930's intellectuals who believed they were predestined to save Brazilian society.

Sociology, then, was a science able to provide guidelines for the State to act in the organization of society. The argument for sociological studies was based on the assumption that "one can know, scientifically, why the past was what it was, why the present is what it is, and how the future will be inevitable" (Oliveira et al., 1980: 41). When sociology was institutionalized, there was a widespread belief that social tensions (especially in the cities) and regional inequalities could be corrected by the discipline.

The connections between the modernist movement, the search for a national character, the Estado Novo, and the institutionalization of sociology were not accidental or unrelated. All were part of an intellectual and ideological movement of dissent against political control by the rural oligarchy
which ran the Brazilian economy. Miceli (1979) examined the social backgrounds of the modernists in an attempt to explore these relationships. Their family ties with this rural oligarchy and their cooptation by a bureaucratic State, during the 1937-1945 period, shed light on the use of sociology as a tool of social control and later the acceptance of the North-American brand of sociology. He says that the majority of intellectuals of the 1920's and 1930's came from families related to the rural oligarchy but socially downwardly mobile because of economic losses. They were the "poor cousins" struggling for professional and political recognitions; careers as writers and social scientists were avenues for regaining some status. As a consequence of the landowners' loss of power, law — a traditional and powerful field of study — became less important in the studying of social science's subjects. With the influence of positivism, and Comte's ideas of "order and progress," the role of engineering in the social sciences increased, as he says (1979: 38):

"The 1920's were marked by the prevalence of engineers, not yet called by the State to solve technical problems, but were attracted to the study and explanation of social problems in their complexity."

In the 1930's these "poor cousins," who had received university degrees (bacharel "livre") competed with law graduates (the bachareis) for bureaucratic positions and the former were, for the most part, more acceptable to Vargas' government as employees, than the law graduates, whose traditional educations tied them to the rural oligarchy. Many of these young intellectuals became allied with the State and participated in the cultural reorganization and legitimation of President Vargas' Estado Novo from 1935 to 1945. Velloso (1982: 71-108) analyzed this alliance and saw a relationship between intellectuals and the State — or culture and politics. Velloso describes the Estado Novo as
an "extremely articulated and well-elaborated political and ideological project" with the objective of directing and organizing society. As a reaction to liberalism, in which individualism and voluntarism "lead man to wars, class struggle and social unrest," the Estado Novo had the "moral and intellectual obligation" to socialize society's members into a new order. A Department of Journalism and Publicity (Departamento de Imprensa e Propaganda) was created on December 1939 to propagate the "New State's" image. It was responsible for centralizing, coordinating and supervising national propaganda both internally and externally. This department had the following subdivisions: official communication, radio transmission, motion picture, theatre, tourism and press-releases, according to Velloso (1982: 72). Through official publications, this department acted as censor and ideological propagandist of the new regime. Velloso's analysis of several of the government's publications showed a predominance of the political as the guide for the social domain, as exemplified by some subtitles: "The political order and the social evolution;" "The political order and the intellectual evolution;" "The political order and the artisitic evolution." Thus Velloso (1982:75) writes that:

The development and/or social evolution are conditioned to or can only be explained in function of a 'permission' from the political.

In other words, the Cultura Política was responsible for creating a predetermined conception of the world and was to inform an "authoritarian discourse," the Cultura Política was in the hands of the "great intellectuals," whose discourse serves as paradigms for others, or middle-range intellectuals, who were responsible for communicating to society's, the State political and ideological stance. Thus the intellectuals functioned as codifiers of the States' thoughts and teachings (Velloso, 1982:81). In its first issue in November of 1940, one
of the Department's primary publications (the *Cultura Politica*, or "Political Culture") cited the following "national guidelines for the development of Brazilian culture:

1. the need to undertake objective and serious studies, *sociological observation* and investigations of national psychology;
2. to request the creation of this Brazilian cultural movement to be broadly diffused (in the schools, in the army, etc.);
3. such a movement should have headquarters in every state of the Union to study the knowledge of the various *sociological aspects* of the country;
4. the national elite ought to concern itself exclusively with the Brazilian culture,
5. to put such a project into action so that a social consciousness of contemporary reality and the nations' problems be widely known.

Also this publication (1982:90, note 47) makes reference to Brazil's role in Latin America as one of "great potency" and emphasized the urgent need to establish cultural and economic relations with the United States through the "Pan-American" agreement. Thus, in June 1941, the *Ciencia Politica* announces the creation of the Institute of Higher Studies of Economics, Politics and Social Sciences, and the formation of an exchange of Brazilian and North American professors to study the country's problem.

**Summary**

The purpose of this chapter was to examine major socio-historical and intellectual influences at the time of the institutionalization of sociology in
Brazil. Sociology was first introduced in 1926, in secondary schools, by reformist positivist educators and was known in the army and law schools, but it was after 1933 that sociology, as a scientific body of knowledge for studying society, was formally included in universities' professional training.

Although Brazil had shown signs of major economic and political changes after World War I, it was only in the 1930's that a new urban and national bourgeoisie emerged and gained power. Within Brazil, the cultural movement of the 1920's, the radicalization of the tenentes (who demanded decentralization of the power structure), within the military, and the organization of the Left were simultaneously emerging forces toward nationalism. The program posed by the PCB in coalition with the tenentes, which called for a complete restructuring of Brazilian society, threatened Vargas' alliance with the national bourgeoisie who still had ties with the rural oligarchy. The working classes' demands for better working conditions and more rights pressured Vargas to launch his demagogic campaign of trabalhismo, the paternalistic welfare state. Sociology was institutionalized after the 1932 unsuccessful counterrevolutionary movements in 1932 in Sao Paulo against Vargas' unconstitutional government. The institutionalization of sociology in Brazil had definite and specific objectives: to train the Brazilian intelligentsia to deal with "social problems." In spite of alleged suppression of sociology by Vargas' dictatorial Estado Novo (see Smith, n./d.), it was not because its practitioners were committed to a critical and revolutionary sociology. In fact, a positivistic and empiricist sociology with utilitarian ends fitted in, although not explicitly, with Vargas' nationalism ideology to control and exploit the working classes, and to expand capitalism. This argument will be further developed and substantiated in the
chapter that follows. It is appropriate to restate that sociology in Brazil was created institutionally, not as a byproduct of political movements seeking a radical transformation of Brazilian society, but as part of an intellectual project to maintain the status quo.

As projected by Saint-Simon and August Comte in the 1800's, sociology had emerged in France as "an attempt to deal with the social, moral and cultural problems of the capitalist economic order, under the shadow of a militant working class movement and a more or less immediate threat of revolutionary socialism" (Therborn, 1980:115). In the United States, sociology emerged in response to concerns with "social problems" caused by rapid industrialization and urbanization, and it was ideologically committed to moral and ethical betterment of the lower classes' conditions (see Hinkle and Hinkle, 1954; Hinkle, 1980; and Oberschall, 1972). At the same time that sociology was called to deal with "social" tensions in Brazil, U.S. sociology was seeking to be scientific and pragmatic, and to isolate the discipline from the economic and political upheavals of the 1930's (see Therborn, 1980: 422). The influences of this concept of sociology within a socio-historical context of relations between the United States and Brazil are the subject of following chapters.
FOOTNOTES FROM CHAPTER 2

1. Brazil was the last country in Latin America to include sociology as a discipline in its universities. "As early as 1877 there was an Institute of Social Sciences in Caracas which was affiliated with the University," says Hopper (1964:250), and "chairs of sociology were also established in Bogota in 1822, Buenos Aires in 1896, Assuncion del Paraguay in 1900 and Ecuador in 1906."

2. Skidmore (1967: 8) describes Vargas as a man who "seemed possessed of an ambition hardly distinguishable from many other members of the political elite during the Old Republic. He was born in 1883 of a wealthy racing family in Rio Grande do Sul, near the Argentine border, where the tradition of border warfare was still alive. Vargas first embarked on a military career but after a brief stint as a cadet switched to law, the preferred training for Brazilian politicians."

3. The movement known as tenentismo was lead by progressive young officers, the tenentes, or lieutenants, who rebelled against the dominant oligarchies of São Paulo and Minas Gerais. "The tenentes desired to bring democracy to Brazil and end oligarchical rule. Thus, they contributed to the downfall of the First Republic by ushering Vargas to power (Chilcote, 1980:ix)."

4. The year of 1930 as the time for the Brazilian revolution is still in debate among historians, political scientists and sociologists. There are those who attempt to show that changes in the relationship between the state and the working class took place in 1926, when the state began to act to control the work force. Others give importance to dissident ideas that germinated in the Old Republic (1891-1930) controlled by the rural oligarchy. There is also a debate over terminology. The 1930 revolution is here defined as "a political and military movement carried out by a heterogenous coalition against the homogeneous oligarchic block, and its historical context is the rise of the Brazilian agro-mercantile capitalism, whose contradictions were enhanced and affected by the crises in the world market." (Saes, 1976:7). The term bourgeois revolution refers to a national bourgeoisie that had industrialization as a goal. Chilcote (1980: xiii) explained that "Brazilians of all political persuasions do not hesitate to employ the terms from the Marxist vocabulary to identify the class structure of Brazilian society. The national bourgeoisie consist of Brazilian industrialists and capitalists who place priority on national development and presumably oppose imperialist capital." Finally, the word Revolution is sometimes questioned in terms of its true meaning as a "revolution" made for the interests of the working classes. Oliveira et al. (1980:36) notes that those who win are more likely than the losers to call their success in gaining power a revolution.
5. The term urban middle classes refers to those strata of Brazilian society that saw a lower standard of living as a consequence of the agro-mercantile capitalistic crises. They were usually people employed in commerce, light industry and bureaucracy (see Skidmore, 1967:12, and Fausto, 1970).

6. Nachman's dissertation on the "Brazilian Positivism as a Source of Middle Sector Ideology" (1971), was based on a sample of 400 positivists. One hundred of them were members of the Positivist Church; the others were verified as orthodox in their adherence to Comtean ideas, at least during the period in question (1889-1915). Most of them remained so throughout their lives (Nachman, 1977:8, footnote 19). Benjamin Constant was one of these influential leaders of the republican movement against the Brazilian Empire.

7. Some of the other important participants in the Modern Art Week were Manuel Bandeira, Oswaldo de Andrade, Plinio Salgado, Carlos Drummond de Andrade, Jose Lins do Rego, Jorge Amado, Gilberto Freyre, Graciliano Ramos, Erico Verissimo. Books associated with or flowing from the movement are: A Pauliceia Desvairada (1922), Retrato do Brasil (1928), Macunaima (1928), Martim Cerere (1928), Casa Grande e Senzala (1933). Martins (1970: 4) believes that these works represent "a new orientation in (Brazilian) studies of sociology and social history. Each one of these dates and each one of these titles signifies a break with the past or a new program aimed at the future, no matter what their specific qualities or defects might have been."
CHAPTER 3

U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY, CULTURAL EXCHANGES
AND SOCIAL RESEARCH

Although U.S. scholars have been interested in Latin American societies since the turn of the century, institutionally supported research projects and cultural exchange activities were officially intensified in the 1930's and with President Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy. The control of Latin American raw materials and markets by European powers—especially the influence of Nazi Germany—endangered U.S. national security. Despite good intentions and individual contributions by U.S. sociologists in the development of scientific research in Brazil and other Latin American countries, the question of economic interests and political and ideological influences of the U.S. must be addressed. An analysis of the institutionalization of sociology in Brazil and the adoption of U.S. sociology cannot leave out these international interests and influences operating at the time (see Dean, 1971).

Interest in conducting research in Brazil by North American social scientists emerged after 1935 (Smith, 1954:234). This is not to say that important studies by naturalists, explorers and travelers from Europe and historians, geographers from the United States had not published earlier. Smith (1954) discusses U.S. sociologists, who visited and wrote about Latin American societies at the turn of the nineteenth century. Frank W. Blackmar, for instance, published _Spanish Institutions of the Southeast_ in 1891. E.R. Ross, one of the pioneers of American sociology, wrote _South of Panama_ (1915) and
The Social Revolution in Mexico (1923). L.L. Bernard, maintained correspondence with Latin American scholars during the 30's, and Emmory S. Bogardus, traveled to Mexico and wrote on Latin American topics around the same time. Carle C. Zimmerman, as a member of the Commission on Cuban Affairs, published Problems of the New Cuba (1935) and Robert E. Park, from the University of Chicago, visited Brazil in 1935. Except for Zimmerman, who was the first to have an official assignment from the U.S. government, all others were individually motivated and self-supported in their visits to and study of Latin American societies (Smith, 1954).

Inter-American Commercial and Cultural Relations

Cultural exchanges between the U.S. and Latin American countries were initiated in 1936, with the signing of the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations. This was followed in 1938 by the creation of the Division of Cultural Relations in the U.S. Department of State. Four years later, the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (CIAA) was formed with Nelson Rockefeller as its head (Wagley, 1964:9). In the summer of 1940, when the CIAA was created, German armies had conquered Belgium and the Netherlands and defeated British and French troops, and "the threat to the Western Hemisphere was intensified even beyond a point at which the dangers involved had caused grave concern to the Government of the United States" (U.S. Office, 1947:3). South and Central America were important producers of raw materials for German rearmament. In 1930, Germany bought large quantities of raw materials with blocked currency, which made Latin American countries dependent on the Nazi economy.
The contest for Latin American markets and raw materials had gone on, of course, for many years until the end of the Brazilian Empire in 1889, Brazil's only foreign loans were with Britain. Late in the nineteenth century, however, imperial Germany had expanded into South America in search of raw materials. The estimated 50,000 German settlers who emigrated to Brazil had created by 1890 a German-speaking community of around 200,000, many members of which were engaged in import-export and banking activities (Hilton, 1975: xvii). By the end of the century, Hamburg became the leading coffee market in Europe, importing 20 percent of Brazil's production.

The United States could not challenge British and German domination of the Brazilian market until the post-Civil War industrial boom permitted it to displace the British. By 1870 the United States annually consumed more than half of Brazil's coffee exports, and by World War I the U.S. was also purchasing over half its rubber and most of its cacao from Brazil (Hilton, 1975: xix). By the end of World War I, the British and the Germans had lost almost all the Brazilian market while the United States had made substantial gains.

With the Great Depression, South America became a chief battlefield for commercial struggle and Brazil was the outstanding example of the success of German efforts. Reich merchants doubled their sales to Brazil during the Depression (Hilton, 1975: xxi). The Vargas government increased the United States' growing concerns about Nazi political penetration in Brazil and other South American countries. The United States felt that political instability and chronic indebtedness might offer an opportunity for German propaganda and infiltration. As McCann (1974:7) stated:
"American interest in Brazil increased during the 1930's for two reasons, the Good Neighbor Policy and the rise of Nazi Germany. Franklin Roosevelt's desire to create a Good Neighborhood in the hemisphere meant that the U.S. would renounce direct intervention in favor of more subtle forms of domination. In its post-Depression pursuit of markets the United States turned to Latin America as the logical area in which to recoup its losses in foreign trade elsewhere...American officials talked in terms of equal opportunities for all in the Latin American market, but what they meant was equal opportunity based on American rules."

Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy was thus a pledge against military interventions and direct political interferences in the domestic affairs of Latin American countries, as had occurred in the past. It was felt that internal economic stability and dependence on the United States would contribute to military security in the Western Hemisphere. In 1940, Roosevelt addressed a memorandum to the Secretaries of State, Commerce, the Treasury, and Agriculture, stating "the necessity of the United States to protect its international positions through the use of economic measures, which would be competitively effective against totalitarian techniques" (U.S. Office, 1947:5). It was argued that for the security of the Western Hemisphere, "the governments of all other American republics should be made acquainted with the program of the United States, and an effort should be made to obtain their wholehearted cooperation." Instead of military intervention, Roosevelt's policy sought to reorganize international relations by promoting interdependence in trade and economic aid to Latin America. "Emergency measures should be taken to absorb agricultural and mineral products where such surplus affected the welfare of the nations of the hemisphere; these surpluses should be pooled and disposed of under a single management, and steps should be taken to reorganize production on a long term basis" (U.S. Office, 1947:5). Roosevelt's financial program of investment included both public and private interests:
"The memorandum suggested that the necessary integration of private interests and the various agencies of the federal government might be accomplished by the appointment of an interdepartmental committee and an advisory group drawn from private industry."

It also emphasized, continued the U.S. Office, (1947:5), that "a vigorous program of educational and cultural relations should be pursued concurrently with the economic program."

The promotion of cultural and commercial exchanges can be partly explained by briefly examining the background and role of Nelson Rockefeller, the head of CIAA. His particular interest in Latin America began with his first visit to Venezuela in 1935. As the head of the Museum of Modern Art in New York at that time, he went to oversee the activities and enterprises of the Rockefeller family. The International Division of the Rockefeller Foundation was doing work in Latin America, especially in the areas of health and elementary education. In 1937 he revisited Venezuela as representative of the Standard Oil Company. During this visit "he took part in the establishment of a development company...designed to set an example by the promotion of agriculture and industry, and also was instrumental in the construction of a modern hotel in Caracas" (U.S. Office, 1947:6). After his return, Rockefeller discussed with President Roosevelt's aides the possibility of beginning an inter-American program with the cooperation of the government and private businesses.

Rockefeller was appointed head of the CIAA because of "his optimism, directiveness, enthusiasm and interests in the Latin American field, and the 'good neighbor' idea had gained him the post despite the fact that he was a Republican, rather youthful, and lacking the experience in governmental
administrative practices. Particularly in the cultural field, the Rockefeller name was considered an asset (U.S. Office, 1947: 8).

The CIAA was active in many areas: commercial, financial, economic development, transportation, the press, publications, radio, motion pictures, information services, cultural, educational, health, sanitation, nutrition, food supply, emergency rehabilitation and training programs. All of these activities, said the U.S. Office (1947:165), merged in order to meet the "need for defense of the United States against the threats of totalitarian aggression."

Before World War II the CIAA's philosophy was in accord with Roosevelt's Good Neighbor policy toward Latin America: to promote cultural and economic development, without direct military intervention, in order to cope with European influences and threats. It was believed that if Latin American governments were helped to build the new industries they wanted, they would have more enthusiasm for cooperating with the United States in other ways. Common interests would also be served, as when the United States helped to increase production of strategic raw materials. Moreover, dollars in aid from the U.S. would eventually replace German currency, and would overcome any economic difficulties and forestall political problems that might make Latin American countries more vulnerable to subversion by the Germans.

Cultural influences from the United States became the cornerstone of an effort to guarantee national security in Latin America, when that security was directly threatened by war in 1941:
"When the United States actively entered the World War following the attack on Pearl Harbor, the Policy Committee of CIAA immediately considered the advisability of reorienting the program of the Cultural Relations Division with a view to 'double all cultural efforts and speed up their execution, but with new accent tuned to new developments.' A study was immediately made of projects then in operation, and each one considered in the light of the new situation. These projects were classified in four categories, as follows: Class A: those having an immediate defense significance; Class B: those having secondary defense significance, including a direct propaganda effort; Class C: those having an immediate influence on improving Latin America's sympathy for the United States; Class D: those having a long-range influence on promoting hemisphere understanding. It was recognized that few projects of the Cultural Relations Division were in Class A, and that those in Class B were in the main concerned with health and security activities such as medical and dental training, housing, and labor activities. In Class C there were a number of projects concerned with bringing persons of influence in all fields from the other American republics to the United States, in order to further their interest and enthusiasm for hemisphere solidarity; there was likewise a certain proportion of projects under Class D which should be continued, to indicate the sincerity of the United States interest in the hemisphere as a whole. In following months those interested in working with cultural relations in CIAA tried to concentrate efforts upon projects which would fit into the pattern just indicated" (U.S. Office, 1947:92).

National Security and Social Research

After 1942, the CIAA went through administrative modifications and several subcommittees were formed. Among these were the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies, and the Social Science Research Council. Around the same time, the Department of State, in conjunction with the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations of the Department of Agriculture, sent three rural sociologists to study the three largest countries in Latin America. They were, Carl C. Taylor, who went to Argentina; T. Lynn Smith, who went to Brazil; and Nathan L. Whetten, who went to Mexico.6
Brazil, Mexico and Argentina were obviously chosen for their sizes and potentialities, which are all strategically important for the security of the United States. Demographic data and the main features of each country's social organizations were compared to those of the U.S. — the comparative method a prerequisite for empirical and inductive sociology. The Department of State was responsible for national security supported, during Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy era, all cultural activities as means to obtaining interdependence and security for the United States. The discussion that follows will examine the logical relationships between the questions and answers.

The reasons for studying these major strategical areas in Latin America, according to Nelson (1967:327) were:

"the exigencies of World War II. Many critical items, like rubber, jute and quinine, could no longer be obtained outside the hemisphere. Rubber and quinine were indigenous but required immense labor to obtain. North Americans knew little of the backlands from which many critical items were to come, if at all. It was time to find out something about our neighbors to the South, who lived outside the capital cities. So it was argued, anyway, and the decision was made."

The relationship between U.S. foreign policy and research in the social sciences, in strategically important areas, can also be ascertained from Bryce Wood's explanations to the Latin American panel at the National Conference on Area Studies.

"In the first place, after 1939, when the agencies of the federal government discovered the resources of scholarship to be an arm of policy and hitherto lonely scholars found themselves unwantedly besieged by officials desiring knowledge to buttress national power, the Latin Americanist came under less pressure than were specialists on nearly all other areas. Latin America, unlike any other major areas, has never contained a center of political or military power that threatened the U.S., nor has it in the past hundred years been directly and immediately in danger of falling under the political or military control of a dangerous enemy of the United States" (quoted in Wagley, 1964:12).
Wood's explanation shows first there was a need for scholarly research on Latin American countries, and second that interest in particular countries depended upon whether the country was or was not a threat to the security of the United States. Wagley also (1964:2) makes the second point:

"What political institutions will take form in Latin America in the next generation or so? Latin American nations might develop a liberal democratic system both analogous to and different from our own. They might also fall into chaos and adopt totalitarian regimes of one kind or another. The future of Latin America is thus important to our own security."

Also, the rapid social changes and the perceived notion of "social problems," such as the rates of population growth, concerned U.S. scholars and the lack of knowledge and information about these "troubled" areas stimulated research.

"Never before has knowledge of Latin American societies been so important to the United States. In Latin America there are over 200 million people living in twenty nations. Their numbers increase each year as Latin America undergoes one of the most severe population explosions in the modern world. At the present rate of population growth, there would be 300 million Latin Americans by 1975 and over 600 million by the end of this century - twice as many as North Americans. The future of these Latin American nations and of these rapidly expanding peoples is crucial to our way of life" (Wagley, 1964:1).

**What Sociology Was Predominant?**

Hinkle and Hinkle's (1954) analysis of American sociology between 1918 and 1954 shows what type of sociology was predominant as a consequence of the interplay between the forces acting in society and methods of analysis.
"World War I was accompanied by a pervasive revision of the intellectual justification for science. Previously, sociologists had shared in the prevailing American belief that man is essentially rational, by virtue of which a faith in science and progress is encouraged, if not guaranteed. As man's intellect makes possible technical and material progress, so social-scientific knowledge, it was held, advances society in harmony with humanitarian ideals and thereby assures moral progress" (Hinkle and Hinkle, 1954:21).

Shocked and pessimistic about man's irrational behavior during the world wars, sociologists sought to explain how these irrational social forces operated and what was the impact of technological innovations upon society's organization. This period in American sociology was characterized by "the quest to make sociology more scientific;" a preference for concrete, empirical research; multicausal explanations; statistical techniques; and value-free approaches to social analysis. Sociologists trained in the U.S. during this time believed that the main task for sociology was to establish itself as a science, whereby social forces could be described, classified systematically, measured quantitatively and formed into laws. As said by Hinkle and Hinkle (1954:22):

"Both the scarcity of knowledge about such laws and the prevailing quest to make sociology as scientific as other, more mature social science disciplines encouraged the increase of scientific method and the need to reassess their own principle of inquiry."

Most U.S. sociologists defended sociology as a positivist and empiricist science with practical applications (see Taylor, 1965; Smith, 1957). Smith (1953:280), for instance, saw the role of international activities and research "sponsored by UNESCO and the Organization of American States as especially notable and...generally recognized as having already done much to enhance interest in applied sociology." Smith (1950) also reported in the Handbook of Latin American Studies that the "numerous community studies of the type carried on in Brazil (Donald Pierson's study of Cruz das Almas, for instance)"
and an increasing emphasis on racial anthropology (a subject closely related to sociology) as an aid in social progress." Smith endorsed the use of sociological research "as a prerequisite to social planning...the constant search for Latin American solutions of Latin American problems (with the help, of course, of principles which have found universal application) have endowed sociology with a vitality it did not have in the earlier days of academic theorizing and facile generalization" (Smith, 1953: 280).

This period of American sociology was thus marked by a rejection of "speculative" theory and acceptance of more concrete and empirical knowledge. There were more concerns for "careful description and comparative analysis of actual behavior," say Hinkle and Hinkle (1954:22). Multicausal explanations, as opposed to "single-factor, monistic, or particularistic interpretations" were prominent as a clear reaction to unilinear evolutionary theory of earlier sociology. Statistical techniques, to avoid subjectivism and personal bias, were preferred. Quantitative research, as opposed to qualitative and case-study research techniques, was wanted. Although sociologists often debated this issue, quantifiable and statistical methodology prevailed. The reasons given by Hinkle and Hinkle (1954:25) were:

"Statistical conclusions are precise, verifiable, valid, useful in prediction, less elaborate, less costly than those arrived at by qualitative methods, such as life histories, and finally, are objective in that they cannot be biased by prejudiced interpretations of the data."

Irrational behavior also led sociologists to investigate human psychic factors. Research dealing with social attitudes and personality development expanded. The University of Chicago played an important role in laying theoretical foundations for "interactionist social psychology" (Hinkle and Hinkle, 1954:29).
After World War II, sociologists shifted attention "from the task of making sociology scientific to efforts to make the discipline of sociology useful." This trend was associated with the participation of sociologists in the federal government which helps us understand U.S. rural sociologists' role in Brazil. According to these authors (1954:44):

"During the years of the two great crises sociologists were frequently employed by the Federal government. Throughout the depression years, sociologists joined the staffs of the Works Progress Administration, the Department of Agriculture, the TVA, the National Resources Committee, and other federal, state, and local agencies concerned with practical problems of social welfare. With the war, sociologists accepted commissions in the armed forces, participated in training programs for servicemen, became consultants or regular personnel for OSS, OPA, the Department of State, and other federal agencies. Their professional counsel is still employed in the formation of domestic and foreign governmental policy today."

This was the period in which government sought to sponsor sociological research in the hopes of resolving emergent "social problems" (Hinkle and Hinkle, 1954). For instance, President Hoover had asked two prominent sociologists, William F. Ogburn and Howard W. Odum, "to explore the extent and directions of changes in various facets of American society." Another important sponsored sociological research was a comprehensive study of racial relations in the United States. This study was directed by Gunnar Myrdal and was funded by the Carnegie Corporation. Myrdal's book, *An American Dilemma* (1944), raised some pertinent questions about science and social values. Concerns with scientific method, empiricism, concrete and quantifiable facts, accurate descriptions of social characteristics, and value-free analysis were operating assumptions among post-war sociologists who wanted to put sociological knowledge to useful purposes.
Summary

Were sociological research and knowledge about Latin American societies after 1930's immune from the world crises? How did U.S. foreign policy influence decisions in the selection of the object of study, research questions, and methods of analysis? How did values, beliefs and assumptions, inherent in American sociology, relate to events occurring in society? How was empirical and quantitatively-oriented sociology related to the intentions of inter-American relations? Answers to these questions are implied in the logical arrangements of the affirmations so far analyzed. A synthesis may be reached through a brief review. First, in spite of previous individual visits by renowned Europeans and U.S. scholars at the beginning of the nineteenth century, widespread interests in studying Latin American societies did not begin until after 1935. Institutionally-sponsored research projects and cultural exchange activities actually materialized when President Roosevelt encouraged the Good Neighbor Policy, between 1933 and 1945, and when the Coordination of Inter-American Affairs was created in 1940. Beginning in 1938, the United States government sought to promote interests to gain the sympathy of Latin Americans. This was made possible through Mr. Rockefeller's particular interests and concerns for cultural exchanges between the United States and Latin American countries. The stated objectives of these cultural exchanges were to openly enhance commercial relations and inter-economic dependence. European powers had controlled Latin American markets and resources since colonial times, but by the end of the First World War, the penetration of Germany into the major areas represented a threat to the security of the United States. Germany had established strong ties with Brazil. In 1930, Nazi Germany purchased large
quantities of raw materials from Brazil, dominated the currency, and culturally established its influences. Threatened by German propaganda and control of Brazil's natural resources, the United States government, through the promotion of good-neighbor relations, associated its concerns for national security, with commercial and cultural activities. Cultural activities and influences from the United States had their peak, when the question of national security was at stake. There was a strong effort to combat German propaganda and impute values, beliefs and what is commonly known as the "American Way of Life."

The Department of State, responsible for national security, and closely tied with the Department of Agriculture, financed research in rural sociology, in the three largest countries: Brazil, Mexico and Argentina. Territorial sizes and natural resources, especially for war's rearmament, were crucial determinants for choosing these countries. Concerns for the expansion of totalitarianism, communist ideology, population size, and the rates of population growth in these countries were perceived as problematic. Misconceptions and the lack of knowledge about these strategically important areas were also important determinants for interests in studying and understanding Latin American societies. The impact of World Wars and the Great Depression caused sociologists to intellectually revise American sociology; between World War I and the years followed by the Depression, U.S. sociologists sought to make sociology more scientific and objective. There was a preference for more concrete, empirical research, statistical techniques, inductive reasoning and multicausal explanations. World conflict and crises had a pressing impact on sociologists in the United States, leading them to question man's rational behavior and actions. This period was marked by a search for the mechanics
of operating social forces and the impact of technological inventions on society.
The task of sociology was to discover and to unfold social patterns, as modeled in the laws of the physical and natural world. Psychological explanations for man's irrationality was also popularized in this period. After the Depression and Second World War, U.S. sociologists shifted efforts in making sociology a science and attempted to make the discipline useful. Many U.S. sociologists were employed by the Federal Government as consultants in several agencies concerned with practical problems and welfare. In this period the Government began to invest in sociological research, both in domestic and international projects. Thus, the sociology brought by U.S. sociologists to Brazil and other Latin American countries after 1935 was not free from the concerns of United States foreign policy. In order to assess this "ideologization" of sociology, the next chapter examines rural sociology, a subdiscipline born institutionally in the United States (see Nelson, 1967 and 1969).
FOOTNOTES FROM CHAPTER 3

1. T. Lynn Smith was responsible for the area of sociology in the Handbook of Latin American Studies, an annual bibliography and review of articles begun in 1935 and edited by Lewis Hanke. In 1950, the first section of sociology was introduced by Smith with the following: "Events of the past thirty or forty years have stimulated the emergence of sociology as a separate discipline in Latin American studies. In recognition of this fact, the Handbook initiates with the present number a section devoted to sociology as a distinct field of Latin American interests." (Handbook of Latin American Studies: 1950, No. 16, Francisco Guilherme, ed., Gainesville, Univ. of Florida Press, 1953, p. 279).

2. L. L. Bernard is known for his "voluminous correspondence with Latin American scholars and to contribution to the periodical literature" (Smith, 1954: 234). Bernard wrote about sociology in Argentina and was responsible for "one of the earliest — if not the earliest — attempts to survey the state of sociology in Latin America" (Hopper, 1963: 245). See Bernard, L. L.: "The Social Sciences or Disciplines in Latin America," in Encyclopedia of Social Sciences I: 301-20. He also published "Recent Work in Cultural Sociology in Brazil, Argentina and Mexico," after the first publication (1936) of The American Sociological Review (Vol. II, 1937, No. 1–6, pp. 265-269). Under the title "Foreign Correspondence," he writes that "the last decade has witnessed a marked increase in the study of social anthropology, cultural sociology, and archaeology in several Latin American countries, and particularly Brazil, Mexico, and Argentina" (Bernard, 1937: 265).

3. The Commission on Cuban Affairs "was appointed by the Foreign Policy Association, in response to an invitation extended by President Carlos Mendieta early in 1934" (Smith, 1954: 235). Besides Zimmerman (Harvard Univ.) there were Leland Hamilton Jenks (Wellesley College), Helen Hall (Henry Street Settlement of New York) and M. L. Wilson (director of the United States Agricultural Extension Service) as members. According to Smith, the works of this commission represent "for the first time the application of North American empirical research technique in the sociological studies of a part of the Latin American area" (Smith, 1954: 235).

4. Park visited Brazil and the Caribbean Islands and "the social problems of Brazil and the West Indies seem to have impressed him greatly. As a result he did much to stimulate an interest at Chicago, at Fisk University, and at other centers of learning in the subject of race and culture in Latin America. One of his students, Donald Pierson, went to Bahia, Brazil, in 1935 to collect materials for his Ph.D. dissertation." See Donald Pierson, Negroes in Brazil (Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1952).
5. Some examples of these cultural and educational activities: In 1941, the sculptor Jo Davidson visited 10 countries in Latin America, at the request of President Roosevelt, to make portrait busts of their presidents (see U.S. Office, 1947, pp. 91-114). The exhibition of 300 contemporary United States paintings in oil and water color, from the U.S. Museum, Archeological expeditions to key areas in Latin America. The Yale Glee Club went on a tour. Music books were catalogued, folk music was recorded, several books in U.S. history, literature and poetry were translated. Several persons in this education were exchanged between the two countries. "Exchanges activities were under the direction of a Committee for Inter-American Artistic and Intellectual Relations, whose members were directors of the Guggenheim, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations." A strong effort was made in "strengthening United States schools in Latin America...(and) in combating the growth of German and Italian schools." Cultural Institutes were established along with libraries. In Mexico was created the Benjamin Franklin Library under the direction of the New York Public Library. This included "the acquisition of the best American books on science and art, literature, mechanical training, public health, nursing, and similar subjects giving a good background of United States civilization."

Another interesting activity sponsored by the Coordination was motion pictures. The Germans had had access in this area. The Motion Picture Division was first directed toward showing historical and cultural features of the United States but later "maintained a Hollywood office which maintained contact with the industry and advised producers on their problems which related to the other American republics." For instance the Coordination financed a trip by Walt Disney and a staff of assistants to Latin America to gather background materials."since Disney cartoons were extremely popular in the other American republics."

6. The reports prepared for the State Department resulted in Smith's Brazil: People and Institutions (Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1946), Taylor's Rural Life in Argentina (Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1948), and Whitten's Rural Mexico (Univ. of Chicago Press, 1948). Later Lowry Nelson was sent to Cuba "under a similar arrangement, and published Rural Cuba (Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1950)." (Smith, 1954: 237.)
Before 1933, when social sciences were formally introduced in Brazilian universities and before the arrival of foreign scholars, the Brazilian intellectual elite had studied and formulated theories about the country's rural society. With Brazil's independence, the opening of sea ports, and the growth of cities and outside influences (mainly from France), intellectuals had become interested in understanding ethnic groups in the interior of Brazil. Local elites had always regarded Brazilian coastal cities as symbols of wealth and prestige. Until 1930, when a shift in political and economic power occurred, the planters and ranchers of the rural elite sent their sons to law schools in Recife and Sao Paulo, "subcultural oases where students immersed themselves in French Literature, German philosophy, Brazilian politics, and riotous living" (Cowell, 1979:193).

Rural living was thus perceived as a backward unproductive existence that lagged behind progressive and civilized societies. Some early studies of rural life were pessimistic, others more optimistic, about the dangers of such extreme differences between the social life of the interior and that of the coast. More important, however, were assumptions about the make-up of Brazilian society. As discussed in Chapter II, Brazilian intellectuals laid the foundations for the ready acceptance of the American brand of sociology, predominant during the Depression Era, as an empirical, inductive, reductionist,
and utilitarian approach. This brand of sociology had strong influences in the training of the first generation of Brazilian social scientists. Such influences, however, were not without debate and criticism, mainly from French "structuralists."

The purposes of this chapter are threefold: first, to discuss pioneering studies in Brazilian sociology and their differences; second, to examine the origins and impacts of dualism or rural versus urban concepts in rural sociology; and finally, to investigate some reactions by Brazilian sociologists to rural sociology, and some alternative formulations of the object of study of the discipline.

**The Founding Fathers of Brazilian Sociology**

Many authors in the past have discussed the presence and influence of U.S. sociologists in Brazil. One of the earliest appraisals was in 1933 by Bernard for the Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. Ramos (1936: 375) also briefly cited some of the Brazilian social scientists influenced by North American sociology. He indicates that Delgado de Carvalho, Fernando de Azevedo, and he himself, were followers of Ward, Giddings, Park, Burgess, Cooley, Ross, Elwood, Alport, Kimball Young, Folsom, Murchison, Dunlap and others. Bastide (1945) and Hopper (1964) analyze theoretical influences on Brazilian sociologists and reaffirm that Delgado de Carvalho was the first to introduce empirical methods in use by U.S. sociologists. They also mention Carneiro Leão, who applied ideas of rural and urban sociology, and the concepts of social control to Brazilian realities. Davies (1950), Pinto and Carneiro (1955) issued reports on the "state of the art" in teaching and sociological
research in Brazil. Berlinck (1961), Diegues (1962a), Semenzato (1963), Stavenhagen (1964), Rios (1972), Lopes (1973) and Smith (n/d) also mention North American influences in sociology and rural sociology in Brazil. Diegues (1962a) and Rios (1972) are, however, the only analysts who include the 1920's modernist movement in Brazilian literature, in Sao Paulo and Recife, as an important influence on rural studies.

Diegues (1962a:249) says that Carneiro Leao's textbook, *A Sociedade Rural: Seus Problemas a Sua Educacao* (1941) was not, as such, a work of rural sociology. He indicated that rural sociology was first taught in Brazil during the 1930's under the influence of exchange sociologists from the U.S. along with the establishment of the Escola Superior de Agricultura de Vicosa — "thanks to the North American influences." Professor John B. Griffing is said to have taught the first course in rural sociology in Brazil in 1937. His lectures were aided by a Brazilian sociologist, Edgard Vasconcellos de Barros, who succeeded Griffing in teaching the course in 1939. Diegues (1962a:249) writes that:

"Due to the lack of Brazilian bibliography, the data and information for the course were taken from North American reality and bibliographical sources. Later professor Vasconcellos felt that it was necessary to begin small research projects in areas near the university to fill this gap."

T. Lynn Smith and John H. Kolb were in large part responsible for training the new generation of Brazilian sociologists such as J. V. Freitas Marcondes, Lucilla Herman, Olavo Batista Filho, Carlos Borges Schmidt, Joao Goncalves de Souza and Jose Arthur Rios (Smith, n/d:22). Smith is the best known U.S. sociologist and had unmatched influence on Brazilian sociology (see Nelson, 1967, 1968). Smith published widely about Brazilian society, including his now classic book, *Brazil: People and Institutions* (1946). In his words:
"From the beginning a major part of my own professional activities has been devoted to the work of increasing and disseminating a body of comprehensive, systematized, and empirically tested knowledge about Brazilian society" (Smith, n/d:23).

His first textbook, *Rural Sociology* (1940), was translated into Portuguese six years later. "Although it was directed to the problems of North American society," wrote Rios (1972:111), "Smith's book exerted great influences on Brazilian authors for its methodology and vigor of synthesis." According to Diegues (1962b), in 1952 Kolb organized a course in rural sociology in the Rural University, near Rio de Janeiro, and conducted community research in neighboring areas, was not widely acclaimed for his contributions to Brazilian sociology. Kolb continued to teach two rural sociology courses between 1952 and 1954, and assisted in developing a social work course in rural areas. Rios (1972) says that rural sociology, as a discipline, was institutionalized in Brazil between 1930 and 1950, along with the foundation of the School of Sociology and Politics in Sao Paulo. He categorizes the "evolution of rural sociology in Brazil" into four phases. The first, which he calls "sociographic or descriptive," took place in the colonial era when European travelers and historians made descriptive observations of Brazilian rural societies. The second phase, "presociology," lasted from independence until the abolition of slavery, when the literature about rural society was written by the thinkers (pensadores) and social reformers. The third phase, dominated by the "positivists" and the "evolutionists," was called the "phase of transition" extending from the fall of the Empire in 1889 to 1930, when the sons of the old oligarchy entered law and technical schools which enthusiastically embraced the positivist creed (Rios, 1972: 71). The fourth phase, between 1930 and 1950, was the "contemporary or sociological par excellence," when the discipline was formally introduced into
Brazilian universities. Rios (1972) cites the studies of "population problems" and "interracial marriages" by Samuel H. Lowrie, ethnographic studies by Herbert Baldus, and community studies by Emilio Willems and Donald Pierson as the most important outside influence.2

Stavenhagen (1964:233) also sees the 1930's as the time when "systematic, empirical, rural sociological research was being introduced to Brazil in courses at the Rural University of Vicosa, and the state of Minas Gerais, and the Rural University, near Rio de Janeiro." He asserts, however, that the topic of rural sociology was first taught in Brazil by the anthropologist Gilberto Freyre, in 1935, at the Law Schools of Recife and later in Rio de Janeiro. Later the University of Wisconsin, through a USAID grant, established a teaching and research program with the Centro de Estudos e Pesquisas Economicas at the University of Rio Grande do Sul. According to Rios (1972:167) "the objective of this program, for both rural sociology and economics, consisted in providing graduate training for graduate and undergraduate researchers, theoretical and practical knowledge of these sciences, in the solutions of Brazilian social and economic problems." According to Stavenhagen (1964:233) in 1962, the Institute of Rural Studies was added to the School of Sociology and Politics "in answer to increasing demands for qualified research in rural areas."

Smith (n./d.) briefly analyzed the development of sociology in Brazil and called Fernando de Azevedo, Delgado de Carvalho, F. J. Oliveira Vianna, Antonio Carneiro Leao, Ponte de Miranda and Gilberto Freyre the founding fathers of sociology in Brazil. According to Smith (n/d:17), Fernando de Azevedo was influenced by the French, especially Durkheim, Ponte de Miranda
by the Germans, and Oliveira Vianna by European thinkers including racial theorists such as Gobineau, Ammon, Lapouge and Chamberlain. Delgado de Carvalho, Giberto Freyre and Carneiro Leao were strongly influenced by U.S sociology, says Smith. Most of these Brazilian social scientists wrote textbooks bearing the name sociology. The choice of names on various lists of the founding fathers of sociology in Brazil seems to reflect authors' opinions of what did or did not constitute the discipline of sociology itself. Smith (n/d:17), for instance, excludes Euclides de Cunha, the authors of Os Sertoes, because, he said, "I am sure that Euclides never considered himself to be a sociologist and in his work I find no mention of Comte, Spencer, or any other sociologists." On the other hand, he includes Gilberto Freyre, a self-declared social anthropologist, trained at Columbia University under the guidance of Franz Boas. Freyre even wrote a book entitled "Why I am not a Sociologist." Although Cunha in Os Sertoes does not mention any of the classical social thinkers explicitly by name, one cannot discard the fact that at the end of the nineteenth century most social analysis, especially in a diversified society such as Brazil, would not be free from the influences of these leading social thinkers. How can one negate, for instance, the influences of the naturalist Charles Darwin in Herbert Spencer, the British sociologist? One could also question whether any or all of these Brazilians, at the time, called themselves sociologists.

Pereira de Queiroz (1978b) also analyzes the works of the early and most important authors in the development of social sciences and rural sociology in Brazil. Carneiro Leao (1958), Diegues (1962), Rios (1972), and Fernandes (1963 and 1977) also presented accounts of early influences in the development of
social sciences in Brazil. Pereira de Queiroz's analysis is, perhaps, the most comprehensive and for this reason will be discussed in detail. According to her, the first social investigations were motivated by ethnologists interested in the uncivilized tribes of Indians in the interior of Brazil. In these studies the investigators sought not only to document Indian customs before they disappeared but also to integrate the tribes into the civilized world. This notion of national integration predominated in Brazilian social thought.

Before 1870, she says, there were no intentions of interpreting Brazilian society as a unitary whole. Interest in a "national" society began in 1873 with Sivio Romero, who studied not only the Indian but also the Negro, the mulatto and the sertanejo (inlanders) from northern Brazil. Romero was the first one to interpret the nature and characteristics of Brazilian society. His conceptual interpretations were heavily influenced by social evolutionism and Darwinism, which were, along with the influence of positivism, the dominant ideas prevalent on the coast of Brazil at that time (Cruz Costa, 1964). The differences among Indians, Negroes, sertanejos and city dwellers were due to their unequal stages in mankind's social evolution, Romero argued. As social progress unfolds, he said, these peculiar differences would tend to disappear until society reaches a "perfect cultural state of civilization." Romero was not pessimistic about the inequality between ethnic groups, nor did he envision this as an obstacle to national unity. With time, socialization, and adequate instruction, the problems of socio-cultural differences would tend to disappear and an "improvement of the races" would take place. This cultural and racial perfecting would be gradual and unilinear.
Romero was also the first to observe the Negro's influence on Brazilian culture. He considered this influence to be inferior because its genesis was among the barbarian and primitive African tribes. Pereira de Queiroz (1978b:102) quotes Romero:

"This racial factor was responsible for much of our intellectual weakness, which could only be overcome when the process of integration of all heterogeneous elements would take place...But this intellectual weakness was no reason for alarm...applying Darwin's law to literature and to the Brazilian people, it is easy to perceive that a new race will win out...and it is the white race."

Racism, white supremacy and the search for a harmonious socio-cultural assimilation to achieve national integration were pertinent ingredients of future social investigation. Two other Brazilians questioned the validity of Romero's optimism and his unilinear concept of social evolution. Raymondo Nina Rodrigues and Euclides da Cunha saw possibilities of social conflict in the heterogeneity of Brazilian society. Nina Rodrigues felt that Negroes were not completely "Christianized" and were still bound by their African heritage. These cultural and religious discrepancies posed serious risk to social progress. In Os Sertões, Cunha also perceived danger in the cultural and religious fanaticism among the sertanejo inhabitants. He viewed Brazilian society as divided into two opposite societies: the modern and progressive city dwellers and the rural traditionalists. The religious fanaticism of the Canudo movement resulted from the sertanejo's cultural isolation since colonial times, and this threatens national integration. Both authors shared this dualistic view of society: one saw Blacks against Whites; the other saw antagonistic rural and urban societies. Both also shared notions of social evolution and Darwinism: social progress would take place only when backward and marginal social groups were assimilated and integrated into the civilized and dominant urban culture.
Socio-cultural differences were viewed as dangerous and undesirable for the social integration of Brazilian society.

A more optimistic view appears in Manuel Querino's (1938) analysis of Negro influences. According to Querino, Brazilian whites, brought up by the maes-pretas (breast-mothers), learned from childhood the African customs and traditions, so that the differences between the races would be gradually diminished. This close and intimate relationship would affect every social class, it was said, since Brazilian society was a result of cultural and social fusion in which both Black and Whites were immersed.

By 1920, Oliveira Vianna, also puzzled over the questions of national integration and cultural heterogeneity and sought explanations in the evolution of Brazilian social and political institutions. Both social evolutionism and Darwinism influenced his main thesis of the "arianization" of Brazilian society. Negroes were bluntly perceived as inferior "in intelligence and capacity for progress" (Pereira de Queiroz, 1978b:106). Oliveira Vianna recognized the importance of Brazilians of African heritage, especially in literature, and explained this by pointing out that in colonial times and during the Empire, blacks who most resembled whites—in terms of "morality and coloring"—were able to move up socially. The Republic brought about a confusion of values, with the notion of "equality among men." The notion of equality was false, thought Vianna, because it could not change biological and moral differences. Thus he called for "the restoration of the old values, based upon color and blood discrimination, so that 'natural selection' could again operate freely and permit the Arian elements to rule society and to re-establish its old equilibrium."
Oliveira Vianna does not view heterogeneity in Brazilian society as the cause for social conflict, but as an inversion in the value system.

By 1933, when Gilberto Freyre's *Casa Grande e Senzala* was published, the notion of dualistic societies was dominant. Dualism in Brazilian society was not only cultural, but structural and ecological. Combining Querino's culturalism with Oliveira Vianna's stratified and dynamic perspectives of society, Freyre argued that, in the colonial era master and slaves existed side by side within the same family structure — the patriarchal family. With the freedom of slaves and growth of the cities, dualism emerged spatially and separated slaves' residential shanties from the masters' mansions—the "haves" from the "have-nots." Like Querino, Freyre felt that Negroes and Whites, rich and poor, rural and urban, all belonged to the same civilization, which was more or less homogeneous. The fact that all participated in the same culture as Brazilians helped to ease social tensions and racial conflicts. He contradicted Nina Rodrigues and Cunha who saw tensions from cultural differences. The intimacy between white masters' sons raised by Black slave mothers under patriarchal family relationships linked the races and allowed them to assimilate each other's customs and traditions. Freyre's major contribution was to bring dualism forward to contemporary times. Thus, urbanization separated social classes, but did not break paternalistic relations and family solidarity between Blacks and Whites. Culture played a homogenizing role in preventing social tensions and conflicts between different social classes. The transformation from a patriarchal society into a stratified one did not hinder the intimate and internal social integration of Brazilian society. The threats were not from within, Freyre said, but from outside values and ideas alien to the national
culture. Freyre stressed strengthening Brazilian traditions, especially the African heritage, to counteract external influences. Like Oliveira Vianna, Freyre saw Brazilian society as socially unjust, but believed that with the active role of culture, Negroes and mulattoes experienced social mobility and moved up in the hierarchy through wealth, education, and marriage. Pereira de Queiroz (1978b:109) says that "Freyre shares racism with his predecessors, but his praising of the Negro in the ethnic formation of Brazilian culture was so expressive, that it made him a rehabilitator of the Negro race.

Thus from 1873 to 1933, the founding fathers of sociology and research in Brazil endorsed a theory of social evolution and also a notion and social cohesiveness of consensus in the search for national integration and a concept of Brazilian society as a whole. Underlying this notion of social progress through harmony was implicit a nostalgic longing for societal organization in which the cohesive ties of a dominant elite ruled the masses. This conservative and elitist ideology was rooted in the development of sociology by Comte in France, and was present as well among the Brazilian intellectuals when the discipline was formally introduced in academia (see Nisbet, 1966).

The Dual Thesis and Rural Sociology

Even though most of the Brazilian population and national resources in the last century were concentrated in the interior, the Brazilian elite looked to the coastal cities for modernization, social progress, liberal ideas and new ways of life. In contrast, rural society was downgraded as backward, marginal, isolated, traditional, and conservative. All early studies stressed two opposite poles in the social and cultural hierarchy. Cunha nostalgically termed Brazilians
from the interior as the "bedrock of our race" (Cowell, 1979:193). Many social writers of the modernist movement were influenced by Cunha's world view. Indeed, Cunha was credited with being one of the first writers to contrast Brazilian rural life to the modern ways of the coastal cities (Pereira de Queroz, 1978a:47).

The dual thesis influenced sociological analysis as a precondition favorable to the diffusion of ideas and technologies from more advanced societies. In fact, dualism was said to have inspired the formulations of "theories of underdevelopment" in the United States and elsewhere. Os Dois Brasis (The Two Brazils) by Jacques Lambert (1958)10, illustrated quite well the dualist perspective. For Lambers, those countries that had gone through a colonial past showed a dual structure: one part open and modern, an other closed and archaic. The rationale of dualism was based upon historical development in Europe and the United States. Industrial development in these countries occurred continuously for both urban and rural sectors. In Brazil, development has been discontinuous, between the old colonial structures and the modern and industrial ones. To develop, it was argued in a seminar appropriately called "Obstaculos e Resistencias a Mudanca" (Obstacles and Resistances to Change),11 Brazil or any other "underdeveloped" society had to overcome resistance by the archaic sector (the other Brazil) by introducing capitalism, technology and modern ideas. Most Brazilian community studies undertaken by North Americans and the first generation of Brazilian-trained social scientists after World War II were conducted within this dualistic frame of reference. The relationship between dualism and the selection of ruralism as the object of study of rural sociology is a very close one.
As a point of departure for sociological theory, the sharp distinction between rural and urban sectors has been widely questioned. Gilbert (1982:611), for example, stated that since its origin, 70 years ago, U.S. rural sociology has been searching for its object of study. So far, he added, rural sociology has chosen several objects of study such as "types of cultural systems, dispersed settlement patterns, and particular (extractive) occupations." These attempts, he cautioned, have been "insufficient to ground rural sociology" as a separate discipline. In order to understand rural sociology's choice of an object for study, a brief account of the intellectual origins of the discipline in the United States is needed.

Rural Sociology's Development in the U.S.

Rural sociology, as a discipline, was highly dependent on early American sociological theory, methods and underlying assumptions (see Hooks and Flinn, 1981). According to Hinkle (1980:267), the sociology of the founding fathers "sought to discover the first principles, causes, and laws of the origin, structure, and change of human association, human society, or social phenomena generally and irrespective of variant, particular, idiosyncratic, or unique forms." Using a "periodicizing-characterizing scheme" he contrasted the founding fathers' concern with social origin, social structure (epistemology-methodology) with social change (ontology). Early theorists, he argues, were epistemological dualistic, with some stressing sensation or experience and others, reason or logic. Observation, detachment, impersonality, and description of facts (not ideas) were predominant among them. Induction should be followed by deduction and inference or reasoning was "imperative to achieve the abstract generality
of generalization and law which science demands" (Hinkle, 1980:268). In fact, logical reasoning is important to separate the "individual, concrete, particular, peculiar, abnormal, accidental, exceptional, or unique." Early sociologists differentiated drastically between science and history; the latter being concerned with the accidental and particularities. Except for Cooley, most early sociologists embraced a "positivistic methodological stance," and resorted to the "comparative method" (which was derived from biology, as Comte had noted much earlier), according to Hinkle (1930:268).

"Darwinian (and Spencerian) views of organic evolution became the basic point of departure for formulating explanatory statements of and about social phenomena," says Hinkle (1980:270). Early sociologists viewed social change also from a dualistic perspective, the majority of them being more idealistic, as opposed to materialistic. Man is a social being, but egotistical by nature, especially if basic needs (hunger and sex) cannot be satisfied. "Consciousness, purpose, intention and choice orient relationships and (external) activities," says Hinkle (1980:274). He also states that early American sociologists were nominalist (1980:280 ff); that is, they argued that "the concept, category or logical universal (universalia) had no reality apart from the composite summary of the characteristics or properties of the particulars (or singuli) to which it refers. Reality resides in the particulars." Realism, on the contrary, "argued that the concept, category, or logical universe represents something different from and organizes the properties or characteristics of the particular to which it refers. Reality resides in the universal, the idea, ideal, the logical whole." Early sociologists subscribed to "social nominalism" (social atomism, individualism or analytical individualism), according to Hinkle (1980:281). The
dispute between social nominalism and realism goes beyond the discipline of sociology, the point worthy of being noted here is that early American sociologists concentrated their analysis on the parts of the whole, or social reality. Sociological studies focused on the identification of human survival strategies and patterns of adaptation. Values such as "ameliorism" and belief in technological progress dominated early sociologists' world views.

As a subdiscipline, rural sociology inherited theory, methods and approaches from the founding fathers. John Gillet's *Constructive Rural Sociology*, the first textbook of rural sociology used the adjective "constructive" in its title," because at that time rural sociology was supposedly concerned with improvements or 'betterment', or 'rural progress'" (Nelson, 1969:106). Rural living was viewed as "maladjustment" by early sociologists (Nelson, 1969). Despite farmers' self-reliance and egalitarianism, "farm problems" were said to stem from defects in the psyche of rural residents. In this view, "rural out-migration...drained the best of the rural minds and left dullards to farm; it thus contributed to further deterioration in the quality of rural leadership and undermined essential social institutions, especially churches" (Hooks and Flinn, 1981:135). Early sociologists perceived U.S. farm problems as moral decay and themes for rural research were strongly influenced by the Country Life Commission and Protestant churches (Smith, 1957 and Nelson, 1969), which sought to link the rural personality and the "farm problem" and so to reject the economic and political factors claimed by the populists (Flinn, 1982).

Later, when rural sociology became linked to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the moralizing tendency of rural sociology came under criticism. Zimmerman (1929) argued that rural sociology should
provide reliable information—not unscientific moralizing—to policymakers. It should produce "facts" based on sound methodology and statistical techniques. In the decade between 1930 and 1940, rural sociology put more emphasis on the study of groups and social organization, as an applied science, "while general sociology was a theoretical science," said Nelson, (1969:107). By 1940, T. Lynn Smith's *Sociology of Rural Life* textbook was published, and it showed strong influences from Sorokin and Zimmerman. Nelson (1969:117) says that:

Like his mentor, Smith conceived of rural sociology as a scientific discipline, the sociology of rural society. His approach, however, was not exclusively that of the rural-urban dichotomy treated comparatively. Although he compared the two entities in terms of environment, population characteristics, and behavior, as did practically all the writers, he refused to follow the concept slavishly.

Smith's text also introduced analysis of population and the relations of people to the land, including such matters as the form of settlement, land divisions, land tenure, and size of holdings. He also was one of the first to discuss the "social process": competition and conflict, cooperation, accommodation, assimilation, acculturation, and mobility in rural sociology. In Nelson's (1969:114) appraisal:

"These relationships were considered by Smith to be part of the general subject of 'rural organization,' which also embraced social differentiation and stratification, along the the institutions of the family, school, church, and local government."

Gilbert (1982:612) showed that Galpin, the father of rural sociology in the U.S., questioned as early as 1915 the validity of ruralism as an isolated concept. From the formation of rural sociology, as a subdiscipline of sociology, Galpin saw interconnections in the relationship between city and country. He felt further that "rural" and "urban" were vague and contradictory and that their use should be discontinued for scientific work. Galpin developed the
concept of "urbanism" as opposed to "ruralism" to call attention to the submission of the rural sector to urban influences. Bailey (1924) also reacted against a distinctive line between urban and rural concepts (see Gilbert, 1982:611).

Galpin and Bailey's preoccupations were put aside in the Sorokin and Zimmerman text, Principles of Rural and Urban Sociology (1929). From this textbook, several generations of rural sociologists were trained to study rural and urban areas separately. The main purpose was to establish descriptive differences between the two supposed social worlds from a functional and causal frame of reference. The point of departure was the consequences for the lives of the rural populace in the processes of urbanization and ruralization. This text also had strong theoretical and methodological influences on rural sociology in Brazil and Colombia through the teachings of T. Lynn Smith. The following section will focus more specifically on Smith's sociological and personal influences on Brazil.

T. Lynn Smith (1903-1976) and Brazilian Sociology

T. Lynn Smith's influence in Brazilian sociology and rural sociology has far surpassed that of any other North-American sociologist, not only through his writings and research but also through dissemination of his concept of sociology and approaches to the study of society. Smith was a very prolific writer. From 1940 to 1976 he published 30 books (including re-editions, translations in Portuguese and Spanish, and co-authorships), about 18 monographs and bulletins, 52 chapters in other books, and about 230 articles to professional journals. Most of his major writings were in the area of rural sociology (10
publications), urban sociology (1), population analysis (4), gerontology (2), and "social problems" (3). Seven dealt with Brazil, one with Colombia, and another with Latin America in general. Born in Stanford, Colorado in 1903, "son of a farmer and stockman," he received his bachelor's degree at Brigham University in 1928, his M.A. degree at Minnesota in the following year and his Ph.D. in 1932, where Carle Zimmerman was his professor. Between 1930 and 1932 he was a research fellow at Harvard University under Pitirim Sorokin. At the age of 39 in 1942, Smith was sent to Brazil for one year by the U.S. Department of State, in cooperation with the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations and the USDA, to secure a picture of "the basic patterns of rural society" (Smith, 1951:237). Among the three North American sociologists sent at the same time to Latin America, according to Nelson (1969:143), "Smith (was) the only author of a book-length study on a Latin American country to continue his observation." In 1946, six years after the publication of his first book, *Sociology of Rural Life* (1940), he published *Brazil: People and Institutions* (1946). "His work," wrote Nelson (1969:143), "was widely appreciated in Brazil and he was awarded honorary degrees by the University of Sao Paulo and the University of Brazil."

The book discussed cultural diversity, levels and standards of living, relations of people to the land, and social institutions. *The Sociology of Rural Life* was translated into Portuguese as *Sociologia da Vida Rural.* He also published, with Alexander Marchant, *Brazil: Portrait of Half a Continent* (1951). *Brazilian Society* (1963), *The Race Between Population and Foods* (1976), *Agrarian Reform in Latin America* (1966) as well as other books on population and problems of rural and urban development include studies of
Smith's influence on sociology in Latin America can not be measured by his writing alone. Many students from Latin America have received instruction from him at Louisiana State University, at Vanderbilt University where he directed the Institute of Brazilian Studies, and finally at the University of Florida, and "many from the U.S. have written Ph.D dissertations on various countries of Latin America" (Nelson, 1969:144).

After World War II, additional rural sociologists under contract from the USDA and the Department of State went to Brazil and other Latin American countries to conduct research and gather information about rural conditions. Most of those who traveled to Latin America used similar theoretical and methodological frames of reference.

Smith (1946) for instance, followed Sorokin and Zimmerman's theoretical conceptualization of the rural-urban continuum in Brazil: People and Institutions (1946), although he claimed he did not follow it closely. In Brazil, Smith studied population composition, land tenure, levels of living, and social institutions such as the church, the family, and the school system. He also stressed the sharp contrasts between urban and rural living, especially in a chapter called "The Cultural Mosaic."

"But the time element, cultural evolution, and cultural lag are concepts to be reckoned with in properly interpreting the present cultural diversity in Brazil. One would not be far wrong in saying that Brazil contains representations of all cultural stages through which man has passed during the last millennium. A world citizen feels at home in Rio de Janeiro, Sao Paulo, and other greater metropolitan cities. Paved roads and automobiles, telephones and radios, telegraph lines and buses, provide a system of communications and transportation that compares favorable with that found anywhere....Yet one does not need to go far from any of the capitals to have firsthand contact with much older material culture and patterns of living....As one goes into the interior, especially into the more hilly and mountainous portions, roads, trucks, and automobiles give way to foot and saddle paths, saddle horses, pack trains, and ox-drawn carts. Electric and steam-propelled engines are replaced by water-
powered gristmills and sawmills, of types common in the United States a century or so ago" (Smith 1946:20-23).

In another passage, he stressed even more this contrast of the archaic with the modern and expressed his explanation about the causes for such extreme polarities between rural and urban societies.

"Socially, Brazil is not a superimposition of classes but of epochs. It is not divided into layers of human beings but into a juxtaposition of centuries. If near the seacoast, the intensely cultivated regions, there vibrates the same activity as in the countries that are possessed by the machine, in the agricultural band of territory work still has aspects of the eighteenth century, in the pastoral areas society still contains survivals from the seventeenth century, and the sixteenth century survives in the forest of the West" (Smith, 1946:25).

As with earlier analysts of Brazilian society and like most early U.S. sociologists, Smith was highly influenced by evolutionary naturalism, optimism and progress (see Hinkle, 1980:30). Smith states his views on the role of international agencies and the industrialized countries in diffusing ideas, cultural values and technologies to the "troubled" Third World nations. Social problems, for Smith, could stem from the conflict between the two opposite poles, the traditional and the modern:

Many of the perplexities troubling Latin Americans of all social levels arise from the tremendous clash between traditional subcultural values and those to which they are exposed as the world-wide process of the homogenization of society rapidly brings about a more equal distribution of the various cultural and social components throughout all parts of the world. Problems of this type had hampered the efforts of the various agencies of the United States government engaged in programs of technical assistance in Asia, Africa and Latin America to a large extent as early as 1955..." (Smith, 1970a:206).

In October 1955, Smith and other sociologists were invited to address the Sixth Conference for Agricultural Services in Foreign Areas, a meeting sponsored by the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the Land-Grant Colleges and the International Cooperation Administration.
Here Smith defined "social problems" and endorsed the identification of social problems in Latin America from "one of Brazil's noted intellectuals, M. A. Teixeira de Freitas, based upon the social realities he encountered in connection with the 1920 census of population" (Smith, 1970:213). One may see his epistemological concept of the "social" and, more important, his view of sociology's object of study. First, he broke down his concept into two components, "social" and "problem". He defined "social" as:

"an interplay of stimulus and response and a patterning of behavior, the essence of that which we designate as social, is, of course, present among others of those belonging to the animal kingdoms other than those classified as human; however our purpose it is best to limit social to the group activities of homo sapiens" (Smith, 1970a:210).

Thus, following Bernard's classification scheme—a common tendency among early U.S. sociologists—Smith related the social category to human interactions and seemed to allude to the main distinctive characteristic between other species, and man as being able to think rationally. A "problem," personal or social, involved "a perplexing situation or a troublesome question." In line with early functionalist concepts and ethical concerns, he stated that:

"Many social problems involve the ideas of misconduct and maladjustment of one kind or another, activities thought to be detrimental to the well-being, or at least to the self-respect, of other members of the group. Prostitution, juvenile delinquency and crime—to mention only three—involve behavior generally considered as damaging to society; and way and means for protecting and caring for abandoned children, the mentally deficient, and the mentally deranged frequently have developed largely because of a sense of shame emphasis added produced by a comparison of the situation in one community, state, or nation with that in another" (Smith 1970a:211).

In sum, Smith (1970a:211) pointed out that "for a social problem to be serious, it must arouse awareness and stimulate concern in a considerable portion of the members of the society." No warning was given as to which social class was most likely to have its voice and opinions heard in a society such as
Brazil's. Thus, Smith showed an elitist world view, even though he appeared a humanist. In fact, he (1970a:15) did affirm that one of the "factors retarding the development of rural sociology" in Latin America was that the professors and the leading intellectual authorities who speak out on "social problems" are members of the upper class — who devote the bulk of their time and energy to various professional, business, political, and other interests. In other words, they are from the ruling classes and perceive "social problems" according to their own world view. Smith's criticism of Brazilian intellectuals was not in line with his choice of a source of information about Brazil. Smith relied on Teixeira de Freitas, one of Brazil's authoritarian moralist and liberal educators of the 1930s (see Miceli, 1979). "Twenty-seven unfavorable realities" of Brazilian society are listed by Smith under Freitas' influence (1970a:213-14); these are condensed in the following statements:

- social isolation, which is often accompanied by extreme physical and moral degradation
- insufficiency...of religious participation, facilitating the moral regression...
- lack...of urban hygiene...and personal hygiene among some (lower) social strata
- extreme misery among...agricultural proletariat...precarious condition of diet, dress and shelter
- outbreaks of banditry
- widespread abuse of alcohol
- maladies, prevailing in the Brazilian interior, syphilis, lung disease, digestive and intestinal ailments, leprosy, goiter, malaria...etc.
- impurity of...fetish doctors and charlatans
- lack of medical...assistance of the rural population
- development of gambling
- routine in the processes of work
- unnecessary devastation of the forests
- deficient means of communication and transportation
- lack of practical knowledge
- regression to illiteracy among elementary school graduates
- insufficient administrative assistance to the productive classes
According to Miceli (1979:167) Anisio Teixeira was among the group of intellectuals who climbed professionally through cooptation by Vargas' New State during the 1930's and 1940s. Anisio Teixeira, along with Fernando de Azevedo, Carneiro Leao, Lourenco Filho and others, was directed by the State to bring about reforms in the Brazilian educational system. Son of a medical doctor, landowner and political leader in the sertao of the Bahian region, he had religious training in Jesuit colleges and in law. Through his father's political connections, he was assigned to the life-time post of "General-Inspector of Education" (Miceli, 1979:169). With the support of the Catholic church, he visited Belgium, France, and Rome, where he was received by Pope Pius XI, and the United States, where he was greatly influenced in his "divine calling" to be a great reformer of Brazilian education (Miceli, 1979:170). Anisio Teixeira also studied at Colombia University with Dewey, Kilpatrick, Bagley, and received a Masters' degree in education. In Brazil, he occupied several administrative posts and was the founder of the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro in the late 1930s. Paradoxically as it seems, he was later labelled a communist during the dictatorial regime of Vargas. Anisio Teixeira's perceptions of social problems in Brazil reflect his religious and moral concerns. He saw problems in rural areas as the "lack" of modernization and technological advancement, as did most of his generation. Smith's sociological analysis of Brazil and other "less developed" nations was more "scientific" and used more sociological concepts, but does not deviate from Anisio Teixeira's view.
In chapter II of *Sociology of Rural Life*, Smith (1940:13) began by stating that:

"Farm folk differ from urban people, and rural society from urban society, principally because of the different environments impinging upon the two populations...Undoubtedly the environmental factors and conditions are the influences that are chiefly responsible for the contrasting patterns of behavior to be found in the two populations; and a knowledge of the fundamental characteristics of the rural situation should contribute much to an understanding of the structure of rural society, the way it functions, the operation of social controls in the rural group, and the manner in which social change proceeds in the rural districts."

Hinkle's epistemological and ontological framework (1980:59-64) assists in the analysis of Smith's theoretical conception about the nature of the "rural" as a social category — how it is structured, organized, maintained and changed. Smith adopts from Bernard the concept of environment. According to Bernard there are four classes of environment (Smith, 1940:20-21), the first being "the physical or inorganic," the second "the biological or organic," third "the social," and fourth "a composite of institutionalized derivative control environments."

The physical environment includes "all cosmic and physiographic forces, soil, climate, inorganic resources, natural forces like winds and tides, combustion, radiation, and gravity." The biological accounts for "all microorganisms, insects, parasites, undomesticated plants and animals, together with the relationships between these, both ecological and symbiotic." Following Bernard's classification, Smith subdivided the social environment into three categories: "(a) the physiosocial, (b) the biosocial, and (c) the psychosocial." Physiosocial includes "our material culture whose objective expressions are constructed out of inorganic materials, i.e., tools, weapons, machines, roads, etc." The biosocial was made up of "non-human (domestic plants and animals and all materials used by man) and human beings." The psychosocial "designated
the inner behavior (the attitudes, ideas, desires, etc.)" while "customs, folkways, mores and external symbols, such as language, make up the outward expressions of this category." The last part of Bernard's four major classifications is the "composite or institutional derivative control environment." Here "operates...our social organization...represented by such systems of the economic, political, racial, educational, etc."

Smith wrote that "practically all aspects of rural life are conditioned directly by the physical environment. The farmer is in direct contact with nature in all its friendly aspects" (Smith, 1940:22). The social, psychic and control environments of rural society differ from urban in both quantity and complexity. There are more homogeneity, integration, and primary close-bound associations in rural areas. Smith also discussed rural social stratification and distinguished it from urban societies in four aspects: (1) rural areas have "less social classes," (2) the "extremes of the social pyramid are not so far apart," (3) there are tendencies for an "intermediate or middle class," and (4) class position is largely determined by the status of one's immediate ancestors (Smith, 1940:27). Thus his concept of the structure and social organization of rural society followed Durkheim's conception of social organization and differentiation. Smith, in fact, made such a reference (1940:35). It must be emphasized, however, that Smith did not follow very closely the standard rural-urban dichotomies (Nelson, 1969:117) but instead argued for "a scale of urbanization and rurality." On Smith (1970b:8), Nelson wrote that:
"...rural and urban are not merely the two parts of a simple dichotomy but rather, segments on a scale in which the smallest, most remote settlements of agriculturalists, herders and collectors figure at one extreme, and the largest, most diversified and most complex centers of manufacturing, transportation and commerce are located at the other. The vast majority of communities are neither purely rural nor purely urban, but combine rural and urban features in varying proportions."

Rural and urban societies lie on a continuum of varying degree of rurality and urbanity. Social problems are thus defined by Smith as "troubles," abnormalities or factors causing disequilibrium in the pre-conceived notion of a socially cohesive and close-bound system of interactions.

Although he subscribed to positivism and a value-free sociology, Smith believed that sociological knowledge should be applied for the solution of society's problems. He considered that only after North American sociology was introduced could Brazilian studies of society become "scientific" and reliable. Smith (1953:279) wrote that:

The twentieth century witnessed the rise of sociology in the area (Brazil) as a separate field of interest. It has ceased to be vague and contains highly theoretical elements among those related special disciplines characterized as 'social'."

Pierson's community studies, for instance, were "prerequisites to social planning and the constant search for Latin American solutions of Latin American problems, with the help, of course, of principles which have found universal applications," Smith concluded (1953:280). Science for Smith (1940:3) "is the accumulation, arranged in orderly fashion, of facts and principles which have been derived from the application of the scientific method." "Science seeks to discover order in nature, to ascertain common and repeated characteristics" he wrote (1940:4). The purpose of disciplines such as ethnology, or anthropology, or sociology, or psychology was to find general laws or common patterns. Consistent with this basic tenet of positivism for a scientific sociology, Smith
(1940:41) affirmed that "empirical verification is what distinguishes science from philosophy" and that "sensory stimull are all-important in scientific endeavor." "Hypotheses which cannot be tested are useless, regardless of how consistent they may be with other hypothesis," he said, but "in philosophy, on the other hand, the chief criterion of usefulness and value is that hypothesis or proposition be consistent with previous assertions (Smith, 1940:5).

Smith's concepts of the social structure, how it is organized, and how it changes, followed positivism and empiricist approaches to the study of society. Smith's sociology generally, and his conceptions of the social, social structure, and social change followed the natural and physical sciences. He also showed influences from that generations of U.S. sociologists of the post-Depression era who sought to make sociology more scientific and utilitarian. His sociology was quite consistent and clean cut throughout his active professional life and never departed from that of Sorokin and Zimmerman, his "masters." His influence on Brazilian sociology and rural sociology was unequalled, but such influence was not without counterreactions.

Reactions to Dualism

Ianni (1967 and 1971) criticized models of analysis transferred to Brazil for community studies under the North American theoretical orientation. These studies were patterned after the Lynds' Middletown (1929), Redfield's The Folk Culture (1941), and Warner and Lunt's Social Life of a Modern Community (1941). They were introduced and promptly accepted as "improvements" on previous studies which were commonly called "speculative," "pre-scientific", thematic, "subjective" methods. Ianni (1967) complained of those who in their
appraisal of the development of sociology in Brazil and Latin America, reacted negatively to the lack of scientific approach in the study of society. Ianni (1967:195) stated that "currents of sociological thought from the angle of positivist empiricism...minimized the relative importance of the theoretical and methodological contributions of scientists and philosophers who furnished other bases of reference for sociology in Latin America."

For more than two decades after 1940, these studies influenced sociological research in Brazil. Although they greatly contributed to the development of social sciences in Brazil, Ianni (1971:81) found this model of analysis to be highly descriptive, classificatory and functionalist. Most of the Brazilian studies modeled after U.S. forerunners described demographic composition, social classes based on social and cultural indicators, mutual aid processes, family organization patterns, political and cultural institutions, leisure habits, and religious beliefs. Some of the themes researched were isolation, secularization, social disorganization, individualization, socio-cultural changes, etc. As indicated by Fernandes (1963:48), "the interpretations developed (in these studies) stop at the limit of empirical classification of the social and cultural structures." In sum, argued Ianni (1971:80), these studies in empirical sociology failed to establish connections between the expansion of capitalism and the problems of rural communities: "It (was)...a methodological solution to observe a social reality that has been confused with a theoretical model of understanding this reality."

Ferrari (1958:136-203) compiled a bibliography showing research and publishing tendencies from 1933 until 1958 in Sao Paulo. Since most of the intellectual production in the social sciences was concentrated at the School
of Sociology and Politics, the influences of early American sociology in Brazil can be observed and evaluated. Ferrari's bibliography contains 607 items on subjects that are organized into eleven categories in Table 1. Anthropology was the most influential discipline, with 181 items of research in ethnology, folklore, community studies, archeology, and ethnographic methods. The second most researched and published subject is the general category of social organization (108 items); of this total, 30 items were research on race relations. Most of the items in the economic category refer to international finance, prices, foreign exchange, industrialization, industrial productivity, and the role of the entrepreneur. Twenty-three items of the total in this economic category refer to the Sao Paulo working class' level of living, such as family budget, cost of living, nutrition, housing, minimum wages, inflation, and the general conditions of the urban proletariat. Many articles were also written about research methodology and sociological theory, 63 items or 10 percent. Most of these publications are about the scientific method, such as Donald Pierson's "Is Sociology a Science?"\textsuperscript{20}, how Sociology differentiates from other social sciences and the process of accommodation, assimilation, cooperation and conflict. Child psychology and social psychology items were very frequent, 55 items or 9 percent. Publication of items about statistical analysis and its application in the study of the urban classes, population and international migration account for 32 items or 5 percent. Subjects concerning library sciences are also numerous, 30 items or 5 percent. Publications of languages and literature accounts for 13 items or 2 percent; law items add 10 items or 1 percent, which are mostly combined with social sciences subjects. Ferrari (1958:147) says that the Rockefeller Foundation helped to fund this course and gave the U.S.
Table 1. Subject Categories of Research and Publications in Social Sciences at the School of Sociology and Politics of Sao Paulo, 1933-58.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>SUBJECT CATEGORIES</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>ANTHROPOLOGY</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>SOCIAL ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>RESEARCH METHODS AND THEORY</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>STATISTICS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>LIBRARY SCIENCE</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>RURAL SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>98.0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Total differs from 100.0 per cent because of rounding errors.
contacts incentives to improve research and the organization of libraries in Sao Paulo. Publications in rural sociology as a discipline number only 9 items, and the subjects researched were rural-urban migration, rural community, and customs of rural folk. Most of these items were from Pierson's community studies and Willems two articles on "The Solutions of Brazilian Rural Problems as a Induced Change" and "The Brazilian Rural Problem from and Anthropological Point of View".21

Ferrari (1958:137-8) also lists disciplines taught during the 1933-1958 period. For the first three years following the creation of the School of Sociology and Politics, the subjects taught were:

"Sociology, social psychology, social economy, introduction to economy, statistics, physiology of the work process, social biology, psychotechnic, cultural anthropology, world economics, contemporary ideas and political schools of thought, policies and finances, agrarian policies, business and administration, Brazilian education, Brazilian economy, social history and politics of Brazil, Brazilian demo-psychology, public administration, social organization of labor, social services, and Sao Paulo's social problems."

After these initial three years, when the School was under the guidance of Brazilian intellectuals, many of whom were law graduates and bureaucrats, foreign professors from Europe and the United States were sought to teach and do research in Brazil. Ferrari (1958:138) lists the Introduction of the following disciplines:

"Brazilian economy, history of economic doctrines, psychoanalysis and mental hygiene, public finances, public administration, social anthropology, geography, social organization, human ecology, social disorganization, collective behavior, sociological research in Brazil, politics and finance, methodology of research in social sciences, money and credit, public administration and others."

From the content analysis of research, publications, and course work before and after the arrival of foreign scholars at the School, one may conclude that
the U.S. influence through Donald Pierson and Robert Park (Pierson's teacher at the University of Chicago) was significant.22 Pierson taught courses in sociological theory, methods of research, and social organization. He also directed research projects on communities and studied race relations. He published 84 items or 14 percent of the total (607) publications in Ferrari's bibliography. Willems, who assisted Pierson in the community studies of assimilation and acculturation of immigrants, also published 33 items. Together they accounted for many of the items in anthropology, social organization, and research methodology and theory. Pierson's influences may also be noted in the courses on "social organization, human ecology, social disorganization and collective behavior," mentioned by Ferrari (1958:138).

Donald Pierson's Sociology

The presence and influence of Donald Pierson was also important in Brazil, especially during the institutionalization of sociology. Born in Indianapolis, Indiana in 1900, Pierson graduated from the College of Emporia, Kansas with a B.A. in psychology, history and literature. In 1933, the year the School of Sociology and Politics was created in Sao Paulo, he received his M.A. degree in sociology. In 1939 he earned his Ph.D. degree at the University of Chicago while studying with Robert Park, George Herbert Mead, Robert Redfield, A.R. Radcliffe-Brown, Herbert Blumer, Louis Wirth and Ernest W. Burgess, Pierson's dissertation topic on the "Negroes in Brazil: A Study of Race Contact at Bahia, in Brazil," was published in 1942 as a book. As a fellow researcher and general secretary of Park's committee for the study of "race and culture," he spent the period of 1935 to 1937 in Bahia, collecting
data for his study. After his graduation in 1939, Pierson was hired to teach sociology to Brazilian graduate students in Sao Paulo, where he remained for almost two decades. "His classes," says Lourenco Filho (1968:7), "awakened such interest in Sao Paulo's School of Sociology, that he was asked to remain for a long time." In 1940, he and Bruno Rudolfer taught a seminar on "Methods of Social Sciences and in the following year he organized the Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology. In 1943, the Department became the Division of Graduate Studies under Pierson's direction.

According to Lourenco Filho (1968), Pierson worked closely in Sao Paulo with A.R. Radcliffe Brown (Oxford), Emilio Willems (Sao Paulo), Herbert Baldus (Columbia), T. Lynn Smith (Louisiana), Willard Quine (Harvard) and Kalervo Oberg (Smithsonian Institute). The period in which Pierson taught in the School of Sociology coincided with the 1940's era in which Europe and the United States competed for the establishment of economic and political influences in Brazil. First, one could ask why the University of Chicago's interest in studying Brazilian race relations within this historical context. Secondly, as Lowrie (1937) and Nogueira (1978), reported the presence in Sao Paulo of European and North American social scientists created an intellectual atmosphere of debate where one's training and theoretical inclinations could be challenged and sharpened. Pierson's textbook, Teoria e Pesquisa em Sociologia (1968), which congregates the bulk of his published works, in Brazilian journals which were written during his tenure as a faculty member of the School of Sociology permits examination of his conception of sociology and his philosophic orientation. Both questions raised earlier deserve a more detailed treatment than the scope of the present study allows. Some general comments, however,
will show the dialectical interconnections between sociology, propounded to study society, and the influences of the socio-historical context. In fact, Pierson's position in regard to the discipline, makes this point clear and the distinction between different approaches to the study of society, while maintaining scientific, will be discussed in chapter 5.

Pierson belonged to a generation of sociologists who sought to make sociology more scientific, patterned after the natural sciences and ethically committed to better humankind. These two purposes are inconsistent and for this reason their direct relationship has been denied by their practitioners. Those committed to a positivistic concept of science argued that the practice of science does not mix with social intervention; however, an analysis of Pierson's textbook shows that these two purposes are related.

In the late 1930's, the United States and specifically Chicago was characterized by race riots, social tensions and conflicts between workers and employers (see Oberschall, 1972:88 and Therborn, 1980:422). The institutionalization of sociology at the University of Chicago parallels its commitments to provide answers to social chaos (see Hinkle and Hinkle, 1954). Race relations in Brazil were perceived, at the time, as harmonious and integrated. This notion was mainly diffused in the United States through Gilberto Freyre's books (1933 and 1936). Pierson (1935) reported in the Handbook of Latin American Studies, that his main objective in Bahia was to study "the process of racial and cultural contact, accommodation and assimilation." He justified the project by stating that "the probability that racial prejudice (as we know it in the United States, at least) does not exist in Brazil enhances the significance of this area as a field of study" (see Hanke,
1963:235 ff). In spite of slavery, Brazil's northeast was viewed as having "no discrimination based upon race." Brazilians' uniqueness was seen as a "gradual emergence of an ethnic groups of interior status into relatively complete social and political equality with the master class." "Such a resolution of Negro/white relations," he pointed out, "stands in sharp contrast to the termination of race relations in the U.S., where the attempted emergence of an ethnic group of inferior status has resulted in extensive and prolonged discrimination in an effort to maintain the established racial relation." Pierson's book (1942) on Negroes in Brazil was awarded the Anisfield Award as "the best scientific book of the year about race relations" and contributed greatly to the debate on the question of race relations. Since then, several studies by the French structural Marxist school have been conducted which challenge Pierson's sociological approach, methodology, and results. The individuals involved in these studies include the Frenchman Roger Bastide, the Brazilians Florestan Fernandes, Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Octavio Ianni, and the Americans Charles Wagley, Harry W. Hutchinson, Marvin Harris and Ben Zimmerman.*
It could be argued, however, that these differences are due to the difference between sociology in comparison with the European influences which led to my second question.

In chapter II of Pierson's textbook (1968:23) he distinguished sociology from "social thought, social philosophy, social ethics, social work, political sciences, and sociology as science." All these disciplines, he argued, have the same subject matter: the "collective life of human beings," but they differ so far as the objective and methods of studying "collective life." There are many people who reflect, speak and write about social life but are not sociologists, he says. There are others, "in fact very capable and intelligent, who accept without criticism the reflections of Aristotle, Plato, Marcus Aurelius, Saint Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Hegel, Kant, Ian Jaldun, Karl Marx, as though these reflections were sociological" (Pierson, 1968:24). These reflections have undoubtedly contributed to the development of sociology as those of St. Simon, Spencer, Comte, Ward, Giddings, Small, Dewey, Mead and many other "social philosophers." However, these are merely "armchair reflections" but they are not sociology. They are not sociological because they have not been formulated as "hypothesis," and are not submitted to the empirical verification in the "external world," but only in the realm of "ideas." None of these social thinkers occupied themselves with a "careful, rigorous, systematic and continuous investigation of a penetrating and complete research" (Pierson, 1968:24).

Sociology is not to be confused with social ethics, which ask "what should we do?" or with social work, which "attempts to do something to ease social problems." It is also different from political sciences because sociology is not
concerned with the realization and planning of programs or social reform. It also does not claim an understanding of the social whole, in its totality. Sociology, Pierson argues, is a "special" type of science, with its own object, which is not treated by any other of the social sciences. It deals only with what is "sociological" and leaves for human geography, history, economics, political science, to education and other disciplines, the geographic, historical, economic, political educational, etc. of human life. In sum, he concludes, sociology is concerned first of all with the social groups: its origin, relative stability and subsequent disintegration, or in other words, it relies on the study of the fact that human beings everywhere live together "in association with another and never alone" (Pierson, 1968:30).

Methodologically, "sociology is similar to the physical, chemical and biological sciences," he argued; except that sociology goes one step further in the understanding of the process, by which "the spirits of certain organism (homo sapiens) becomes human, and the circumstances by which they can, later to "disintegrate." Thus, "sociology is a natural science and in the same way as other natural sciences, is capable of producing research, but sociology provides a comprehension of the natural process at the sociological level." For him, sociology has three major sub-areas: social organization, social psychology, and social change.

As Ianni (1971), Wagley (1964) and other North American social anthropologists also criticized this descriptive, classificatory and functionalist approach to understanding the mechanism for social change in rural communities. Wagley's *The Amazon Town*, Harris' *Town and Country in Brazil* and Hutchinson's *Village and Plantation Life in the Northeast Brazil* deviated
from rural versus urban approach and showed how rural society interacts with towns and cities. As said by Cowell (1979:194):

"Harris for example, described his small town in backland Bahia as a stratified society whose members held urban values and practiced bureaucratic, commercial, or artisan occupations. Economically the town depended on sharecroppers in the adjacent rural area, but disdained them as social inferiors. The result of the study suggested that by the mid-twentieth century, urban culture and behavior had spread to low ranking centers throughout the interior of Brazil."

Community studies done by them thus showed that rural societies do interact with towns and cities. They claim that theoretically social and cultural characteristics of rural society, sought by both rural and urban researchers, cannot be separated from urban living. These findings began to challenge the notion of "rural" as a point of departure for research. The validity of the rural-urban continuum, which predominated in North American rural sociology for more than 100 years, was seriously challenged by Pahl (1966:312), an urban sociologist. He found that there are many "continuous" and "discontinuous" phenomena, both within and between rural and urban areas. The complex nature of the relationship between city and country, he said, makes it impossible to consider a single rural-urban continuum in geographic, demographic, or economic terms. Instead of searching for typologies, rural sociology must view rural society in terms of changing social relationships, according to Pahl (1966:302): "Both gemeinschaft and gesellschaft relationships are found in different groups in the same places," says Pahl (1966:311). For instance, the patron-client relationship in Brazil is not characteristically rural—the same pattern continues in the cities (see Hutchinson, 1966). Rural-urban continuum is understood as a process of urbanization, argues Pahl (1966). It has a strong physical or spacial bias; the temporal element has been inadequately stressed,
that is why it concentrates on typology rather than a process. He concluded that the notion of a rural-urban continuum arose in reaction to polar types, but that there are dangers in accepting false continuity.

North American theoretical and methodological influences, such as Smith's and Pierson's, were also criticized by two Brazilian rural sociologists. For Pereira de Queiroz (1978a:51), "rural sociology in the United States is eminently analytical and rarely arrives at the synthesis which should be the final objective of any research." She further wrote that "North American rural sociologists carefully select parts of the real analysis in all its details, but do not relate its position to the whole of which it is part. They also do not examine how the whole reacts to its parts. Furthermore, their analysis lacks historical perspective." For her, the rural sector cannot be studied within itself, but only as a part of the totality of which the city is also part. Conversely, urban sociology must also encourage rural aspects when defining its problem of research, since the city is always vinculated to the country, having a variety of relationships and exerting different functions according to each case specifically.

In an article called, "Dialectics do Rural ao Urbano (From Rural to Urban Dialectic)" Pereira de Queiroz (1978a:263-413) summarized her criticisms, of North American rural sociology in four points:
"(1) There is a conception of dualism, in the philosophical sense of the term...of societies living side by side, interacting, but irreducible to one another. North America even accepts that there is reciprocal influence between rural and urban, but holds they have different essences, which cannot mix. When they mix, rural population is viewed as trying to adapt to urban living.

(2) Rural is viewed as 'backwards' in an evolutionary scale of urbanism considered as a final stage.

(3) Innovations from urban society are seen as beneficial advancements for rural societies.

(4) Increasing penetration of urban life styles contributes to a homogenization in society, helping rural characteristics to disappear. As rural becomes urban, the dualism would no longer exist."

Martins (1981) argued that dualism as a model of analysis was not a naive mistake of early rural sociologists in their view of society. He claimed that the selection of rural society as an object of study is manifested in the ambiguities (not contradictions) which are, in turn, inherent in sociology since its origins. In order to show how these ambiguities exist in sociology, he cited the works of two influential social thinkers: Mannheim's study of conservatism in sociology and Nisbet's (1966) study of sociological tradition. For Mannheim, early sociology, such as Tonnie's, was based on conservative assumptions in reaction to the development of capitalism, modernization, and rationalism.

Rural sociology was, then, conceived as "surviving" (see Smith, 1946) modern modes of thinking and the rationalism in modern capitalism caused ambiguities in sociological reflection. Nisbet analyzed the same phenomena from a different perspective. He defends the view that sociological knowledge originated as a reaction to the secularization of society. The "two revolutions" (French and industrial) created a set of "ideas" and a correspondent "antithesis."
The ideas and antitheses, respectively, were: community-society, authority-power, status-social class, sacred-profane, and alienation-progress. This set of antitheses expressed bourgeoisie and liberal thinking, in reaction to conservative ideas. This confrontation, Nisbet said, caused ambiguities in social analysis; that is, using traditional notions of the pre-capitalistic world to explain capitalistic societies.

Martins hypothesized that such ambiguities in the origins of sociology unfold themselves into dichotomies — in using traditional-modern, rural-urban, pre-capitalist-capitalist. In each dichotomy there is ambiguity about society as a totality. In the interpretation of this totality, the social world appears as ambiguities, not as the constructed types of each dichotomy.

A sociological analysis of rural sociology, separated from its relationships with urban domination, does not find concrete contradictions inherent in the relationships of town versus country. Consequently, rural sociology appears as an instrumental resource to maintain cohesiveness in a society from an urban, industrial and capitalistic standpoint.

Summary and Discussion

In summary, before a sociological framework from the United States was introduced in Brazil, there was already an intellectual tradition of conceptualizing rural living as archaic; "backward" by an urban, progressive and dominant point of view. This dualistic thinking was explicitly, at least by two founding fathers of social sciences in Brazil: Euclides da Cunha (1902) and Gilberto Freyre (1933). Notions of unilinear evolutionary changes, coupled with Darwin's "survival of the fittest" by the dominant white race and culture,
underlied pioneer social investigations. Endorsement of social cohesiveness, consensus and rejection of social integration through conflicts, were also inherent in the development of social through in Brazil.

Rural-urban continuum, rural sociology's major paradigm, predominated especially in the studies of community by North American sociologists, after World War II. Rural sociology in the United States was highly dependent on general sociology for its theory, methods and basic assumptions. Influenced by evolutionary naturalism, its explanations were individualistic, idealistic and voluntaristic. Most early research in the U.S. focused on human survival and strategic patterns of adaptation. The idea of progress and diffusion of technology guided most of the knowledge produced in the field of rural sociology in the United States. The agrarian problem was initially viewed by early rural sociologists as moral decay. Themes for research in rural sociology were influenced by the Protestant Church, state Smith (1957) and Nelson (1969). This tendency was abandoned when rural sociology became linked to the USDA.

Sorokin and Zimmerman (1929) critically proposed a "more scientific" methodology to study rural societies, but there were still doubts about what should be rural sociology's object of study from its formation as a sub-discipline. This textbook was responsible for establishing a methodology of rural research, also trained many rural sociologists both in and out of the United States.

When sociology was institutionalized in Brazil, the elite, in spite of strong nationalistic feelings, sought in scientific sociology from the United States, answers to alleviated tensions and "social problems," in emergent urban and industrial society. U.S. sociologists became very important figures in Brazilian universities. The most important was said to be T. Lynn Smith. Smith's
positivism and empiricism was characteristic of North American sociology of that era. Donald Pierson was important in Brazil, especially during the institutionalization of sociology. For example, Lowrie, the first sociologist to be contracted by the Brazilian government, reported in the second edition of the *American Sociological Review*, that the presence of the United States was "because these founders (of the School of Sociology and Politics in Sao Paulo) had great respect and admiration for the social research done in American educational institutions, they planned to make research an important part of the work of the new school" (Lowrie, 1937:262). Although American sociology was accepted, because Brazilian elite, viewed sociological knowledge as able to correct "social problems," and conformed to theoretical foundations of social thought in Brazil, the intellectual climate was of competition and rivalries between the two leading schools: French and North American. Following the creation of the School of Sociology and Politics in 1933, the School of Philosophy, Science and Letters was founded in 1934 and staffed mostly with social scientists from France.

"Naturally, rivalries sprang up between different national groups, and discord arose in the group that came from the country. Instead of cooperation and working unitedly to aid the Brazilians in setting up an efficient educational institution, they broke up into cliques for championing nationalistic viewpoint or for defending some especial doctrine" (Lowrie, 1937:263).

Lowrie's (1937:264) report was relevant to the extent that these intellectual debates reflect theoretical and epistemological differences present at the time.
"A reason why this conflict of culture patterns (between French and American culture) is of particular interest of sociologists is that the conception of sociology is the center of debate."

The first school was influenced mostly by North American Sociology, through Herbert Lowrie, T. Lynn Smith and Donald Pierson, while the second received French influence through Roger Bastide. (Roger Bastide arrived in Brazil in 1938 to teach at the School of Philosophy, Science and Letters. According to Pereira de Queiroz (1978a:117). He took an 'anti-ethnocentric' approach as a researcher. Bastide belonged to the generation of Marcel Mauss, from whom he adopted the notion of totality, structuralism and the influences and psychological variable in analyzing social reality. He also followed George Gurvitch's notion of dialectics but modified it in Brazil. Bastide wrote extensively on Brazilian Negro, race relations and Afro-religious practices. He reacted against the concept of social integration of early Brazilian writers. For him, "a heterogeneity constitutes in itself its own basis for integration, which should be sought out from the differences. Social, economic and cultural differences should always be searched, ideally, but it is never found, in practice."

Oracy Nogueira, one of Bastide's disciples felt that the ongoing debates, of the two factions was a chance for intellectual enrichment. Most Brazilian students were trained under both influences. The libraries of each university accumulated bibliographical material of each tendency." It was common for different nationalities to go to the other's library for consultation and get acquainted with the tendencies in sociology of another's country. Nogueira (1978:143), for instance, reported that:

"One has only to open North American journals of anthropology to see that society, for them, is part of culture, and not as a part of a dialectic totality. Certain U.S. social scientists accept this view, such Sorokin or even Parsons, who had to propose a new theory of Social Action to establish more objectively the cultural and social relations, which are not seen as part of a totality, but in relation of one domain to the other. This is undoubtedly because the influence of Marxism in North America has been very weak. Consequently, they focus solely on the static and are not sufficiently concerned with dialectical process..."

Lowrie also expresses his notion of science as based on objective research for social knowledge.
The "specific question of whether sociology is a doctrinaire system of thought or an objective study of social relationships. Traditional backgrounds favor the philosophical conception; the American case rests upon the appeal of objective inquiry."

A content analysis of Ferrari's bibliography clearly shows a tendency for community studies and research on social organization themes following an influence of early American sociology, more specifically, Robert Park's concerns for community organization and represented in Brazil through Donald Pierson.26

Most studies in Brazilian rural communities, in the two decades following the Second World War, under North American influence, were said to be highly descriptive, functionalist and failed to establish connections between the expansion of capitalism and problems found in rural communities (Ianni, 1971). Medina (1966) stated that because of North American influences, "global theories" of society and historical explanations were considered outdated. The tendency to duplicate studies of U.S. communities prevailed. Between 1950 and 1960, Brazilian sociology was characterized by the intensification of studies with practical aims, by the tendency to view sociological research as a response to administrative problems and this is the only case where it employs quantitative methods. Two other rural sociologists reacted to the selection of rural sociology's object of study and its ideological implications. Pereira de Queiroz (1978) criticizes North American atomism; that is selecting part of a whole, analyzing separately without establishing relationships between the whole and its parts. Rural sociology is analyzed to adapt to urban and industrial ways of living. Innovations from the city are viewed as beneficial and contribute for a homogenization of society, thus eliminating discontinuities between urban and rural societies. Martins (1981) analyzes the genesis of dualism in rural sociology. He concludes that conservative assumptions of early sociologists
influenced their reactions to the notion of rationalism and expansion of capitalism. These confrontations, between emerging expressions of the bourgeoisie, such as society, power, social class, profane and progress, in contrast to pre-capitalistic notions of authority, status, sanctity and alienation, respectively caused ambiguities in the analysis of society. According to Martins, these ambiguities generated contrasting dichotomies, as a way to get rid of the ambiguities, inherent in the society, as a whole.

Thus, rural sociology appears as a tool for the urban sector to maintain cohesiveness in society as a whole. It has been instrumental in consolidating urban and industrial domination. Analyses of rural societies are necessary resources for the diffusion of ideas and technologies from urban centers.
FOOTNOTES FROM CHAPTER 4


7. For instance Machado de Assis, the nineteenth-century novelist and Brazil's greatest novelist.


15. Among the Brazilians who studied under T. Lynn Smith there are: J. V. Freitas Marcondes, Lucilia Herman, Olavo Baptista Filho, Carlos Borges Schmidt, Hilgard O'Reilly Stenberg (a geographer), Jose Arthur Rios, Joao Goncalves de Souza, Manuel Diegues Jr., Emilio Willems, Hiroshito Saito, Sugiyana Yutaka, John V. D. Saunders, Fernando Oliveira, Fabio Barbosa da Silva (and this author). (See Smith, n/d:17).


19. Some of these studies are: Emilio Willem's *Tradicao e Transicao em uma Cultura Rural de Brasil*, (Sao Paulo: Secretaria da Agricultura do Estado 1947) and Donald Pierson, *Cruz das Almas, a Brazilian Village*, Institute of Social Anthropology, Publication No. 12 (Washington, DC, Smithsonian Institute, 1948). See also Pierson's publications in Ferrari, (1958:170-3) and Ianni, (1971:69-70, footnote 2).


26. See Hinkle and Hinkle (1954:33-37) for Park's background, his sociology (espistemological and methodology), concept of social change (ontology), and concerns for social reform.
CONCLUSION

As demonstrated in previous chapters, sociology as an academic discipline was institutionalized in Brazil during a period of socio-political turmoil and in a specific intellectual context. After the revolution of 1930, Brazilian society underwent deep-seated changes at all levels. In 1933-34, the creation of the schools of sociology, politics, philosophy, and science and letters in Sao Paulo had the explicit objectives of training an intellectual elite to seek peaceful solutions to Brazilian "social problems." Sociology and social sciences were used by the bureaucratic and authoritarian Brazilian State as a tool for controlling and maintaining a new social order in the interest of the Brazilian national bourgeoisie. The new academic disciplines were influenced both by European and North American social science. "American sociology" was the most easily accepted partially because of Brazilian society's long adoption of positivism in both theory and in practice. As was shown earlier, the notions of progress through social order and unilinear evolution coupled with natural selection were present in the early studies of Brazilian society by Brazilians. After the Great Depression and World War II, U.S. sociologists were interested in establishing a more scientific and applied sociology, and this approach coincided with the aspirations of the leaders of the 1930 bourgeois revolution,
who sought to apply sociology and positivism to their problems in producing peaceful answers.

Although Brazil flirted with German fascism and segments of the military as well as portions of the urban working classes embraced socialism, the cultural and ideological campaigns of the United States were powerful in establishing its hegemony. This was mainly accomplished through President Roosevelt's "Good Neighbor" policy and Rockefeller's "Inter-American Affairs." American sociology, said to be scientific and ethically neutral, had little difficulty in gaining acceptance by Brazilian intellectuals, who were allying with the new industrial bourgeoisie against the old rural oligarchy and the latter's view of the world. Sociology and scientific research came to replace the monopoly enjoyed by the lawyers and engineers in the study and analysis of Brazilian society. Ironically, these latter professions were greatly influenced by Comte's Positivism — which was also the philosophical underpinning of the scientific sociology, and this was reinforced by U.S. sociologists working in Brazil.

Brazilian rural sociology can be traced from roots in the early historiographic and ethnographic studies of society by Brazilians. These studies were primarily motivated by the exotic and unique makeup of Brazilian culture and were intended to promote social consensus and/or national integration of different races (Negro, White and Indian) as well as rural and urban populations for social progress. Theoretical explanations for disparities between racial groups and their physical locations provided the origin for a dualistic perspective. The rural-urban continuum, with a long intellectual tradition in the formation of U.S. rural sociology, was the main theoretical paradigm used
for the study of Brazilian society. As a subdiscipline of sociology, early rural sociology was heavily influenced by natural evolution, social psychology and reformism. Research in Brazil under North American influences primarily focused on studies of communities and institutions. From the mid-1930's until the early 1960's, dualism in the form of the rural-urban continuum was employed as a conceptual framework, especially in the studies under the direction of Donald Pierson, T. Lynn Smith and John Kolb. T. Lynn Smith, however, was by far the most prominent U.S. sociologist in Brazil.

Recently new generations of Brazilian social scientists trained at home and abroad have questioned and criticized the rural-urban continuum and alternative theories. Today, works of Brazilian sociology and rural sociology draw primarily upon European and structural Marxist approaches. However, in Brazilian universities where professors from U.S. land-grant institutions have taught and conducted research, the influence of American sociology still prevails. In sum, there is a direct link between various important socio-historical events and relationships between Brazil and the United States and the genesis of sociology, rural sociology and social sciences, in general, in Brazil.

Present critiques of the theoretical orientation of rural sociology in Europe and in the United States can profit from an analysis of the socio-historical and intellectual factors which led to the formation of Brazilian sociology. An American-molded discipline was exported to Brazil and other Third World countries as part of an ideological package of technological modernization and expansion of capitalism. Such claims, however, have often been made by critics, mostly from developing countries, and these are viewed by some as radical and consequently unwelcome or impolite academic behaviors.
This study has frequently suggested that sociology, as a discipline for study of society, and especially rural sociology's linkages with the U.S. governmental programs, have been implicitly if not explicitly historically and politically committed to a conservative ideology that favors maintaining the status quo. The analysis of early sociology and rural sociology in Brazil substantiates this thesis.

This analysis has raised several questions about sociology's object of study, its status as a science, and its ability to be both politically conservative and ideologically committed. Such questions are broad in scope, but some general comments can be made in order to enlighten the subject and, perhaps, stimulate research. These questions will be discussed within the following categories: (1) sociology and historical materialism and their historical determinants as an alternative to the rural-urban continuum and a search for a community of values, (2) positivism versus dialectical approaches to the study of society, and (3) the importance of the "point of departure" in the grasp of sociology's object of study. This discussion does not pretend to fully discuss, in all its details, the complexities of these important issues. My intentions, however, are merely to develop a frame of reference for understanding the subject matter in question — sociology and the study of society.
DISCUSSION

In Search of a Community of Values and Norms

Therborn (1980:115 ff) views sociology "not as social thought or a social science in general, but as a specific discipline developed as a post-revolutionary body of thought," conservative in its roots (see Nisbet, 1966) and propounded to study "social problems" that result from major structural changes in society. Sociology did not emerge as a critique of political economy or other theories of the market, but as a distinct body of knowledge with a specific object of study. Therborn also explains that when the term sociology was first coined in 1838 by August Comte, the French Revolution had already defied the authoritarian and paternalistic power structure between kings, churches and people. Social unrest, class conflicts, and an upsurge of revolutionary fervor predominated in the cities. Government and maintenance of social order were unstable. A new industrial and emergent class, the bourgeois, was pressing its will against a failing but still rigid superstructure (the ancien regime) to gain political legitimacy. Saint-Simon and Comte projected for this new discipline "an attempt to deal with the social, moral and cultural problems of the capitalist economic order, under the shadow of a militant working class movement and a more or less immediate threat of revolutionary socialism."

Sociology emerged, not as a by-product of those seeking a radical transformation of the whole society, but as a post-fact. Therborn (1980:118) further says that "...the post-revolutionary timing of the emergence of sociology is rather striking." In France, it rose after the Bourgeois Revolution; in England, with Spencer, it appeared "not only after the revolution of 1688 but after the parliamentary reform of 1823 and the repeal of the Corn Laws as well."
"American, German, and Italian sociology all wholly post-date the decisive events of the respective bourgeois revolutions of their countries." As we have seen this was also true in Brazil.

When sociology emerged in Europe, social sciences were already in practice. The rise of the study of economics, for instance, is directly related to the rise of a new type of economy: buying and selling of commodities. What was written during the 16th and 17th centuries in the area of economics were discourses on trade, or the commercialization of commodities in the market. Colonial expansion and trading by the East India Company, and the plundering of gold and silver from South America, led to the rise of political economy in the 18th century. "Political (sic) economy emerged as a term to denote the management of a state in contrast to the running of a family household," says Therborn (1980: 83). Quesnay, Smith and Ricardo — the founders of political economy — struggled to abolish the feudal system of taxes based on the economy of the royal household administration. Their discourse on taxation was to determine the forces acting in a new market under the control of the bourgeois state. Their contributions were not in any way to question or to hinder the development of capitalism, but to favor it. In fact, the founders of political economics had personal interests at stake. Therborn (1980:89-90) gives a list of those who combined business activities with theoretical interests:
"William Petty, whom Marx regarded as the first classical economist, made himself one of the country's biggest landlords in the course of his land survey in Ireland. The philosopher John Locke was secretary to the Council on Trade and Plantation and an investor in the silk and slave trade. David Ricardo made himself an enormous fortune as a stockbroker and contractor of loans during the Napoleonic Wars. He was also a member of Parliament, as an Independent, though tending to the Whigs. Before he was invited to a chair of economics, the Marquis Bifredo Pareto was for about twenty years general manager of an Italian railway company and an unsuccessful liberal politician. Von Boehn-Bawerk, the distinguished Austrian marginal economist and Marxist critic, was three times Minister of Finance of the Austro-Hungarian empire. His brother-in-law, the equally distinguished Baron Von Wieser, became Minister of Commerce in the last year of World War I and of the Empire. For a short time in 1919, in the chaotic days of the new Austrian republic, Schumpeter was an unsuccessful Minister of Finance; subsequently, before he wholly went into academic life in the middle twenties, he was also president of a small Austrian bank. John Maynard Keynes too was offered a bank directorship twice, but preferred to make his fortune as a jobber in currency, primary commodities, and securities. He was an active member of the Liberal Party and played an important part in many government economic commissions and delegations."

Indeed, theory and knowledge of the forces acting in the market were put into practice, and their interests were not in defense of class struggle. Thus sociology emerged, not as a critique of political economy or a discourse on the market, but as a discipline with its own object of study. Its first preoccupations were with the problems of politics and political reconstruction, and, in particular, with the "social question." Immediate concerns were to gather information on the conditions of the lower class — poverty, unemployment, housing, health, delinquency, leisure and morality. In the United States, particularly, there were philanthropic motivations and worries about the magnitude of "social problems."

Hinkle and Hinkle (1954) present four specific evidences for early U.S. sociologists' concern for emerging social problems (1905-1918) as a result of rapid industrialization, urbanization, and social reform. First, the vast majority
of eminent sociologists before 1920 came from rural and religious backgrounds. They were almost without exception fundamentally concerned with ethical issues (Hinkle and Hinkle, 1954:3). Second, sociology courses were accepted more readily in the Midwest, a sort of "frontier" where social change was strongly felt and where reformist arguments were frequently voiced and widely approved (Hinkle and Hinkle, 1954:3). Third, because other disciplines such as economics, psychology, philosophy, or history did not deal with the "betterment of urban social conditions," sociology appealed to groups in favor of social reconstruction, such as the Protestant clergy, municipal reformers, philanthropists, charities, etc. (Oberschall, 1972). These movements had the backing of "respectable, old American, Protestant, middle-and-upper class groups having influences with the universities, boards of trustees and the heads of foundations" (Oberschall, 1972:188). In fact, U.S. sociology was institutionalized before it possessed a distinctive intellectual content, a distinctive method, or even a point of view. Sociology was said to be "more a 'movement' than an intellectual discipline" (Oberschall, 1972:189). Fourth, early U.S. sociology was expressly interested in "conditions or issues associated with urban poor: pauperism, charity, scientific philanthropy, private and public relief, unemployment, migratory labor, child labor, women wage-earners, the labor movements, dependent children, insanity, illness, crime, juvenile delinquency, family instability, temperance, immigration and race relations" (Hinkle and Hinkle, 1954:4).

As a discipline, U.S. sociology was affected by the historical upheavals of the 1930's, a period of mass unemployment, and of hunger marches, of ferocious resistance to trade-unions by employers. It was in these turbulent
years that Talcott Parsons formulated his sociology of value-integration (Therborn, 1980: 422). Most striking, perhaps, is the fact that the U.S. sociological experience of the 1930's led to the virtual disappearance of the concept of class struggle from sociological language, and that the concept of class was submerged under "stratification" and evaluational ranking. From the outset, sociology's project was directed toward social and political reconstruction based on the adjustment and/or adaptation of unsocialized individuals to a benevolent state, after it achieved a rank of "civilization," expressed in industry, science, and system of government (Therborn, 1980:416).

Sociological research, especially on the social conditions of impoverished workers, was essentially an attempt to discover "the ideological community, i.e. community of values and norms, in human aggregate of various types and sizes" (Therborn, 1980:224).

Gracierana (1978) confirms this ideological content in the rise of sociology throughout Latin America and discusses the interrelations of crises, social upheavals, national aspirations of Latin American elites and the directions sociology has taken. In times of crisis, social unrest, and conflict between social classes, when a breakdown occurs in the ongoing structural organization of society, sociology has been called to study the connections of the broken process in the hopes of saving the whole (or national unity) from complete chaos. All disciplines of social science seek to integrate research findings in attempts to understand totality, but the contrary happens during progress. Intellectuals are not called nor asked to question or "change the 'logic of history' or planners to interfere in the delicate balances achieved by the 'invisible hand' in the dynamics of the market" (Gracierana, 1978:45). This is
the period for optimism, of what Graciarana calls "the utopia of peaceful progress towards a fairer society, through consensus and rational methods."

Knowledge, under these circumstances of strong nationalism, is viewed in terms of dichotomies, extracted from a differentiated whole and analysis of these realities are attempts to eliminate obstacles and resistances, which hinders growth and progress. Social science becomes specialized knowledge under:

"...authoritarian technocratic order...because it is based on a division of scientific labor, stemming from the idea that general truth neither attained nor perhaps even desirable...Hence technocratic power is intellectually repressive, because it needs an 'official' knowledge, an 'official' science to legitimize its policies" (Graciarana, 1978:47).

After World War II, he argues (1978:43), Latin American elites welcomed this package of progress, or developmentism, from the United States.

"...It was confidently believed that by planning the changes and growth of the economy and society and harmonizing possibilities and needs, economic crises and internal and external structural imbalances could be overcome, making it possible to realize at long last the idea of a society governed by omniscient, benevolent sages, who, with the help of scientific knowledge and technical resources, would be able to create a veritable golden age."

There is, therefore, a close connection between social historical context, class struggle, and the emergence of sociology to study society. Its emergence has not been within the intellectual context of those wishing revolutionary changes. Its search for an "ideological community," as object of study encountered at the turn of the century a fertile field in the United States. This same pursuit was later transported to Latin America, particularly after the Second World War, when optimism and nationalism were strong ideologies. A critique of sociology's object of study and ideological commitments is best understood when contrasted with historical materialism.
Historical materialism as sociology, according to Therborn (1980: 317), developed as a reaction to the social revolution in France and the expansion of industrial capitalism in England. It emerged in the mid-1840's, reached maturity with Karl Marx's Capital in 1867, much earlier than sociology, whose classical achievements were above all the work of Durkheim and Weber. Whereas sociology, economics and (as Marx terms it "vulgar") political economics, were in favor and helped to develop the expansion of capitalism in Western Europe, "historical materialism developed as a scientific pursuit in frontal opposition to this capitalist world" (Therborn, 1980:317). Although the formation of historical materialism deserves a much more profound analytical treatment, our purpose here is to contrast historical materialism's approach to the study of society to sociology's approach. This comparison is intended to distinguish between positivism-empiricism and dialectical materialism as methods for the scientific study of society.

Most sociologists agree that there has existed a deep schism within sociology since its foundation. On one hand there is a positivistic-empiricist and conservative approach, and on the other a historical dialectical-materialistic and revolutionary approach. These two distinct positions differ, we will argue, because of: (1) divergent conceptualizations of science, positivism and realism; (2) the specific nature of science itself, in the process of production of scientific activity; (3) the specificity of social sciences, as opposed to natural sciences; and (4) different epistemological assumptions for social action. These basic differences between the two main approaches have a direct effect in determining the "point of departure" for social analysis. Which sociological
approach grasps more comprehensively the object of study is the question that concerns the social analysis.

According to Keat and Urry (1975), the positivistic view of science is an attempt to gain predictable and explanatory knowledge of the external world. Scientific categories are constructed from highly abstract and general statements or laws that express regularities found in the world. Knowledge about these regularities cannot be found a priori; they must be objectively tested by means of experimentation and observation, which in turn are the only source of empirical knowledge. Thus, for the positivists, Keat and Urry (1975:5) write:

"It is not the purpose of science to get 'behind' or 'beyond' the phenomena revealed to us by sensory experience, to give us knowledge of unobserved natures, essences or mechanism that somehow necessitate these phenomena...Any attempts to go beyond these representations plunges science into the unverifiable claims of metaphysics and religion, which are at best unscientific, and at worst meaningless."

The realist view shares its conception of science with the positivist. Realism also views knowledge as rational and objective with the purpose of gaining explanatory and predictive knowledge of nature. What the realist disagrees with is the equal importance that positivists give to explanations and prediction as purposes of science. Explanations should be pursued as the primary goal of science, argues the realist, who disagrees with the positivist's use of scientific knowledge for prediction and control. For the realist to explain is not simply to show well established regularities — "...instead, we must discover the necessary connections between phenomena, by acquiring knowledge of the underlying structures and mechanism at work" (Keat and Urry, 1975:17).
The differences between positivistic and realistic approaches are more fully understood when we see the relationship between "production" and scientific enterprises. Cornforth (1978:98) argues that "while science has its roots in production, and is applied in production, at the same time it is developed as a specialized activity distinct from (it)." He argues that science, as a systematic body of knowledge, always arises from some need. Throughout human history, man has stored ideas and acquired consciousness from the objects with which he comes into contact. The materials he uses, and the techniques he employs. In the process, man makes discoveries about the properties of those objects and materials and about what can be done with them. Thus the first source of people's discoveries is the practice of social production, an activity that is not divorced from theory or the mental conceptualization of experience.

To illustrate further the historical relationship between theory and practice, Cornforth (1978) distinguishes between knowledge possessed by primitive people, extensive and accurate as it is, and their relation with nature and knowledge. Throughout history, scientific knowledge was only raised to the level of science when it became the subject of special investigation, distinct from actual production. According to Cornforth, science has three outstanding characteristics that distinguish scientific knowledge from any others. (1) Science engages in systematic description and classification of natural objects and processes; (2) on the basis of such description and classification, science, by abstraction, formulates principles and laws about the properties and motions of natural objects; and (3) with such concepts, science formulates hypotheses to explain and predict interconnections and motions of things under
study, in order to provide a systematic theory of the phenomena. Because of these requirements, scientific discoveries have historically acquired momentum of independent and practical application. Thus, from the outset, science as theory of production is distinct from the practice of production, both in its organization and in the personal activity and consciousness of its practitioners, he concluded.

With further development of division of labor, science developed as a special field of mental labor, distinct from physical labor:

"...From the division of labor arose private property and exploiting classes, and so the division between the masses of producers, wholly engaged in productive toil, and the privilege and leisure minority who took over the general management and direction of society. The development of sciences, as a branch of mental labor, was dependent upon the existence of such a minority, freed from the physical labor of production and able to undertake such mental labor" (Cornforth, 1975:99).

Scientific advancement has historically depended upon class interests. If it was not beneficial, the ruling class would limit its growth. In slave societies, for instance, the ruling class boycotted developments in agriculture and industry. When bourgeoisie society arose, manufacturers and industries developed created a great demand for scientific work. Thus a social class that managed and controlled the State, religion and other social institutions also took charge of science and exercised influence over its development. A social class in control may promote the development of science according to its own interests, or also keep others ignorant. Upon the emergence of the European working class, and threats of socialism, the bourgeois class controlled the investigation of social phenomena and ignored the interrelationships between the economy, politics, ideology, and history. This has given social sciences a character profoundly different from natural science. Cornforth delineates four main
features of social sciences that distinguish them from natural sciences, which the former have sought to emulate.

(1) Social investigation has more obstacles than the study of natural phenomena. When critically analyzed, certain findings about society may run against class interests. "It will not recognize facts which would expose the real nature of its own system of exploitation, and laws which would make clear the inevitable downfall of that system" (Cornforth, 1975:105).

(2) The same historical process by which a dominant class has helped natural sciences to realize man's mastery over nature withholds from them the possibility of developing a social science which helps to realize man's mastery over his own social organization.

(3) While the dominant class has contributed to inquiries into the underlying causes of natural phenomena, social phenomena have been studied only on the surface. Research in the spheres of production relations or property and class relations has been discouraged.

(4) Class ideology influences sciences in general but has not hindered natural sciences from investigating essential interconnections of a phenomena under study. In social sciences, class ideology has prevented social scientists from developing a general theory of society. Social phenomena are studied by several parent disciplines because social sciences, in the hands of representatives of the controlling class, have interests in an atomistic conception of social reality. This specificity of sociology and other social sciences,
imposed by control of the ruling class, has accounted for its inability to grasp the study of society in toto.

Epistemological differences that explain the distinctions between positivism-empiricism and dialectical materialism (in their approaches to sociology) are better appreciated when their respective positions are related to "action research." Oquist (1978:145) makes such comparisons and defines action research as "the production of knowledge to guide practice, with the modifications of a given reality occurring as part of the research process itself." For the empiricist, action research can be anything but "scientific research," because empiricists are epistemologically committed to separating theory (the subject) and practice (the object of analysis) in the process of producing knowledge. "Science should be value free and based upon the criteria of direct and neutral observation of reality, it can (author's italics) be value free" (Oquist, 1978:146).

Contrary to empiricism, dialectical materialism "considers that action research not only accepts, but that it is the scientific method for producing knowledge capable of justification." In fact, to be scientific, this method must be "linked to a concrete social context" (Oquist, 1978:159). In order to understand the production and justification of knowledge in dialectical materialism, a brief comment on Marx's view of man is necessary.

Marx views man socio-historically, not as an abstract category, but as a concrete active being, master of his own actions. The role of man in the production of knowledge, like all other problems, must be related to specific historical and social contexts. As a method, dialectical materialism operates
within a theoretical framework to guide social analysis. That framework is historical materialism.

To ensure human survival, man must produce his subsistence and, in the process, he enters into definite relations with nature (productive forces) and with other men (social productive relations). Man molds nature and in the process of production he is also molded by both natural and social environments. This material relation, gathered through man's senses with his consciousness (the ideal), is dialectically determined. Human praxis, therefore, is the dialectical union of sense-based practice and of human intelligence engaged in creative, selective and critical social activity. Knowledge is produced in dialectical materialism.

How knowledge is changed can be explained by the following ontological presuppositions: All phenomena are constantly changing. Change may be quantitative and qualitative. Knowledge is an understanding of such changes. Change does not occur randomly. The transformation process is structured and varies according to external conditioning elements. In dialectical materialism the key concept to understand the transformation process is the notion of contradiction, the unity of opposites. That is, one cannot think of the concept of change without making reference to stability and vice-versa. Both form the same basic conceptual category despite the fact that they are opposites. When viewed as contradictions, these concepts are studied with regard to dialectical interrelations within the unity of opposites rather than as independent, unrelated variables. The production of knowledge, from dialectical materialistic's point of view, is neither static nor subjective:
explanations are based in the dynamics of the relations between concrete social groups in determinate socio-historical contexts.

The production of knowledge under dialectic materialism is geared toward a solution of the problems of specific social groups at determinate historical conjunctures. It is also a continual process, sensitive to changing factors: "Inasmuch as reality is dynamic, knowledge must also be dynamic" (Oquist, 1978:158). Theory and practice are dialectically related. Theory guides practice and practice, in turn, must guide theory. Action without thought is meaningless.

The question of sociology and rural sociology's object of study is a very important one and the debate regarding the most appropriate epistemological and methodological approaches to sociological inquiry and analysis should be these disciplines' major challenge. The present study tries to provide evidence to support the notion that sociology has historically misconstrued its object of study because of influential outside factors, and that no intellectual or material production unfolds in a vacuum.
APPENDIX A

IMPORTANT EVENTS AND THE PRESENCE OF U.S. AND EUROPEAN SOCIOLOGISTS IN BRAZIL

1838
August Comte coined the word sociology.

1868-78
Positivism comes to Brazil as part of a "wave of new ideas."

1873
Silvio Romero begins studies of Brazilian ethnic groups.

1881
The first Positivist Church is founded in Brazil.

1888
Brazilian Empire falls.

1889
Slavery is abolished and First Republic is declared and lasts until 1930.

1902
Euclides da Cunha publishes Os Sertões (Rebellion in the Backlands).

1917
 Strikes by Sao Paulo's working class, almost paralyzing the city.

1920
Oliveira Vianna publishes Populaires Meridionais do Brasil, in search of national integration.

1922
Foundation of Brazilian Communist Party (PCB).

1922
Rebellion within the military (the tenentes or lieutenants' movement in Rio de Janeiro).

1922
Week of Modern Art in Sao Paulo (the modernismo movement).

1925-27
The Coluna Prestes, written by Luis Carlos Prestes, a tenente and leader of the PCB.

1928
Mario de Andrade publishes Macunaima in Sao Paulo and other Brazilian writers' social novels influence rural sociology.

1930
President Washington Luis (1926-1930) fell. Vargas rises to power, supported by the tenentes.

1932
Counterrevolutionary reaction in Sao Paulo, against Vargas' unconstitutional government.
1933 The School of Sociology and Politics is created in Sao Paulo through a manifest signed by intellectuals (mainly influenced by U.S. sociology).


1933-1946 President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy.

1934 A Commission on Cuban Affairs, appointed by the Foreign Policy Association, and led by Carle C. Zimmerman (Harvard University), Leland Hamilton Jenks (Wellesley College), Helen Hall (Henry Street Settlement, New York) and M.L. Wilson (Division of Subsistence Homesteads of the U.S. Department of the Interior, later director of the United States Agricultural Extension Service. (Smith, 1954:235).

1934 Faculty of Philosophy, Sciences and Letters is founded also in Sao Paulo (mainly influenced by European sociology).

1935 Carle C. Zimmerman and T. Lynn Smith (Louisiana University) went to Mexico for brief reconnaissance survey of rural Mexico.

1935 Gilberto Freyre, first to teach courses in rural sociology in Recife then later in Rio de Janeiro.

1935 Robert Park (University of Chicago) after visiting Brazil and the West Indies, advised Donald Pierson, his student, to study race relations of Bahia, in Brazil.

1935 Donald Pierson went to Brazil to do research.

1935 Luis Carlos Prestes attempts to gain power in Brazilian government.

1936 Samuel H. Lowrie (University of Columbia) went to the School of Sociology and Politics as faculty, "the first U.S. sociologists to fill such a role in Latin America" (see Smith, 1953:236).

1936 Convention for Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations.

1937 John B. Griffing begins to teach rural sociology (University of Vicosa, Minas Gerais) in Brazil helped by a Brazilian sociologist. Vascocellos de Barros, who later in 1939 takes up Griffing's teaching responsibilities.

1937 President Vargas establishes the *Estado Novo* or the New State, a bureaucratic and dictatorial state.
The U.S. Department of State creates the Division of Cultural Relations and the Inter-Department of Committee on Cooperation with the Latin American Republics.

Horace B. Davies (University of Columbia) is also contracted as faculty of the School of Sociology and Politics in Sao Paulo. Davies specialized in labor problems and he studied the standard of living of Sao Paulo's urban workers.

Roger Bastide, a French sociologist went to the Faculty of Philosophy, Science and Letters in Sao Paulo as faculty. Bastide belongs to the generation of Marcel Mauss.

Bruno Rudolfer, professor of statistics from Germany, becomes faculty at the School of Sociology and Politics in Sao Paulo. He organized the first index of cost of living of Sao Paulo's working class. This index was accepted later to settle conflicts between workers and employers in the struggle for the minimum wage.

Donald Pierson returns to Brazil, this time as faculty of the School of Sociology and Politics in Sao Paulo. Mainly responsible for theoretical and methodological research of community studies.

T. Lynn Smith spent four months visiting Latin American countries, observing patterns of race relations and studying the problems of exchanging professors and students between universities in the United States and Latin America.

The Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs is created with Nelson Rockefeller as head.

T. Lynn Smith brings Arthur Ramos, a Brazilian anthropologist to teach courses on Brazilian Negro and culture at the Louisiana University.

The U.S. Department of State assisted by the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), sent three U.S. rural sociologists to the three largest Latin American countries: T. Lynn Smith went to Brazil, Carl C. Taylor went to Argentina and Nathan L. Whetten to Mexico.

The Joint Committee on Latin American studies of the American Council of Learned Societies.

Herbert Baldus, a German anthropologist went as faculty to the School of Sociology and Politics in Sao Paulo. Willems was the first to do a systematic community study in Brazil.
(1947) applying the approach of the folk-urban continuum (from Robert Redfield community study in Mexico).

A.R. Radcliffe Brown (from University of Oxford), Claude Levy-Strauss (France), George Gurvitch ( ).

Pierre Monberg, a human geographer from France studied man-land relationships.

Charles Wagley, anthropologist from the University of Columbia went to Brazil to do research on the Indians and communities in the Amazon. He wrote *The Amazon Town* (1947).

Kalervo Oberg (University of Chicago) went to the School of Sociology and Politics in Sao Paulo as faculty.

T. Lynn Smith publishes *Brazil: People and Institutions*.

John H. Kolb (University of Wisconsin) went to teach at the Rural University near Rio de Janeiro and did community research in nearby areas. He also went to the University Federal of Rio Grande do Sul and initiated an exchange program between the University of Wisconsin and Brazilian universities in the area of rural sociology and agricultural economics.

Lowrey Nelson was sent by U.S. State Department and USDA to Brazil, in a program of technical assistance known as the Mission Four.

John H. Kolb returned to Brazil to continue development in the field.

The Institute of Rural Studies is founded, in conjunction with the University of Sao Paulo.

Archie O. Haller went to the same university and repeated Kolb's studies. Others, such as Glen Pulver, Ruben Buse, Frederick Fliegel, Thomas Lucien Blair, Bert Ellenbogen, Don Johnson, James Converse and David Hansen, helped to develop and strengthen faculty exchange and research between U.S. land-grant institutions and Brazilian graduate programs in rural sociology.
APPENDIX B

Graduate Schools of Sociology and Rural Sociology in Brazil by Regions, State, Major Areas of Studies and Degrees Offered, 1984

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/State (Location)</th>
<th>Major Area of Studies</th>
<th>Degree Offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTHEAST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Univ. of Ceara</td>
<td>Sociology (Development)</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fortaleza)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Univ. of Paraiba</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Joao Pessoa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Univ. of Paraiba</td>
<td>Rural Sociology</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Campina Grande)</td>
<td>(Agricultural Economics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Univ. of Pernambuco</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Recife)</td>
<td>(Sociology of Law)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Univ. of Bahia</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Salvador)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CENTRAL WEST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Univ. of Brasilia</td>
<td>Sociology (Rural &amp; Urban)</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Capital)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Univ. of Vicosa</td>
<td>Rural Sociology</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Minas Gerais)</td>
<td>(Agricultural Economics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATLANTIC COASTAL ZONES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Institute of</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>M.A. &amp; Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio de Janeiro (IUPERJ, Rio)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Univ. of Rio de Janeiro</td>
<td>Rural Sociology</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(KILOMETER 47, Rio)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sao Paulo Catholic University</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sao Paulo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sao Paulo</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>M.A. &amp; Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sao Paulo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University &quot;Julio Mesquita Filho&quot;</td>
<td>Sociology (Rural &amp; Urban)</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Araraquara, Sao Paulo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist University of Piracicaba</td>
<td>Social Sciences (and History)</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Piracicaba, Sao Paulo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Agriculture</td>
<td>Rural Sociology (Agricultural Economics)</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ESALQ, Sao Paulo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOUTH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Univ. of Santa Catarina</th>
<th>Sociology (Industrial)</th>
<th>M.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Florianopolis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Univ. of Rio Grande do Sul</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Porto Alegre)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Political</td>
<td>Sociology (Agricultural Economics)</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IEPE, R.G.S., Porto Alegre)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled and adapted from CEDAU-Centro de Pesquisa e Informacao de Assuntos Educacionais, Rio de Janeiro, August, 1982 and (Hansen, et al., 1979)

注: Rural Sociology is institutionally linked to Agricultural Economics.
Fig. A Regions, States, and selected cities of Brazil
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